



PLANNING FOR GROWTH



**Housing and Economic Land Availability
Assessment 2019
(HELAA)**



Table of Contents

1.0 Executive Summary..... 6

 Development Context..... 8

 Policy Context 8

 National Planning Policy Framework 8

 Planning Practice Guidance 9

 Core Strategy..... 10

 Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan (AAP) 10

 Site Allocations and Development Management (SADM) Policies Plan 10

2.0 Methodology..... 12

 Introduction 12

 Stage 1: site/broad location identification 13

 Geographical area covered 13

 Other parties involved 13

 Size of site and broad locations 13

 Types of site 13

 Call for Sites 14

 Site and broad location survey (a) 14

 Stage 2: Site/broad location assessment..... 15

 Site and broad location survey (b) 15

 Assessment 16

 Assessing Suitability 16

 Assessing Availability 17

 Assessing Achievability 17

 Constraints 17

 Timescale – Deliverable/Developable..... 17

 Estimating development potential 18

 Lead-in times and build out rates 19

 Sources of Sites and Information 20

 Lapse Rate..... 21

 Windfall 22

3.0 Maximising the potential of brownfield land 23

 Achieving appropriate densities 23

 Maximising the potential of sustainable locations 24

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Updating the HELAA methodology for estimating the potential site capacity | 24 |
| Empty and second homes | 26 |
| Empty homes | 26 |
| Second homes | 27 |
| Conclusions | 28 |
| Reviewing the achievability and deliverability of Hertsmere’s owned assets | 28 |
| 4.0 Assessment of Supply - Housing | 31 |
| Overview | 31 |
| Developments with Planning Permission | 32 |
| Identified Sites within existing policy context | 32 |
| Alternative policy context | 35 |
| 5.0 Assessment of Supply - Economic Land | 37 |
| Economic Land: Class B Uses | 37 |
| Potential sites for economic development | 40 |
| Economic Land: Class A Uses | 42 |
| 6.0 APPENDICES | 43 |
| APPENDIX 1: NEW ASSESSMENT SHEET PRO FORMA | 44 |
| APPENDIX 2: SITES FROM PREVIOUS HELAA WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN REASSESSED | 48 |
| APPENDIX 3: SITES FROM PREVIOUS HELAA WHICH HAVE BEEN CARRIED FORWARD | 52 |
| APPENDIX 4: METHODOLOGY CONSULTATION LETTER AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT HELAA METHODOLOGY CONSULTATION | 54 |
| APPENDIX 5: ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED ON HELAA/INVITED TO SUBMIT SITES TO THE CALL FOR SITES | 59 |
| APPENDIX 6: CALL FOR SITES LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE | 64 |
| APPENDIX 7: CONVERSION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS FOOTPRINTS ON GREEN BELT SITES INTO DWELLING YIELD | 71 |
| APPENDIX 8: TABLE OF RESPONSES TO HELAA AND/OR HELAA-RELEVANT RESPONSES TO POTENTIAL SITES FOR HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT (PSHE) REPORT | 73 |
| APPENDIX 9: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - BOREHAMWOOD AND ELSTREE | 93 |
| APPENDIX 10: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - BUSHEY | 202 |
| APPENDIX 11: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - ELSTREE VILLAGE | 280 |
| APPENDIX 12: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - POTTERS BAR | 304 |
| APPENDIX 13: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - RADLETT AND NEARBY VILLAGES | 364 |
| APPENDIX 14: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - SHENLEY | 439 |
| APPENDIX 15: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - SOUTH MIMMS | 479 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX 16: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - OTHER LOCATIONS | 517 |
| APPENDIX 17: EXTANT PLANNING PERMISSIONS AS AT 1 ST APRIL 2019 | 534 |
| APPENDIX 18: SITES UNDER CONSTRUCTION AS AT 1 ST APRIL 2019 | 559 |

Table of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| TABLE 1: 15 year land supply (as at 01/04/19) | 7 |
| TABLE 2: Typical build out rates by 5 year periods | 20 |
| TABLE 3: HELAA build out rates | 20 |
| TABLE 4: Lapse Rate 2006 – 2016 | 21 |
| TABLE 5: Windfall completions 2014/15 to 2018/19 | 22 |
| TABLE 6: Densities of current permissions and target densities | 25 |
| TABLE 7: Density multipliers | 25 |
| TABLE 8: Empty homes - reasons for vacancy | 27 |
| TABLE 9: Empty Homes – expected times till back in use | 27 |
| TABLE 10: Empty Homes – occupancy rates | 27 |
| TABLE 11: Potential site deliverability under alternative policy framework for HBC sites | 29 |
| TABLE 12: Current housing commitments for HBC sites | 29 |
| TABLE 13: 15 year land supply (as at 01/04/19) | 31 |
| TABLE 14: HELAA sites in existing policy context | 32 |
| TABLE 15: Estimated Housing Supply from Identified Sites in the Elstree Way Area Action Plan | 33 |
| TABLE 16: Estimated Housing Supply from Identified Sites in the SADM Policies Plan | 34 |
| TABLE 17: 5 year land supply as at 01.04.19 | 35 |
| TABLE 18: HELAA sites in alternative policy context | 36 |
| TABLE 19: Potential sites for economic development | 40 |
| TABLE 20: Potential sites for employment (including safeguarded sites) conclusions | 41 |

IMPORTANT INFORMATION – PLEASE READ

The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) is a technical study prepared to inform the Council’s local planning framework. The assessment and identification of sites has no status in formally allocating land for future development and will not be treated as a material consideration in any future decision that the Council makes on individual planning applications.

The purpose of the HELAA is to quantify the future supply of housing and employment land. It does this through assessing sites with future development potential. It is not a statement of policy and does not allocate sites to be developed. This is the role of the Local Plan.

The identification of potential development sites within the HELAA as deliverable does not oblige or mean that the Council will grant planning permission for development. All planning applications will continue to be considered against the appropriate policies in Hertsmere’s local planning framework and any other material considerations. The inclusion of potential housing sites within the study does not preclude them from being developed for other purposes.

Phasing

The phasing of sites is based on the Council’s views at the time of the study and an assessment of deliverability, having regards to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Circumstances or assumptions may change. This may mean that sites come forward sooner or later than originally envisaged. The HELAA does not prevent planning applications being submitted on any sites identified or excluded within it at any time.

The information published as part of the HELAA is based on information available at the time of the study, much of which is supplied by landowners or their representatives. As such, there may be some omissions and/or factual inaccuracies, for which the Council does not take liability. Therefore, users of the study’s findings will need to appreciate that there may be additional constraints on some sites that were not identified at the time of the survey and that planning applications will continue to be treated on their merits at the time of the planning application, rather than on the information contained within the HELAA. Likewise, some of the identified constraints may have changed since the information was compiled. Issues may arise during the course of a detailed planning application that could not be or were not foreseen at the time of the assessment.

Generally, the housing capacity of a site in the study either relates to the number of dwellings granted in an unimplemented planning permission (where applicable) or is an estimate based on the methodology contained within the HELAA. However, the site capacities in the study do not preclude densities being increased or decreased on sites, nor does it mean that the densities envisaged within the assessment would necessarily be appropriate. Appropriate densities would need to be assessed through the planning processes when a planning application is submitted. Further technical work to be undertaken as part of the preparation of the Local Plan may also indicate that sites, or parts of sites, are not suitable for development.

1.0 Executive Summary

- 1.0 This Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) is a technical study that provides an overview of Hertsmere's housing and economic land supply to meet the borough's future development needs. The most recent HELAA was produced in 2015 which was an update of a previous Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), in 2011.
- 1.1 The methodology for the housing-related elements of this update broadly reflects that used in previous years but it is recognized that there have been significant changes to the policy context within which it is prepared. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) replaced all previous national planning policy in 2012. New national guidance has been introduced in the form of the Government's [Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Guidance](#) (the PPG), which was originally released in 2014 and updated in 2018 and 2019. The updated methodology was issued for consultation in 2017 resulting in some further amendments. A summary of the comments received and the Council's responses is appended to this report.
- 1.2 A draft HELAA was previously published in late 2018 and comments were invited, alongside the publication of the Council's Potential Sites for Housing and Employment report. A significant number of responses were received to both documents which either referenced or had implications for the HELAA and these were carefully reviewed. A summary of these and the Council's response is appended to this report, with a number of changes made to the HELAA in light of the responses received.
- 1.3 The HELAA concludes that in the existing policy context, potential residential yield for the five year period beginning 1 April 2019 is estimated to be 2,429 units. The total housing supply (planning permissions, prior notifications/approvals, identified sites and windfall) for the 15 year period beginning 1 April 2019 are estimated to be 3,770 units.
- 1.4 Were changes to the policy context to result in green belt sites being released for development, total housing supply (planning permissions, prior notifications/approvals, identified sites and windfall) for the 15 year period beginning 1 April 2019 would be an estimated 17,956 units. Other policy changes, such as de-designating some existing employment areas, would increase this figure further.
- 1.5 By settlement, Borehamwood continues to have the largest urban capacity, followed by Bushey and Potters Bar. Sources of supply are summarised in Table 1 below.

| TABLE 1: 15 year land supply (as at 01/04/19) | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Planning permissions | Schemes not yet commenced | 634 |
| | Schemes under construction | 572* |
| Prior notification process | Schemes not yet commenced | 187 |
| | Schemes under construction | 68* |
| Identified sites | Current Local Plan allocations (without planning permission) | 651 |
| | Other HELAA sites (under current policy context) | 800 |
| | Other HELAA sites (under alternative policy context) | 14,985 |
| Windfall | | 825 |
| | Total net yield (current policy context) | 3,770 units |
| | Total net yield (alternative policy context) | 17,956 units |

*Lapse rate not applied to sites under construction
Source: Hertfordshire County Council CDP Smart data

1.6 Over the next 15 years, within the current policy context, the majority of Hertsmere's new class B employment floorspace¹ would be provided within the employment areas/sites identified below.

- Centennial Park, Elstree
- Cranborne Road Employment Area, Potters Bar
- Elstree Way Employment Area, Borehamwood
- Otterspool Way Employment Area, Bushey
- Station Close Employment Area, Potters Bar
- Stirling Way Employment Area, Borehamwood
- Various designated Locally Significant Employment Sites

1.6 It is recognised that additional sites exist with the potential to be brought forward for employment development, including a number promoted through the Call for Sites. Were changes to the policy context to result in green belt or safeguarded sites being released for development, and additional sites to be allocated for development in the new Local Plan, additional B class development could be provided in the following locations:

- Land North of Centennial Park, Elstree , Elstree
- Land between A41 and M1, near Hilton Hotel, Bushey
- Safeguarded employment and other land east of Rowley Lane, Borehamwood
- Land adjacent to Elstree Road, A41 and Dagger Lane
- Land east of M25 Junction 22
- Wrotham Park Estate land, West of Baker Street
- Land north of St Albans Road, South Mimms
- Safeguarded employment land, north west of Cranborne Road industrial estate

¹ The schedule of use classes can be viewed at www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use

Development Context

- 1.7 Almost 80% of Hertsmere is designated as Green Belt land, with the built-up areas of Borehamwood, Bushey, Radlett, Potters Bar and parts of Elstree Village and Shenley comprising the remainder. Although located within the Green Belt, the villages of South Mimms, Aldenham, Letchmore Heath, Patchetts Green, Ridge and parts of Elstree and Shenley Village also contain modest areas of previously developed land that contribute to the housing stock of Hertsmere.
- 1.8 During the year 2018/19, a net total of 630 new dwellings were added to the existing housing stock. As at 1 April 2019, construction of 640 dwellings had commenced with a further 864 dwellings, with planning permission or prior notification/approval, yet to commence development. Previously developed land remains the borough's main source of sites for new housing under the Council's current planning policy context. Although 58 out of the 637 units approved in 2018/19 were on sites in the Green Belt, none of these units were on a site which contained no previously developed land/buildings.
- 1.9 In terms of significant sites that are likely to be delivered in the short-term, a number of large housing-led developments remain in the pipeline. This includes the Gasworks, Borehamwood (78 units), Hertswood School, Borehamwood (301 units) and Europcar House, Bushey (61 units). The strength of the local housing market and continued churn of sites within existing built up areas, mean that previously developed land will continue to play an important role in future housing supply.
- 1.10 In the medium-term, it is expected that a significant level of housing will continue to be delivered in Borehamwood through redevelopment in Elstree Way, which is a designated national Housing Zone and through which remaining sites have the potential to deliver 685 units within the key opportunity area. It is also likely that more flats will continue to come forward in former offices under the permitted development prior approval system. 344 units have been created to date though this process with a further 265 units currently being implemented.

Policy Context

- 1.11 Since publication of the previous HELAA in 2015 there have been significant changes to both national and local policy.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 1.12 The [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF), which replaced all previous national planning policy documents in 2012, was previously updated in July 2018 and again in February 2019. Paragraph 67 of the NPPF requires that in order to boost significantly the supply of housing:
- Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of:
 - a) specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period; and

- b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan.

(paragraph 67, NPPF)

Where an allowance is to be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends. Plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area.

(paragraph 70, NPPF)

- 1.13 The changes made to the National Planning Policy Framework in February 2019 sought to provide further clarification in relation to the following:

- The footnote on Paragraph 73 now includes reference to where the local housing need is used as the basis for assessing whether a 5 year housing land supply of specific deliverable sites exists, it should be calculated using the standard methodology.
- Paragraph 177 was amended to state the following:

“The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.”

- 1.14 Paragraph 68 of the NPPF expects a minimum proportion (10%) of the housing requirement to be met through sites no larger than one hectare, unless there are strong reasons why this cannot be achieved. This will be addressed as part of preparing the Local Plan.

- 1.15 Most recently in July 2019 the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government issued a Written Ministerial Statement to remove paragraph 209a from the revised National Planning Policy Framework following a legal judgement in relation to on-short oil and gas development.

Planning Practice Guidance

- 1.16 [Planning Practice Guidance \(PPG\)](#) in relation to the production of a HELAA was initially published in 2014 with updates issued in 2018. The overall [methodology approach](#) and associated stages for producing such assessments has not changed but updated guidance has been introduced in relation to the 5 year land supply and new Housing Delivery Test.

- 1.17 The PPG has subsequently been updated in July 2019. The sections that have been updated are listed below along with any new sections which have been created.

- Advertisements
- Appropriate Assessment*
- Historic environment*
- Consultation and pre-decision matters
- Effective use of land*
- Housing supply and delivery*
- Land affected by contamination
- Land stability
- Natural environment
- Noise
- Plan-making

- Enforcement and post-permission matters*
- Green Belt*
- Healthy and safe communities*
- Housing and economic land availability assessment
- Housing and economic needs assessment
- Housing needs of different groups*
- Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal
- Town centres and retail*
- Use of planning conditions
- Water supply, wastewater and water quality
- When is permission required?

*New or renamed sections

1.18 The HELAA, has been reviewed against the PPG. The updated PPG puts greater emphasis on the importance of identifying a 5 year land supply, and that planning bodies should consider constraints when assessing the suitability, availability and achievability of sites within the plan-making area. This includes:

- providing a complete audit of available land and the information required to assess the most suitable locations.
- identifying all sites and their constraints and not simply ruling out sites outright with the initial surveys being proportionate.
- assessing a development's potential based on ensuring that the site makes the most efficient use of land in line with the NPPF.
- assessing the sites economic viability
- assessing the location (a site can be considered suitable if it would provide an appropriate location for development against relevant constraints and their potential be mitigated).
- accounting for potential policy changes or other factors that impact suitability
- considering the existence of planning permission (all sites with detailed planning permission should be achievable within the next 5 years)
- applying a range of densities that reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas
- establishing whether the need might be met in other areas if required

Core Strategy

1.19 The Hertsmere [Core Strategy](#) was adopted by the Council in 2013. Policy CS1 (The Supply of New Homes) specifies that the Council will make provision for at least 3,900 additional dwellings within the District between 2012 and 2027, a development rate of a minimum of 266 dwellings per year.

Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan (AAP)

1.20 The [Elstree Way Corridor AAP](#) was adopted by the Council in 2015. The renewal of the Elstree Way Corridor formed a key component of housing supply in the Core Strategy and the AAP identifies the policy to guide development of the area. The Elstree Way Corridor has also been designated by the Homes and Communities Agency as a national Housing Zone to support the AAP's vision of delivering 1,000 – 1,500 across the area as a whole including 800 units within an identified Opportunity Area.

Site Allocations and Development Management (SADM) Policies Plan

- 1.21 The Council adopted its [SADM Policies Plan](#) in 2016. This included details of housing land supply in relation to the Core Strategy housing requirement, informed by the 2015 HELAA. A number of sites were allocated in the Plan under Policy SADM1 which were identified as suitable for the delivery of 654 units, with 92 units on town centre sites under Policy SADM43. A large proportion of the sites identified have either been built out, are under construction or have secured detailed planning consent.

2.0 Methodology

Introduction


2.1 The NPPG states that an assessment of land availability identifies a future supply of land which is suitable, available and achievable for housing and economic development uses over the plan period. An assessment should:

- Identify sites and broad locations with potential for development;
- Assess their development potential and suitability; and
- Assess the likelihood of development coming forward (the availability and achievability)

2.2 The process followed for the HELAA completed in 2019 closely aligns with the methodology set out in the PPG. This methodology is not substantively different from that followed in the SHLAA update undertaken in 2015.

2.3 The PPG sets out five main stages to preparing a HELAA, illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: HELAA Methodology, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Practice Guidance



Stage 1: site/broad location identification

Geographical area covered

- 2.4 The assessment covers the whole borough of Hertsmere, which lies within the SW Hertfordshire strategic housing and functional economic market areas.

Other parties involved

- 2.5 In line with the duty to cooperate, other local planning authorities in the SW Hertfordshire SHMA and FEMA, together with other neighbouring authorities were engaged in the HELAA process.
- 2.6 The following other bodies have also been engaged in the HELAA process:
- Developers, land owners and promoters of land
 - Local property agents
 - LEP
 - Local interest groups
 - Businesses and business representative organisations
 - Parish and town councils
 - Other public and statutory bodies
- 2.7 A complete list of those invited to comment on the HELAA methodology and to submit sites to the call for sites is attached at Appendix 5.

Size of site and broad locations

- 2.8 Sites and broad locations capable of delivering 5 or more dwellings or 0.25ha/500 sqm of economic development were considered for inclusion in the HELAA. Sites have been identified without reference to the amount of land for development needed.

Types of site

- 2.9 In line with the guidance in the NPPG, sites with policy constraints were included in the initial list of those to be considered for inclusion in the HELAA. Only a very limited number of policy constraints (see 2.14 below) have led to exclusion of sites from consideration prior to *Stage 2 site/broad location assessment*.
- 2.10 In identifying the list of sites/locations to be considered for assessment account has been taken of the guidance in the NPPG, and where relevant, sites in the following categories are being included:
- Existing Local Plan allocations (including safeguarded land) without planning permission
 - Sites identified through the SADM consultation process but not included in the current Local Plan
 - Sites submitted through the call for sites 2017/2018
 - Sites included in the previous HELAA where the site has continued to be promoted through the planning application process
 - Development briefs without planning permission

- Refused, withdrawn and lapsed planning applications
- Land in Local Authority ownership or subject to the plans of Hertfordshire County Council, Government, NHS, police, fire, utilities providers, statutory undertakers (as indicated through the call for sites)
- Surplus public sector land
- Vacant and derelict land and buildings
- Additional opportunities in established uses e.g. under-used garage blocks
- Business requirements
- Sites in rural areas
- Redevelopment of existing residential or economic areas
- Sites in and adjoining rural settlements and rural exception sites
- Urban extensions
- Free standing settlements
- Any other sites as judged appropriate by Council officers

2.11 Where sites already have planning permission or have been subject to prior notification/approval they are included in the HELAA but further detailed site assessments are not considered necessary unless other information suggests this to be required (see para 3.3 below).

A complete list of sources of sites suggested in the NPPG is at Appendix 2

Call for Sites

2.12 Stakeholder input plays a key role in the delivery of a robust HELAA evidence base. As part of the preparation of the HELAA 2017, a call for sites was issued in early 2017. This was publicised on the Council's website, in press releases, and in the first newsletter concerning the preparation of the new Local Plan which was circulated to all residents in the borough with the winter edition of the council's newsletter Hertsmere News. The new Local Plan preparation process was itself also promoted through social media and press releases and people were encouraged to visit the council's website for further information. In addition a specific request for people to submit sites was included in the spring edition of Hertsmere News. The Council also wrote to a wide range of organisations, including those identified in paragraph 2.3 above, inviting them to submit sites for assessment.

2.13 A HELAA questionnaire was made available on the website; those submitting sites for consideration were required to complete the questionnaire and provide a site plan with the site boundaries clearly indicated. A copy of the questionnaire is attached at Appendix 6.

Site and broad location survey (a)

2.14 Conflict with a limited range of national policies and designations may exclude sites from further assessment as follows:

- SSSI, Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves and Regionally Important Geological Sites – locating housing or employment development on these sites could result in the loss of significant protected species, habitat, visual amenity and/or areas of general scientific interest.

- Historic Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Historic Battlefields and Sites of Archaeological Interest - housing or economic development on these types of sites would compromise the amenity value and/or historic value of such sites.
- 2.15 Sites and broad locations are not excluded at this stage on the grounds of being located within the Green Belt (as identified in the current Local Plan 2016). Given the quantum of new development that is likely to be required in the next 15 years there is likely to be a need to identify sites that are currently in the Green Belt for development.
- 2.16 It is acknowledged that footnote 6 of the NPPF (February 2019) includes both Green Belt and other designations including SSSIs. The NPPF does, however, in paragraph 136 set out where Green Belt boundaries may exceptionally be altered and only where this is fully evidenced and justified. A stage 1 Green Belt Review was undertaken in 2016, followed by a Stage 2 Review 2018. Sites have been assessed against the outcomes of this review in order to identify their contribution to Green Belt purposes.

Stage 2: Site/broad location assessment

- 2.17 To enable a preliminary judgement to be made about whether a site or broad location can be considered deliverable or developable over the plan period, its suitability, availability and achievability was assessed. For those sites/areas judged to be suitable, available and achievable, an assessment of their development potential enabled their potential contribution to meeting housing and employment land needs over the plan period to be identified. A combination of desk based and site survey work was used.
- 2.18 Sites assessed in the previous HELAA were reviewed to ensure the information is up to date; they were not, however, subject to site visit and full assessment unless there was evidence that circumstances pertaining to the site had changed significantly.
- 2.19 Where sites already had planning permission, site assessments were not considered necessary as planning permissions provide a high degree of certainty in terms of yield. Sites were taken as being available deliverable and achievable unless other information suggested that they should be reassessed.

Site and broad location survey (b)

- 2.20 A new pro-forma was produced to enable assessment and survey work to be undertaken in a more integrated way than in previous SHLAA/HELAA updates. This is attached at Appendix 1. New HELAA sites were surveyed and assessed using this pro-forma.
- 2.21 A desk based initial assessment of the potential contribution to housing and economic land supply of each site/broad location was also carried out prior to undertaking a site visit. The site visit enabled existing information about the site to be confirmed/corrected and enabled any questions arising during the process of assessing suitability, availability and achievability in relation to the potential development of any site (see paragraphs 2.23 – 2.27 below) to be checked at the same time.
- 2.22 The site survey included recording/checking the following information:
- Site size
 - Site boundaries
 - Site location

- Current land-use(s)
- Surrounding land use(s)
- Character of surrounding area
- Physical constraints (e.g. access, steep slopes, evidence of flooding, natural features of significance, pylons, trees)
- Potential environmental constraints
- Development progress (e.g. ground works completed, number of homes started and number of homes completed)
- Initial assessment of whether the site is suitable for a specific use or a mixed-use development

As well as ensuring that up to date information has been captured, the surveys assisted with

- Firming up on appropriate type/scale of development
- Firming up on deliverability, any barriers and how to overcome them
- Identifying any further sites nearby with potential for development

Assessment

- 2.23 Sites were assessed for their suitability, availability and achievability. Where constraints were identified action that would be needed to remove them was considered. This was to enable a realistic assessment to be made of the potential type and quantity of development that could be delivered on each site/broad location and in what timescale.

Assessing Suitability

- 2.24 Suitability was guided by:
- Existing and emerging local plan policy and national policy. Policy restrictions may affect the quantum of development that a particular site can reasonably deliver under current planning policies. Where there is a clear prospect that relevant policies in the new Local Plan may change and affect the status of the site/location in policy terms e.g. the current designation of a site no longer reflects development which has since occurred on that site, this was to be taken into account. Otherwise, sites which could not be reasonably delivered under current planning policies have been recorded separately in a category of sites which, whilst available and developable, would not be acceptable under the current Local Plan.
 - Market and industry requirements
 - Physical limitations or problems such as access, infrastructure, ground conditions, flood risk, hazardous risks, pollution or contamination
 - Potential impacts including the effect on landscapes including landscape features, nature and heritage conservation
 - Appropriateness and likely market attractiveness for the type of development proposed
 - Environmental/amenity impacts experiences by potential occupiers and neighbours

At this stage of the process no sites were ruled out by topography or landscape issues.

Assessing Availability

- 2.25 An available site is one where on the best information available there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems e.g. multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners. This will often mean that the land is owned by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop, or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell. Where any problems were identified an assessment has been made as to how and when they might realistically be overcome. Factors could include the delivery record of the developer or landowner concerned and the planning history of the site. The current use of the site may also affect its availability during the Plan period – e.g. a quarry with 10 years' worth of resource still to be extracted may not be developable until years 11-15 at the earliest, and possibly much later.

Assessing Achievability

- 2.26 An achievable site is one where there is a reasonable prospect that the type of development proposed will be developed at a particular point in time. This means that

- it should be economically viable, and
- the developer has the capacity to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period.

- 2.27 The viability of a site will depend on a range of factors including the quantum of development which can be accommodated and the cumulative development costs (including any planning obligations/CIL) while ensuring an appropriate site value for the land owner and an appropriate return for the developer. Demand for housing in Hertsmere remains very high with a buoyant housing market reflected in average property prices increasing by over 40% in the last five years. Therefore, for the purposes of the HELAA, where land has been actively promoted for development or it has planning permission or is allocated in an existing plan, there is an overall assumption that a site is capable of being viable. Detailed viability testing will be carried out in due course, where required, for the sites that the Council chooses to allocate for the plan.

Constraints

- 2.28 Where the above assessments identified constraints to development, the actions needed to enable sites to be delivered were considered. This may include e.g.:
- Consolidating ownerships
 - Investment in infrastructure
 - Environmental improvement
 - Changes to emerging development plan policy

Timescale – Deliverable/Developable

- 2.29 The following information has been used to estimate the timescale within which each site/location is likely to be developed:
- Suitability, availability, achievability and constraints
 - lead-in times for development proposed

- build-out rates for development proposed

2.30 To be considered deliverable, sites should be:

available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. In particular:

a) sites which do not involve major development and have planning permission, and all sites with detailed planning permission, should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within five years (for example because they are no longer viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans).

b) where a site has outline planning permission for major development, has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.

(NPPF Glossary)

2.31 To be considered developable, sites should be

In a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.

(NPPF Glossary)

Estimating development potential

2.32 For those sites considered to be suitable, available and achievable within the Plan period, an estimate of the site's capacity /development potential has been made.

2.33 The method of assessing residential development potential reflects that used in the 2015 HELAA. This method uses a baseline density of 30 dwellings per hectare and allows for factored changes according to a range of indicators surrounding density and character and likely dwelling type. A GIS-based analysis of proximity of sites to different services, weighted according to the importance of the facility and distance involved, was also undertaken. It is recognised that site promoters have typically provided an indication of potential housing yield, either in their Call for Sites response, or in a masterplan subsequently submitted. However, to ensure consistency throughout the HELAA, the same methodology has been used throughout for calculating development potential.

2.34 For economic development, a land area has been included. Given that the end user(s) of potential employment sites are not currently known, it would be difficult to convert land area into a realistic floor space or jobs total at this stage.

2.35 Sites capable of delivering less than five units were excluded from the identified site yield. Future yield from these sites will be accounted for through the windfall allowance. Similarly, sites promoted for less than five units, were not considered.

2.36 Some yield based on developments that have been refused planning permission may be included; this will be the case if the development was supported in principle and it is considered likely that an amended version of the proposal will be pursued and may subsequently obtain planning permission.

- 2.37 Most planning permissions are implemented, but some lapse. Where sites already have planning permission, the potential reduction in yield arising from permissions not being implemented will be identified. As with the 2015 HELAA, a discount rate based on an analysis of planning permissions that have lapsed over the preceding 10 years will be applied.

Lead-in times and build out rates

- 2.38 The NPPF states that sites which are allocated in a development plan should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years. The lead-in time for construction to start on-site also varies widely but independent research² published in 2016 suggests that the very largest sites have a shorter lead-in once planning permission has been granted or a site has been allocated.
- 2.39 These larger sites are likely to be split into deliverable shorter phases with many of the planning and land assembly issues having been considered in the plan making stage. However, the length of time leading up to the submission of a planning application for sites of 500 units or more was identified as being typically around four years after the first identification of the site. This would suggest that most sites with a potential capacity of 500 units which have been identified in the HELAA will not see a planning application submitted until 2021 (which is also the anticipated year for adopting the new Local Plan).
- 2.40 It is recognised that planning applications may be submitted on some sites as they progress through the plan making process and the majority of those promoting sites have stated that their land is available for development within the first five years. However, for the purposes of the HELAA, all sites seeking more than 500 units do not include any delivery within the first five years from being identified in 2017/18.
- 2.41 The published research indicates that sites under 500 units have a planning approval period of 1-2 years followed by a similar period prior to first completion. Unless a site promoter has indicated otherwise, the HELAA considers those sites to be capable of contributing either in part or in full, within the first five years.
- 2.42 The actual build out rate each year depends on a number of factors including (in the case of larger sites) the number of individual housebuilders. Sites with a larger number of housebuilders will typically produce increased build out rates.
- 2.43 The PPG does not include any indicative build out rates although the recent government-commissioned Letwin Review³ considered build out rates across the country. The Letwin Review revealed an average annual built out rate of 6.5% of approved units on sites with an average size of almost 5,000 homes. On smaller sites, the 2016 NLP report identified annual build out rates ranging from 30 homes on sites of fewer than 100 units to over 100 homes on sites of over 1,000 and over 160 homes on sites of more than 2,000.
- 2.44 Once development has commenced, the data suggests that the following proportions are

² *Start to Finish, How Quickly do Large-Scale Housing Sites Deliver?* Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (November 2016)

³ *Independent Review of Build Out Rates, Draft Analysis*, Rt Hon Sir Oliver Letwin MP (June 2018)

built within each five year period:

| Number of homes | Years 1 - 5 | Years 6 - 10 | Years 11+ |
|------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Less than 500 units | 95% | 5% | 0 |
| 501 – 1000 units | 80% | 18% | 1% |
| 1001 – 2000 units | 60% | 27% | 13% |
| 2001 units+ | 44% | 31% | 24% |

Based on sample of 47 sites from NLP report for which there is annualised completions data available

- 2.45 Build rates are relatively even across the first five years for sites of over 500 units although a lower proportion – around 6% - come forward on Y1 on sites of over 1,000 units. On this basis, a lower proportion of completions in Y1 are included only in HELAA sites of more than 1,000 units with completions spread equally across subsequent years. It should be emphasised that these rates have been set to enable a housing trajectory to be produced and in reality, different sites will generate their own time till first completion and build out rates. Informed by this research and unless there is specific evidence to support an alternative approach on individual sites (as indicated in individual site proformas), the HELAA assumes the following build out rates.

| Number of units | Planning approval period | Time till first completion following planning permission or allocation | Years from 2017/18 till first completion | Completions in Y1 | Completions from Y2 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Up to 100 | 1 year | 2 years | 3 years | 25 | 25 per year |
| 101 to 250 | 2 years | 2 years | 4 years | 50 | 50 per year |
| 251 to 500 | 2 years | 2 years | 4 years | 75 | 75 per year |
| 501 to 1000 | 5 years | 1 year | 6 years | 50 | 100 per year |
| 1001 to 2000 | 5 years | 1 year | 6 years | 75 | 150 per year |
| 2001+ | 6 years | 1 year | 7 years | 100 | 200 per year |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

Sources of Sites and Information

- 2.46 The Council's review included, but was not limited to, the following types of sites and sources of data:
- Sites identified through SADM representations
 - Existing housing development allocations and site development briefs not yet with planning permission
 - Planning permissions for housing development that are unimplemented or under construction
 - Planning applications that have been refused or withdrawn
 - Land in the local authority's ownership
 - Surplus and likely to become surplus public sector land
 - Vacant and derelict land and buildings (including redundant and disused agricultural buildings, potential permitted development changes e.g. offices to residential).

- Additional opportunities in established uses (e.g. making productive use of under-utilised facilities such as garage blocks)
 - Sites in rural locations
 - Large scale redevelopment and redesign of existing residential or economic areas
 - Sites in and adjoining villages or rural settlements and rural exception sites
 - Potential urban extensions and new free standing settlements
- 2.47 As was the case for the 2015 HELAA, self-contained units of C2 extra care housing were taken as a source of potential housing supply.
- 2.48 Housing sites from the previous HELAA were included in this assessment if they were not re-promoted or there had been no further indication that the site will be developed and these are set out in Appendix 2. One site from the previous HELAA, potentially yielding 10 units, has been carried forward on the basis that they continue to be the subject of pre-application / application interest. However, the likely timescale for which the site is capable of being developed is currently unknown.
- 2.49 Where planning permissions have lapsed since the 2015 HELAA, the sites in question have not been included in this assessment unless there is information indicating that development is likely to be pursued in the future through, for example, the submission of a new planning application.
- 2.50 Where sites in the Green Belt contain previously developed land and buildings capable of being redeveloped under paragraph 145 of the NPPF as 'appropriate development', two site yields have been calculated. In addition to a calculation for the entire site using the base density multiplier highlighted above, a separate figure has also been calculated based on what might be deliverable for the reuse of previously developed land and buildings. This was derived from a calculation of the footprint of existing buildings and applied through the approach set out in Appendix 7

Lapse Rate

- 2.51 Most planning permissions continue to be implemented but even in an area of high housing demand, some residential permissions will inevitably lapse. To calculate lapse rates, planning permissions granted for schemes providing new housing units over the ten year period between 01/07/2006 – 01/07/2016 were reviewed. Applications from the past 3 years were not considered as these were still extant at the time of preparing the HELAA.
- 2.52 The sites included were then assessed to identify whether they had been implemented, based on the Council's monitoring records. Where a variation of the original permission has been sought, the original application has not been classed as lapsed. In addition, only the most recent lapse was recorded where sites had multiple lapsed applications for similar development over the ten-year period. On the basis of the analysis carried out, which showed that 4.8% of units on sites with planning permission (where development had not commenced) were not implemented, a lapse rate of 5% has been applied to the HELAA.

| TABLE 4: Lapse Rate 2006 – 2016 | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Period | Number of new units granted | Number of units for which permission lapsed | Percentage Lapsed |
| 01/04/2006 – 31/03/2016 | 3,485 | 169 | 4.8% |

Source: Hertfordshire County Council CDP Smart data

Windfall

- 2.53 The NPPF sets out that an allowance can be made for windfall sites as part of anticipated supply where there is compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. Windfall sites have, for many years, made an important contribution to housing supply in the borough and given the continued high level of demand for housing, this is expected to continue. Many windfall sites are small sites, often fewer than five dwellings, brought forward through the redevelopment of existing residential properties.
- 2.54 The reduction in ‘garden land’ development, following changes to the definition of brownfield sites in 2010, has not led to a significant change in windfall numbers. Between 2005/6 and 2014/15, there was an average of 174 units completed on windfall sites. The average windfall figure over the past five years to 2018/19 has been 179 units including an average of 55 units on small urban and rural windfall sites. These are sites of fewer than 5 units, below the threshold for identification in the HELAA.
- 2.55 It is acknowledged that the supply of large urban sites, particularly in Borehamwood, may begin to diminish over time, notwithstanding the possibility of changes of use from office to residential under the prior approval system. However, small urban and rural windfall sites are likely to continue to come forward and it is considered appropriate to include a windfall allowance of 55 units per year in the first five years.
- 2.56 The NPPG (paragraph 24) also states that broad locations in years 6 to 15 can include a windfall allowance based on a geographical area. Land within existing urban and rural settlements will continue to be a source of some housing land supply within years to 6 to 15 and it is considered appropriate to include an annual windfall allowance of 55 units within these locations (51 units within urban areas and 4 within rural areas).

| TABLE 5: Windfall completions 2014/15 to 2018/19 | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Windfalls (less than 5) | Urban windfalls (less than 5) | Rural windfalls (less than 5) | Large windfalls (5 or more) | All windfalls |
| 2014/15 | 47 | 47 | -1 | 21 | 68 |
| 2015/16 | 56 | 51 | 5 | 82 | 138 |
| 2016/17 | 60 | 58 | 2 | 122 | 182 |
| 2017/18 | 67 | 57 | 10 | 147 | 214 |
| 2018/19 | 45 | 41 | 3 | 177 | 222 |
| Annual average | 55 | 51 | 4 | 110 | 165 |

Source: Hertfordshire County Council CDP Smart data

3.0 Maximising the potential of brownfield land

3.1 In accordance with the new NPPF (Feb 2019) the Council has reviewed its assessment approach for brownfield land, to ensure that the potential of all brownfield land was maximised. This included:

- 1) Reviewing the densities and capacities of all potential sites located within major settlement boundaries. (Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements)⁴
- 2) Assessing the utilisation of local vacant housing stock as a source of untapped brownfield housing supply.
- 3) Reviewing the achievability and deliverability of Hertsmere's owned assets.
- 4) Contacting owners/occupiers of major brownfields sites who have not yet submitted any of their land holdings.

Achieving appropriate densities

3.2 The Council has reviewed the HELAA methodology to ensure that appropriate densities are achieved across the borough. This is to ensure that the assessment aligns with paragraphs 122 and 123 of the NPPF 2019 which state that planning policies should support development that makes efficient use of land and avoids homes being built at low densities. NPPF paragraph 123 also provides that minimum density standards for city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport should be contained in local plan policies and that these standards should seek a significant uplift in average densities unless it can be shown that there are strong reasons why this would be inappropriate.

3.3 Many of the sites included within the HELAA are located within the Green Belt. Whilst the Council has previously identified the likelihood of Green Belt land needing to be released to meet its housing need, it is important that use of any brownfield land is optimised. By reviewing the current HELAA methodology for estimating potential capacities the council has looked to ensure that brownfield land and densities are examined fully reflecting the requirement that Local Plans promote a significant uplift in the density standards in towns and urban centres. (paragraph 137 NPPF). As the council has identified that Green Belt land may be required, the densities of all sites should reflect their accessibility and location in order to promote sustainable patterns of development. (paragraph 138 NPPF)

3.4 In accordance with national guidance, the established HELAA methodology for estimating the potential site capacities includes the following density multipliers:

- a) The likely type – identifying the need for different types of housing across the borough;
- b) The area type – assessing the local market conditions;
- c) Accessibility – considering the availability and capacity of infrastructure services;
- d) Prevailing density – ensuring that an area's prevailing character is maintained.

3.5 It is important that the densities used also reflect those which have been previously approved in the borough, given that these schemes would have only been granted if the Council considered them to be promoting well-designed, attractive and healthy places.

⁴ Tiers as defined in Settlement Hierarchy and Accessibility Mapping Analysis, published November 2018

Maximising the potential of sustainable locations

3.6 The council recognises that there is a need for development to be promoted in locations that either are or can be made sustainable, taking account of the current infrastructure provision, including the strategic road network. Through an assessment of the scale and pattern of approved development and the need to encourage higher densities in areas that allow for greater uptake of sustainable transport modes and wider social and health objectives, there is considered to be some further scope to maximise the development potential of land in these locations. To that end, the estimated potential capacities have been reviewed for sites that are in:

- Accessible locations, or
- Areas with a more urban character, or
- Areas with higher prevailing densities.

3.7 The first step was to examine the density of recent permissions. The NPPG states that relevant existing development schemes can be used as the basis for assessment. This was achieved through analysing all major planning applications (10 homes or more) that have been granted and/or completed since the adoption of the current Core Strategy in 2013. As there was a lack of major rural applications due to existing Green Belt constraints, rural applications of 5 or more dwellings have also been included. The applications were then categorised in relation to their geographical location:

- Very high accessibility/sustainability – any site that is located within close proximity to key infrastructure (e.g. railway stations) and major settlement high streets in the borough (Tier⁵ 1, 2 and 3 settlements).
- High accessibility/sustainability – sites located close to local services and within proximity of key infrastructure and major settlement high streets (Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements).
- Medium accessibility/sustainability – sites within predominately residential areas within the boundary of major settlements (Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements).
- Low accessibility/sustainability – sites located in the centre of rural settlements (Tier 4 and 5 settlements), or along the settlement boundary of major settlements.
- Very low accessibility/sustainability – Sites located in small rural settlements (Tier 6 and 7 settlements), or sites in rural locations that do not border any major settlement.

Updating the HELAA methodology for estimating the potential site capacity

3.8 TABLE 6 below sets out the results of this investigation and, in the final column, the proposed target densities for sites in each of the location types identified. These target densities will not directly reflect the estimated density and capacity for each site as this will be determined by which density multipliers apply on a particular site. However, an adjustment has been made to the factored increases possible for certain multipliers, to reflect the scope for a general uplift in the density of sites within central and more accessible locations.

⁵ Tiers as defined in Settlement Hierarchy and Accessibility Mapping Analysis, published November 2018

- 3.9 The target densities for very high and highly sustainable locations have been further adjusted, as shown in TABLE 6, to include a significant uplift of 25% over and above the average density. This reflects the approach sought in paragraph 123 of the NPPF and ensures that land in these locations has the potential to be optimised and can demonstrate its ability to meet as much of the identified housing need as possible. Initial testing against average densities since 2013 indicates that a significant uplift of 25% whilst potentially challenging, may be achievable to meet government policy, but that anything significantly in excess of 25% is likely to compromise layout and design standards to an unacceptable degree.

| Sustainable locations | Total no. of units | Total site area (ha) | Average density since 2013 (dph) | Uplift (25%) | Previous HELAA Target Density (dph) | New HELAA Target density (dph) |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Very high | 415 | 3.28 | 126 | 157.5 | 70 | 160 |
| High | 1672 | 20.66 | 81 | 101.25 | 55 | 100 |
| Medium | 393 | 7.02 | 56 | N/A | 45 | 55 |
| Low | 537 | 10 | 31 | N/A | 40 | 40 |
| Very Low* includes sites with 5 to 10 dwellings | 67 | 5.24 | 13 | N/A | 30 | 30 |

Source: Hertfordshire County Council CDP Smart data and Hertsmere Borough Council

- 3.10 The target densities previously used for estimating site capacity in the more sustainable locations are clearly lower than what has actually been approved in the borough over recent years. The factored increases for the following density multipliers have therefore been amended to reflect the target densities stated for sustainable locations as shown in 7 below.

| LIKELY TYPE | AREA TYPE | | ACCESSIBILITY ⁶ | | | PREVAILING DENSITY | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------|----------------------------|------|----------|--------------------|----------|------|-----------------|------|------|
| | Previous | New | Previous | New | Previous | New | Previous | New | | | |
| Urban brownfield flat | 0.35 | 0.35 | Central | 0.35 | 1.35 | Very high | 0.35 | 1.35 | Urban | 0.35 | 1.35 |
| Urban brownfield mixed | 0.30 | 0.30 | Transitional | 0.20 | 0.70 | High | 0.20 | 0.70 | High | 0.20 | 0.7 |
| Urban brownfield house | 0.20 | 0.20 | Suburban | 0.15 | 0.25 | Medium | 0.10 | 0.20 | Medium | 0.10 | 0.20 |
| Garden suburbs | 0.10 | 0.10 | Rural/suburban | 0.1 | 0.1 | Low | 0.05 | 0.05 | Low | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Key villages | 0.10 | 0.10 | Rural | 0 | 0 | Very low | 0 | 0 | Very low | 0 | 0 |
| Other villages | 0.05 | 0.05 | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

- 3.11 The adjustments to the density multipliers corresponded to the criteria used in determining the accessibility/sustainability of a site. The council considered that three of the four density

⁶ Scores for each site taken from the Settlement Hierarchy and Accessibility Mapping Analysis, published November 2018

multipliers were of equal importance and therefore the uplift has been applied evenly across area type, accessibility and prevailing density. The density multiplier for likely type has not been adjusted, as this multiplier was more aspirational and reflected the need for different housing types within the borough, as opposed to the current ground/on site conditions.

- 3.12 Under the current HELAA methodology a baseline density of 30 dwelling per hectare has been used. Although the average density of permissions in very low accessibility locations in the borough is a notional 13dph, this figure is skewed by some very large plot sizes which exist in rural locations and a minimum density of 30dph is set for all sites promoted within the HELAA. This is to ensure that the potential for all allocated land is being maximised, and that assumptions around homes being built at low densities are avoided. Furthermore, this baseline density reflects the overall prevailing character and setting of the borough. Densities for sites promoted as garden villages were assessed on the basis of a baseline density of 30dph. As and when any detailed masterplans are drawn up for these sites and additional technical studies and the scope to deliver additional infrastructure provision is identified, densities for those sites may change.

Empty and second homes

- 3.13 Empty and second homes as defined for Council Tax purposes represent a potential source of underutilised housing supply. To identify the extent to which any of these properties can be included the borough's housing capacity, it is necessary to consider
- how long properties have been empty for
 - whether the vacant units are simply part of ongoing housing market churn
 - the extent of second home ownership within the borough
 - whether steps are being taken to bring both empty and second homes into regular use
- 3.14 In 2017, the planning and housing departments jointly carried out an empty homes and second homes project to establish the number of unused or underused domestic properties in the borough and the reasons behind this. A Community Housing Fund grant was secured from MHCLG to carry out this work.

Empty homes

- 3.15 Based on initial data provided by the Council Tax team, a questionnaire was sent to over 300 properties in the borough understood to have been vacant for more than six months. Information was also provided about the assistance available from the Council, including interest free loans to improve and lease the property or the scope to purchase the house outright from the owners.
- 3.16 Subsequent information from the Council Tax department and other staff within the organisation resulted in the empty homes list being reduced to 194 properties. The average time properties had been recorded by Council Tax as vacant was 2.4 years. A follow-up communication was sent to the individuals liable for empty properties in Hertsmere where responses were not initially received.
- 3.17 In total, 105 replies were received including six individuals who expressed some interest in assistance from the Council. Around 40% of responses clarified that the properties were not

vacant. 62 responses confirmed the property was vacant with the following reasons provided:

| TABLE 8: Empty homes - reasons for vacancy | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Reasons for Vacancy | Number of replies |
| Genuinely and actively trying to sell or let the property | 31 |
| Currently renovating property or plan to do so in the future | 25 |
| Absent to provide care for a person due to old age | 1 |
| Other | 5 |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

- 3.18 Responses were from across the borough with the largest number of empty homes reported in Potters Bar (19) and Bushey (17) and Borehamwood/Elstree (13). 90% of those who responded stated that it was their intention to bring the property back into use with over 50% stating their intention to do so within the next 12 months.

| TABLE 9: Empty Homes – expected times till back in use | |
|---|----------------------------|
| Expected time to bring property back into use | Number of responses |
| Less than 6 months | 25 |
| 6-12 months | 7 |
| 12-24 months | 3 |
| 24 months+ | 1 |
| Not known | 4 |
| Not stated | 15 |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

Second homes

- 3.19 A cover letter and questionnaire were initially sent to over 200 properties that were classed as second homes by the Council Tax department. In total, 72 replies were received with 13 individuals stating that the property was in fact their main residence. Three individuals expressed an interest in renting out their second home. Reasons given for the existence of a second home in the borough including having a primary residence elsewhere in the UK, a primary residence overseas and awaiting the sale of another property which would otherwise enable the second home to become the primary residence.
- 3.20 Almost half of those who responded indicated that the property is either never vacant or that it is used on a reasonably frequent basis.

| TABLE 10: Empty Homes – occupancy rates | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Level of occupancy (use may not be concurrent through the year) | Number of respondents |
| Never vacant | 19 |
| Less than two months a year | 7 |
| At least two months a year | 1 |
| At least four months a year | 4 |
| At least six months a year | 3 |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

Eight of those responding also indicated that they were either selling or planning to sell their property or were interested in letting their property.

Conclusions

- 3.21 The government defines six months as long term vacant for the purposes of calculating New Homes Bonus. However, churn within the housing / lettings market and the inherent delays associated with buying, selling and letting homes (e.g. a lengthy chain, delayed probate) mean there is always likely to be a pool of properties which are effectively between occupiers. It is considered reasonable to exclude the 35 properties where the owners stated an intention to bring the property back into use within the next 12 months (which would mean those properties will have been vacant for no more than 18 months) and all other properties which have been vacant for less than 12 months.
- 3.22 There are estimated to be approximately 70 homes which might be considered as genuinely long term vacant, accounting for less than 0.2% of the total housing stock of over 43,000 homes. This is a relatively modest number and is not considered to represent a significant under-utilisation of local housing stock or major source of untapped brownfield housing supply. Nevertheless, the Council published an Empty Homes Strategy in 2018 and has used or threatened to use its CPO and empty dwelling management orders to bring some long term empty/abandoned homes in recent years. It is therefore considered reasonable to include an aspirational capacity of 70 from the reintroduction of long term empty homes.
- 3.23 Out of the 208 properties identified as second homes, 40 have been registered as such for less than six months and it is recognised that some second homes are simply a consequence of the owner not have sold their primary residence elsewhere. Around 40 second homes have been confirmed as being in reasonably regular use throughout the year. There are therefore an estimated 130 second homes which can be described as not being in use with over 30 of these declared as being second homes for over 10 years. Despite this, second home ownership does not distort the local housing market in the way that it has been seen to do so in popular tourist areas and where some steps have been taken to control the problem. The Council's housing department does not therefore target second home ownership within the borough and so it is not considered reasonable to include an aspirational capacity from second homes in the borough.

Reviewing the achievability and deliverability of Hertsmere's owned assets

- 3.24 As part of the HELAA review a reevaluation of the Council's current land holdings within the borough was undertaken, to establish their achievability and deliverability under both the current and alternative policy framework. As shown in Table 11, a large number of the sites being promoted by the council are within the major urban areas (Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlement boundaries). It is therefore important that these sites are considered carefully to ensure that all available brown field land within the borough is maximised.
- 3.25 Table 11 is based on the information received from the Council's asset management department and the stated potential deliverability and availability for these sites are based on their advice. The Council owned assets that have capacity for 5 homes or fewer have not been listed as they are below the threshold for the HELAA. This includes garage blocks and vacant land such as Caishowe Road and Green Street.
- 3.26 Some of the sites promoted within the Council's ownership are dependent on decisions still to be made with regard to their availability and utilisation. The deliverability of these sites are currently stated as unknown but were decisions to be made these sites would be deliverable within the Local Plan period (2018-2036).

- 3.27 The PPG requires that all sites which do not involve major development with any form of permission, and all sites with detailed permission should be considered achievable within the next 5 years, unless evidence indicates otherwise. None of the HELAA promoted sites within Hertsmere Borough Council's ownership currently have detailed planning permission, and the deliverability rates stated reflect this. This includes the EWC Opportunity Area and Table 15 shows the deliverability rates for the remaining sites within this designated area.

| TABLE 11: Potential site deliverability under alternative and current policy frameworks for HBC sites | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|----------------|-----|---------|-----|------------|---|-------------------|-----|
| Site Ref | Site location | Capacity | Deliverability | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1-5yrs | | 6-10yrs | | 11 - 15yrs | | 16 plus (unknown) | |
| C = Current policy framework, A = Alternative policy framework | | | C | A | C | A | C | A | C | A |
| HELAA Promoted sites | | | | | | | | | | |
| 176 | Bushey Golf Course | 676* (85PDL) | 50 | 50 | 35 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 591 |
| 401 | Kemp Place Car park, Bushey | 34 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 34 | | | | |
| 371 | Old Haberdashers Sports Ground, Borehamwood | 200* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 |
| 388 | The Point, Borehamwood | 121 | 50 | 50 | 71 | 71 | | | | |
| 405 | Brook Road Car Park, Borehamwood | 32 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 32 | | | | |
| 406 | Clarendon Car Park, Borehamwood | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 | | | | |
| 518 | Former Day Centre, Grosvenor Road, Borehamwood | 23 | 23 | 23 | | | | | | |
| 177 | Dove Lane, Potters Bar | 169 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 | | | | |
| 404 | Barnet Road Car Park/Clayton Centre, Potters Bar | 14 | 14 | 14 | | | | | | |
| 403 | Newberries Car Park, Radlett | 104* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 104 |
| SADM Sites | | | | | | | | | | |
| H1 | Site of former pub Directors Arms, Ripon way, Borehamwood | 26 | 26 | 26 | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | 1,417 | 163 | 163 | 190 | 359 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 895 |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council Asset Management

*See paragraph 3.26

- 3.28 Table 12 below shows the extent of current housing commitments on Council owned land.

| TABLE 12: Current housing commitments for HBC sites | | |
|--|--|----------|
| Sites with planning permission or under consideration | | |
| Site ref | Site location | Capacity |
| N/A | Garage Site South of 77 Eldon Avenue, Borehamwood (Planning Permission granted – 19/0213/FUL) | 11 |
| N/A | Orchard Close Garage Site , Radlett (Planning Permission granted – 19/0212/FUL) | 7 |
| N/A | St Johns Church Gills Hill Lane , Radlett (Planning application under consideration) | 6 |
| N/A | Crown Road Garages, Crown Road Borehamwood (planning permission granted – 17/1950/FUL) <i>Modular units for temporary accommodation only. Not classified as C3 housing and not included in housing supply.</i> | 28 |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

Approaching owners/occupiers of major brownfield sites

- 3.29 As set out in paragraph 2.12, the Council carried out a comprehensive call for sites in 2017. This resulted in a significant number of sites being promoted by developers, land promoters and land owners. Most of the land promoted was in the Green Belt on sites containing little or no previously developed land. This is not overly surprising given that almost 80% of the borough is designated Green Belt and the key urban regeneration area, the Elstree Way Corridor, has already been allocated for development.
- 3.30 In 2019, to ensure that potential major brownfield sites were not overlooked, the Council subsequently approached the owners/occupiers of previously developed land that had sufficient capacity to accommodate a reasonable quantum of development. This included sites with large areas of car parking, including Network Rail and all major supermarkets, as well as sites where redevelopment could have the scope to improve the local area such as Potters Bar Bus Depot.
- 3.31 This approach resulted in the promotion of two new sites for employment development, HEL520a and HEL520b, on and adjacent to the Costco Warehouse on Hartspring Lane, Bushey. These are assessed later in the report.

4.0 Assessment of Supply - Housing

Overview

4.1 For the purposes of this study, housing supply has been separated into the following categories:

- **Developments with planning permission or prior notification/approval under permitted development rights.**

This category includes schemes that have commenced (but have not yet been completed) as well as those that have not yet commenced. It includes development in EWCAAP and SADM with permission.

- **Identified sites.**

This category includes sites identified through the Call for Sites including Council-owned land as well as existing allocations (without planning permission) in SADM and the Elstree Way Corridor AAP.

- **Windfall yield.**

The NPPF classifies windfall as “Sites which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. They normally comprise previously-developed sites that have unexpectedly become available.”

4.2 The findings of the HELAA are set out in the Table 13 below. It is important to note that this table accounts for supply for a 15 year period from 2019/20.

| TABLE 13: 15 year land supply (as at 01/04/19) | | |
|---|--|--|
| Planning permissions | Schemes not yet commenced | 634 (667 - 5% Lapse Rate) |
| | Schemes under construction | 572* |
| Prior notification process | Schemes not yet commenced | 187 (197 - 5% Lapse Rate) |
| | Schemes under construction | 68* |
| Identified sites | Allocations SADM | 34 (36 - 5% Lapse Rate) |
| | Elstree Way Corridor opportunity area | 651 (685 - 5% Lapse Rate) |
| | Other HELAA sites (under current policy context) | 800 (842 - 5% Lapse Rate) |
| | Other HELAA sites (under alternative policy context) | 14,985 (15,774 - 5% Lapse Rate) |
| Windfall | | 825 |
| | Total net yield (current policy context) | 3,770 units |
| | Total net yield (alternative policy context) | 17,956 units |

*Lapse rate not included on sites under construction

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

Developments with Planning Permission

- 4.3 As at 1 April 2019, planning permission or prior approval had been issued for 1,504 units⁷. Of these, 640 units were part of schemes that had commenced. 864 were part of schemes that had not yet commenced. The 5% lapse rate has been applied to the schemes that have not yet commenced, leaving a net total of 1,461 units. These are considered to be deliverable within five years.

Identified Sites within existing policy context

- 4.4 An overview of the HELAA sites can be found in Appendix 2, with an assessment sheet for each identified site included in Appendix 8 (Site Assessment Sheets). Table 14 provides a summary of potential yield from identified sites by area, excluding planning permissions and prior notifications/approvals.

| LOCATION | TIMEFRAME (Years from this assessment) | | | | TOTAL (within 15 years) |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------|----------|----------------|----------------------------|
| | 1-5yr | 6-10yr | 11-15yr | 16+ or unknown | |
| Borehamwood and Elstree | 130 | 137 | | | 267 |
| Potters Bar | 65 | 169 | | | 235 |
| Bushey | 178 | 92 | | | 270 |
| Radlett and nearby villages | 27 | | | 104 | 27 |
| Elstree Village | 15 | | | | 15 |
| Shenley | 3 | | | | 3 |
| South Mimms | | | | | 0 |
| Other locations | 25 | | | | 25 |
| Gross total | 443 | 398 | 0 | 129 | 842 |
| Net total* (5% Lapse Rate) | 421 | 379 | 0 | 123 | 800 |

*Numbers may not tally due to rounding

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

- 4.5 A proportion of the borough's housing supply will continue to be delivered in Borehamwood through redevelopment of the Elstree Way Corridor (EWC) in accordance with the [Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan \(AAP\)](#). This 15 year statutory plan was adopted by the Council in July 2015 and forms the basis of a housing-led regeneration of the corridor. 895 units have been built across the EWC at an average density of almost 170dph.
- 4.6 The AAP identifies a core Opportunity Area with the capacity to deliver up to 800 units. 829 units have already been built within this area to date, however the council considers that there is potential for a further 985 units to be allocated taking the total net capacity of the site to approximately 1,765 units. Table 15 provides an overview of estimated housing yield from the EWC.
- 4.7 Whilst the figures shown are higher than originally envisioned the estimated allocations for the site are based on the densities referred to in Policy EWC3, reflect the current

developments built within the core Opportunity Area, and the need to maximise brownfield land in accordance with the updated NPPF (Feb 2019).

| TABLE 15: Estimated Housing Supply from Identified Sites in the Elstree Way Area Action Plan | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| EWC AAP Ref | Site Location | Built | Timing (Years) | | | | Total within 15 years |
| | | | 1-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16+ or unknown | |
| EWC – Allocated sites remaining | | | | | | | |
| EWC Opportunity Area | | | | | | | |
| Site 3 | Civic Cluster | | 50 | 180 | | | 230 |
| Site 4 | Elstree Way North | | 50 | 65 | | | 115 |
| Site 5 (part) | Elstree Way South | | 50 | 130 | | | 180 |
| Site 6 | Civic Car Park | | 50 | 20 | | | 70 |
| Site 9 | Elstree Way / Bullhead Road | | 50 | 40 | | | 90 |
| Other sites | | | | | | | |
| Site 12 | Manor Way | | | | | 300 | |
| Total Allocated | | | 250 (238 net) | 435 (413 net) | | 300 (285 net) | 685 (651 net) |
| EWC Sites Under construction | | | | | | | |
| Total under construction | | | 0 | | | | 0 |
| EWC Sites Built | | | | | | | |
| Site 1 and other sites | Various | 646 | | | | | |
| Site 1 (part) | NatWest House | 95 | | | | | |
| Site 5 (part) | Former Affinity Sutton | 88 | | | | | |
| Site 10 | Former Oaklands College | 13 | | | | | |
| Site 11 | Chess House, Studio Way | 53 | | | | | |
| Total built | | 895 | | | | | |
| Total built | 895 | | | | | | |
| Total under construction | 0 | | | | | | |
| Remaining allocated | 985 (936 net) | | | | | | |
| 15 year total | 685 (651 net) | | | | | | |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

4.8 Table 16 identifies the remaining sites in SADM which have not been built, are not under construction or yet to receive planning permission. All other housing sites in SADM (H2 to

H10 inclusive) have either been built, have planning permission or are currently under construction.

| TABLE 16: Estimated Housing Supply from Identified Sites in the SADM Policies Plan | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------------|----------------|------|-------|----------------|-----------------------|
| SADM ref | Site Location | Built | Timing (Years) | | | | Total within 15 years |
| | | | 1-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16+ or unknown | |
| Sites not yet built, under construction nor subject to planning permission/prior notification | | | | | | | |
| H1 | Directors Arms Public House, Ripon Way, Borehamwood | | 26 | | | | 26 |
| H11 | First Place Nurseries, Falconer Road, Bushey | | 10 | | | | 10 |
| TC1 | 29-59 and 61-71 Shenley Rd, Borehamwood | | | | | Not known | |
| Planning permission | | | | | | | |
| H2 | Gas Holders site, Station Road, Borehamwood | | 50 | 28 | | | 78 |
| H3 | Land to the south of Elstree and Borehamwood Station | | 43 | | | | 43 |
| H4 | Land at Bushey Hall Golf Club, Bushey | | 31 | | | | 31 |
| H7 | Land at Lincolnsfield, Bushey | | 50 | 5 | | | 55 |
| H9 | Birchville Court and adjoining haulage yard, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath | | 41 | | | | 41 |
| Under construction | | | | | | | |
| H6 (part) | Hertswood Upper School, Thrift Farm Lane, Borehamwood | | 236 | | | | 236 |
| H8 | Europcar House, Aldenham Road, Bushey | | 62 | | | | 62 |
| Built | | | | | | | |
| H5 | Land at Rossway Drive, Bushey | 82 | | | | | |
| TC2 | Service Stn/Regency House/Burrell & Co, Radlett | 15 | | | | | |
| H6 (part) | Hertswood Upper School, Thrift Farm Lane, Borehamwood | 65 | | | | | |
| H10 | Elton House, Elton Way, Bushey | 71 | | | | | |
| Total built | | 233 | | | | | |
| Total under construction | | 298 | | | | | |
| With PP | | 248 (236 net) | | | | | |
| Remaining allocated | | 36 (34 net) | | | | | |
| 15 year total | | 549 (522 net) | | | | | |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

- 4.9 Combining the various sources of housing land supply in Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9 enables a five year land supply to be calculated. Based on all potential sources, under the current policy framework, a five year housing land supply of 2,429 has been identified.

| TABLE 17: 5 year land supply as at 01.04.19 | |
|--|------------------|
| Source of land supply | Net units |
| Planning Permissions under construction (Table 13) | 572 |
| Prior notifications under construction (Table 13) | 68 |
| Planning permissions (Table 13) | 634 |
| Prior notifications (Table 13) | 187 |
| HELAA sites (Table 14) | 421 |
| AAP (ex sites with pp) (Table 15) | 238 |
| Local Plan allocations (ex sites with pp) (Table 16) | 34 |
| Windfall allowance of 55 pa (paragraph 2.56) | 275 |
| Total | 2,429 |

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

Alternative policy context

- 4.10 The HELAA also assesses sites under a potential alternative policy context, where some existing constraints have been removed. This is primarily because the Council acknowledges it will not be possible to accommodate the entirety of local housing need on previously developed sites within existing built up areas.
- 4.11 As an authority with almost 80% of its area designated as Green Belt, exceptional circumstances may exist to review the Green Belt boundary in some locations in order to accommodate growth. Whether exceptional circumstances will exist will depend on:-
- (i) The acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed housing need
 - (ii) The inherent constraints on supply/availability of land suitable for sustainable development
 - (iii) The consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt
 - (iv) The nature and extent of the harm to those parts of the Green Belt which may be removed via a boundary review, and
 - (v) The extent to which impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practical extent
- 4.12 The HELAA therefore considers an alternative policy context whereby existing Green Belt restrictions are not applied to an assessment of theoretical site capacity. It must be emphasised that it is not the role of the HELAA to determine if and where Green Belt boundary changes should be made but for the purposes of assessing how much developable housing land is potentially available for development, the HELAA includes an alternative policy context.
- 4.13 A number of sites were also submitted for housing within the existing Elstree Way employment area in Borehamwood and under the current policy framework; these sites would not be suitable for development. Together these sites could accommodate approximately 570 residential units, applying the HELAA methodology for assessing site

yield. At this stage, the extent to which existing employment area boundaries will need to change is not known and so the timescale for the delivery of these sites is included within the 16+ years/unknown category.

| TABLE 18: HELAA sites in alternative policy context | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Potential housing supply by location (excluding allocated SADM sites and Elstree Way) | | | | | |
| LOCATION | TIMEFRAME (Years from this assessment) | | | | TOTAL (within 15 years) |
| | 1-5yr | 6-10yr | 11-15yr | 16+ or unknown | |
| Borehamwood and Elstree | 644 | 2,061 | 532 | 1,986 | 3,238 |
| Potters Bar | 172 | 1,518 | 1,359 | 842 | 3,049 |
| Bushey | 509 | 1,079 | 199 | 1,089 | 1,787 |
| Radlett | 215 | 1,082 | 319 | 130 | 1,616 |
| Elstree | 225 | 472 | 0 | 50 | 697 |
| Shenley | 497 | 1,232 | 26 | 345 | 1,754 |
| South Mimms | 400 | 1,073 | 44 | 342 | 1,518 |
| Other locations | 192 | 875 | 1,048 | 4,829 | 2,114 |
| Gross total | 2,854 | 9,393 | 3,526 | 9,614 | 15,774 |
| Net total (5% Lapse Rate*) | 2,712 | 8,923 | 3,350 | 9,133 | 14,985 |
| | | | | | |
| SADM sites with PP (gross) | 215 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 248 |
| SADM sites with PP (net) | 204 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 236 |
| EWCAPP/SADM sites under construction | 298 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 298 |

*Numbers may not tally due to rounding. Figures in final three rows form part of the area totals stated above.
Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

5.0 Assessment of Supply - Economic Land

- 5.1 Hertsmere Council, along with the neighbouring boroughs of Dacorum, Three Rivers and Watford, commissioned work in 2016 to identify (a) the extent and characteristics of employment growth that our collective areas will undergo in the coming years, and (b) the resulting requirements for employment land. An update of the 2016 SW Herts Economic Study will be published shortly which will provide:
- An up to date understanding of the functional market area and relevant policy context
 - An objective assessment of the long term employment land and premises needed over the period 2018-2036
 - Local authority planning and strategic economic development responses
- 5.2 In summary, the SW Herts Economic Study 2018 highlighted certain notable strengths including:
- High rates of enterprise: highest business start-up rate in SW Herts, 22 new businesses per 1,000 working age people in 2016.
 - Good transport connections: well-connected strategic road network, with A1 (M), M1 and M25. Along with notable rail links at Borehamwood, Radlett and Potters Bar.
 - Strength in TV and Film production: High concentration in creative industries with high LQs in publishing, broadcasting, arts and entertainment.

Economic Land: Class B Uses⁸

- 5.3 Over the 15 year plan period, Hertsmere's new or improved class B floorspace will be provided within a mix of the employment areas/sites identified below and new areas which will needed to be allocated in the Local Plan.

Existing employment sites

Centennial Park, Elstree (See [Map E](#), SADM) A large and modern industrial park owned by SEGRO just south of Elstree and located in/washed over by Green Belt. The site is in close proximity to the A41/M1 corridor and with the A1 and M25 within easy reach. The site has grown to include over 75,000 sqm of mixed use space including a significant amount of Grade A office space.

The site is vehicle dominated with extensive parking within the marked car park areas and also on Centennial Way. Continues to operate as a successful business park including a mix of office and light industrial uses, with recent demand for space being strong and site being nearly fully occupied.

Cranborne Road Employment Area, Potters Bar (See [Map C](#), SADM) Medium-sized industrial estate located on the northern periphery of Potters Bar. The predominant use is B1, B2 and B8 in units of varying size and occupancy rates are high. Recent investment in the area includes new office/warehouse space at Harvest House, small/medium sized industrial units at the Devonshire Centre, and

⁸ The schedule of use classes can be viewed at www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use

larger warehouse units at the Expert Logistics site. The Enterprise Centre also accommodates around 40 small businesses in dedicated serviced offices.

Access to the wider strategic road network is not ideal, with access to the M25 and A1(M) via the B road network either through Potters Bar town or via South Mimms. The area is well-connected by local bus routes and a train service to London.

There is scope for some redevelopment and intensification within the area. The site continues to operate as a successful mixed use site.

**Elstree Way
Employment Area,
Borehamwood (See
[Map A](#), SADM)**

This is a large, intensively developed employment area to the east of Borehamwood town centre. It spans either side of Elstree Way and supports a mix of employment uses, including B1, B2 and B8. There are several large scale distribution warehouses in the area, including a Sainsbury's distribution centre; Sainsbury's are due to vacate the site shortly with a new operator planning to take over and upgrade the site.

Occupancy rates are relatively high although permitted development rights to enable offices to be converted into residential have resulted in a scheme coming forward for Elstree House.

The location is accessible. Some of it is within walking distance of Borehamwood town centre and is well-serviced by public transport, including the Thameslink train service to London. Access to the strategic transport network is good, with the A1 Barnet By-Pass nearby.

There is scope for some redevelopment and intensification within the area.

**Otterspool Way
Employment Area,
Bushey (See [Map B](#),
SADM)**

Medium sized employment area located just off the A41, close to the junction with the M1 (J5). The area currently comprises a limited number of class B sites, with more under sui generis use. Existing uses include a large Porcelanosa showroom, several car showrooms, and builders' merchants.

Occupancy rates are high, particularly for the larger units. There is scope for some redevelopment and intensification within the area. In particular, the vacant units mentioned above are generally of older stock and could represent a redevelopment opportunity.

**Station Close
Employment Area,
Potters Bar (See
[Map C](#), SADM)**

Small industrial area located to the north of Potters Bar railway station. Darkes Lane (the town's main shopping area) and the train station are within walking distance. Station Close is a cul-de-sac and vehicular access is via Darkes Lane only.

The area is intensively developed and comprises office and light industrial tenancies in one and two storey buildings. Occupancy rates

are still good overall, and the site is still operating successfully mixed use site. There is little scope for expansion or redevelopment.

**Stirling Way
Employment Area,
Borehamwood (See
[Map A, SADM](#))**

Small industrial area on the south eastern periphery of Borehamwood. A row of industrial units provide mix of small scale office and workshop space along Stirling Way, which runs alongside the A1 Barnet by-pass. Vehicular access is good, with a road linkage directly onto the A1. Occupancy rates are high although permitted development rights to enable offices to be converted into residential are beginning to be exercised on some sites, with a large amount of space on site now in non-B class uses.

There is little scope for expansion or redevelopment within the area.

Other

The sites listed below make a significant contribution to the Borough's current supply of employment land and are identified as Locally Significant Employment sites by the Council. However, the potential for these sites to accommodate additional floorspace is limited.

- Wrotham Business Park
- Borehamwood Enterprise Centre and adjoining sites;
- Theobald Court and adjoining site, Borehamwood;
- Lismirrane Industrial Park, Elstree;
- Hollies Way Business Park, Potters Bar;
- Beaumont Gate, Radlett; and
- Farm Close sites, Shenley.

Outside of the designated areas above, there are a number of other sites which employ significant numbers of people in B class activities including:

- The Waterfront, Elstree
- Imperial Place, Borehamwood
- Canada Life, Potters Bar
- Cancer Research UK, South Mimms
- NIBSC, South Mimms
- Bio Products, Elstree
- BBC Elstree, Borehamwood
- Elstree Film Studios, Borehamwood

5.4 Available industrial floor space² in Hertsmere is estimated to be 61,530m² with the demand being calculated at 81,900m² and the availability rate ranging from 2.0% for small units to 7.3% for large units. The vacancy rate in 2018 was 2.9%. Over the past decade, Hertsmere's annual take-up of industrial floorspace has averaged 2,100sq m² (2009 – 2018)⁹.

5.5 There is an estimated shortfall of 8,142m² of available office floor space² in Hertsmere, with the demand being calculated at 35,700m² and the availability rate being less than 3%. Over the past decade, there has been an average net take-up of 1,400m² (2009 – 2018).¹⁰

⁹ Data Sources: Costar Focus / Hatch Regeneris

¹⁰ Data Sources: Costar Focus / Hatch Regeneris

- 5.6 The adopted Hertsmere Local Plan seeks to encourage economic development and promote a competitive local economy within the Borough. To this end, provision will be made for the supply of at least 110ha of designated employment land for B-class development up to 2027.

Potential sites for economic development

- 5.7 The NPPG requires that assessments should consider potential sites for economic development on sites of 0.25 hectares (or 500 square metres of floor space) and above. A number of sites have been promoted for economic development purposes and those which are considered suitable, available and achievable are set out below.
- 5.8 Sites under a potential alternative policy context have also been identified, where some existing constraints have been removed. This is primarily because it may not be possible to accommodate employment requirements on previously developed sites solely within existing built up areas, given that 80% of the borough is designated as Green Belt.
- 5.9 As exceptional circumstances may exist to review the Green Belt boundary in some locations in order to accommodate economic development, the HELAA considers an alternative policy context whereby existing Green Belt restrictions are not applied to an assessment of potential locations. It must be emphasised that it is not the role of the HELAA to determine if and where Green Belt boundary changes should be made but for the purposes of assessing economic land, the HELAA includes an alternative policy context.
- 5.10 This alternative policy context includes land as part of an innovation hub proposed for a new garden village. Land which is currently safeguarded for employment purposes in the current Local Plan, in Borehamwood (Rowley Lane) and Potters Bar (Cranbourne Road) is also included with both sites available for development. Furthermore, there were a small number of other potential development sites promoted for mixed use schemes or where the use was not yet determined. In these instances, the sites have been included within the employment figures below.
- 5.11 Translating these sites into potential jobs figures is difficult at this stage given that specific uses have not been proposed and the final occupiers of sites are not known. Consequently, only sites areas alone are shown.

| TABLE 19: Potential sites for economic development | | |
|---|--|--|
| Site | Current policy context (15 year supply) | Alternative policy context (15 year supply) |
| | Total area (ha) | Total area (ha) |
| Borehamwood and Elstree | 0.8 | 43.4 |
| Bushey | 6.8 | 20.2 |
| Potters Bar and South Mimms | 0.1 | 2.6* |
| Radlett and nearby villages | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Shenley | 0 | 0 |
| South Mimms | 0 | 1.4 |
| Other locations | 0 | 55.8 |
| Total | 7.8 | 123.5 |

*Excludes HEL361 for which employment land site area has not been identified.

**Numbers may not tally due to rounding.

Source: Hertsmere Borough Council

- 5.11 As part of the SW Herts Economic Study, an assessment was conducted that analysed all of the existing employment sites, along with all of the potential employment sites (excluding car parks) that had been submitted at the time.¹¹ The report concluded that current employment spaces are trading well and have high levels of occupancy, and that market demand for these sites appears to be strong. The only site that was identified to have significant supply of vacant space was at Cranbourne Road. Meaning that there was very limited opportunities for redevelopment or intensification within existing sites. A breakdown of the conclusions, from this study, for the potential employment sites (including the sites safeguarded for employment) are shown in Table 20 below.

| TABLE 20: Potential sites for employment (including safeguarded sites) conclusions | |
|---|--|
| Elstree Way Employment Area | The size, flat topography and proximity to the strategic road network are strengths, positioning the site to accommodate future strategic employment land. Employment land development would be a natural extension from the existing Elstree Way Employment Area and likely attract similar light industrial strategic industrial uses in the medium term. Any development requires the delivery of access roads from Rowley Lane and utilities infrastructure. |
| Land at Rowley Lane | The site is well positioned strategically with strong access to the motorway network and labour pool which will likely attract investment from both local and strategic industrial markets. However, the site is currently Green Belt and located north of an existing safeguarded site, meaning the likelihood of development is long term. Any form of development would be a natural extension from the existing Elstree Way Employment Area. |
| Tyttenhanger Estate | The site is subject to proposals for a new garden village, however consideration should be given to employment land adjacent to the M25 Junction. The M25 Junction is strategically connected to local industrial and regional industrial markets. The site is well positioned to accommodate medium term demand from logistics and local light industrial activity. |
| Land to East of South Mimms Services | The location of the site on the A1/M25 junction positions the site to accommodate demand for large scale strategic industrial uses, particularly logistics and distribution as well as light industrial. The neighbouring South Mimms Services is an advantage as it provides services to support the 24 hour function of these uses. Any form of development needs to consider the environmental impacts and is reliant on the delivery of access roads and utilities infrastructure. |
| Elton Way, Bushey | The site is strategically positioned between the A41 and the M1 motorway. The proximity to the established employment land west of the site provides an opportunity for the site to accommodate similar uses which will respond to the growing demand for local population serving industrial uses. |
| Land adjacent to Cranborne Rd | The potential expansion area suffers from a less prominent location and a poorer quality environment than elsewhere in the business park. However the industrial estate is performing well and we continue to consider that the expansion area provides an attractive proposition for further expansion of the employment area. |
| Land to north and west of Centennial Park | Centennial Park is a successful and commercially attractive site. There is further limited development opportunities within the existing site. We therefore continue to recommend the potential expansion opportunities are strongly considered by the Council. The Green Belt designation still means that this option would require careful consideration. |

Source: Hatch Regeneris/ GL Hearn

¹¹ This report excludes HEL520a and b Costco and the land South east of Costco, HEL503 Land adjacent to Lissmirrane Industrial Park, and HEL519a and b Tarmac land south of M25.

Economic Land: Class A Uses¹²

5.12 Over the 15 year plan period, the majority of Hertsmere's class A floorspace is expected to be provided within the centres listed below, as identified in the South West Hertfordshire Retail and Leisure Study (September 2018), as well as any local centres created through new garden suburbs and/or garden village. It should be noted that the typology of settlements proposed in the Retail and Leisure Study does not correspond directly with that contained within the current Local Plan.

Town Centre: Borehamwood

Local Town Centre: Potters Bar (Darkes Lane)

District Centre: (Potters Bar (High Street), Bushey Village, Bushey Heath, Radlett

Local Centre: Leeming Road, Borehamwood

Key Neighbourhood Parade: Manor Way (Borehamwood), Harcourt Road (Bushey), Bushey Hall Road (Bushey), Cranborne Parade (Potters Bar)

Service Village/Neighbourhood Centre: Elstree Village Centre, Andrews Close (Shenley)

¹² The schedule of use classes can be viewed at www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use

6.0 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: NEW ASSESSMENT SHEET PRO FORMA

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|-----------|--|------------------|--|
| Site Name | | | |
| Address | | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | |
| Ward | | Town/ Village | |
| Promoter | | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | | Current use(s) | |
|--------------------|--|----------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | | | |

Planning history:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Residential or care home | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| | | | | |
| Stage 1 Comment | | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| | | | | |
| Stage 2 Comment | | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | |
| Any access difficulties. | |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | |
| Any other environmental constraints? | |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Has the owner said the site is available | | Is there developer interest | |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Is the Site available | |
|-----------------------|--|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Is the Site achievable | |
|------------------------|--|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Higher | Very high | Urban brownfield flats |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| | | |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|--|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | |
| Reason | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|-------------|
| Capacity: * |
|-------------|

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

APPENDIX 2: SITES FROM PREVIOUS HELAA WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN REASSESSED

| Borehamwood | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Previous HELAA ref. | Site address | Reason for non-reassessment in 2019 HELAA |
| S27 | Elstree Distribution Centre | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| S61 | 57-59 Oakwood Avenue | Pre-application interest only for 4 dwellings and so falls below HELAA threshold |
| S137 | Land rear of Crown Road | Planning permission since granted for modular units for temporary housing (not C3 and do not count towards housing supply in Appendix 16) |
| S142 | Garages off Grove Road | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| S143 | Land rear of 16-28 Masefield Avenue, adjoining 13-43 Milton Avenue | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| S144 | Land rear of 13-21 Hartforde Road, 16-18 Spring Close and 3-7 Winstre Road | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| SU7 | St. Andrews United Reformed Church, Aycliffe Road | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C3 | Land to the rear of 28 - 42 Alexandra Road, Well End | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C6 | Paramount House, 17-21 Shenley Road | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C7 | Elstree House, Elstree Way | Site has been converted into residential units. |
| C48 | 36-44 Lodge Avenue, Elstree | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |

| Bushey | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Previous HELAA ref. | Site address | Reason for non-reassessment in 2019 HELAA |
| S74 | 121-123 Aldenham Road | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| SU21 | Bushey Police Station, 43 Sparrows Herne | Site since converted for residential development |
| C29 | 129 - 135 High Road | Site since redeveloped for residential |
| C32 | 2 & 4 Steeplands, 1 & 3 Claybury Hertfordshire | Site since approved for residential development |
| C33 | Walnut Green Garages and Land at the rear of 301,303, 313 Park Avenue | Site since approved for residential development |
| C34 | Land At Caldecote Farm Livery, Caldecote Lane | Site since approved for residential development |
| C35 | Land To the rear Of Grove House, High Street | Site since approved for residential development |
| C36 | St Margarets School Merry Hill Road | Site since approved for residential development (on part of school site) |
| C37 | 61-63 Bushey Hall Road and Abbeyfield Society Walker Lodge, Ashlyn Close | Site since approved for residential development |
| C38 | 6 - 14 High Road, Bushey Heath | Planning application since refused/appeal dismissed on the site. Existing business still operating on site and no indication that site, which was not promoted through the HELAA, is currently available for development. |

| Potters Bar | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| Previous HELAA ref. | Site address | Reason for non-reassessment in 2019 HELAA |
| S45 | Oakmere Library, High Street | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| S55 | Potters Bar Garden Centre (formally identified as 'land at Bentley Heath) | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| S159 | Elm Court, 363 Mutton Lane | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| S160 | Former Cranbourne Library and Clinic, Mutton Lane | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C15 | Metropolitan House, Darkes Lane | Prior Approval secured for conversion into flats |

| | | |
|-----|---|--|
| C19 | Land Behind Stagg Ridge Flats | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C63 | Council-owned garage sites: Kimptons Close and Oakmere Avenue | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C16 | 233-235 Darkes Lane | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C14 | The Green Man, 238 High Street | Planning application and listed building consent application for 18 units approved in January 2019. Site included within extant permissions. |

| South Mimms | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| Previous HELAA ref. | Site address | Reason for non-reassessment in 2019 HELAA |
| S29 | Land at 49-55 Blanche Lane | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |

| Radlett | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Previous HELAA ref. | Site address | Reason for non-reassessment in 2019 HELAA |
| S60 | Land rear of The Warren (Site B) | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| SU39 | Radlett Youth Centre, 2 Loom Lane | Site since approved for residential development |
| C53 | 2 Newlands Avenue | No further promotion of the site and no applications submitted since previous HELAA |
| C54 | 8 Watford Road | Site since approved for residential development |
| C55 | 18 Watford Road | Site since approved for residential development |
| C56 | 203-205 Watling Street | Site since approved for residential development |

APPENDIX 3: SITES FROM PREVIOUS HELAA WHICH HAVE BEEN CARRIED FORWARD

| Previous HELAA ref. | Site address | Reason for inclusion in 2019 HELAA | Capacity |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------|
| C20 | Hollies House, 230 High street | Recent pre-application interest in adding two additional floors to create 10 new flats supported by officers. Timescale unknown. | 10 |

**APPENDIX 4: METHODOLOGY CONSULTATION LETTER AND RESPONSES ON DRAFT HELAA
METHODOLOGY CONSULTATION**



Planning and Economic Development

Your ref:
Our ref: HELAA 2017
Direct line: 0208 207 2277
Ext:
Email: local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk
Fax: 0208 207 7444
Date:

Dear

New Local Plan: Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) – draft methodology

You may recall that earlier this year we wrote to you advising that the council was issuing a Call for Sites as part of the update of its Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The HELAA update is an important step in the preparation of the new Local Plan for the borough as it will help the council to identify land potentially available for future housing and economic development sites during the period covered by the Plan. A significant number of sites and areas have been submitted for inclusion in this HELAA update and detailed assessments will shortly start to be undertaken.

The purpose of writing at this stage is to give all interested parties an opportunity to comment on the council's draft methodology for assessing these sites and areas. The draft methodology is available on the council's website at www.hertsmere.gov.uk/HELAA

If you would like to make any comments on the draft methodology (NOT on individual sites please) please do so by Friday 28 July 2017, preferably by email, to

- local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk

Postal submissions should be sent to

- Planning Policy Team, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood, WD6 1WA

to be received by the same date.

I would like to remind all parties that the HELAA itself is of course not a statement of council policy and does not allocate land for future development; rather it forms one part of a larger evidence base that informs the plan making process. Inclusion of a site in the HELAA does not mean that the site will be allocated for development or that planning permission would automatically be granted if an application were made.

I hope the above is self-explanatory but if you have any queries or need a hard copy of the draft methodology please contact the Policy and Transport team in the Planning department on the number above or email local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk.

Yours faithfully

Mark Silverman
Policy and Transport Manager

| Submitted by | On Behalf of | Comments | HBC response |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Bidwells | Endurance Estates Strategic Ltd. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of a comprehensive HELAA. • It is not defined what constitutes new evidence to revisit sites. • Each site should be assessed again. • There isn't sufficient guidance for the survey form in appendix 4 to carry out assessments. • Support the suggestion for sites to be joined together. • Suggest a further category should be added to identify green belt and rural sites <p>Methodology should provide clear guidance to ensure the HELAA results are robust.</p> | <p>New evidence may vary according to each site and could include a new planning permission, new ownership, removal of previously identified constraints etc.</p> <p>A proportionate approach to assessing sites will be taken.</p> <p>Guidance based on that in the PPG will be used when assessing sites.</p> <p>The assessment pro-forma includes the need to identify all different types of location outside the urban area</p> |
| CPRE Herts Local Plan Team | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with comprehensive assessment • Figure one fails to accommodate a conclusion at the end of stage 4 that there are not enough sites to meet/ locations to meet development needs. • Pleased by a wide range of potential development land sources considered in paragraph 2.6. • Additional opportunities in established uses should be specifically expanded to include other categories of underused land. • Don't limit redevelopment opportunities to 'large scale' • Care needs to be taken in considering conflict with 'a limited range of national policies and designations'. • In paragraph 2.9 some policies carry less protection under national policies set out in the NPPF than those that the draft methodology is proposing to ignore. • Both Green Belt and SSSI's are listed in footnote 9 to the NPPF, and should surely be treated in a similar way if the | <p>Figure 1 is taken directly from the PPG https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-land-availability-assessment However the point that repeated iterations of the site search/assessment cannot go on ad infinitum is accepted.</p> <p>In paragraph 2.6, under-used garages are given purely as an example – it is not meant to be exhaustive. It is the example quoted in the PPG. Reference to 'large scale' redevelopment has been amended to 'redevelopment'.</p> <p>An additional paragraph relating to Green Belt protection is added to the methodology as follows: <i>It is acknowledged that footnote 9 of the NPPF includes both Green Belt and other designations including SSSIs. The NPPF does, however, at</i></p> |

| Submitted by | On Behalf of | Comments | HBC response |
|------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>process is to be found sound at the end of the day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 3, windfalls. Urge council to recognise the impact of a series of changes to permitted development rights that has resulted in a very significant increase in available dwellings nationally and locally in the last 4 years. • Appendix 2, the extract from the NPPG under ‘Vacant and derelict land and buildings’, to ‘potential permitted development changes, e.g. offices to residential’, and the lack of any ‘potential data source’ against this category • Not an excuse for the Council to underestimate the true scale of the potential contribution that such sources are likely to make over the next 15 years. | <p><i>paragraphs 83 and 84, allow for the review of Green Belt boundaries. A stage 1 Green Belt Review was undertaken in 2016. Sites will initially be assessed against the outcomes of this review in order to identify their contribution to Green Belt purposes.</i> The assessment pro-forma has been adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>The council will make realistic estimates of the contribution that windfall arising from such changes can be expected to make.</p> |
| HNL Sustainable Places | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not have any comments to make on the contents of the report. • We would however just take this opportunity to remind you that once sites have been identified as potentially available, flood risk will need to be considered in line with the Sequential Test, whereby sites in Flood Zones 2 and 3 should not be allocated unless it can be demonstrated that there are no other available sites within Flood Zone 1 | <p>The sequential test will be applied in relation to any potential new sites proposed to be allocated.</p> |
| Mark Homan | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reference to types of site at paragraph 2.6 should include a reference to existing Safeguarded sites or clarify that these are included in those already identified under the SADM consultation process | <p>The first bullet point in para 2.6 has been amended to say ‘Existing Local Plan allocations <i>(including safeguarded land)</i>...’</p> |
| Richard Carr | Transport for London | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment | |
| | The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To align the questionnaire with SADM10, include in Q6 [Site Restraints] ‘RIGS’ • A question to ask if the site was previously submitted to SHLAA and its reference number [if known] | <p>If a site lies within a RIG this would be picked up in the site assessment under Site suitability and would exclude sites from further assessment as per para 2.9 of the methodology.</p> |

| Submitted by | On Behalf of | Comments | HBC response |
|--------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A question to ask if the site lies in a Landscape Conservation Area, protected under the Local Plan 2003-2011, Policy C9 • Are the former Local Plan Policy C9 sites are carried through into the SADM, adopted in 2016? • In particular, I refer to the protection of Landscape Conservation Areas, specifically site S22 in the SHLAA of 2009, that forms part of the Green Belt boundary of Radlett, and which finds itself within the Radlett NP area | <p>Sites are cross referenced to previous SHLAAs as part of the initial assessment process and their previous reference number noted.</p> <p>Landscape Conservation Areas are no longer a designation.</p> |
| Groombridge | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment | |
| Paul Cronk | JB Planning Associates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that the council is only seeking to exclude sites with a very limited number of major policy constraints is to be welcomed • Care will need to be taken to ensure that no double-counting arises in relation to prior-approval and windfall sites. | <p>The council will ensure that there is no double counting of sites.</p> |

APPENDIX 5: ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED ON HELAA/INVITED TO SUBMIT SITES TO THE CALL FOR SITES

The following were invited to submit sites to the Call for Sites and to comment on the proposed HELAA Methodology.

| Councils, Government Departments and other Statutory organisations | |
|---|---|
| Aldenham Parish Council | Environment Agency |
| Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council | NHS |
| Ridge Parish Council | NHS Property |
| Shenley Parish Council | Herts Valley CCG |
| South Mimms Parish Council | Hertfordshire Community NHS Trust |
| Hertfordshire County Council | Watford Chamber of Commerce |
| Dacorum Borough Council | Affinity Water |
| East Herts Borough Council | Thames Water |
| St Albans District Council | British Gas |
| Three Rivers Borough Council | National Grid |
| Welwyn Hatfield Borough council | NPower |
| Watford Borough Council | EDF Energy |
| LB Barnet | EE |
| LB Enfield | Energy UK |
| LB Harrow | EON Energy |
| Colney Heath Parish Council | SSE |
| London Colney Parish Council | UK Power Networks |
| North Mymms Parish Council | CPD.CustomerServices@hertfordshire.gov.uk |
| St Stephens Parish Council | Govia Thameslink |
| Watford Rural Parish Council | Highways England |
| Greater London Authority | Transport for London |
| Hertfordshire Police | Network Rail |
| Hertfordshire LEP | |
| Ministry of Defence | |
| DEFRA | |

| Developers/ Agents/Land Owners | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Affinity Sutton - now Wandle | Beechwood Homes |
| AKT Planning and Architecture | Bell Cornwell |
| Alan Cox Associates | Bellway Homes |
| Aldenham Residential | Berkeley Group |
| Aldwyck HA | Bidwells |
| David Ames Associates | Bishopswood Estates Ltd |
| Anderson | Blue Sky Planning |
| Annington Property Limited | BNP Paribas Real Estate |
| Apcar Smith Planning | Boyer Planning |
| APC Planning Ltd | Bio Products Laboratory |
| Armstrong Rigg | CALA Management Ltd |
| Aylward Town Planning Ltd | Capita |
| Barker Parry Town Planning | Careys New Homes |
| Barratt North London | Catalyst Land Solutions |
| Barton Willmore LLP | Catesby Property Group |
| CgMs Ltd | CC Town Planning |
| Chris Thomas Ltd | Mark Homan |
| Circle Housing Group | House Builders Federation |
| Cliff Walsingham & Company | Iceni Projects Limited |
| Colliers CRE | Inland PLC |
| Comer Homes | Januarys Consultant Surveyors |
| Commercial Estates Group | Jehovas Witnesses |
| Consensus Planning Ltd | JB Planning |
| Countryside Properties (Southern) Ltd | Jennifer Lampert Associates Ltd |
| County Group | Jeremy Peter Associates |
| Stewart Ross Associates | JFL Planning |
| | Jones Lang LaSalle, |

| | |
|--|---|
| Developers/ Agents/Land Owners | Beechwood Homes |
| Dandara Group Holdings Ltd. | JPB Architects |
| Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd | KJD Solicitors |
| Daniel Watney | Knight Frank LLP |
| Deloitte Real Estate | Lambert Smith Hampton |
| Defence Estates | Land and partners |
| DLA Town Planning | Lanes New Homes |
| DLP Planning | Linden Homes |
| DMH Stallard | Martin Robeson |
| DPDS Consulting | Shakespeare Martineau |
| Edaw PLC | Maze Planning Ltd |
| Edwards Covell | McGuire Architecture & Design |
| Elliott Burkeman Minton Group | Roy Monk |
| Fisher German LLP | Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners |
| Fusion Residential | Newell Projects Ltd |
| Fusion Online Ltd | Nicholas King Homes |
| Gerald Eve | Paradigm Housing Group |
| Gregory Gray Associates | Peacock and Smith |
| GL Hearn | Pegasus Group |
| Grigg Homes | Persimmon Homes |
| DLA Town Planning | Peter Brett Associates |
| DLP Planning | Phillips Planning Services Ltd |
| DMH Stallard | Planning Potential |
| DPDS Consulting | Planning Works Ltd |
| Edaw PLC | PlanwareLtd |
| Edwards Covell | Robert Pott |
| Elliott Burkeman Minton Group | PPML Consulting Ltd |
| Fisher German LLP | Prestige Products |
| Fusion Residential | Preston Bennett Planning |
| Fusion Online Ltd | Quod Consultancy |
| Gerald Eve | Rapleys LLP |
| Gregory Gray Associates | Redrow Homes |
| GL Hearn | Relic Homes |
| Grigg Homes | rg+p Ltd |
| Heaton Planning | Rinsler & Co |
| Heine Planning | Robin Bretherick Associates |
| Hepher Grincell | Robson Planning Consultancy |
| Heronsea Group | Rolfe Judd |
| Hightown Praetorian and Churches Housing Association | Rosenfelder Associates |
| RPS Planning and Development Ltd | Carter Jonas |
| RPS PLC | Clivenden Homes |
| Rumball Sedgwick Chartered Surveyors | David Russell Associates |
| Savills | DPP LLP |
| Shandler Homes | E M Pick Planning |
| Shanly Homes | Frank Timothy Associated Ltd Architects |
| Silk Planning | Freeth Melhuish |
| Smith Jenkins | George Wimpey Strategic Land |
| SSA Planning | GHM Rock Townsend |
| St Modwen PLC | Hertford Planning Service |
| Ian Stewart | Jarvis Homes |
| Stewart Management and Planning Solutions | JCPC Ltd |
| Stewart Ross Associates | John Griggs and Son LTD |
| Strutt and Parker LLP | John Martin & Associates |
| Taylor Wimpey | Kent Jones and Done |
| Terence O'Rourke | Land Securities Trillium |
| Tetlow King Planning | Landmark Information Group |
| Turley Associates | Leach Homes |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Developers/ Agents/Land Owners | Beechwood Homes |
| Vincent & Gorbing | Lennon Planning |
| Walsingham Planning | LEVVEL Old Road Securities PLC |
| Weston Home Plc | M J Mapp LLP |
| Woolf Bond Planning LLP | Mike Hastings Design |
| Wyevale Garden Centres Ltd. | MVM Planning |
| Wakelin Associates | Mymmsmead Land Trust |
| VRG Planning Ltd | Pearson Associates |
| Jeremy Peter Associates | Planning Bureau Limited |
| Robert Young Associates | Planning Issues |
| A.C.P. Askew | Post Office Property Holdings |
| T Ball | RAF Hard FM Land Management Services |
| Blue Sky Planning | Sheppard Robson |
| British Land Company PLC | Slough Estates plc |
| | Scott Land Properties |
| | Taylor Wimpey |
| | Widacre Homes Ltd |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Estate Agents | Interested Organisations |
| Abaco | Allotments Association (Watford) |
| Aitchisons | Borehamwood Four Parks Friends Association |
| Andrew Ward, Potters bar | Bushey Heath Residents Association |
| Auckland Estates, Potters Bar | Bushey Green Belt Association; Little Bushey Residents Assoc |
| Barkers | Bushey Hall Park Residents Association |
| Barkers | Bushey Museum |
| Barkers | Bushey Residents Action Group |
| Barons, Borehamwood | Caldecote Neighbourhood Association |
| Carrington Estate Agent | Cherry Tree Lane Green Belt Protection Group |
| Churchills, Bushey | Church Commissioners |
| Clarets Estate Agents | Community Development Agency for Hertfordshire |
| Duncan Perry Estate Agents | CPRE Hertfordshire |
| Eden Estates Borehamwood | Cranborne Road Residents Association |
| Fine & Country - Radlett | Elstree and Borehamwood Green Belt Society |
| Haart | Elstree and Borehamwood Residents Association |
| Hobdays | Groundwork Hertfordshire |
| JW&Co Langleys | Hadley Wood Assoc. Council |
| L&H Residential Borehamwood | Hartsbourne Manor Residents Association |
| LEV Lettings & Sales Borehamwood | Haydon Hill House (Garden Association) Ltd |
| Lumleys Estate Agents Radlett | Heathways Residents Association |
| Martin Allsuch | Letchmore Heath Village Trust |
| Michael Yeo | Little Heath Action Group |
| Morris & Joel Borehamwood | Local Agenda 21 Transport & Pollution Group |
| Open Estates | Manor Court Residents Association |
| Raine & Co | Maxwell Park Community Centre |
| Shenley Estates | Merryhill Residents Association |
| Simmons Estates | National Federation of Gypsy Liason Groups |
| Squires Estates Borehamwood | Newlands Avenue Road Committee |
| Statons | North Bushey Residents Group |
| Vanessa McCallum Estates Potters Bar | North Mymms District Green Belt Society |
| Village Estates | Oakridge Avenue Road Association |
| Winkworth - Borehamwood & Elstree | Open Spaces Society |
| | Oxhey Village Environmental Group |
| | Paddock Road Allotments |
| | Patchetts Green, Roundbush & Aldenham Conservation Society |
| | Potters Bar Chamber Of Commerce |
| | Potters Bar in Focus |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Potters Bar Society |
| | Potters Bar Society (Rural Access Co-ordinator) |
| | Potters Bar Society (Town Group) |
| | Radlett Society and Green Belt Association |
| | Railtrack plc |
| | Ridge Residents Association |
| | Royds Conservation Residents Association |
| | Save the Green Belt Association |
| | Shenley Park Trust |
| | Shenley Village Society |
| | Swanland Road Residents' Group |
| | The Bushey Forum |
| | The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups |
| | The Ridgeway Road Association |
| | The Royal Veterinary College |
| | The Woodcock Hill Village Green Members |
| | The Woodland Trust |
| | Warren Estate Residents Association |
| | Well End Residents Association |
| | Woodland Trust |
| | Wroxham Residents Action Group |

APPENDIX 6: CALL FOR SITES LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE



HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Civic Offices, Elstree Way
Borehamwood
Herts WD6 1WA
Tel: 020 8207 2277
DX45602 Borehamwood
www.hertsmere.gov.uk

Planning and Economic Development

Your ref:
Our ref: HELAA 2017
Direct line: 0208 207 2277
Ext:
Email: local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk
Fax: 0208 207 7444
Date:

Dear

New Local Plan: Call for Sites and update of Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)

I am writing to advise that the Council has issued a 'Call for Sites' as part of the current update of its Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA).

The HELAA is a technical study that provides an overview of the borough's housing and economic land supply. It is updated regularly and is used to inform our planning policies and choices on specific allocations of land to meet the borough's future development needs. The previous HELAA was published in 2015.

The Council has also recently begun the process of preparing a new Local Plan for the borough. Further information on this is available on the Council's website at www.hertsmere.gov.uk/newlocalplan. The current HELAA update will help the Council to identify land that may potentially be available for future development and is an important step in the preparation of the Local Plan.

If you wish the council to consider whether a particular site has potential for development and could be considered for inclusion in the new Local Plan, please complete and return a HELAA Site Questionnaire with a plan clearly identifying the site boundary. We can then consider whether your site is potentially available, suitable and achievable for development during the plan period. Sites should only be submitted if they could provide five or more dwellings, or economic development of 0.25ha (site area) or 500m² (floorspace). Sites which could accommodate pitches for Gypsies and Travellers can also be submitted.

Further information and the questionnaire to be completed can be found on the *Call for Sites* page on the council's website www.hertsmere.gov.uk/callforsites.

If you wish to

- submit a new site for consideration, or

- confirm that a site previously included in the HELAA (or its predecessor study, known as the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment or SHLAA) should remain under consideration

please return a completed questionnaire and site plan either by email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to the Policy and Transport Team at the address above by 5pm on **Friday 3 March 2017**. Please complete and return a questionnaire and site plan even if your site has previously been included in the HELAA/SHLAA to ensure that your site is considered on the basis of up to date information.

It is important to emphasise that the HELAA itself is not a statement of Council policy and does not allocate land for future development; rather it forms one part of a larger evidence base that informs the plan making process. Inclusion of a site in the HELAA does not mean that the site will be allocated for development or that planning permission would automatically be granted if an application were made. Please note that information on sites considered through the HELAA cannot be treated as confidential and will be publicly available.

I hope the above is self-explanatory but if you have any queries please contact the Policy and Transport team in the Planning department on the above number or email | local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk.

Yours faithfully

Mark Silverman
Policy and Transport Manager



**Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
Local Plan Call for Sites 2016
Site Questionnaire**

Hertsmere Borough Council is currently reviewing its Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) to identify land available for potential future housing and economic development sites up to 2031 in order to inform the preparation of its new Local Plan.

To assist the Council in determining whether sites are potentially available, suitable or achievable for housing (including for Gypsy and Traveller pitches) or economic development, please complete and return this questionnaire. All sites submitted should be capable of delivering five or more dwellings, or economic development on sites of 0.25ha or 500m² of floorspace and above. Completed questionnaires can be returned using one of the following methods:

By Email (preferred): local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk

By Post: Planning Policy and Transport Team, Civic Offices,
Elstree Way, Borehamwood, WD6 1WA

**Please use a separate form for each site submitted and
include a plan clearly identifying in red the site boundary.**

Please note that information on sites considered through the land availability assessment process will be openly available to the public and the information submitted will NOT be treated as confidential.

Inclusion in and assessment through the HELAA does not guarantee planning permission for nor imply the designation or allocation of any site for development.

1. CONTACT DETAILS

Owners Details (required):

Name:

Click here to enter text.

Address:

Click here to enter text.

Postcode:

Click here to enter text.

Tel No:

Click here to enter text.

Email Address:

Click here to enter text.

Agent's Details: (if applicable)

Name:

Click here to enter text.

Address:

Click here to enter text.

Postcode:

Click here to enter text.

Tel No:

Click here to enter text.

Email Address:

Click here to enter text.

2. SITE DETAILS

Please include a plan clearly showing the exact location, and boundaries (marked in red) of the site. Forms submitted without a site plan will not be considered.

Site Address including postcode:

Click here to enter text.

OS Grid Reference (if known):

Click here to enter text.

Site Area (Hectares):

Click here to enter text.

Land ownership (if you are not the owner):

Click here to enter text.

3. CURRENT AND POTENTIAL USE

a) What is the site currently used for?

Click here to enter text.

b) When did this use commence?

Click here to enter text.

c) What was the site used for prior to the current use?

Click here to enter text.

d) If the site is currently occupied by another individual or organisation, please describe their status (e.g. tenant, leaseholder) and the expected duration of this arrangement.

Click here to enter text.

e) Please describe the overall level of occupancy:

Click here to enter text.

f) What is the proposed use of the site? (i.e. residential (please indicate type if known – eg market, affordable, specialist, gypsy/traveller), employment, mixed use)

Click here to enter text.

g) Does the site currently have planning permission and if so, would this form the basis of what you intend to deliver on the site?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

h) If the site has a recently lapsed planning permission

(i) please clarify why the permission has been allowed to lapse

[Click here to enter text.](#)

and

(ii) do you intend to reapply for a similar scheme which delivers the same amount of development?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

4. TIMESCALE

When do you consider the site will be available for development?(Please select the option that applies)

[Choose an item.](#)

On what grounds is this assessment based?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

5. ECONOMIC VIABILITY

a) Has there been interest in the site from any other developer?

Yes

No

b) Has a developer or you already taken steps toward developing the site for housing? (If yes, please give details)

Yes

[Click here to enter text.](#)

No

c) How many dwellings might you/the developer wish to build on the site, if known?

(Please give details)

[Click here to enter text.](#)

| 6. SITE CONSTRAINTS (Please give as much detail as possible if any of the following affect the site) | |
|--|---|
| <p>a) <i>Contamination/pollution issues (previous hazardous land uses)</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b) <i>Environmental issues (e.g. Tree Preservation Orders, SSSIs)</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) <i>Flood Risk</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>d) <i>Topography affecting site (land levels, slopes, ground conditions)</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>e) <i>Utility Services (access to mains electricity, gas, water, drainage etc)</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>f) <i>Legal issues (For example, restrictive covenants or multiple ownership/titles affecting the site)</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>g) <i>Access. Is the site accessible from a public highway without the need to cross land in a different ownership to the site?</i> Click here to enter text.</p> <p><i>If no please provide details of how the site could be accessed. (Without this information the site will not be considered to be deliverable).</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>h) <i>Any other constraints affecting the site</i> Click here to enter text.</p> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION |
|--|
| <p><i>Is there any other information regarding the site that we should be aware of? (if yes, please provide details)</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes Click here to enter text.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> |

If you require any further assistance completing this form please contact the Planning Policy and Transport team on 020 8207 2277. Alternatively email local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk.

APPENDIX 7: CONVERSION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS FOOTPRINTS ON GREEN BELT SITES INTO DWELLING YIELD

The footprint of existing buildings on sites within the Green Belt was used to guide an assessment of what might be suitable under paragraph 145 of the NPPF which allows for:

limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- *not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or*
- *not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.*

The total footprint was divided by the equivalent footprint of a typical 1 bed flat, 2 bed flat, 3 bed house or 4 bed house, which was derived from the nationally described space standard. Sites were assumed to be capable an equal mix of dwelling types although sites in less accessible locations were limited to 3 bed and 4 bed houses only.

| Dwelling type | Gross internal floor area | Additional 20% for communal areas (flats) | Additional 15% for garaging (houses) | Floor area per unit | Total footprint per unit (2 storeys) | Total footprint per unit (3 storeys) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|
| 1b flat (1 storey) | 50 sq m | 10 sq m | n/a | 60 sq m | n/a | 20 sq m |
| 2b flat (1 storey) | 66 sq m | 13 sq m | n/a | 79 sq m | n/a | 26 sq m |
| 3b house (2 storey) | 93 sq m | n/a | 14 | 107 sq m | 61 sq m (50% of GIA + garaging) | n/a |
| 4b house (2 storey) | 111 sq m | n/a | 17 | 128 sq m | 73 sq m (50% of GIA + garaging) | n/a |

APPENDIX 8: TABLE OF RESPONSES TO HELAA AND/OR HELAA-RELEVANT RESPONSES TO POTENTIAL SITES FOR HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT (PSHE) REPORT

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|---|---|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| HEL160, Elstree Gate | Turley on behalf of Panattoni | Any allocation of HEL160 for residential needs to recognise the proximity to and importance of existing nearby employment sites and uses and not prejudice their ongoing and future operation. | This is noted and would need to be considered as part of any reallocation away from employment uses within the Elstree Way employment area. However, the HELAA does not count such sites within the plan period, only including them within the 16+ years/unknown category because it is not yet known whether existing employment area boundaries will change. | N | N | N |
| Land adjoining Fenny Slade, HEL164 | Coral Little, Bidwells on behalf of the owner | Additional site promoted for development having not been identified in the PSHE report | The HELAA will be updated to include any additional available sites being promoted. | N | Y | N |
| HEL169, Aldenham Reservoir | Ross Middleton, CC Town Planning on behalf of client | Request that site be withdrawn from the Call for Sites process. | HELAA will be updated accordingly. | N | N | Y |
| HEL174, HEL350, HEL389, Harperbury Hospital, Harper Lane | Sarah Hamilton-Foyn, Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes | <p>General review of HELAA undertaken.</p> <p>A revised masterplan showing an enlarged developable area would deliver 1,400 homes rather than the 228 dwellings indicated in the HELAA . A specific trajectory for delivery is shown.</p> <p>Own Green Belt assessment and addendum which concludes, inter alia, that development within SA-31 would be able to provide a clear strongly defined gap between Harper Green and Shenley and that the sub-area is weakly performing against Green Belt purposes.</p> | <p>Receipt of revised masterplan noted. HELAA will be updated accordingly.</p> <p>The Green Belt Stage 2 assessment concluded that development of the southern part of Site A (HEL389B) would lead to encroachment beyond the existing tree line and towards Shenleybury/Porters Park, further narrowing the gap between Harperbury and Shenley and the overall gap between London Colney and Shenley. The sub-area as a whole was</p> | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | | <p>considered to make a moderate contribution to Green Belt purposes 2 and 3.</p> <p>The promoter's Green Belt assessment and addendum have been carefully reviewed but the Stage 2 assessment commissioned by the Council has now been finalised. Parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector.</p> | | | |
| HEL200, Land at Elton Way, Bushey | Richard F Sanders, Sanders-Laing on behalf of client | Site has been withdrawn due to there being no agreement reached between the multiple land owners | The HELAA will be updated accordingly | N | N | Y |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|---|--|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| HEL201, Land at Little Bushey Lane | Kathryn Ventham, Barton Willmore on behalf of Redrow Homes | <p>Alternative assessment of contribution site makes to the Green Belt, concluding sites makes a weak contribution to purpose 2 and moderate contribution to purpose 3.</p> <p>Do not agree with build out rates used for large sites (500+) as set out in the HELAA suggesting such sites are unlikely to deliver until 2025 at the earliest.</p> | <p>The Stage 2 assessment concluded the site scored 3 out of 5 for purpose 2 and 2 out of 5 for purpose 3. The suggested assessment provided by Barton Willmore would not affect the overall conclusion which sets out that SA-57 meets the assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt, recommending the sub-area for further consideration.</p> <p>The assessment has now been finalised; parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector.</p> <p>The HELAA cannot predict exactly when sites will come forward but the table in paragraph 2.45 of the HELAA is based on a certain number of years for first completion, following an allocation in the plan, rather than publication of the HELAA itself. No completions are anticipated within the first five years following the allocation of on any sites allocating more than 500 homes.</p> | N | N | N |
| HEL208/EMP2, Land between A41 and M1 near Hilton Hotel | Chris Beard, DP9 on behalf of Nolan Brothers Properties Ltd | Proposal that HEL208 should be designated for flexible B class employment uses (previously promoted for open storage and education). | The HELAA will be updated to reflect the new promotion. It should be noted that HEL200, which made up the remainder of EMP2, has been withdrawn by the site promoter due to there being no agreement reached between the multiple land | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|---|--|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | | owners. | | | |
| HEL209 | Richard Turnbull, Fuller Long on behalf of Mr and Mrs Kevehazi | Consider conclusion of Green Belt assessment underplays the role of the land in the Green Belt, stating that the site already provides a strong boundary for the Green Belt. Development on the southern side of Barnet Lane thereby reducing the effectiveness of the road as a Green Belt boundary, constituting urban sprawl. | The Green Belt assessment considers that the release of the sub-area would provide the Green Belt with a more recognisable and likely permanent boundary than is currently the case. This is considered to be a valid conclusion given the layout of the southern half of Borehamwood and the fact that the town does not effectively extend south beyond Barnet Lane towards London. As the assessment has now been finalised, parties who do not support its conclusions with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector. | N | N | N |
| HEL212, Land off Watford Road, Elstree | Helen Robertson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Retirement Villages Ltd | Various comments and clarifications on the HELAA including purpose 3 score in Green Belt assessment. Alternative HELAA 'reassessment' form provided. | A limited number of changes have been made to the HELAA form in response to the comments and clarifications. The scoring differential for purpose 3 on sites with more than 15% built form is noted. However, whether a site scores 1 or 1 or 2 out of 5 for encroachment into the countryside does not substantively effect the overall conclusion or recommendations for that sub-area, given that both scores mean it performs weakly against that purpose. The assessment has now been finalised; parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | | which will then be considered by the Inspector. | | | |
| HEL214, Land at Theobald Street, Radlett | Robert Mitchell, Richborough Estates | <p>Site should be released ahead of HEL358 which is not currently achievable or deliverable. Detailed comments on other sites promoted in and around Radlett.</p> <p>Alternative scoring for Green Belt stage 2 assessment scoring put forward, namely a reduction to 1 (out of 5) for preventing neighbouring towns merging, to 1 (out of 5) for safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and 0 (out of 5) for impact on setting of Radlett as a historic town.</p> <p>Clarification provided about access across highway land into the site</p> | <p>No additional evidence has been provided which would indicate why this is the case and so no change is being considered for HEL358.</p> <p>The points raised in respect of other sites form part of the Council’s overall consideration of sites to be included in the draft plan but do not require changes to be made to the HELAA itself.</p> <p>A scoring of 3 out of 5 reflects that a site ‘moderately’ contributes towards a Green Belt purpose and the analysis in the stage 2 assessment is considered to be valid, notwithstanding the points made in the representation. The original Stage 1 methodology was agreed in consultation with neighbouring authorities and identified as Radlett as one of two areas considered to be relevant to purpose 4 (setting and special character of historic towns). The report already concludes that the site makes a ‘less important’ contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt with a similarly strong green belt boundary if redrawn around the site, with SA-40 recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The Green Belt Stage 2 assessment has now been finalised but parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at</p> | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|--|---|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | Capacity is estimated to be 60 dwellings rather than 92 as stated in the HELAA | <p>Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector.</p> <p>The HELAA will be updated to reflect this</p> <p>Capacities in the HELAA are based on a standardised and established methodology which includes variables that reflect the location of the site. It is not intended to provide an exact indication of any final housing quantum of the site and it is recognised that any final allocation may produce a different figure.</p> | | | |
| HEL217, Manor Place Industrial Estate, Borehamwood | Oliver Milne, Savills on behalf of Legal & General | Consider that more efficient use of the site can be made and that the density applied in the HELAA to the site is too low. An estimated capacity of 40 homes is requested. | The HELAA methodology allows for the location and accessibility of a site to produce an uplift to a baseline density of 30dph for all sites. For HEL217, this produces a density of 66dph which is not significantly less than the figure referenced in the representation. However, the HELAA is not intended to determine the precise quantum of development which may be acceptable on any sites which are subsequently allocated for development and it is not considered necessary to update the report and/or depart from the methodology used for calculating yield. | N | N | N |
| HEL218 Organ Hall Farm, Borehamwood | Star Planning on behalf of High Moon Ltd | Acknowledge that site is currently in Green Belt and under current policy could not come forward for development. However, are supportive of Stage 2 Green Belt assessment which identifies that land should be | Comments are noted. | N | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|---|-------------------------------|--|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | considered for release. | | | | |
| HEL221 (H1), Rabley Green | John Hodge | <p>Constraints in Green Belt assessment sub-area h are not appropriately considered and do not agree with Sustainability Appraisal assessments/scores/conclusions in relation to the site.</p> <p>Confirm that the site is not available for development in light of multiple ownerships.</p> <p>Reference is made to the number of road traffic accidents including at the junction of Rectory Lane and B556.</p> | <p>The Green Belt Stage 2 assessment has now been finalised but parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector.</p> <p>The points raised about the Sustainability Appraisal would be considered further in the event that the site is considered for inclusion in the draft Local Plan although the HELAA emphasises that the site is not available for development due to the multiple ownerships.</p> <p>Although the HELAA references the likely inability of Rectory Lane and other narrow lanes to support any significant increase in traffic, the HELAA will be updated to reference reported RTAs.</p> | Y | N | N |
| HEL223, 75 Hatfield Road, Potters Bar | Mr and Mrs Nadji | Request that site be withdrawn from the Call for Sites process. | HELAA will be updated accordingly. | N | N | Y |
| HEL233, 1 and 2 Borehamwood Industrial park | Turley on behalf of Panattoni | Site should retained for employment use given importance of employment land on eastern side of Borehamwood and likely prejudicial impact of residential development on the current and future use of the depot. | This is noted and would need to be considered as part of any reallocation away from employment uses within the Elstree Way employment area. However, the HELAA does not count such sites within the plan period, only including them within the 16+ years/unknown category because it is not yet known whether existing employment area boundaries will change. | N | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| HEL236a and b, Rectory Farm, Shenley | Neil Rowley, Savills on behalf of Comer Homes | Do not agree with conclusions of Stage 2 Green Belt report which considers parcel is important in terms of its contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Consider the site should be seen as infill development rather than expansion with alternative analysis provided. | The Stage 2 assessment concludes that the site performs strongly in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, both locally and as part of the wider Green Belt, for a number of reasons including its current lack of built form, open wide fields, long views and strong sense of rurality. The conclusions are considered to be valid but the assessment has now been finalised; parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector. | N | N | N |
| HEL251, Potters Bar Golf Course | Rachel Clements, Lichfields on behalf of CEG | All proposed development is in areas identified as Flood Zone 1 and extensive work has already been prepared and agreed with the EA to demonstrate suitability of the site. Consider that the accessibility scoring used in the PHSE underplays accessibility of the site. Consider that PB2 should be re-classified in | The HELAA will be updated to indicate that development is proposed solely in areas identified as FZ1. Due to the size and shape of the site with the distance to services increasing in proportion to the distance from Darkes Lane, the accessibility mapping identified a number of different scores. A weighted average was then applied which resulted in the accessibility score being used. The Green Belt assessment recognised that the | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|--|--|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | terms of its contribution to Green Belt purposes, 'being bounded on three sides by development and densely planted buffer on the non-developed northern edge'. | relevant sub-area meets the relevant criteria moderately while making a less important contribution to the wider Green Belt. As such, it already recognises that it performs a more limited role in wider Green Belt terms. However, the sub-area opens out beyond the adjoining development and the assessment recognises the role it creates in terms perceptual coalescence between settlements, particularly from areas of raised topography to the east. As such, the conclusions of the assessment are considered to be valid. The assessment has now been finalised; parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector. | | | |
| HEL348, HEL349, Shenley Grange | Eddie McGuire on behalf of himself and owners of Mr and Mrs R Prince | Consider figure of 380 dwellings is optimistic and unlikely to be achievable. | Capacities in the HELAA are based on a standardised and established methodology which includes variables that reflect the location of the site. It is not intended to provide an exact indication of any final housing quantum of the site and it is recognised that any final allocation may produce a different figure. | N | N | N |
| HEL355, land south of Elstree Road, Bushey | Simon Warner, Fisher German on behalf of TLC Group | Change to type and quantum of development proposed Additional technical information submitted | The HELAA will be updated to reflect the new promotion although this itself does not have any bearing on the HELAA assessment which only considered the principle of residential use on the site. The HELAA will be updated where additional | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|---|---|--|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | | technical about the site is highlighted | | | |
| HEL358, Land south of Shenley Road, Radlett | Philip Alin, Boyer Planning on behalf of Fairfax Acquisitions | <p>Support the general conclusions of the HELAA site assessment.</p> <p>Emphasised that HCC as highway authority own all land immediately abutting the site and on this basis, consider the site is entirely deliverable from a highways perspective.</p> | <p>Comments are noted</p> <p>Comments on HCC land ownership are noted. HCC would be consulted as highway authority on any potential allocations where impact on local network would also need to be assessed.</p> | N | N | N |
| HEL359, Land north of Stapleton Road, Borehamwood | Philip Alin, Boyer Planning on behalf of Fairfax Acquisitions | <p>Support the general conclusions of the HELAA site assessment.</p> <p>Do not consider the conclusion that the site's ecological value is a 'challenge and constraint'. Local Wildlife Site</p> <p>Reference to the potential to include neighbouring sites such as HEL152 for delivering new social infrastructure.</p> <p>Question phasing indicated in HELAA of 75 homes in the first 5 years and the remainder in years 6-10. Consider the bulk of housing could be delivered in first 5 years.</p> | <p>Comments are noted</p> <p>The Council has received a significant number of technical reports to support land promotions in the borough. These reports, including ecological assessments, will need to be corroborated with the relevant organisation(s) with responsibility for reviewing LWS in the area before challenges/constraints can be considered to have been addressed.</p> <p>HELAA recognises potential to join the site up with HEL152</p> <p>The HELAA methodology has a number of bandings with different commencement and build out rates depending on the site size, having regard to the NLP report (2016) and the Letwin Review (2018). They are intended to provide a guide to build out rates using rounded numbers but clearly individual sites</p> | N | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|---|--|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | | will vary. | | | |
| HEL360, Land south of Radlett Road Shenley | Philip Alin, Boyer Planning on behalf of Fairfax Acquisitions | Support the general conclusions of the HELAA site assessment | Comments are noted | N | N | N |
| HEL367, Land west of Watling Street, Radlett | David Neame, Neame Sutton, on behalf of Catesby Estates | <p>Consider conclusions in HELAA on site access and biodiversity to be wrong, referencing previous planning application on the site and enclosing arboricultural and ecological appraisals.</p> <p>Also consider Green Belt assessments conclusions, as summarised in the HELAA, to be flawed including fact that SA-42 is a wider area than the promotion site.</p> | <p>The application referenced was for a sport and recreation use and was itself withdrawn prior to a decision being made. Access to the site remains limited at present to use with either landowner permission or private access rights and so the previous consideration of access for application 16/0340/FUL is not considered to be directly relevant. However, the HELAA will be updated to reference this.</p> <p>The findings of the arboricultural impact assessment/method statement are noted but the assessment was undertaken for a previous proposal, namely the planned sports ground at HEL367. It is unclear whether the findings are still relevant for a residential development at the site.</p> <p>The comments on the Green Belt assessment are noted. The Stage 1 assessment identified a series of much larger parcels across the borough but the Stage 2, in identifying smaller sub-areas including SA-42, was considered by Arup to represent an appropriate and more granular level of assessment. HEL367 comprises a significant proportion of SA-42</p> | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|---|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | | <p>and the process for identifying sub-areas is considered to be sound and is set out in the methodology.</p> <p>Although there is a degree of subjectivity in attributing individual scores against Green Belt purposes, the score of 0 against purpose 1 reflects the HELAA methodology in only treating Borehamwood and Potters Bar as 'large built up areas' and is considered to be a valid approach. The score of 5 on page 192 of the annex does not relate to the sub-area but the wider parcel (19), with the commentary providing an analysis of the sub-area against the wider contribution of parcel 19.</p> | | | |
| HEL369 Well End Lodge, Well End Road | Riyen Ramani | <p>Various comments on the HELAA, the suitability of the site and the surrounding land use/character.</p> <p>Separate comments on Green Belt assessment emphasise that the site should be considered together with HEL347, reflecting the fact that they form part of an area identified as a recommended strategic cluster (RS-2).</p> | <p>The comments raised have been noted and a limited number of changes made to the HELAA. However, there is no change to the overall conclusions on HEL369 which state that in isolation, residential redevelopment on the site would be unlikely to deliver the wider sustainability benefits that would outweigh Green Belt harm.</p> <p>The comments about RS-2 are noted and consideration of any potential allocation in this area will need to assess RS-2 as a whole.</p> <p>The application at Silverhill Cattery has not been determined and is not considered to be relevant to</p> | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | Reference also made to a planning application at Silverhill Cattery. | the consideration of HEL369. | | | |
| HEL370, Land west of Shenley | Steven Brown, Wolf Bond on behalf of Heronslea Group | <p>Updated masterplan submitted for 210 dwellings. Additional highways, landscape and other technical information provided addressing points raised in PSHE report/HELAA including access being taken from Porters Park Drive.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Overview queries the finding of Stage 2 Green Belt assessment, stating that the adjacent golf club forms the larger part of the gap between Shenley and Radlett.</p> | <p>The HELAA will be updated to reflect the updated information about access into the site from Porters Park Drive. The number of dwellings proposed does not affect the HELAA assessment which only considered the principle of residential use on the site.</p> <p>No change to the HELAA itself is considered necessary.</p> <p>The Stage 2 assessment, in stating that the sub-area forms almost the entire gap between Shenley and Radlett, qualifies this by setting out that “While there is another sub-area contributing to the separation of the settlements, there are no additional strong boundary features. Development would significantly reduce the perceived and actual distance between these settlements.”</p> <p>The overall findings of the Stage 2 assessment are considered to be valid in that they conclude that both sub-areas 30 and 35 are two of the sub-areas which both strongly meet the Green Belt purpose criteria and make an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt and so are not recommended for further consideration. That</p> | Y | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | Change to type and quantum of development proposed | assessment has now been finalised but parties who do not support its conclusion with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector. The HELAA will be updated to reflect the new promotion. | | | |
| HEL371, Old Haberdashers Sport Ground, Croxdale Road, Borehamwood | Mark Jackson, Fairview Estates | Consider that the 'significant technical constraints' referenced are overstated and alternative provision can be achieved. Various planning arguments put forward as to why the site can be brought forward including reprovision of facilities elsewhere and opening of part of site for public use. Other open space sites are identified as having capacity for development despite being designated as open space. | Paragraph 2.7 of the PHSE report relates to a significant number of sites which are considered to require further assessment to establish their suitability for development, as such technical constraints have been identified. Most significantly, HEL371 is not presently available for development being in the ownership of Hertsmere BC and not being promoted by the Council as the freeholder. The HELAA acknowledges that there are no significant physical constraints within the site itself but acknowledges that there have also been challenges in OHA identifying a replacement sports ground. As such it is considered reasonable in the PHSE to have highlighted that constraints exist. The other site highlighted (HEL239) is treated similarly in the HELAA in that it shows no capacity within the next 15 years given that there is no certainty that any scheme would comply with SADM34. Neither the HELAA nor the PHSE report should be interpreted as meaning the promotion of a site will result in an allocation or grant of planning | N | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | | permission. | | | |
| HEL379 (R1), Land north-west of Watford Road (Kemprow Farm), Radlett | Savills UK on behalf of Crown Estate | <p>Detailed comments on level of accessibility attributed to Radlett, as referenced in the HELAA, considering that the accessibility/range of services is greater than indicated.</p> <p>Potential capacity of 500 homes considered higher than initial capacity studies have shown as appropriate. Also consider capacity of HEL358, HEL231 and HEL214 elsewhere in Radlett to be too high and overall Council is over-estimating the capacity of sites, which could lead to insufficient land being allocated.</p> <p>Conclusions of Stage 2 Green Belt assessment are disputed as reported in HELAA and noted that only the southern section of R1 was considered. Argue that R1 has strong boundary features and restricted visibility in the wider and that methodology has been inconsistently applied. Own landscape assessment considers that the proposed development 'would be a modest extension to Radlett, not represent significant urban sprawl or encroachment and would not prejudice more open and longer distance views across the Green Belt.'</p> | <p>The comments about the accessibility of Radlett as a whole will be considered as part of the assessment of the overall representation from Savills on the PSHE report. The score itself is derived from a weighted average of the four different accessibility levels which exist due to the size and shape of the larger site.</p> <p>Capacities in the HELAA are based on a standardised and established methodology which includes variables that reflect the location of the site. It is not intended to provide an exact indication of any final housing quantum of the site and it is recognised that any final allocation may produce a different figure.</p> <p>The basis for defining sub-areas is set out in section 3.3 of the main report of the assessment and was agreed with Arup involving an element of professional judgement on the part of the consultants, taking account of durable man-made and natural features. All sub-areas were subsequently visited.</p> <p>The comments about both R1 and comparative analysis with HEL214 are noted and will be taken into consideration along with all other technical information submitted by or on behalf of site promoters. However, the Green Belt Stage 2</p> | N | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|---|--|--|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | Request that aspects of the assessment are reviewed identifying issues with how HEL214/SA-40 has been assessed elsewhere in Radlett. | assessment has now been finalised and parties who do not support its conclusions with regard to allocations in the draft Local Plan will be able to make representations at Regulation 19 stage which will then be considered by the Inspector. | | | |
| HEL384 Organ Hall Farm, Borehamwood | Star Planning on behalf of High Moon Ltd | <p>Welcome recognition that site could potentially be classified as PDL although capacity could be 30-35 homes rather than 13 set out in HELAA.</p> <p>Incorrect to state there is no vehicular access from Theobald Street as there is an existing wide gated access to both HEL384 and HEL218</p> <p>There is no covenant on the site which would preclude residential development</p> | Further assessment has shown that the majority of buildings on the site are agricultural building in use for agricultural purposes. As such, most of it falls beyond the definition of previously development land as defined in the NPPF paragraph and could not constitute appropriate development as described in paragraph 145g. The HELAA report has been updated to reflect this. | Y | N | N |
| Birchville Cottage, Heathbourne Road | Mr and Mrs Farley | Additional site promoted for employment development | An assessment of the site is being undertaken and will be set out in the final HELAA report | N | Y | N |
| Caldecote Farm, Caldecote Lane, Bushey | Matthew Blythin, DHA Planning on behalf of MrEdward Brook | Replacement and enhanced equestrian training centre, stud farm and livery with associated ancillary facilities and including external show jumping and cross country training facilities | The uses promoted do not fall within the remit of the HELAA which by definition focusses on housing and employment uses. No change to the HELAA is required although the site can be considered as part of the wider Local Plan review. | N | N | N |
| Cranbourne Road Industrial Estate , Potters Bar | Bryan Rees | Additional site promoted for development having not been identified in the PSHE report | No additional information received despite request so insufficient to include in HELAA. | N | N | N |
| Fields opposite | Miss M Davies | The fields opposite Morrisons would be | The land has not been promoted for development | N | N | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|---|---|---|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| Morrisons, Borehamwood | | suitable as there would be good access and not be too close to existing housing. | and is therefore not available. As such, it would not be included in the final HELAA report. | | | |
| Greenacres, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath | Peter Biggs, Preston Bennett Planning on behalf of site owner | Site promoted for development having not been identified in the PSHE report | The HELAA will be updated to include any additional available sites being promoted | N | Y | N |
| Land adjacent to Lismirrane Industrial Estate | Dan Di-Lieto, Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners | Additional site promoted for employment development | An assessment of the site is being undertaken and will be set out in the final HELAA report | N | Y | N |
| Land at Kendall Hall Farm, Watling Street | Steve Oliver, Fortress Lane | Site promoted for development having not been identified in the PSHE report | The HELAA will be updated to include any additional available sites being promoted | N | Y | N |
| Land east of St Albans Road, South Mimms | Simon Andrew, DLA Town Planning on behalf of Oakbridge Homes | Additional site promoted for development having not been identified in the PSHE report | The HELAA will be updated to include any additional available sites being promoted. | N | Y | N |
| Land north east of Otterspool Way, Bushey | David Peters | Land bounded by A4008, Bushey Mill Lane, Highwood Avenue and Porcelanose does not appear in the report and has potential for housing and industrial use | The land has not been promoted for development and is therefore not available. As such, it would not be included in the final HELAA report. | N | N | N |
| Land north of Barnet Lane | Craig Pettit, Barton Willmore on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land | Additional site promoted for employment development | An assessment of the site is being undertaken and will be set out in the final HELAA report | N | Y | N |
| Land to south of Rectory Farm, Shenley | Catherine Mason, Savills on behalf of Comer Homes | Additional site promoted for development having not been identified in the PSHE report | The HELAA will be updated to include any additional available sites being promoted. | N | Y | N |
| Norwegian Barn, Elstree | Paras Shah, on behalf of owners | Site promoted for development having not been identified in the PSHE report | The HELAA will be updated to include any additional available sites being promoted | N | Y | N |
| Part of EMP3 | Aaron Brown, Quod | Additional site promoted for development | The HELAA will be updated to include any additional | N | Y | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--------|----------|-------------|
| | on behalf of RRHE | <p>having not been specifically identified in the PSHE report although it does form a part of the overall EMP3 site.</p> <p>Support use of the RRHE site for employment purposes but object to inclusion within the wider EMP3 designation due to varying characteristics of and accessibility to different parts of EMP3 site, Green Belt designation on part of EMP3 site and greater accessibility of RRHE site.</p> | <p>available sites being individually promoted.</p> <p>The comments about the RRHE site itself are noted. The extent of EMP3 reflects the fact that the majority of the land was promoted for development and that this overlaps with the overall safeguarded area which includes the RRHE site. The safeguarding of the RRHE site does not preclude it being separately considered for and/or brought forward for development ahead of other parcels either within the safeguarded area or (were it to be allocated) that part of EMP3 within the Green Belt, so long as it does not prejudice the delivery of employment development across the remainder of the area. The HELAA will be updated to clarify this.</p> | | | |
| Sainsbury's Depot Site | Turley on behalf of Panattoni | Site is promoted for allocation in the new Local Plan for B1, B2 and B8 uses | The site is already in use and allocated for B class purposes and so no additional employment land is being identified for the purposes of the HELAA. As such it is not considered necessary to include the site in the HELAA. Any additional allocation over and above the existing employment area allocation in the Local Plan, will be considered through the Local Plan review. | N | N | N |
| Tarmac sites south of London Colney | Sheila Keene, David Lock Associates on behalf of Tarmac Trading Ltd | Land promotion for 'a range of leisure and tourism uses and for the creative industries' either as stand-alone developments or to complement the suggested new garden | The site as originally promoted was for uses which would not be included within a HELAA which by definition focusses on housing and employment uses. The latest promotion incorporates the | N | Y | N |

| Site | Organisation | Substantive points raised | HBC response | Change | New site | Remove site |
|--|--|---|--|--------|----------|-------------|
| | | village. | potential for 'creative industries' and so the HELAA will be updated to include consideration of this site. | | | |
| Various | Debbie Mack, Historic England | Various general comments in relation to HELAA methodology advocating a wide definition of the historic environment, consideration of cumulative impact of a number of site allocations in one location and consideration of on and off site heritage assets and their setting. | The comments are noted. The HELAA identifies a range of heritage assets including locally listed buildings and if sites are taken forward for further consideration, the advice provided will need to be applied. | N | N | N |
| Various sites around Shenley | Savills, on behalf of Comer Group promoting HEL236a and 236b (Rectory Farm, Shenley) | Comments also provided on other sites being promoted around Shenley. Other sites around Shenley are highlighted as having 'anticipated ground conditions [which] are unlikely to support the use of infiltration drainage' and would 'rely on an attenuated discharge' which 'may rely on 3 rd party landowner consent' | Although this could potentially impact on the deliverability of any of these other sites, no evidence is provided to confirm these assumptions about 'anticipated' ground conditions or that any required 3 rd party consent would not be attainable. As such no change in the HELAA around the deliverability of these other sites is considered necessary at this stage. | N | N | N |
| Radlett Society and Green Belt Association | Land to rear of Oakway Parade, Radlett | Various warehouses and other commercial uses which appear not to be well used. Should be explored for housing. | The buildings on Oakway Place are located within a very narrow strip between the rear of Oakway Parade and the railway line. There would be insufficient space, in terms of privacy/distance from the properties above Oakway Parade, for additional residential properties to be developed the rear. However. the land has not been promoted for development and is therefore not available. As such, it would not be included in the final HELAA report. | N | N | N |

APPENDIX 9: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - BOREHAMWOOD AND ELSTREE

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL152

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Lyndhurst Farm | | |
| Address | Green Street, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 5NF | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Catalyst Land Solutions on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 3.97 | Current use(s) | Derelict landscape contractors yard, commercial turf plantation with no active use |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open fields to all sides except the south east edge of the site adjoins the northern edge of Borehamwood. Residential frontage to opposite side of Green Street to the east. Gas transfer station to NE. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location. To the south is the built up area of Borehamwood whereas the character in other directions is largely open fields in agricultural use. 7 minute drive from Elstree and Borehamwood station, Borehamwood high street and shopping park |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Adjoining land to the west owned by Wood Hall Estate has been submitted to the Call for Sites |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL359 |

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is at the edge of Borehamwood and forms the wider gap between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. The southern part of the parcel is less important for preventing coalescence but is connected to Borehamwood and prevents its outward sprawl into open land.. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA44 | 5+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt and an Archaeological area |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Yes - Small isolated areas of fuel spills from historic use as a landscape contractor's yard. |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | An overhead power line is located at the Northern boundary of the site, with a pylon straddling the site boundary. There is also an adjacent gas transfer station which may limit development. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The site adjoins Organ Hall Pastures Local Wildlife Site to the SW. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy, However Part of the site is PDL and some development may be appropriate here. Provided constraints can be overcome development may be suitable if Green belt status changes. |
|---|--|

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 2.98 | 103 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|--|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | PDL part of site may be suitable for consideration |
| Reason | PDL part of site may meet criteria for inclusion on the register |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site adjoins a Local Wildlife Site (Organ Hall pastures) to the west and a pylon/overhead power lines and gas transfer station to the north. There are understood to be some limited areas of land contamination from the historic use of the site as a contractor's yard. Footpath 53 runs along the southern boundary of the site parallel to Stapleton Road.

A local convenience store on Thirsk Road and Leeming Road shops are located approximately 0.5 miles and 0.75 miles from the site respectively. Being located beyond the built up area, Borehamwood town centre is some distance away although a number of bus routes run past or near to the site - 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood) and two school routes 823 (Borehamwood – Garston school service only) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only) .

The site is located at the southern end of parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing. The southern part of the parcel is less important for preventing coalescence between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley but is connected to Borehamwood and prevents its outward sprawl into open land. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Under the current policy framework, the site is not considered suitable other than for appropriate development within the parameters set out in the NPPF which under paragraph 145 allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'. Based on the footprint of existing and former buildings/structures, amounting to approximately 500 sq m, the site could potentially be suitable for 7 homes based on an equal mix of 3 and 4 bed houses.

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 to deliver 103* homes subject to further technical assessments, including ground surveys. However, currently the wider site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 7 homes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 103* homes, 50* in years 1-5 and 53* in years 6-10

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL160

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Elstree Gate | | |
| Address | Elstree Gate, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 5PZ | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of AEW UK | | |

Site size / use:

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

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/0530/FUL. External works to include new entrance door and canopy. (GRANTED). 15/2224/FUL. External works to Unit 3 to include new entrance door and canopy. (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within a currently designated Employment area |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Possibly - Potentially due to its location within a major employment area. Existing B class office and industrial uses surround the site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within a designated Employment area. Should the policy framework change the site could be suitable for residential use |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Urban | Very high | Urban brownfield flats |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 142.5 | 1.21 | 172 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within the designated Elstree Way Employment Area where the adjoining uses are commercial and a hotel and loss of employment land is currently resisted. The site is accessed from the service road along the south side of Elstree Way and also from Warwick Road. This is a relatively accessible location, being approximately 1200m from Borehamwood town centre and on bus routes 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 398 (Watford - Potters Bar) and 644 (Hatfield - Queensbury). Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, the nature of many of the surrounding uses is such that the site is not, in isolation, suitable for residential use bearing in mind the impact of surrounding employment uses and buildings on the amenity of any residential development here.

The potential for significant residential development in this location to prejudice the delivery of the EWCAAP also needs to be borne in mind. The owner has indicated that the site is available for development which would be deliverable within the next 5 years, although the site is currently in employment use; there have been recent planning consents for external works to provide a new doorway and canopy.

The site is not suitable for residential development under current policy, nor when taking into account the character of the surrounding employment area and potential impact on the delivery of EWCAAP targets. The most recent evidence (South West Herts Economy Study, 2016) indicates a need to retain this area for employment (para 8.42). Should the designation of the site and surrounding area change then the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for approximately 172* dwellings

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any review of Employment Land allocations and change to policy framework: 172 dwellings*, timescale unknown

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL163

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Evelyn House | | |
| Address | 3 Elstree Way, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 1RN | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Planning Potential Ltd on behalf of owner (subsequently sold) | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.39 | Current use(s) | Class B employment |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Commercial sites either side – B1 office use to west (IBSA offices, formerly Cardiff Pinnacle); 4 Elstree Way to east (2-storey office/light industrial building housing a groundwork and concrete frame company). |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Built-up area. Employment area. Surrounded by B Class employment uses. Proximity to Elstree Way Corridor housing area to the west of Manor Way. 4-storey modern office building to west on corner of Manor Way. 2-storey locally listed 1930s Modernist movement buildings 4 and 5 Elstree Way are to the east. Front of site occupied by 2-storey 1930s building; car parking/hardstanding to rear. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL166 1 Elstree Way to the west |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/00/0363. Two storey extension to provide additional toilet facilities. (GRANTED). |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 or C3/employment |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within a currently designated Employment Area |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes - Locally listed building 4 Elstree Way adjoins the site to the east |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Yes - Potentially due to the location within a major employment area. Existing B class office and industrial uses surround the site. There is an electricity sub-station on site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within a designated employment area. Should the policy framework change the site could be suitable for residential use |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Unknown - site has recently been sold | Is there developer interest | Unknown - site has recently been sold |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|

| | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Unknown - site has recently been sold |
| Is the Site available | Unknown - site has recently been sold |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Urban | High | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 121.5 | 0.39 | 47 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within the designated Elstree Way Employment Area where the adjoining uses are commercial and loss of employment land is currently resisted. The building itself adjoins locally listed buildings with which it shares features and is considered to represent a good example of modern movement architecture. The site is accessed from the service road along the south side of Elstree Way. This is an accessible location, being approximately 0.8km from Borehamwood town centre and on bus routes 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 398 (Watford - Potters Bar) and 644 (Hatfield - Queensbury).

Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, the nature of many of the surrounding uses is such that the site is not, in isolation, suitable for residential use bearing in mind the impact of surrounding employment uses and buildings on the amenity of any residential development here. The site is close to but outside the designated EWCAAP area. The potential for significant residential development in this location to prejudice the delivery of the EWCAAP also needs to be borne in mind.

Whilst the Call for Sites submission indicated that the site was available we have recently been advised that the site has been sold; the new owners have not indicated their intentions with regard to the site.

The site is not suitable for residential development under current policy, nor when taking into account the character of uses and form of development in the surrounding employment area and potential impact on the delivery of EWCAAP targets. The most recent evidence (South West Herts Economy Study, 2016) indicates a need to retain this area for

employment (para 8.42). Should the designation of the site and surrounding area change then the site could be suitable, and achievable for approximately 47 dwellings if the new owners make it available.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Possible capacity following any review of Employment Land allocations and change to policy framework: 47 dwellings*, timescale unknown

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL166

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | 1 Elstree Way | | |
| Address | 1 Elstree Way, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 1RN | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | International Bible Students Association/Jehovah's Witnesses | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.66 | Current use(s) | Warehouse/production unit (B8) with ancillary offices. Expected occupation is until December 2017 if the site is sold, or until the workforce is relocated to the new headquarters in Chelmsford by December 2019, whichever is sooner. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Class B employment and a garage adjoin the site. The Elstree Technical College is opposite, across Elstree Way to the north. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is within the built-up Employment area. It is surrounded by B Class employment uses to the east and south. Elstree Way Corridor housing area is located to the west of Manor Way. Corner site occupied by 4-storey modern office building and warehousing behind, with car parking adjoining Manor Way. A 2-storey Modernist movement building adjoins to east (Evelyn House, HEL163). | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL163 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 18/0922/CLE. Continued use as offices B1(a) with ancillary storage. (PENDING); 17/1366/PD56. Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) (69 studio flats). (REFUSED). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within a currently designated Employment area |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Yes - Potentially due to location within a major employment area. Existing B class office and industrial uses surround the site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within a designated Employment area. Should the policy framework change the site could be suitable for residential use |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
|--|-----|-----------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Urban | High | Urban brownfield flats |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 123 | 0.56 | 69 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within the designated Elstree Way Employment Area where the adjoining uses are commercial and loss of employment land is currently resisted. It adjoins the edge of the Elstree Way Corridor AAP area to the west where residential led regeneration is under way. Whilst the building fronts Elstree Way vehicular access to the site is from Manor Way.

This is an accessible location, being 0.8km from Borehamwood town centre and on bus routes 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 398 (Watford - Potters Bar) and 644 (Hatfield - Queensbury) and close to the 657 (Borehamwood - Harpenden via St Albans).

Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, the nature of many of the surrounding uses is such that the site is not, in isolation, suitable for residential use bearing in mind the proximity of adjoining employment uses and buildings and the likely impact on the amenity of any residential development here. The site is close to but outside the designated EWCAAP area. The potential for significant residential development in this location to prejudice the delivery of the EWCAAP also needs to be borne in mind.

The owners of the site have been promoting the development of the site for several years as the current use of the

premises is being transferred out of the area and most recently have submitted a prior approval application to convert the office building at the front of the site into flats.

The site is not suitable for residential development under current policy, nor when taking into account the character of uses in the surrounding employment area and potential impact on the delivery of EWCAAP targets. The most recent evidence (South West Herts Economy Study, 2016) indicates a need to retain this area for employment (para 8.42). Should the designation of the site and surrounding area change then the site could be suitable, and achievable for approximately 69* dwellings if the new owners make it available.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Possible capacity following any review of Employment Land allocations and change to policy framework: 69 homes*, timescale unknown

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL167

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Manor Point | | |
| Address | 1-3 Manor Point, Manor Way, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 1EU | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | International Bible Students Association/Jehovah's Witnesses | | |

Site size / use:

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

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | Unit 1: TP/05/0648. Proposed electricity sub-station screened with stained timber boarding. (GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within a currently designated Employment area |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing ‘bad neighbours’ which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Yes - Potentially due to location within a major employment area. Existing B class office and industrial uses surround the site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within a designated Employment area. Should the policy framework change the site could be suitable for residential use |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes - relating to the part they own (units 1 and 2). Unit 3 is in separate ownership | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Unit 3 is under separate ownership. Communication between the owner of Unit 3 and the promoter of Units 1 & 2 is on-going. Unclear whether whole site is available. Clarification on ownership and availability of Unit 3 required | | |
| Is the Site available | Partly. All may be available but not currently confirmed | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Urban | Very high | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 109 | 0.77 | 109 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|--|
| <p>The site is located within the designated Elstree Way Employment Area where the adjoining uses are commercial and loss of employment land is currently resisted. It adjoins the edge of the Elstree Way Corridor AAP area to the west where residential led regeneration is under way. Access to the site is from Manor Way.</p> <p>This is a reasonably accessible location, being 1km from Borehamwood town centre and close to bus routes along Elstree Way - 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 398 (Watford - Potters Bar), 644 (Hatfield - Queensbury) and 657 (Borehamwood - Harpenden via St Albans).</p> <p>Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, the nature of many of the surrounding uses is such that the site is not, in isolation, suitable for residential use bearing in mind the proximity of adjoining employment uses and buildings and the likely impact on the amenity of any residential development here. The site is close to but outside the designated EWCAAP area. The potential for significant residential development in this location to prejudice the delivery of the EWCAAP also needs to be borne in mind.</p> <p>The owners of units 1 and 2 have been promoting the development of the site for several years as the current use of the premises is being transferred out of the area. It is not clear whether the owners of unit 3 will make this part of the site available. The site is not suitable for residential development under current policy, nor when taking into account the character of uses in the surrounding employment area and potential impact on the delivery of EWCAAP targets. The most recent evidence (South West Herts Economy Study, 2016) indicates a need to retain this area for employment (para 8.42). Should the designation of the site and surrounding area change then subject to the availability of unit 3, the site could be suitable, and achievable for approximately 109* dwellings.</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 0 Possible capacity following any review of Employment Land allocations and change to policy framework: 109 homes*, timescale unknown</p> |
|--|

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

| | |
|----------------|---------|
| Site reference | HEL197a |
|----------------|---------|

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land at Barnet Lane | | |
| Address | Barnet Lane, Elstree | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3JE | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree | Town/ Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | Inland Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.65 | Current use(s) | Unused Paddock. Field with mixture of mature hedgerows and agricultural fencing to the boundaries. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the west of the site, field to north and east. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Residential area to the west is located on higher ground. Otherwise the site comprises and is surrounded by open fields, at the edge of the built up area (Elstree and Borehamwood). Adjoining residential area is mainly detached and semi-detached properties with good sized gardens, rural area is characterised by fields with hedge and fence boundaries. Barnet Lane is an urbanising influence. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Site to north - same prospective developer has option on it. Land to east has been submitted but is local wildlife site Elstree Tunnel Grasslands | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Site to north is 197b. Site to east is 209b | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 12 | 3+ | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. Barnet Lane and the M1 likely to contribute to the prevention of coalescence of Borehamwood and Greater London. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA49 | 1+ | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No. However would require a new access onto Barnet Lane A411 unless access can be gained from Hartfield Ave. Access is proposed from A411 |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The site adjoins Elstree Tunnel Grasslands wildlife site. Any impact needs to be avoided or mitigated. The site is well screened.. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No. Inland Homes have option to purchase. | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Low | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 40.5 | 1.4 | 57 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site adjoins a Local Wildlife Site (Elstree Tunnel Grasslands). The land slopes gently to the north but there are no topographical constraints and it is indicated as being accessed directly from Barnet Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access could also be secured through the adjacent turning head on Hartfield Avenue.

The site is approximately 1200m from Elstree and Borehamwood station on foot, via Deacons Hill Road. However, in terms of public transport accessibility, no bus routes currently serve the site.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site identified as making a moderate contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The parcel forms a small part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. However, the western part of the parcel which includes HEL197a is identified as being rural in character, playing an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside on the south side of Borehamwood. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further .

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site could be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 57* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 57* homes, 50 in years 1-5 and 7 in years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

| | |
|----------------|---------|
| Site reference | HEL197b |
|----------------|---------|

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Site Name | Land north of Barnet Lane 2 | | |
| Address | Barnet Lane, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3JE | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood |
| Ward | Elstree | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Inland Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.36 | Current use(s) | Open field. Surrounded by mature hedging and agricultural fencing. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north and west, open land to south and east. Agricultural buildings immediately adjoining eastern boundary. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The area is open land on the edge of built up area (Elstree and Borehamwood). Adjoining residential area is mainly detached and semi-detached properties with good sized gardens; the rural area is characterised by fields with hedge and fence boundaries. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes. It adjoins site submitted to HELAA to the south, over which access would be required. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL197a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/78/0230 Change of use from agricultural to gardens (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 12 | 3+ | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. Barnet Lane and the M1 are likely to contribute to the prevention of coalescence of Borehamwood and Greater London. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA49 | 1+ | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt and partly within the Elstree Tunnel Grassland local wildlife site. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Applicant says no problem. However would require access over HEL197a - Inland Homes also have an option to purchase this site. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Adjoins local wildlife site Elstree Tunnel Grasslands so would need to avoid or mitigate any negative impact. TPO/23/2010 is partly located in north east corner which applicants intend leaving for landscaping. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Non-Wildlife site part of site could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes. Access also required over adjoining site |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No. Access over 197a would be required but land will be in same ownership. Inland Homes has an Option to purchase the Site. | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Is the Site achievable | yes subject to access |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Low | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 40.5 | 1.16 | 47 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|-------------------|

Conclusion:

Part of the site incorporates a Local Wildlife Site (Elstree Tunnel Grasslands) whose grasslands support a moderate diversity of grasses and herbs. The site can only be accessed via HEL197a which is being promoted by the same developer who has advised it has control over both sites.

Access would therefore potentially be achievable directly from Barnet Lane although pedestrian and cycle access could also be secured via HEL197a and through the adjacent turning head on Hartfield Avenue. The land slopes gently to the north but there are no topographical constraints. The suitability of the site is wholly dependent on the availability/achievability of HEL179a, in order to be deliverable.

The site is approximately 1200m from Elstree and Borehamwood station on foot, via Deacons Hill Road. However, in terms of public transport accessibility, no bus routes currently serve the site.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site identified as making a moderate contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The parcel forms a small part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. However, the western part of the parcel which includes both this site and HEL197a is identified as being rural in character, playing an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside on the south side of Borehamwood. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, the site could only be considered suitable available and achievable for development, including of the unconstrained capacity figure of 47* units, if further investigation indicated that the site no longer meets the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework, with LWS constraint: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework, without LWS constraint: 47* homes in years 1-5

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL204

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land at Stangate Crescent/ Barnet by-pass | | |
| Address | adj Stangate Crescent and Wansford Park,, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 2PH | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Transport for London | | |

Site size / use:

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

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | NONE |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is Minor Amenity Land under current policy SADM36 |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes - FZs 2 & 3 overlap the western edge of site |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Proximity of A1 major dual carriageway. Removal of trees and vegetation which currently forms a barrier between existing residential area and the A1 likely to increase noise and air pollution to existing and proposed housing |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | No |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
|--|-----|-----------------------------|----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | High | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 60 | 1.07 | 0 | 64 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site comprises a long strip of grass verge approximately 16m wide between the adjoining residential area to the west and the A1 dual carriageway to the east. It currently provides a visual and noise/air pollution screen between Saffron Green Primary School and houses fronting Wansford Park and Stangate Crescent and the Barnet bypass A1. The A1 is approximately 45m from the front elevations of these houses. The land has previously been identified as Minor Amenity Land which is protected under current Local Plan policy SADM36. Parts of the site are also within or immediately adjoining Flood Zone 2.

Given the constrained nature of the site, its proximity to the A1 and the role it performs in protecting the amenity of existing residential properties in the area the site is not considered suitable for residential development. (It is not considered suitable for the development of the unconstrained capacity figure indicated above).

Capacity: 0 homes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL206

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land east of Rowley Lane | | |
| Address | Rowley Lane, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Lichfields on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 26.5 | Current use(s) | South eastern part of the site is hard standing; thenorthern part is used for storage/distribution with parking and open land, some of which is agricultural use |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Hotel to the south of the site, commercial to the west, residential to the north west; to the north and east is green field land. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where the urban area of Borehamwood meets open countryside. It is a mixture of some previously developed land amongst more open areas with a rural character. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes. Site incorporates HEL387 (safeguarded) and adjoins Wrotham Park land to the north | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL376B | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1735/OUT. Outline Planning Application for the Development of a Centre of Sporting Excellence comprising: the Erection of Buildings to accommodate a full size Indoor Artificial Pitch, Sports Hall, Sports Academy and Associated Facilities (including Education, Office and Medical facilities); Hotel (including Conference and Leisure Facilities) and Hostel; Office/Commercial and Research Buildings; Community Sports Facility; Outdoor Grass and Artificial Sports Pitches (including Floodlighting); New Access Arrangements, Parking, Landscaping, Infrastructure and Associated Works. (GRANTED/sub-link to S106) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mix of sports and employment uses comprising pitches, sports hall, sports academy, hotel/hostel, office/commercial |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | and research buildings and parking. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents outward sprawl of Borehamwood. Forms gap between Borehamwood and Lomdon Colney as well as Greater London. Less than 5% of the parcel is built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA47 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criterial moderatley and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - part of the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes . Part of site within FZ2/3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Possible contamination associated with previous agricultural activities. |
| Any access difficulties. | No - new access is proposed |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Safeguarded land is suitable for permitted / employment development. The remainder of the site is not suitable under current policy but could be suitable for development should Green Belt boundaries be changed. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential – employment uses

Capacity under current policy framework: 0ha
 Capacity following Local Plan review and release of safeguarded land up to 11.3ha of employment land
 Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: up to 26.5ha of employment land

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints across the majority of the site although there are a number of areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3 which in total amount to around 3.6ha of land. The site has been promoted for economic development. Access into the site is from Rowley Lane with a priority junction in the southern part of the site and two further accesses off Rowley Lane to the north. Around 3ha of land comprises hardstanding which is primarily used for car parking.

Part of the site makes up a significant proportion of a 14.6ha area which has been safeguarded for employment development in the current Local Plan and is no longer within the Green Belt. Although there is an extant outline permission (14/1735/OUT) for a Centre of Excellence for Sport, no applications for reserved matters have been made and that part of the site remains suitable, available and achievable for employment development subject to its release through this review of the Local Plan. The adjacent Holiday Inn site (3.3ha) which is also within the safeguarded area has not been promoted for development meaning that around 11.3 ha of the safeguarded site, which is included in HEL206, would be available. Around 1.7ha around the southern boundary of the safeguarded part of the site lies within the flood zone; subject to more detailed investigation this may therefore reduce the available developable area.

The land to the north of the safeguarded area, amounting to 15.5ha, remains in the Green Belt and most of it also forms the part of HEL376b which has been promoted separately for employment as part of a wider mixed use development south of Rowley Lane and beyond this, residential. Although this northern part of HEL206 forms part of the application site for 14/1735/OUT, it is not suitable for employment development under the current policy framework. A small proportion (1.9ha) of the northern part of HEL206 is also within the flood zone. It comprises the most southerly part of a large parcel in the Green Belt Stage assessment which was identified to be strongly performing, particularly with regard to preventing the sprawl of large built up areas. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering a significant quantum of growth, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for a further 15.2 ha of employment land. However, currently the northern part of the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable for employment development.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0ha

Capacity following Local Plan review and release of safeguarded land: up to 11.3ha of employment land within 15yrs

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: up to 26.5ha of employment land within 15yrs

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL209a

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land North of Barnet Lane | | |
| Address | Barnet Lane, Borehamwood (eastern site) | | |
| Postcode | WD6 2DR | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Hillside | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Barratt David Wilson North Thames | | |

Site size / use:

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

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north and east, A41 to the south, Woodcock Hill Village Green to the west | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is open land on the edge of built up area. The residential areas to the north and east of the site are largely semidetached to the north, with some terraced as well to the east, all with reasonable sized gardens. The open land runs right up to the edge of built up area. To the south of the A411 residential properties are larger detached with extensive gardens. Barnet Lane is an urbanising influence. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. adjoining land is Woodcock Hill Village Green. Submission also made for an additional site to the west in same ownership (HEL209b) but which does not physically adjoin this site. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/80/0797 outline application for housing and open space (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Option for school site, health facilities or extra care facilities |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 12 | 3+ | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. Barnet Lane and the M1 are likely to contribute to the prevention of coalescence of Borehamwood and Greater London. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA50 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt. The western part of site is local wildlife site Woodcock Hill Fields |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The western and south western part of site is Village Green and local wildlife site Woodcock Hill Fields so would not be able to be built on. Any negative impact must be avoided or mitigated. TPO/387/1997 affects the site - 17 individual trees and six groups |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but part could be suitable for development should Green Belt boundaries be changed. Wildlife site most likely not suitable for development. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No. Tenant on short term lease | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 54 | 8.19 | 442 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The western side of the site forms part of Woodcock Village Green which is also a Local Wildlife Site (Woodcock Hill Fields) supporting a range of grassland and scrub species. A TPO (387/1997) covers a large number of trees across the site including mainly individual Oaks as well as various groups and woodland areas containing a variety of species.

Given the above constraints, the area indicated for future residential development by the site promoter would be to the east of the village green and amounts to approximately half of the entire 12.6ha site. A concept plan submitted indicates that the village green site presents an opportunity for a school site but the village green designation would preclude development from taking place.

The site is approximately 1 mile on foot from (via Coleridge Way) the station and (via Furzehill Road) the town centre would potentially be accessed via both Barnet Lane and Furzehill Road. The 107 (Edgware – New Barnet) and 292 (Borehamwood – Colindale) bus routes serve the south east corner of the site which is 400m from the Morrisons supermarket.

The site makes up a large proportion of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel identified in the Stage 1 assessment. The parcel was identified as playing an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside south of Borehamwood albeit forms part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London with Barnet Lane itself identified as contributing to the prevention of coalescence.

Under the current policy framework, none of the site would be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, part of the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 442* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 442 homes*, 75* homes in years 1-5, 367* homes in years 6-10

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL209b

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land North of Barnet Lane | | |
| Address | Barnet Lane, Borehamwood (western site) | | |
| Postcode | WD6 2DR | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Hillside | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Owner | D Rinsler on behalf of the owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 2.84 | Size (ha) Net | 2.13 |
| Current use(s) | Grazing Horses. The land is open grassland with mature trees around the edge and heavily treed at the northern end. | | |

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open land/fields/open space on all sides. A411 Barnet Lane to the south | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The immediate area is open land on the edge of the built up area. It contributes to a rural break between the residential areas of Elstree and Borehamwood . Barnet Lane is an urbanising influence | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes if it was suitable for development . A submission has been made for an additional 12 ha site to east in the same ownership (HEL209a) but this does not physically adjoin this site. It could potentially be joined to adjoining sites to the east and west | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Site to west is HEL197, site to east is HEL227 (however this site is only promoted for 1 dwelling and therefore not assessed under the HELAA). | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/76/0538 and TP/78/0955 Timber stable(GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | mixed use options - school site, health facilities or extra care facilities |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 12 | 3+ | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. Barnet Lane and the M1 likely to contribute to the prevention of coalescence of Borehamwood and Greater London. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA50 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt. Most of it is also covered by designated Wildlife site Elstree Tunnel Grasslands |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No. The site does, however, lie across the Elstree tunnel so it is not clear whether development would be acceptable/viable. |
| Any access difficulties. | No although access onto Barnet Lane A411 would be required. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The site contains TPO/23/2010 and TPO/387/1997. It is also covered by designated Wildlife site Elstree Tunnel Grasslands. Any negative impact must be avoided or mitigated. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | No. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | Not known |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no |
| Is the Site available | Not known |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 34.5 | 2.13 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | 0 | 73 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|-------------------|

Conclusion:

Although in the same ownership as 209a, this smaller site is physically separated from 209a by the remainder of Woodcock Hill Village Green. The site is covered by a Local Wildlife Site (Elstree Tunnel Grasslands) and two TPOs (23/2010, 387/1997) extend into the site. The grasslands are identified as supporting a moderate diversity of grasses and herbs with over 10 species recorded.

The Midland Main Line (Thameslink) runs through a tunnel underneath the centre of the site. The only part of the site which is not within the Local Wildlife Site is a narrow strip to the east of the tunnel which is entirely covered by TPO 23/2010. Notwithstanding the Green Belt status of the site, in light of the above constraints, the site is not considered suitable for development under either the current or any new policy framework. (It is not considered suitable for the development of the unconstrained capacity figure indicated above).

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL217

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Manor Place | | |
| Address | Manor Place Industrial Estate, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 1WG | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Hillside | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Savills on behalf of Legal and General | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.55 | Current use(s) | Industrial warehouse units |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/77/0459. Continued use as offices and stores. (DETERMINED). TP/81/0799. Erection of 2 warehouse units and 2 industrial units. (DETERMINED). TP/82/0521. Continued use of structure on roof for experimental purposes. (DETERMINED). TP/84/0015. Change of use of Unit B from light industrial to warehouse. (DETERMINED). TP/84/0737. Change of use from light industry to warehouse. (DETERMINED). |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No - access from Manor Way |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The site adjoins commercial premises but it lies within an area identified as an opportunity area for residential development in the EWCAAP |
| 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 / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Urban | Very high | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 141 | 0.47 | 66 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site comprises 4 commercial units in one building, located at the edge of the EWCAAP area where it adjoins the designated Elstree Way Employment Area, Manor Way being the boundary between the two areas. The site lies within EWCAAP Opportunity Area 12 for residential development. Access is available off Manor Way. There are no constraints to development identified.

The site is in a relatively accessible location being approximately 1.1km from Borehamwood town centre, 0.6km from schools (Monksmead Primary and Yavneh College) and on bus route 292 (Borehamwood - Colindale). The owner has indicated that the site is available, with tenancies either finishing or having a break clause within 5 years.

The site is considered suitable, available and achievable for residential development starting within 5 years.

Capacity: 66* 50 dwellings within 5 years and 16 dwellings within years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL218

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Organ Hall Farm | | |
| Address | Theobald Street, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 4PH | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Brookmeadow | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Star Planning and Development on behalf of Highmoon Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.9 | Current use(s) | Agricultural pasture and former agricultural buildings |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the south, open countryside to remaining sides. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of Borehamwood location - urban area to south, open countryside to remaining sides. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL384 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/78/0978 Dwelling House. (REFUSED) |
|---|--------------------------------------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 28 | 3+ | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms boundary for Northern end of Borehamwood. Creates a gap between Borehamwood and Radlett. Less than 3% is built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA43 | 3+ | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes. Tykeswater runs through part of the site - FZ2 and FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Organ Hall cottages (locally listed) adjoin the site to the north |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No . It is proposed to upgrade the existing entrance onto Theobald Street |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Pylons and power lines run across the site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Part of site not in FZ could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No . Tenancy can be terminated at any time | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 3.68 | 143 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Environmental constraints affect some of the site with Tykeswater running through the north west part of the site resulting in an area being within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Footpath 51 runs through the middle of the site as well as a pylon/overhead power lines.

The site is approximately 1.5m from the town centre and station although the 398 (Watford – Potters Bar), 602 (Hatfield to Watford) and B3 (Borehamwood circular route) all stop close to the site. The site has been submitted separately from Organ Hall Farm itself and is largely open in character although a part of the site, at its southern end, overlaps with HEL384 including the two agricultural workers dwellings.

Other than a very limited amount of previously developed land in the far south east of the site, HEL218 site is not suitable for development under the current policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The land forms the southernmost part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, particularly with regard to its role in maintain the gap between Borehamwood and Radlett. The independent stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional housing in this location, the remaining part of the site not affected by being within the FZ could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 143* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 143 units*, 50* in years 1-5 and 93* in years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL233

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | 1 and 2 Borehamwood Industrial Park | | |
| Address | Rowley Lane, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 5PZ | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Instalcom Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.92 | Current use(s) | Warehouse and office, part vacant |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to northern and western boundaries, and commercial to south. There is a strip of shrub/tree covered land between the eastern edge of the site and Rowley Lane, through which runs a watercourse. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Immediate surrounding area is built up comprising an employment area with large scale purpose built premises and high density residential areas. Beyond this to the east lies open countryside (partly covered by sites submitted to HELAA) and the A1. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within a designated Employment Area |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Possibly. Commercial premises immediately adjoin the site to the south |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within a designated Employment area. Should the policy framework change the site could be suitable for residential use |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Urban | Medium | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 106.5 | 1.63 | 174 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site comprises purpose built commercial premises, currently partly in use as warehouse and offices. It lies at the northern edge of but within the Elstree Way designated Employment Area where loss of employment land is currently resisted.

The site is accessed directly off Rowley Lane. There are no constraints to development identified but the proximity of commercial premises in a variety of B class uses to the southern boundary may limit the suitability of the site for residential development. The site is approximately 1.8km from Borehamwood town centre (slightly less if access through the Studio Way estate was to be provided). There are no buses along this part of Rowley Lane. Routes 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 398 (Watford - Potters Bar), 644 (Hatfield - Queensbury) are within approximately 0.5km walking distance. The owner has indicated that the site is available and that redevelopment of the site would facilitate the provision of a well-planned landscape buffer between residential to the north and commercial development to the south.

The site is not suitable for residential development under current policy. The most recent evidence (South West Herts Economy Study, 2016) indicates a need to retain this area for employment (para 8.42). Should the designation of the site change then the site could be suitable, available and achievable for approximately 174* dwellings, taking into account the need to provide an appropriate landscape buffer between this site and employment uses to the south.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any review of Employment Land allocations and change to policy framework: 174 dwellings* timescale unknown

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL341

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Allum Lane West | | |
| Address | Allum Lane, Elstree | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3NN | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree | Town/ Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | King & Co on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 2.3 | Current use(s) | Limited use for storage and grass cutting |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | cemetery |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 8 | 3+ | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Borehamwood and Elstree. The Green Belt forms an important function here as the gap is narrow. Development would significantly reduce the actual and perceived gap between Borehamwood and Elstree. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA52 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the north-eastern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North eastern part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site adjoins an archaeological site |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The cemetery adjoins the site but is not necessarily an issue. The site is close to the existing civic amenities site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Archaeological area |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if the site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|---|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | Yes . Feasibility work - highways, drainage and planning. The applicant indicates that early market evidence is that this would be an attractive proposition in the market and would be delivered quickly . |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | The storage use is by the landowner and the grass cutting by a third party under licence- the applicant states that the licensed use can be ceased immediately. | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 54 | 1.27 (taking account of cemetery) | 69 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 08/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site has been promoted independently of other land parcels nearby to the south of Allum Lane. The land adjoins the cemetery and an archaeological site and is relatively close to the household waste recycling centre. An area of approximately 1.5ha is proposed for residential development with the remainder of site earmarked for a cemetery extension.

A public right of way (footpath 6) runs through the site connecting Allum Lane with Elstree Hill South. A number of bus routes stop on Allum Lane close to the site, which is approximately 0.75m from Elstree and Borehamwood Station and the town centre, including 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 615 (Stanmore to Hatfield) and 306 (Watford – Borehamwood).

Development of the wider site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework forming part of a highly performing parcel under the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The parcel plays an important role in separating Elstree and Elstree Village, with the western part of the gap, to the west of the recycling centre, being physically distinct and more important in maintaining the separation. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the north eastern part of the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further. HEL341 is more detached from the built up area of Elstree than some of the other sites promoted to the south of Allum Lane.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the residential part of the site could be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 69* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 69* 50 dwellings in years 1-5 and 19 dwellings in years 6-15

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL347

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Wrotham Park Land off Cowley Hill | | |
| Address | Cowley Hill, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley Ward | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Woolf Bond on behalf of Wrotham Park Estates | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 67.66 | Current use(s) | Agriculture, stables and open fields |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 17/2493/OUT Outline planning application for the provision of a 2 form entry primary school to include access (GRANTED);17/2494/OUT: Outline planning application for the erection of 58 dwellings to include access and layout. (GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | School, play areas, open space |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Prevents outward sprawl of Borehamwood. Forms gap between Borehamwood and Greater London. Less than 5% of the parcel is built form. Prevents ribbon development along Well End Road. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA46 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but the southern part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The southern part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No but a number of watercourses cross the site and development will need to be located appropriate distances away. |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Adjoins locally listed Well End Lodge. Locally listed Cowley Hill farmhouse within the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | No, although one of the proposed access points is on Potters Lane which is narrow |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Pylons and power lines cross the site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The site adjoins local wildlife sites Birchwood (Silver Hill) and Silver Hill Woodland strip and Wood next to Well End Road |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 22.8 | 787 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are three Local Wildlife Sites adjacent to northern boundary (Wood next to Well End Road) and eastern boundary (Birch Wood and Silver Hill Woodland). Cowley Farm buildings are locally listed with locally listed Well End lodge immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary. A significant number of watercourses run across the site which slopes from north east to south west; this includes a main river along Cowley Hill (20m to the west of the site) and ordinary watercourses crossing the site elsewhere. The site is located in FZ1 with the site specific Flood Risk Assessment submitted on behalf of the site promoter concluding the site is sustainable in terms of flood risk. Any development will need to be located away from watercourses in accordance with EA requirements.

Access onto the public highway is proposed in three locations although Potters Lane is particularly narrow and likely to require significant improvement to accommodate increased vehicle movements. A number of bus routes currently run along Cowley Hill. However, with the exception of 823 (Borehamwood – Garston school service only), the other routes stop to the south of the site, adjacent to Hertswood Academy - 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood) and two school routes, 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only) and 601 (Welwyn GC - Borehamwood).

The centre of the site is approximately 1.5-2 miles from Elstree and Borehamwood station and 1 mile from the town centre although local facilities are proposed within a designated mixed use area. The proposed development indicates 29ha of developable land out of an overall site area of 69ha; a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment submitted on behalf of the landowner concludes that the site has medium landscape quality sensitivity and value, with the majority of existing features able to be retained within the proposed development layout. This would require further consideration and verification were the site to be considered for further development in the Local Plan.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site forming part of a parcel identified as making a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, particularly with

regard to preventing encroachment into the countryside. Cowley Hill is identified as one of a number of durable boundary features with the parcel as a whole largely comprising open fields with long views and an unspoilt rural character. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the southern part of the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site could be developable for 787* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 787* homes, 350* in years 6-10 and 437* in years 10-16

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL359

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Site Name | Land north of Stapleton Road | | |
| Address | Stapleton Road, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 5 | Parish | Shenley CP and Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Shenley and Borehamwood Cowley Hill Ward | Town/Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Boyer Planning on behalf of Fairfax Acquisitions/Wood Hall Estate | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 14.72 | Current use(s) | Agricultural |
|------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open fields to all sides except the southern edge of the site which adjoins the northern edge of Borehamwood | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location. To the south is the built up area of Borehamwood whereas the character in other directions is largely open fields in agricultural use. The site is a 7 minute drive from Elstree and Borehamwood station, Borehamwood town centre including the shopping park | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Adjoining land to the north east has been submitted to the Call for Sites | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL152 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is at the edge of Borehamwood and forms the wider gap between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. The southern part of the parcel is less important for preventing coalescence but is connected to Borehamwood and prevents its outward sprawl into open land.. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA44 | 5+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. The majority of the site is Local Wildlife Site Organ Hall Pastures. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | No although the only vehicle access would be off Stapleton Road |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | An overhead power line is located at the Northern boundary of the site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The majority of the site is Local Wildlife Site Organ Hall Pastures. The Wildlife site needs an up to date assessment. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. . |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 9.57 | 373 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The majority of the site is designated as Local Wildlife Site (Organ Hall Pastures) which has been identified as a "complex of partly damp neutral grasslands representing the largest remaining block of old semi-improved/unimproved neutral grassland on London Clay in the County." However, a significant part of the site is used for arable farming suggesting that the land has subsequently been turned over for such use since the designation was made in 1997.

An ecology assessment submitted on behalf of the site owner concludes that the ecological value of the majority of the site is moderate, due to its use as arable land, although there are recognised to be some valuable habitats "including the dense continuous scrub, the establishing woodland and the more moderately valuable semi-improved grassland and tall ruderal habitat." Subject to this assessment being verified and in light of the current use of much of the site, it is not considered that the current Local Wildlife Site designation would preclude the site from being considered suitable.

The site itself can only be accessed via Stapleton Road although pedestrian and cycle access could be secured via The Champions and Retford Close. A local convenience store on Thirsk Road and Leeming Road shops are located within approximately 400m (via Aylot Path) and 1000m of the site respectively. As the site is located beyond the built up area, Borehamwood town centre is some distance away although a number of bus routes run along Stapleton Road - 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood), 306 (Watford – Borehamwood) and two school routes 823 (Borehamwood – Garston school service only) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only) .

The site is located at the southern end of a parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing. The southern part of the parcel is less important for preventing coalescence between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley but is connected to Borehamwood and prevents its outward sprawl into open land. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Under the current policy framework, none of the site would be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location and subject to verification of the ecological assessment, part of the site could potentially

be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 373* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 373* homes, 75* in years 1-5 and 298* in years 6-10

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

| |
|--|
| HELAA 2018 SITE ASSESSMENT FORM |
|--|

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL369 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Site source | CFS 2017 |
|--------------------|-----------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Well End Lodge | | |
| Address | Well End Road, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Shenley |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Owner/occupier | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.43 | Current use(s) | House and garden with some dilapidated out buildings |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open countryside to east, south and west although immediate vicinity of site comprises a small cluster of buildings including scout centre and Montessori school to the north. Planning application recently submitted for residential subdivision/development at nearby Wheatsheaf Farm. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Rural area comprising fields with hedge/tree boundaries. Separated from nearby edge of urban area of Borehamwood by land in agricultural use. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes. Site adjoins land submitted by Wrotham Park Estate. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL347 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/0159/HSE Erection of rear conservatory. (GRANTED). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | prevents the outward sprawl of Borehamwood. Forms wider gap between Borehamwood and London Colney. Does not abut an identifies historic settlement core. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA46 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but the southern part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green belt. The southern part of the sub-area is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Well End Lodge is a locally listed building |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing ‘bad neighbours’ which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy. Opportunity for redevelopment of PDL very limited. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential – residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Low | low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 36 | 0.43 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | 0 | 15 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|---|
| <p>The main dwelling is locally listed. The site itself is detached from the built up area of Borehamwood although it adjoins HEL347 (Land at Cowley Hill). There are no public transport connections to either Borehamwood or Shenley.</p> <p>Given the limited amount of existing development within the site, beyond the existing locally listed dwelling, the scope to carry out further development is limited under paragraph 145 (Feb 19) of NPPF which allows for ‘limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt’ as ‘appropriate development’.</p> <p>Beyond this, development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. Although it is recognised that there may be some potential for the site to join with HEL347, it is unlikely that the Council’s policies, including the key principles set out in Policy SP1 (Creating sustainable development) would change to the extent that development would be permitted in isolation on small non-PDL land sites unable to deliver wider sustainability benefits and which could outweigh Green Belt harm. This would be likely to be contrary to paragraph 138 of the NPPF. As such, the site is not considered suitable. (It is not considered suitable for development of the unconstrained capacity figure identified above).</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0</p> |
|---|

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL371

Site source CFS2018

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Old Haberdashers Sports Ground | | |
| Address | Croxdale Road, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 4PY | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Brook Meadow | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Fairview New Homes (site owned by Hertsmere Borough Council) | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.13 | Current use(s) | Sports Ground (private) |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/0341/FUL 170 residential units (WITHDRAWN) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public open space also proposed |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside
Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is designated open space under SADM34 (BW008) |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | There are several protected trees around the edge of the site (TPO07/2005) |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Potentially although current policy framework (SADM34) would limit the quantum and design of any development on the site. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | no | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | yes | | |
| Is the Site available | Not known | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Suburban | V.Low | High | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 64.5 | 3.1 | 0 | 200 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | |
|--|-----|
| | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|------|------------|
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

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

The site is currently occupied by the Old Haberdashers Association and apart from the question of whether the Council as freeholder would release the site, there is a requirement both from the OHA and under Policy CS19 for a suitable replacement sports ground to be identified. This has not proved possible to date. The availability of the site is not therefore established.

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

The site is relatively accessible, being approximately 0.8km from Borehamwood town centre and whilst Croxdale Road is not on a bus route, Theobald Street is only 300m walking distance and gives access to bus routes 601 (Welwyn Garden City - Borehamwood), 292 (Borehamwood – Colindale) and 398 (Watford – Potters Bar). Elstree and Borehamwood mainline station is approximately 1.1km walk away. It is however a designated Open Space under Policy SADM34 and this, together with the requirements of Policy CS19 would currently limit the suitability of the site for residential development unless a scheme came forward in compliance with these policies. Should this be possible it is likely that the quantum of development would be limited and there would be a requirement to provide public open space within the site.

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

Current capacity: 0

Capacity following any change to policy framework: 200* timescale unknown

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference

**HEL376 A
and
HEL376B**

Site source

CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|---------------------|---|
| Site Name | Land off Well End Road (land south and east of Rowley Lane) | | |
| Address | Well End Road, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Shenley CP and Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Shenley and Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/Village | Borehamwood |
| Owner | Woolf Bond on behalf of Wrotham Park Estate | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 49.04 | Size (ha) Net | 17.68 |
| Current use(s) | Agriculture | | |

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the west, open agricultural land to the north, east and south. A1 Barnet bypass runs north south to the east of the site |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where the urban area of Borehamwood meets open countryside. The A1 is an urbanising influence, but the overall character of the area is of open farmland surrounded by hedges/tree screening. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes the site is adjacent to land to the south at Rowley lane which has also been submitted. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL206, HEL387, |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1735/OUT Outline Planning Application for the Development of a Centre of Sporting Excellence comprising: the Erection of Buildings to accommodate a full size Indoor Artificial Pitch, Sports Hall, Sports Academy and Associated Facilities (including Education, Office and Medical facilities); Hotel (including Conference and Leisure Facilities) and Hostel; Office/Commercial and Research Buildings; Community Sports Facility; Outdoor Grass and Artificial Sports Pitches (including Floodlighting); New Access Arrangements, Parking, Landscaping, Infrastructure and Associated Works. (GRANTED sub/link S106) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Local centre |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents the outward sprawl of Borehamwood built up area and ribbon development along Well End Road. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA47 and SA48 | 3/5 | 1/1 | 3/4 | 0/0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | Sub-area SA47 meets Purposes assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. Sub-area SA48 meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the western part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The western part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | FZ2/3 at south east edge of site. Several watercourses cross the site |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Grade II listed barn at Rowley Farm, grade II Nelson Cottage Rowley Lane, Grade II Buckettsland Farm House and Barn adjoin the site at the northern edge, although this is well away from the area originally promoted for development |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Overhead electricity lines/pylons cross the site. There is a telecom tower adjacent to Rowley Lane. The proximity of A1 may cause noise/air pollution issues which would need to be mitigated. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Local Wildlife site Packhorse Lane runs along the eastern boundary of the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but subject to technical assessments could be suitable if the site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | Not known |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 17.27 | 596 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|------------------------|
| 0ha under new proposal |
|------------------------|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

Following amendments to the application, prior to April 1st 2019, the site now only comprises of the HEL376b site (land south of Rowley Lane) with the proposal now being a solely residential scheme with no employment land provision.

A significant number of watercourses run across the site with around 1.45ha of the south eastern part of the site located within the flood zone (FZ2 and FZ3); any development will need to be sited away from watercourses with attenuation required for other flood risks, such as surface water flooding. Rowley Farm contains a listed building in the northern part of the site with a further listed building, Nelson Cottage, enclosed by but not within the site.

The centre of the site is approximately 1.5 miles from Elstree and Borehamwood station and an approximately 1 mile from the edge of Borehamwood town centre. Currently no buses serve the site with the nearest bus stop 200m from the south west site boundary. The main vehicular access proposed would be through the creation of eastern arm at the roundabout with Studio Way with secondary access formed through a priority junction onto Rowley lane.

A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment submitted on behalf of the landowner concludes that the northern part of the site has medium landscape quality sensitivity and value, with the southern area having a medium-low landscape quality

sensitivity and value. The majority of existing land features are identified as being capable of retention within the proposed development layout. This would require further consideration and verification were the site to be considered for further development in the Local Plan.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site forming part of a parcel identified as making a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, particularly with regard to preventing encroachment into the countryside. Rowley Lane is identified as one of a number of durable boundary features with the parcel as a whole largely comprising open fields with long views and an unspoilt rural character. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site could be developable for 596* homes and/or additional employment land. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 596* dwellings, 350* in years 6-10 and 246* in years 11-15.

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL384

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Organ Hall Farm (buildings) | | |
| Address | Theobald Street, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Borehamwood and Elstree TC |
| Ward | Borehamwood Brookmeadow | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Star Planning on behalf of D2 Investments | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.07 | Current use(s) | Agricultural and Farm buildings |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the south, open countryside to remaining sides. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of Borehamwood location - urban area to south, open countryside to remaining sides. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes - site is surrounded by and partially overlaps adjoining site | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL218 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/96/0578 Retention of a pair semi-detached farmworkers dwellings (GRANTED) TP94/0566 Creation of flood storage pond (GRANTED) TP/91/0437 Extension of new farm area to accommodate slurry storage tank installation to serve new pig unit (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 28 | 3+ | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Radlett and Borehamwood. It is particularly important in preventing ribbon development along Theobald Street. The railway line directly west detracts from the overall rurality. The parcel makes a limited contribution to the broader setting of Radlett Conservation Area by providing a countryside setting for the historic core. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA43 | 3+ | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no. close to FZ2 and FZ3 at northern edge |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | The site has been used for farming so potentially any contamination would be associated with that use. |
| Any access difficulties. | no - access onto Theobald Street can be upgraded |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but subject to technical assessments could be suitable if the site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Possibly some restrictive covenant - being lifted | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | high | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 61.5 | 0.91 | 56 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental constraints affecting the site. Footpath 51 runs across the southern boundary of the site although there is presently no vehicular access into the site off Theobald Street. The site is approximately 1.5m from the town centre and station although the 398 (Watford – Potters Bar), 602 (Hatfield to Watford) and B3 (Borehamwood circular route)

The site has been submitted separately from HEL218 and includes a compact complex of agricultural buildings accessed directly off Theobald Street. Part of the site overlaps with the larger HEL218 including the two agricultural workers dwellings.

As existing development comprises agricultural buildings, this would not fall within the definition of previously developed land where under paragraph 145 of NPPF, some redevelopment could potentially be regarded as appropriate in the Green Belt.

The remainder of the site comprises undeveloped Green Belt and were this to be combined with the previously developed part of the site and the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional housing in this location, the 1.07ha site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 56 homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0* homes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 56* 50 homes in years 1-5 and 6 in years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL 387

Site source I&O

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Rowley Lane safeguarded land | | |
| Address | Rowley Lane, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Lichfields on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 14.5 | Current use(s) | Southern end - hotel. South eastern - hard standing, northern part - storage distribution with parking and open land, some of which is agriculture use |
| Current use(s) | Southern end - hotel. South eastern - hard standing, northern part - storage distribution with parking and open land, some of which is agriculture use | | |

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Commercial to the west, to the north and east is open countryside. A1 Barnet bypass to the east. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where the urban area of Borehamwood meets open countryside. It is a mixture of some previously developed land amongst more open areas with a rural character. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes. Site overlaps HEL206 and adjoins Wrotham Park land to north | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL376B | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1735/OUT. Outline Planning Application for the Development of a Centre of Sporting Excellence comprising: the Erection of Buildings to accommodate a full size Indoor Artificial Pitch, Sports Hall, Sports Academy and Associated Facilities (including Education, Office and Medical facilities); Hotel (including Conference and Leisure Facilities) and Hostel; Office/Commercial and Research Buildings; Community Sports Facility; Outdoor Grass and Artificial Sports Pitches (including Floodlighting); New Access Arrangements, Parking, Landscaping, Infrastructure and Associated Works. (GRANTED/sub-link to S106) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Mix of sports and employment uses comprising pitches, sports hall, sports academy, hotel/hostel, office/commercial and research buildings and parking. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes . Part of the site is within FZ2/3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Safeguarded land suitable for permitted / employment development pending Local Plan review. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|--|
| 11.3ha of land for employment purposes |
|--|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|--|
| <p>There are no particular environmental or topographical constraints to development except for around 2.15ha of the site lying within Flood Zone 2/3. The site is some distance from Borehamwood town centre and rail station. Currently no buses serve the site with the nearest bus stop 200m from the south west site boundary.</p> <p>Although there is an extant outline permission (14/1735/OUT) for a Centre of Excellence for Sport, no applications for reserved matters have been made. That part of the site would be suitable, available and achievable for employment development subject to its release through this review of the Local Plan as it is currently safeguarded. The adjacent Holiday Inn site which is also within the safeguarded area has not been promoted for development, thus the estimated capacity of the site for employment development is 11.3ha. Subject to detailed technical work this could be further reduced due to flood zone considerations .</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 0 Capacity following Local Plan review and release of safeguarded land: up to 11.3ha of employment land within 15 yrs</p> |
|--|

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL387

Site source Safeguarded

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Safeguarded employment land, East of Rowley Lane | | |
| Address | Rowley Lane, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 5PU | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Kenilworth | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Lichfields on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 14.6ha | Current use(s) | South eastern part of the site is hard standing; the northern part is used for storage/distribution with parking and open land, some of which is agricultural use. The southern part of the site is occupied by a hotel. |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Commercial to the west, residential to the south; to the north and east is green field land. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where the urban area of Borehamwood meets open countryside. It is a mixture of some previously developed land amongst more open areas with a rural character. The southern corner of the site is currently occupied by a Holiday Inn. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes. Site incorporates HEL206 which then adjoins Wrotham Park land to the north | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL206 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1735/OUT. Outline Planning Application for the Development of a Centre of Sporting Excellence comprising: the Erection of Buildings to accommodate a full size Indoor Artificial Pitch, Sports Hall, Sports Academy and Associated Facilities (including Education, Office and Medical facilities); Hotel (including Conference and Leisure Facilities) and Hostel; Office/Commercial and Research Buildings; Community Sports Facility; Outdoor Grass and Artificial Sports Pitches (including Floodlighting); New Access Arrangements, Parking, Landscaping, Infrastructure and Associated Works. (GRANTED/sub-link to S106) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mix of sports and employment uses comprising pitches, sports hall, sports academy, hotel/hostel, |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | office/commercial and research buildings and parking. |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes . Part of site within FZ2/3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Possible contamination associated with previous agricultural activities. |
| Any access difficulties. | No - new access is proposed |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Safeguarded land is suitable for permitted / employment development. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
|--|-----|-----------------------------|----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential – employment uses

Capacity under current policy framework: 0ha

Capacity following Local Plan review and release of safeguarded land up to 11.3ha of employment land

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Date | 07/03/2018 |
|-------------|-------------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints across the majority of the site although there are a number of areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3 which in total amount to around 3.6ha of land. The site has been promoted for economic development. Access into the site is from Rowley Lane with a priority junction in the southern part of the site. Around 3ha of land comprises hardstanding which is primarily used for car parking.

The site has been safeguarded for employment development in the current Local Plan and is no longer within the Green Belt. Although there is an extant outline permission (14/1735/OUT) for a Centre of Excellence for Sport, no applications for reserved matters have been made and that part of the site remains suitable, available and achievable for employment development subject to its release through this review of the Local Plan. The Holiday Inn site (3.3ha) located within the site boundary has not been promoted for development meaning that around 11.3 ha of the safeguarded site, which is included in HEL206, would be available. Around 1.7ha around the southern boundary of the site lies within the flood zone; subject to more detailed investigation this may therefore reduce the available developable area.

The majority of the site is included within HEL206 bar the southern corner where the Holiday Inn is located. The land to the north of this site, is also part of HEL206 (15.5ha), and remains in the Green Belt. Most of this land also forms the part of HEL376b which has been promoted separately for employment as part of a wider mixed use development south of Rowley Lane and beyond this, residential.

The site has previously been identified as suitable for employment development (subject to a review of the plan) through its safeguarding in the SADM Plan (2016); it is located at the edge of the urban area of Borehamwood, having previously been removed from the Green Belt. There are no changes in the suitability of the site and it is considered developable for employment purposes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0ha

Capacity following Local Plan review and release of safeguarded land: up to 11.3ha of employment land within 15yrs

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL388

Site source I&O 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | The Point Borehamwood | | |
| Address | Furzehill Road, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | WD6 1EH | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Hillside | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Rapleys on behalf of leaseholder (site owned by Hertsmere Borough Council) | | |

Site size / use:

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

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Retail with flats above to the north, All Saints church and graveyard to the east, residential to the south and west. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the edge of Borehamwood town centre; a mix of uses and forms of development characterise the area including retail, offices, residential and community facilities. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Existing public car park would need to be replaced in any redevelopment. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. All Saints Church on Shenley Road is locally listed. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | No. Car park is currently accessed off Furzehill Road |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Subject to compliance with town centre policies |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | no | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | yes | | |
| Is the Site available | not known | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| central | urban | very high | Urban brownfield flats |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 162 | 0.75 | 0 | 121 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | |
|--|-----|
| | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| Date | 06/08/2019 |
|------|------------|
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is mostly located within the Borehamwood town centre boundary where residential development could be an acceptable use in policy terms. The site is however currently occupied by the Reel cinema, Gala Bingo, and a private gym which are important town centre leisure facilities.

The site is surrounded by existing development, including residential, retail, and All Saints Church and graveyard. Whilst there are no significant physical constraints to development the relationship to adjoining uses and the need to retain public parking provision would limit the development options available. Access would be available from Furzehill Road which runs along the western edge of the site. The site is highly accessible, being within Borehamwood town centre. Bus routes 306 Watford - Borehamwood, 398 (Watford – Potters Bar) and 657 Borehamwood - Harpenden run along Shenley Road, and 601 (Welwyn Garden City - Borehamwood), 644 Hatfield - Queensbury and 758 Hemel Hempstead - London Victoria run on Furzehill Ave. Elstree and Borehamwood mainline station is approximately 0.5km walk away.

The site would be suitable for residential development under the current policy framework subject to compliance with Local Plan town centre policies.

Whilst the application has been submitted by developers on behalf of the leaseholder, the Council as freehold owner has not indicated that the site would be available. The availability of the site is not therefore established.

The site cannot currently be considered available for development and is therefore not suitable available and achievable under the HELAA methodology. (As such it is not available for development of the unconstrained capacity figure identified above).

Current capacity: 121* 50 within years 1-5 and 71 within years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

| |
|--|
| HELAA 2018 SITE ASSESSMENT FORM |
|--|

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Site reference | HEL393 (incl HEL210 & HEL340), superseding HEL159 and HEL391 |
|-----------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Site source | I&O |
|--------------------|-----|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land south of Allum Lane (Endurance) | | |
| Address | Allum Lane, Elstree & Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree | Town/ Village | Elstree & Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Bidwells on behalf of Endurance Estates and owners | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 12.1 | Size (ha) Net | 7.87 |
| Current use(s) | Agriculture, grazing, equestrian. | | |

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Elle Dani equestrian centre and fields, Civic amenities site and cemetery to the west, open fields to the south, residential to the east, Allum Lane to the north. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site lies in the gap between Elstree and Elstree village to east and west, with open countryside to north and south. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | The site incorporates several that were submitted separately to the Call for Sites. It is close , but not physically attached to a further site. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Incorporates/supersedes HEL159, 210 and 340. Neighbouring site HEL341 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/88/0749 Outline application for erection of 2 storey single family dwellings. Density to be determined (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Choose an item. | | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 8 | 3+ | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents outward sprawl of Borehamwood. It forms a gap between Borehamwood and Elstree. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA52 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the north-eastern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North eastern part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. Adjoins sites of archaeological interest. Grade II Nicoll Farm on opposite side of Allum Lane |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Possibly. Proximity of cemetery and civic amenities site |
| Any access difficulties. | No. Access to the whole site can be obtained from Allum Lane. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Civic amenities site and cemetery adjoin. Telecommunications mast adjoins. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/19/2007 within the site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|--|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Applicant states all owners are in agreement |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Garden Suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 7.87 | 307 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 08/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant topographical constraints although the site slopes down from west to east. There are a number of environmental constraints at the perimeter of the proposed residential site, namely TPO trees, archaeological sites and listed buildings. In addition, the site adjoins the household waste recycling centre.

Although originally promoted as a number of land parcels in different ownerships (HEL159, HEL210, HEL340), the site is now being promoted through a single developer meaning there would be no access and ownership barriers.

The site is in a relatively accessible location, approximately 800m from Elstree and Borehamwood station and Borehamwood town centre although the pedestrian route along Allum Lane is relatively undulating. Two public rights of way cross the site connecting Allum Lane with Elstree Hill North (footpath 6) and Barnet Lane (footpath 7). A number of bus routes stop nearby on Allum Lane including Elstree Hill South 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 615 (Stanmore to Hatfield) and 306 (Watford – Borehamwood).

Development of the site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. The site was part of a highly performing parcel under the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, given its role in separating Elstree and Elstree Village. However, the side of the green belt parcel to the east of the household waste recycling centre, was identified as being of less importance in preventing coalescence and recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green

Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessment, the site could be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 307* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 307* homes, 75* in years 1-5 and 232* in years 6-10.

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL405

Site source
Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Brook Road car park | | |
| Address | Brook Road, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Cowley Hill | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.53 | Current use(s) | Car park. Open space at northern end |
| Current use(s) | Car park. Open space at northern end | | |

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | School to the south, park to the east, Brook Road and residential development to the west and north | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is a largely residential area comprising two storey and flatted development. It adjoins Meadow Park. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 17/1410/FUL Change of use of part of existing multi sport courts to temporary public car park to provide an additional 62 spaces (GRANTED); TP/01/0025 New sports pavilion, realignment of footway, fencing and gates (GRANTED); TP/96/0162 Extension of public car park (DETERMINED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retention of surface parking with development above. Type of development sought yet to be determined by the Council. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Part of the site fronting Brook Road is within FZ3 and FZ2. |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Yes, depending on the use proposed |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | medium | High | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 72 | 0.45 | 32 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|------------------------|
| 0.53ha employment land |
|------------------------|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|--|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | Possibly |
| Reason | Brownfield land which if to be released for housing meets criteria for inclusion on register |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located on Brook Road, to the south of Borehamwood FC at Meadow Park and with the rest of the recreational facilities at Meadow Park to the east. St Teresa's primary school adjoins the site to the south. The site is accessed from Brook Road. The main constraint to development, apart from the relationship to adjoining uses and the need to retain public parking provision, is that the front of the site adjoining Brook Road lies within Flood Zone 3. This will constrain both the proposed uses and layout, which will need to pass the sequential and potentially exception tests in order to be acceptable.

The site is reasonably accessible, being located approximately 0.3 miles from Borehamwood town centre and on bus routes 306 (Watford – Borehamwood) and 657 (Borehamwood – Harpenden).

Whilst a decision on the likely future use of the site (in addition to retention of parking) has not yet been made, the site is within the urban area, in a relatively accessible location and should it be put forward for residential development could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for approximately 32* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 32* dwellings within 6-10yrs

OR

Capacity under current policy framework: 0.53ha employment land

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|-----------|---|------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Clarendon Road car park | | |
| Address | Clarendon Road, Borehamwood | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Borehamwood Cowley Hill | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|--------------------|------|----------------|----------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.17 | Current use(s) | Car park |
|--------------------|------|----------------|----------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|---|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north and east, service yard to retail premises to west, retail premises fronting Shenley road to the south. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is on the northern edge of Borehamwood town centre, backing onto commercial premises and close to residential properties - largely 2 storey terraced and a 3 storey flat block at Neptune Court. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|--|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/89/0089 Sheltered Residential scheme incorporating 29 units (GRANTED); |
|--|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Retention of surface parking with development above. Type of development sought yet to be determined by the Council. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt

² washed over by the Green Belt

³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Yes, depending on the use proposed |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Central | medium | High | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 106.5 | 0.17 | 18 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|---------------------------|
| 0.17ha of employment land |
|---------------------------|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|--|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | Possibly |
| Reason | Brownfield land which if to be released for housing meets criteria for inclusion on register |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 06/08/2019 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|---|
| <p>The site is located on Clarendon Road, within Borehamwood town centre. The site is accessed from Clarendon Road which in turn comes off Shenley Road. There are no particular constraints to development apart from the relationship to adjoining uses and the need to retain public parking provision.</p> <p>The site is highly accessible, being located within Borehamwood town centre and approximately 0.07 miles from Shenley Road which is on bus routes 306 (Watford – Borehamwood), 657 (Borehamwood – Harpenden) 398 (Watford – Potters Bar) and 644 (Hatfield – Queensbury). It is approximately 0.4 miles walking distance to Elstree and Borehamwood rail station.</p> <p>Whilst a decision on the likely future use of the site (in addition to retention of parking) has not yet been made, the site is within the urban area, in a relatively accessible location and if put forward for residential development could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for approximately 18* dwellings.</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 18* dwellings within 6-10yrs OR Capacity under current policy framework: 0.17ha employment land</p> |
|---|

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM

Site reference **HEL506**

Site source Sites
consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Allum Lane South | | |
| Address | Allum Lane, Elstree | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3NN | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree | Town/ Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | King and Co | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|----------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | Parcels D, E (proposed for 2 homes only – in addition to the 2 already there) and G only. (1.44ha) | Current use(s) | Parcels G and D are a former caravan park, now unused and overgrown. Parcel E is garden to residential properties. HEL341 (parcel A) is considered separately under its own assessment |
|--------------------|---|----------------|--|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|--|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/89/0966 Change of use from former mobile home site to tree contractors depot and erection of temporary office/equipment store; 19/0263/FUL Demolition of existing 2 semi-detached dwellings and construction of 4 detached dwellings (WITHDRAWN) (THIS IS SITE E PROMOTED UNDER THIS SUBMISSION) |
|--|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cemetery extension on HEL341 |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 8 | 3+ | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents the outward sprawl of Borehamwood. It forms a gap between Borehamwood and Elstree. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA52 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the north-eastern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North eastern part is recommended for further consideration. HEL506 lies outside the area recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes, the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Archaeological area in north east corner of site (parcel B and part of A – HEL341) |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Sites are in a variety of ownerships. Access in the area of the recycling centre is in an area that suffers from surface flooding and is also sloping. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Recycling centre. Telecommunications tower. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Archaeological area (parcel B and part of A – HEL341) |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if the site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Not known | Is there developer interest | Not known |
|---|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|--|---|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | The parcels making up the area covered by the submitted masterplan are in a variety of ownerships, including Hertsmere Borough Council, Housing Association, and privately owned. |
| Is the Site available | Not known |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Very Low | High | Garden Suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 54 | 1.22 | 66 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | N/A | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

It is not clear whether the parcels identified in the masterplan submitted are being promoted for development or whether the submission is purely to illustrate potential for development to occur in some of the individual parcels of land adjoining the promoter's previously submitted HEL341. Potential for residential development has only been indicated in respect of 3 of the identified parcels – namely D, E and G; this assessment relates only to those parcels. These parcels are understood not to be under the control of the promoter and are currently in a variety of ownerships, including Hertsmere Borough Council and it is not known whether the land is available. A planning application relating to parcel E was submitted in early 2019 for the demolition of the existing 2 houses and replacement with 4 houses on behalf of the owner but recently withdrawn.

A public right of way (footpath 6) runs along the north west boundary of the area, connecting Allum Lane with Elstree Hill South. Footpath 7 between Allum Lane and Barnet Lane forms the eastern boundary. A number of bus routes stop on Allum Lane close to the site, which is approximately 0.75m from Elstree and Borehamwood Station and the town centre, including 107 (Edgware - New Barnet), 615 (Stanmore to Hatfield) and 306 (Watford – Borehamwood).

Development of the site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. It forms part of a highly performing parcel under the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which found that parcel plays an important role in separating Elstree and Elstree Village. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the north eastern part of the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further. The group of land parcels identified as HEL506 however lie outside the area recommended for further consideration.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the parcels promoted for residential development could be suitable for the delivery of 5 homes. However, the likely timescale for delivering the site is currently unknown as there is no indication that land parcels other than the already promoted HEL341 would be available.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 66* timescale unknown

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

| |
|---|
| HELAA 2018 SITE ASSESSMENT FORM |
|---|

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Site reference | HEL511a and HEL511b |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|

Site location / address:

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Site source | Sites consultation |
|--------------------|-----------------------|

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Site Name | Woodcock Hill, Borehamwood | | |
| Address | | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood |
| Ward | Borehamwood Hillside and Elstree Wards | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Barton Willmore for Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 511b only (511a is to be village green) 3.41ha | Current use(s) | Grazing, Village Green, residential garden |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Fields to the east (grazed) and west, residential to the north. A411 Barnet Lane to the south |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Site at the southern edge of the built up area of Borehamwood. The open land runs right up to the edge of built up area at Vale Avenue and Byron Avenue. To the south of the A411 residential properties are larger detached with extensive gardens. Woodcock Hill Farm lies opposite the site. The site contributes to a rural break between the residential areas of Elstree and Borehamwood. Although Barnet Lane is an urbanising influence the open fields and mature trees contribute to a rural feel. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL209a (BE1), HEL197a and HEL197b. Site also covers HEL209b and part of HEL227 (only originally promoted for 1 dwelling and thus not assessed under the HELAA) |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/76/0538 Retention of timber shed for agricultural storage TP/78/0955 Timber stable TP/88/0869 Residential development (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Replacement Village Green |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 12 | 3+ | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. Barnet Lane and the M1 likely to contribute to the prevention of coalescence of Borehamwood and Greater London. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA49 and SA50 | 1+/1 | 1/1 | 3/4 | 0/0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-areas meet Purpose assessment criteria moderately/strongly, but make a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. They are recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the sites are in the current Green Belt, and contain 2 designated Local Wildlife Sites (Woodcock Hill Fields LWS and Elstree Tunnel Grassland LWS) and a registered Village Green. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No. Small area of surface water flood risk (according to Environment Agency flood risk maps) to the north west of the site. |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | The masterplan proposes vehicular access through the adjoining residential area via Vale Avenue. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Rail tunnel runs under part of the site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Designated Village Green. TPO 387/1997, TPO23/210 |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Even if the Green Belt status of the site were to change, the status of the part of the site on which development is proposed is registered village green and a designated local wildlife site. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes (not known in respect of rear garden to Little Orchard HEL227) | Is there developer interest | Yes |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|--|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Part of the site is a registered Village Green |
| Is the Site available | Not currently |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not currently |
|-------------------------------|---------------|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------|
| 43.5 | 2.56 | Unconstrained | Constrained |
| | | 111 | 0 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | N/A |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The proposal comprises residential development on site HEL511b, which is currently part of Woodcock Hill registered Village Green in exchange for a 'land swap' which would relocate the Village Green to the south and west. The site covers 2 Local Wildlife Sites (Elstree Tunnel Grasslands and Woodcock Hill Fields); residential development is proposed on Woodcock Hill Fields. The Midland Main Line (Thameslink) runs through a tunnel underneath the western part of the site, which is part of the area proposed as replacement Village Green. The only part of the site which is not within a Local Wildlife Site is a narrow strip to the east of the tunnel which is entirely covered by TPO 23/2010. Whilst 2 TPOs affect the site as a whole these do not cover the area proposed for development (HEL511a)

The site is approximately 0.6 mile from Elstree and Borehamwood station on foot; no bus routes currently serve the site. Vehicular access to the site is proposed from Vale Avenue.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. The site lies within the Green Belt and comprises part of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel which the Stage 1 assessment identified as forming part of the less essential gap between Borehamwood and Greater London. The western part of the parcel which includes HEL511 was identified as being rural in character, playing an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside on the south side of Borehamwood with Barnet Lane itself identified as contributing to the prevention of coalescence. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment identified the sub-areas within which the site is located as performing moderately or strongly in relation to Green Belt purposes, but making a less important contribution to the wider Green Belt and recommended that they could be considered further for release.

The promoters have undertaken a desk based ecology study which concludes that whilst the proposals 'may impact on existing LWSs, it is clear that these sites are not in favourable condition and ample opportunities existing for new and enhanced habitats to be delivered as part of the proposals. Furthermore, in delivering such enhancement to the site these habitats and biodiversity benefits can be secured and protected long-term with effective management.' Confirmation of these conclusions would be required in order for the site to be considered suitable for development; the site's development potential would otherwise be significantly impacted.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments the site could theoretically accommodate 111* homes. However, there is no indication that a Village Green swap would either be acceptable or achievable and a range of legal, ownership, access and ecological factors mean that the site cannot be considered as suitable, available or achievable for development.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review: 111* dwellings timescale unknown

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM

Site reference **HEL514**

Site source Sites consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|-----------|---|--------------|---|
| Site Name | Land west of Borehamwood (Radlett Park Golf Club) | | |
| Address | Off Watling Street | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3AA | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP/ Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Elstree / Aldenham East | Town/Village | |
| Promoter | Strutt and Parker for BRC99 Settlement and Radlett Park Golf Club Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|-----------------|---|----------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 48.22 (excluding flood zone of 26.8ha) Total boundary 75.02 | Current use(s) | North is pasture, centre is golf course, southern part vacant scrub |
|-----------------|---|----------------|---|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community facilities/public open space/primary school |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 13 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is connected to the large built-up area of Borehamwood, preventing outward sprawl into open land. The parcel forms the wider gap between the settlements of Borehamwood and Radlett maintaining the overall openness of the gap and ensuring its overall physical scale is maintained. The parcel prevents ribbon development along the A5100 (Watling Street) between Borehamwood and Radlett. It contains less than 10% built –form and possesses a largely rural character overall. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA53 (part of site) | 5+ | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Green Belt purposes strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | The site is within the current Green Belt. Local Wildlife Sites along the railway line (Pasture by Railway, Borehamwood and Parkfields Open Space) |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Significant parts of central and northern part of the site are in FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Radlett Prep School, Waggon and Horses PH, and barns at South Medburn Farm are Grade II listed close to the western boundary of the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | None indicated although attention is drawn to the fact that there is a man-made golf course in the centre of the site |
| Any access difficulties. | Access via existing access to Golf Club and South Medburn Farm off Watling Street – may need widening. Highway works may be required in order to improve the junction. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The mainline railway runs up the eastern side of the site. Protection from noise and vibration would be required should the site be developed. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/155/1988 woodland containing various species including oak, ash on SW edge of the site and various individual trees across the site |

| | |
|---|--|
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within the Green Belt. |
|---|--|

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Very low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 24.11 | 832 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | N/A |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

Most of the northern half of the site lies within the flood zone; residential development here will not therefore be acceptable and has been excluded from the calculation of possible dwelling numbers. An electricity substation and the mainline railway running up the east side of the site are further constraints to development. Land in the centre of the site is excluded from the area promoted for development. To the south west a woodland area containing various species including oak and ash is subject to a TPO and individual trees across the site are also protected. Land adjoining the railway line is also designated Local Wildlife sites.

The site is accessed off Watling Street via the current access road to the golf course and South Medburn Farm. It is likely that this would need to be upgraded should the site be developed. Although it adjoins the built up part of Borehamwood at the southern end the site is not particularly accessible as its only road access is via Watling Street and it is separated from Elstree and Borehamwood by the mainline railway. No buses serve the site. It is up to approximately 1.7 miles from Elstree and Borehamwood station and 2.5 miles from Radlett station. Footpaths 10, 11, 13, 23, 41, 50, 51 55, 56, and 57 cross the site.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development, forming part of a Green Belt parcel identified in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment as highly performing and as assisting in preventing sprawl, coalescence, and in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is partially located for further consideration

Additional development here would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and would need to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional growth adjoining Borehamwood. However, the importance of the site in Green Belt terms, together with constraints including flood zone, protected trees and the Local Wildlife Sites may significantly constrain the amount of development possible or preclude it from development completely. For the purposes of the HELAA, the site, excluding land in the flood zone, could yield around 832* new homes were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location and a re-assessment of the value of the Local Wildlife Site found development to be acceptable. Were this not to be the case and development not to be acceptable in the area currently identified as LWS, the capacity of the site could be reduced.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0*

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 832* dwellings timescale unknown

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL518

Site source Sites
consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Site Name | Former Day Centre, Grosvenor Road | | |
| Address | Former Day Care Centre, Grosvenor Road, Borehamwood, Hertfordshire | | |
| Postcode | WD6 1BT | Parish | Borehamwood and Elstree Town Council |
| Ward | Borehamwood Brookmeadow | Town/ Village | Borehamwood |
| Promoter | Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.18 | Current use(s) | Former day centre which is currently derelict |
|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Directly north of the site are Clarendon Park and beyond that is BBC Elstree studios with the new EastEnders set (currently under construction). To the south of the site is Shenley Road, Borehamwood's High Street. To the east of the site, the land use is predominately residential and to the west is Clarendon Road Car Park and Borehamwood Shopping Park. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is located in a central location just off the main high street which contains the majority of the retail outlets, shops and restaurants in Borehamwood. To the north of the site is the BBC Elstree Studios. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | <p>18/0845/FUL - Demolition of the derelict structure of the former Day Care Centre and an unused toilet block to allow the redevelopment of the site to introduce a new build 2/3 storey residential building, comprising 11 x 2 bed, 4 person apartments with associated parking spaces and an area of green open space. (Revised Application) – Application Withdrawn</p> <p>17/1961/FUL - The proposal incorporates the demolition of an existing derelict shelter and unused toilet block to allow the redevelopment of the site to introduce two new-build residential buildings, totalling 15 No. 2 bed 4 person apartments along with their associated parking spaces. – Application Withdrawn</p> <p>TP/07/1310 - Demolition of derelict former day centre and public toilets. Construction of 11 no. two bed flats over two floors with 17 no. car parking spaces. (Outline Application including siting, design, access and landscaping) (Amended and additional drawings received 22 August 2007). – Outline Planning Permission Granted</p> |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| 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 / indications that the site may not actually be available | | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Central | Medium | Very high | Urban brownfield flats |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 126 | 0.18 | 23 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | Yes |
| Reason | The site is located in close proximity to Borehamwood's High Street and currently consists of the former day centre which is now derelict. | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 15/07/2019 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located in the centre of Borehamwood's urban area and currently consists of the former day care centre which is now derelict. There are no significant policy or physical constraints to development of the site. The site is accessible, being within walking distance of Borehamwood High Street, and in close proximity to bus routes 107 (Edgware to New Barnet), 306 (Borehamwood to Watford), 398 (Borehamwood to Potters Bar) and 357 (Borehamwood to Harpendon) and close to Fairbrook and The Grove Medical Centres (0.5km) and primary (0.5km) and secondary schools (1.3km, Hertswood Academy) and 0.1km from Borehamwood High Street District Centre. The site can be accessed via car from Grosvenor Road. A previous application for the comprising of 11 x 2 bed, 4 person apartments was withdrawn last year.

The site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable for development for an estimated 23 homes within 5 years, based on the standard method for calculating capacity.

Capacity: 23 dwellings within 1-5yrs

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

APPENDIX 10: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - BUSHEY

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL170

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Bushey Health Centre | | |
| Address | London Road, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 2NN | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey St. James Ward | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | NHS Property Services Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.43 | Current use(s) | Health Care |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Care home to the west of the site, residential to the east and south. The site is opposite Bushey Manor Junior School (across London Road to the north). | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Built up area of Bushey. The predominant character is residential but there are institutional and commercial uses along London Road | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | . TP/02/1326 First floor extension over car park to provide staff room (GRANTED). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Residential or care home | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes (part in FZ2). Current car park area is partly in FZ2 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No. Vehicular access to part of site fronting London Road off Cross Street. Car park currently accessed off Haydon Road/Brick Kiln Close. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| 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. Site to be declared surplus by NHS. GPs and Community Services moving to alternative premises. | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | Higher | Very high | Urban brownfield flats |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 123 | 0.43 | 53 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | Yes |
| Reason | Brownfield land which meets criteria for inclusion on register | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located in the Bushey urban area and is in two main parts – the main building fronting and accessed from London Road, and the car park to the rear accessed via Brick Kiln Close off Haydon Road. Whilst there are no significant policy or physical constraints to development on the front of the site, the car park to the rear lies within Flood Zone 2 and is located behind existing residential properties on all four sides. Development in this part of the site may be severely constrained and may not prove acceptable. The site is accessible, being on bus routes 142 (Watford to Brent Cross) and 258 (Watford to South Harrow) and close to Bushey Medical Centre (0.2km) and primary (0.3km) and secondary schools (0.4km, Bushey Academy) and 0.6km from Bushey High Street District Centre.

The site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable for development for an estimated 53 homes, based on the standard method for calculating capacity.

Capacity: 53* 50 homes within 5 years , 3 in years 6 - 10

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL175

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Hartsbourne Country Club | | |
| Address | Hartsbourne Ave, Bushey Heath | | |
| Postcode | WD23 1JW | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/ Village | Bushey Heath |
| Promoter | Bidwells on behalf of Hartsbourne Properties Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.53 | Current use(s) | Country club and golf course |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north, golf course south of site. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Residential area to north. Golf course then open fields to the south. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1281/TPO, numerous tree works across the site. TP/00/0221, Construction of building containing changing rooms for swimming pools following demolition of existing garage/storage building (GRANTED). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 1 | 5+ | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents outward sprawl of Watford and Greater London. Forms gap between Watford and Bushey. 3% of the parcel is built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The Country Club is a locally listed building. The staff accommodation, former stables, a house and outbuilding constructed are locally listed for their group value. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Possibly - can only be accessed from existing residential streets |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/219/1990 and TPO/29/2007 |
| 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 / indications that the site may not actually be available | The site is owned by Hartsbourne Properties Ltd and the lease with Hartsbourne Country Club is due for review/renewal in 2018. | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------------|
| 39 | 3.4 | 133* but only 70 (based on PDL) |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

No significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting the previously developed part of the site, which is the only area being promoted for development. The clubhouse and some other buildings are locally listed. There are various areas of hardstanding including small car parks. The principle of some development is acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'.

Under the current policy framework, the quantum of 'appropriate development' within the Green Belt would depend on an assessment of building footprint and volume, rather than the red line boundary submitted. The capacity of Hartsbourne Road, treatment of existing locally listed buildings and scale/position of new clubhouse will also determine precise number of units which could be accommodated. The site can only be accessed from Prowse Avenue and Hartsbourne Avenue, two residential streets, although the site is within 1000m of Bushey Heath district centre which is served by two bus routes 142 (Watford- Brent Cross) and 258 (Watford – South Harrow).

The current footprint of development amounts to 3,200 sq m. A clubhouse with a footprint of up to 1,000 sq m is envisaged based on information previously provided on behalf of Hartsbourne Country Club and for the purposes of this assessment, a developable area of 2,200 sq m will be used. The quantum of development which could potentially be accommodated is such that it could be treated as a potential allocation, where development parameters can be clearly set, rather than as a potential windfall site.

The site is available within the next five years having been promoted by the owners of the land who have worked with Hartsbourne Country Club and schemes to secure the future vitality and viability of the Club. Based on an equal mix of 1 and 2 bed flats and 3 and 4 bed houses, the site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable for an estimated 70*

homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 70* homes – 50* in years 1-5 and 20* in years 6-10

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework:: 133* – 50* in years 1-5 and 83 in years 6-10

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL176

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Former Bushey Country Club | | |
| Address | High Street, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey St. James | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 21 | Current use(s) | Former Bushey Country Club (now closed). The only remaining uses on site now are Hertsmere council's Bushey Neighbourhood Office and a community centre operated by Hertsmere Leisure Trust on behalf of the council. A car wash operator holds a licence from the council. |
|----------------------------|----|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential surrounding site to the north, east and west. St Margarets School, Ashfield Junior School and open land to the south. Some commercial (office uses) to the north. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Residential area of Bushey. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/06/1539, Construction of 5 no. new 10 metre lattice towers to support netting for the golf driving range (GRANTED). |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Previously developed part of the site to be considered for mixed use. Consideration to be given to new open space/ parkland allocation and other associated development opportunities on remaining land. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 1 | 5+ | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 strongly. Although the area north of Merry Hill Road feels more detached from the wider countryside, it still plays an important role in preventing further encroachment of development into the countryside and also makes a limited contribution to purpose 4. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA59 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. | | |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No | | |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes - many heritage assets adjoin/are close to the site. Statutory listed buildings (Bushey House, Palgrange Lodge, and Bushey Park, Margaret Howard Theatre and Studios, Heronslea House, 67-75 High Street). Designated Park/Garden Bushey Rose Garden is opposite to the north. Bushey High Street Conservation Area adjoins site to north. Locally Listed Buildings Herkomer House opposite to east and 61 High Street adjoining to south-east. Area of archaeological interest close to site. | | |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No | | |
| Any access difficulties. | No | | |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No | | |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/17/2007. St James churchyard local wildlife site is close to site | | |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | PDL suitable for redevelopment. Rest of site potentially suitable although not under current Green Belt policy | | |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | High | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 58.5 | 11.55 | 676 (85 PDL) |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|---|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | Not as a whole but PDL part of site could be added to Register. |
| Reason | Previously developed area of site is brownfield land which meets criteria for inclusion on register |

Conclusion:

The site comprises a significant complex of existing buildings, other structures and hardstanding, together with pair of semi-detached houses to the front. There is a large area of hardstanding (car park). The principle of some development is acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'.

Under the current policy framework, the quantum of 'appropriate development' within the Green Belt would depend on an assessment of building footprint and volume, rather than the red line boundary submitted.

The majority of existing buildings are close to the lowest part of the site with a 'dip' in the landscape, containing a watercourse, before the site noticeably rises to the south west. Significant gradient means any development beyond PDL part of the site would affect the current open vista when viewed from the main road (A411). A landscape and visual assessment would be required. The site is available following closure of golf club although re-provision or relocation of existing community facilities would need to be considered under current planning policy framework.

The current footprint of development amounts to approximately 2,600 sq m for the purposes of assessing the previously developed part of the site. The quantum of development which could potentially be accommodated is such that it could be treated as a potential allocation, where development parameters can be clearly set, rather than as a potential windfall site.

Subject to more detailed technical assessments and based on an equal mix of 1 and 2 bed flats and 3 and 4 bed houses, the PDL part of the site is available and considered to be suitable, available and achievable for 85 homes, being deliverable within 5 years.

Beyond the previously developed area and subject to clarification about the amount of open space which would be retained, a landscape and visual assessment and traffic impact would guide any assessment of capacity.

Access would be likely to be taken directly from the High Street as the principal point of ingress/egress although the wider golf course abuts Merry Hill Road to the south. The lower part of the site is in an accessible location, abutting Bushey

Village district centre and on two existing bus routes 142 (Watford- Brent Cross) and 258 (Watford – South Harrow).

Development of the wider site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. The site forms part of a wider parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing in terms of preventing sprawl and coalescence of settlements. Although the assessment recognised that the area north of Merry Hill Road felt more detached from the wider countryside, given its recent land use, it was considered to fulfil an important Green Belt function, particularly in terms of encroachment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

No decisions concerning the availability or otherwise of the wider site have yet been made. The potential for any development in the wider site, should it be made available, would depend upon the existence of exceptional circumstances which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 85* homes, 50* within 1-5 years and 35* within 6-10 years

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 676 (timescales not known but 50* within 1-5 years and 35* within 6-10 years under current policy)

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL181

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | land adj Little Bushey Lane & Bournehall Ave | | |
| Address | Little Bushey Lane & Bournehall Ave, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 4JX | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey North Ward/ Bushey St. James | Town/Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Strutt and Parker on behalf of MTGB Nominees | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 48.58 | Size (ha) Net | 15.91 |
| Current use(s) | Agriculture | | |

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential towards the south of the site, cemetery towards the east of the site, playing field and Queens Secondary School towards the north of the site. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is located where open countryside meets the built up residential area of Bushey. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Adjoining tennis courts have been promoted for development |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL337b |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/81/0524 Residential development. (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Primary school, local centre, care home, possible extension to Queens School |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents the outward sprawl of Watford. It forms the gap between Watford and Bushey. Much of the parcel is open and unspoilt. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA60 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | There are TPO trees next to the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes - vehicular access only from Little Bushey Lane. There appears to be a ransom strip here. This needs to be resolved to enable access to Little Bushey Lane |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Local Wildlife Site - Meadow N.W. of Tylers Farm is within the site. There is also a ditch/watercourse. There are TPO trees next to the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes and access resolved |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes - ransom strip adjoining Little Bushey Lane | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable | Yes subject to resolution of ransom strip |
|------------------------|---|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 15.91 | 549 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Environmental constraints include 3.2ha designated wildlife site in the south east of the site, identified as an area of species-rich, damp neutral grassland, and historic landfill in the north of the site. The latter is identified in the high level review submitted on behalf of the landowner. Further investigations would be required to determine whether remediation would be required and the extent to which that part of the site would not be developable. An underground electricity transmission cable through the centre of the site and along site perimeter, adjacent to Little Bushey Lane.

Vehicular access into the site is presently limited to the north east boundary of the site onto Little Bushey Lane. Although the site extends across the Bournehall Avenue and Finch Lane, there is no vehicular access onto either and despite the public rights of way, current connectivity between the site and the surrounding road network is limited. A narrow strip of land between the site and Little Bushey Lane is not currently within the ownership of the site promoter and belongs to HCC. This would need to be properly addressed to secure all of the proposed access points into the site from Little Bushey Lane and for the site to be considered genuinely available.

Given the scale of development proposed, a detailed highway assessment would be required to assess the impact on both the local road network and the strategic road network given the proximity of the site to both the A41 and Junction 5 of the M1; although Sandy Lane offers direct access onto the A41, it is a particularly narrow road and unsuitable for larger volumes of traffic.

The site is currently served by two bus routes on Bournehall Road, 306 (Watford-Borehamwood) and 823 (Borehamwood – Garston school service only) although neither route runs directly into Bushey village district centre which is approximately 1 mile on foot from much of the area proposed for development. Watford town centre is approximately 15 minutes by bus from Bournehall Avenue. Bushey train station is between approximately 1.25m to 2m from the site and

approximately 10 minutes by bus.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a significant proportion of parcel 6 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 2 (coalescence of settlements). The location is identified as forming part of the essential gap between Watford and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, as well as the essential gap between those settlements and North Bushey and Elstree. This is recognised in the High Level review submitted. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Were access/land ownership onto Little Bushey Lane to be addressed and the wider policy framework to change, with the impact on the Green Belt needing to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering a significant quantum of growth in Bushey, the site could potentially be developable for 549* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

The site has been amended since the last HELAA, with the total area proposed for development reducing from 24.15ha to 15.91ha, as of the 1st April 2019.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 549* homes, 350 within 6 to 10 years and 199 homes in 11-15 years

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL201

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | land at Little Bushey Lane | | |
| Address | Little Bushey Lane, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 4RA | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Park | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Barton Willmore on behalf of Redrow Homes Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 18.17 | Current use(s) | Pasture – for grazing horses |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential towards the north, south and west of the site. Next to a farm with equestrian facilities. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Residential to west. Open land to south-east and north. M1 motorway to north-east. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL336 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/79/0845: Outline application, use of the land for the growing, storage and ancillary sale of horticultural produce, garden furniture and equipment. (REFUSED); TP/88/0915: Jewish School Complex (Outline) Application B. (REFUSED) TP/88/0916: Jewish School Complex (Outline) Application A. (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents the outward sprawl of Watford . It forms the gap between Watford and Bushey. 8% of the parcel is covered by built form | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA57 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No, however development may affect the setting of Grade II listed Caldecote Tower to the south east and Immanuel College/Rosary Priory to the south. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Proximity of M1 motorway could impact future occupiers depending on layout and design. Pylons/power lines run across the site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Two Public Rights of Way cross the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 6.98 | 241 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

Flood Zone and pylons/overhead power lines affect the north east part of site. The northern part of the site is approximately 40m from M1 motorway albeit elevated from the carriageway. No other environmental or topographical constraints affect the site. The land is close to the approved Rossway Drive residential developments for over 130 units, one of which has now been built out, as well as an area of post-war residential development to the east of the building line on Little Bushey Lane towards Elstree Road.

Access would be directly onto Little Bushey Lane. A detailed highway assessment would be required to assess the impact on the local road network and the strategic road network, taking account of other sites being promoted in the vicinity and given the proximity of the site to both the A41 and Junction 5 of the M1. Although Sandy Lane offers direct access onto the A41, it is a particularly narrow road and unsuitable for larger volumes of traffic.

Currently the site is not served by any bus routes, the centre of which is broadly equidistant from Bushey Village and Bushey Heath centres, both of which are over 1 mile away on foot. There are no local shopping parades particularly close to this part of Bushey with the convenience shops on Harcourt Road approximately 1 mile away. Although the site is within 800m of a secondary school (Bushey Meads), any significant scale of development in this location would need to address the relatively limited access to services within the vicinity of the site.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering

additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 241* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 241* homes, 50* in years 1-5 and 191* in years 6-10.

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL202

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Land at Merry Hill Road | | |
| Address | Merry Hill Road, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 1DF | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Park | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Clarke and Simpson on behalf of owners | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.82 | Current use(s) | Rough Grassland |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential and St Margarets School to the west, allotments to east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open fields to the south, residential to the north and east. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | NONE |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 1 | 5+ | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents the outward sprawl of Waford and Greater London. It forms the gap between Watford and Bushey. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Applicant indicates that site is within NVZ 2013 Designation – Surface Water |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No although there are mature trees in the vicinity of the access |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/48/2007 |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Medium | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------|
| 45 | 0.7 | 31* |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints with no specific designations affecting the site other than its Green Belt status. The site would be accessed from Merry Hill Road although there are a number of mature street trees across the entry point to the site. The site can be reached via footpath 25 which runs along the western boundary of the site close to St Margaret's School.

The site comprises two distinct parts, namely the relatively narrow gap between Nos.127 and 131 which is between approximately 12m and 19m in width and the wider open area to the rear comprising approximately 7ha of open countryside (other than a single agricultural building/structure with a footprint of a little over 100 sq m). Other than for providing a means of access into the field to the rear, the basis for the gap between 127 and 131 is unclear with no record of a no.129 having been on the site. Nevertheless, were an application to be submitted to develop the gap between the two houses, a case for very special circumstances could potentially be made. However, the size of this part of the site is below the threshold for consideration in the HELAA both in terms of area and likely capacity, given the prevailing pattern of development along Merry Hill Road.

Development beyond the gaps between Nos. 131 and 137 would lead to further encroachment to the south of Merry Hill Road and would not be suitable for development under the current policy framework. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF and subject to highways and other detailed technical assessments, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 31* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 1

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 31* homes in years 1-5

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

| |
|--|
| HELAA 2018 SITE ASSESSMENT FORM |
|--|

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL208 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|----------|
| Site source | CFS 2017 |
|--------------------|----------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Land on NE side of Western Avenue | | |
| Address | Western Avenue, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD25 8HA | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey North | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | DP9 on behalf of NBP Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 11.5 | Current use(s) | Vacant |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Commercial, residential and hotel to the north west. Residential and commercial to the south east. M1 to the north, A41 to the south. A cemetery, playing fields and depot site lie to the south of the A41. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The area is crossed by the A41 and M1 and has a variety of mainly commercial uses consistent with accessibility to major transport routes. However much of the area remains open. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. The site lies within a larger site in multiple ownership previously submitted to the Call for Sites (HEL200) but which has since been withdrawn. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | Importation of inert soil, subsequent releveling of land and erection of noise barrier fencing (County Council Consultation). Herts CC Resolved to permit 21/1/99 |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Open storage and school |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt

² washed over by the Green Belt

³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 14 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The Parcel is moderately performing, in terms of preventing coalescence between towns. It maintains the overall openness of the axis between North Bushey and Bushey Village/Bushey Heath, particularly in the southern part of the parcel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Yes - historic fill operations |
| Any access difficulties. | The proposed creation of a new access onto the A41 would need to be agreed with the Highway Authority. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy and would be subject to agreement from the Highway Authority for a new access onto the A41 |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|---|
| 11.5ha of land is potentially available for employment uses |
|---|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|--|
| <p>HEL208 lies within the larger site HEL200 that was previously promoted but has since been withdrawn. It has been promoted separately for B class development.</p> <p>The site makes up a part of a parcel which was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as moderately performing, in terms of preventing coalescence between towns. Despite being bound by the M1 and A41 and relatively separate from Bushey, it was identified as maintaining the overall openness of the axis between North Bushey and Bushey Village/Bushey Heath, particularly in the southern part of the parcel.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and the Highway Authority were to agree a new access onto the A41, it could be suitable for employment purposes.</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 0 ha of employment land</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 11.5 ha of employment land</p> |
|--|

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL211

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Land on the north side of Little Bushey Lane | | |
| Address | Little Bushey Lane/Hartspring Lane, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey North | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Faybrook Ltd on behalf of HG Winfield | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 3.9 | Current use(s) | Not developed, used for occasional car boot sales |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Sports club and playing field to the south, playing field and cemetery to the east of the site. Commercial use (Costco) to the north | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Largely open but a number of institutional uses - sports clubs, schools, cemetery | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is at the edge of Watford, preventing its outward sprawl. It forms the gap between Watford and Bushey. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA62 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes - northern part of site |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Yes - historic fill operations |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Pylons and power lines |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 2.93 | 114 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are various constraints affecting the northern part of the site, with Hillfield Brook and associated flood zone close to northern boundary, as well as pylons/overhead power lines. The site promoter has indicated that the site was subject to historic fill operations by the previous owners although no details have been provided in relation to the type of fill and no ground surveys appear to have been undertaken.

The site is currently accessed from Little Bushey Lane although an additional access could potentially be created onto Hartspring Lane. The location is relatively detached from other residential areas and notwithstanding the site's proximity to Costco, does not form part of any existing residential area. The closest local centre is approximately 900 metres away on Bushey Mill Lane.

The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, playing an important role in maintaining a gap between Watford and Bushey, with relatively little development on the south side of Aldenham Road/Hartspring Lane which maintains a largely open character and appearance between the Hartspring Roundabout and the junction of Aldenham Road/The Avenue/Bushey Grove Road. However The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 114* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 114* homes, 50* of which in years 1-5, 64* homes in years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL215

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Land west of Rossway Drive | | |
| Address | Rossway Drive, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Park | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Satellite Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.26 | Current use(s) | Hardstanding for parking and storage area associated with development site adjoining. Previously fields. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential and green field land. Farm to the North. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Largely undeveloped greenbelt to the west of the site, east of the site is developed residential area. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. The site is close to HEL203 to the east but separated from it by Rossway Drive. Remaining boundaries are with new housing on Rossway Drive and open farmland. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL203 (now with planning permission so not assessed under the HELAA) | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/0876/OUT. Erection of kennels and cattery (sui generis use) with ancillary office accommodation (REFUSED); 14/1913/FUL Construction of temporary haul access road from Little Bushey Lane to Rossway Drive associated with the delivery of 82 homes on adjoining land. (GRANTED); 16/1906/FUL: Retrospective application for the temporary change of use of the site (until 31st July 2017) to provide hard standing for parking and material storage area to facilitate the completion of planning approval 14/0727/FUL and subsequent conditions. (GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is at the edge of Watford, preventing its outward sprawl. It forms the gap between Watford and Bushey. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA54 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Close to Tylers Farm Grade II listed |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Close to existing commercial uses to east (HEL203) but this site now has planning permission for residential development |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but may be should the site's Green Belt status change |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 1.07 | 40 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting the site itself, although it is close to the Grade II listed Tyler's Farm. The land adjoins approved Rossway Drive residential developments for over 130 units, one of which has now been built out.

Access is likely to be directly onto Little Bushey Lane with Rossway Drive a private road serving the development to the east. A detailed highway assessment would be required to assess the impact on the local road network and the strategic road network, taking account of other sites being promoted in the vicinity and given the proximity of the site to both the A41 and Junction 5 of the M1. Although Sandy Lane offers direct access onto the A41, it is a particularly narrow road and unsuitable for larger volumes of traffic.

Currently the site is not served by any bus routes, which is broadly equidistant from Bushey Village and Bushey centres, both of which are over 1 mile away on foot. The nearest convenience shopping facilities, on Harcourt Road, are approximately 900m away.

The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment identified much of the parcel within which the site is located as scoring strongly against purpose 2 (coalescence of settlements), forming part of the essential gap between Watford and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, as well as the essential gap between those settlements and North Bushey and Elstree. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 40* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 40* homes in years 1-5

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL224

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Royal Connaught Park | | |
| Address | Marlborough Drive, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey St. James Ward | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Savills on behalf of Comer Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.43 | Current use(s) | Building works in connection with RCP development |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Queens School and Metropolitan Police Sports Ground to north and north east of the site, residential to the south east and south, Bushey Grove Leisure Centre and Aldenham Road to the West |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is located between but separate from parts of Bushey where schools and sports grounds maintain a separation between Bushey and the edge of Watford. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 17/1752/FUL Development of land at Royal Connaught Park to provide 100 residential apartments across four residential blocks (PENDING). Planning permission was granted in 2001 for the residential development of the site comprising 307 dwellings (ref: TP98/0620). Phase 1 primarily comprised the refurbishment and works to the listed buildings and is now built and largely occupied. In 2007 an application was submitted for changes to the scheme, including the replacement of 6 of the 11 free-standing buildings approved under the 2001 scheme with 7 new free-standing buildings. These proposals provided for 170 units with an uplift of 50 units over and above the approved scheme (ref: TP/07/2075). This application was approved at planning committee in January 2009 subject to the completion of the S106 Agreement - these however were not met and therefore development is continuing under the 2001 scheme. |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is at the edge of Watford, preventing its outward sprawl. It forms the gap between Watford, and Bushey. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Flood zone immediately adjoins the site |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. There are grade II listed buildings across the wider site |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/412/1998 |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy framework due to location in the Green Belt. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 1.22 | 47 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Constraints include Grade II listed buildings across the developed part of the site with flood zone (FZ2) immediately adjoining the part of the site submitted for the HELAA as well as TPO (412/1998) across the wider site.

The location was previously an allocated housing site (Policy H2) and Major Developed Site (Policy C18) in the Green Belt in the 2003 Local Plan Planning permission in 2001 and commencement/ implementation of development resulted in that designation being removed in SADM Plan (2015). The permission is still being built out but the site remains in the Green Belt and forms part of parcel 6 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 2 (coalescence of settlements). The location is identified as forming part of the essential gap between Watford and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, as well as the essential gap between those settlements and North Bushey and Elstree.

The HELAA site comprises the site area for 2017 application for 100 dwellings which has not yet been determined and which would result in an additional 100 units over and above that allowed for within the original Major Developed Site designation.

In line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF, exceptional circumstances would have to exist to justify a change to the Green Belt boundary in this location, in addition to an assessment of the impact of further development on the impact of the listed buildings given the quantum of development which has already been built and which still remains under construction. However, under the current policy framework, the site would not be acceptable for development due to its Green Belt designation.

Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of allocating land for additional homes in this location and the heritage impact be deemed acceptable, the site could potentially be developable for 47* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 47* homes in years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL235

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Bushey Hall Garage | | |
| Address | Bushey Hall Drive, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 2QE | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey North | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Osprey Homes on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.22 | Current use(s) | Vehicle maintenance and repair |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to south, east and west. Bushey Hall golf course to the north. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of built up area location immediately adjoining the Green Belt. The area immediately adjoining includes a mobile home park as well as bricks and mortar terraced properties. To the north and east Bushey Hall Golf course, a leisure centre, and the Lincolnsfield centre provide a more rural setting. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | The site is enclosed by built up residential area and Bushey golf course |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/79/0651. Part demolition with rebuilding and extension to provide improved facilities. Allowed on Appeal. TP/81/0759. Part demolition with rebuilding and extension. (DETERMINED). TP/85/0729 - Single storey extension to workshops for spray and low stove unit - alterations to side elevation and external fire escape. (DETERMINED). TP/92/0903. Single storey front/side extension to provide M.O.T. Workshop unit. (GRANTED). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside
Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. The site is opposite locally listed Wall Nr Bushey Hall Park |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Some level of contamination is assumed given the current use of the site |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | yes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes - Covenants relate to 1949 – by which vendor gains approval of drawings. No buildings to be erected which will allow the sale of alcohol. Current owners to be relocated | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Suburban | Urban | Medium | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 93 | 0.22 | 20 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | yes |
| Reason | Brownfield land which meets criteria for inclusion on register | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 11/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within the urban area of Bushey where residential development would be an acceptable use in policy terms. The site is surrounded on three sides by residential uses and its redevelopment for residential purposes could improve the amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood by removing a commercial garage use.

There are no known physical constraints other than the likelihood of there being some contamination which would need to be remediated prior to redevelopment.

Whilst there are no bus routes running immediately adjoining the site, routes 398 (Watford to Potters Bar) and 602 (Hatfield- Watford) are within 0.3Km on Aldenham Road. Bushey Grove Leisure Centre and a primary school and nursery are also close by.

The owner has indicated that the site is available and there is developer interest. The site is considered suitable, available and achievable for 20* dwellings.

Capacity: 20 dwellings* within 5 years

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL239

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Elstree Road (The Paddock) | | |
| Address | Elstree Road, Bushey Heath | | |
| Postcode | WD23 | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/ Village | Bushey Heath |
| Promoter | Bushey Museum Property Trust | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.59 | Current use(s) | Occasional temporary storage of garden waste; occasional parking |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Largely Residential built up area. Immanuel college is close to the site to the east on Elstree Road | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1331/FUL. Erection of 38 apartments within 4 residential blocks comprising 6 x 1 bedroom and 32 x 2 bedroom units with associated parking, access and refuse storage. (REFUSED, APPEAL DISMISSED); TP/11/2159. Erection of 75 bedroom residential care home for the elderly with associated car parking and landscaping. (REFUSED, APPEAL DISMISSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is a designated open space under SADM34 |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No. However Reveley Lodge and various outbuildings are located opposite the site on Elstree road and are Grade II listed. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO (TPO/34/2004) on an old oak in the North East corner of the site, 29 silver birch in NE part of site and various other trees scattered around the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Potentially although current policy framework (SADM34) would limit the quantum and design of any development on the site. SADM Inspector indicated only last paragraph of SADM34 would be applicable. Designated an Open Space under SADM34. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Suburban | V.Low | Medium | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 49.5 | 0.5 | 25 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 11/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within the urban area of Bushey Heath where residential development would be an acceptable use in policy terms. It is however a designated Open Space under policy SADM34. There is a TPO covering the site; whilst protected trees are located across the site there is a particular concentration in the north east part of the site which may limit development potential here. Access would most likely be taken from Caldecote Gardens which runs up the west side of the site. The site is approximately 1.1km from Bushey High Road district centre and 2.2km from Bushey High Street and on bus route 306 (Watford to Borehamwood).

The owners have been pursuing development of the site for a number of years through the planning process, including through planning applications, appealing against refusal of planning permission, and the making of representations in support of the development of the site for residential purposes to the SADM Examination; proposals have included a care home, market housing and affordable housing. They are particularly keen to see the site developed in order to release funds to support the maintenance, improvement and ongoing operation of the grade II listed Reveley Lodge and gardens opposite.

Under the current policy framework the site may be suitable for a limited quantum of development if a scheme came forward in compliance with SADM34. Should the current designation of the site under Policy SADM34, or the policy itself change, the site could be considered suitable, available and achievable for a larger quantum of development, in the region of 25* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 25* homes but this would depend upon a scheme being in compliance with SADM34. A lower quantum of development would be more likely to be acceptable. Timescale unknown.

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL336

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Hart's Farm | | |
| Address | Little Bushey Lane, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | unparished part of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Park | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Bell Cornwell LLP on behalf of McGovern Bros (Haulage) Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.54 | Current use(s) | Livery, grazing and 1 dwelling |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential development at Rossway Drive to north and west, agricultural to south. Commercial to the south west, including MOT garage. This area is also put forward to Call for Sites for residential HEL203 and has now been approved. M1 to the east. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the edge of the built up area; the west side of Little Bushey Lane is built up. To the east the urban area has encroached into parts of the rural area between Little Bushey Lane and the M1. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes. The site adjoins HEL203 Land at Rossway Drive to the south west (now approved so not assessed under the HELAA), and also HEL201 Land at Little Bushey Lane to the south east | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL201 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/89/1015 residential development (REFUSED): TP/92/0463, TP/940542, TP/96/0509 and TP/02/1291. Continued use of site for storage of caravans and motor caravans (GRANTED). TP/90/0670. Outline application for residential development (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | As a whole, the parcel meets purposes 1 and 3 moderately and purpose 2 strongly. In particular, it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree. Much of the parcel has a very open and unspoilt feel, particularly the central and eastern areas of the parcel at the edge of Bushey Heath/Bushey Village. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA57 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Phase 1 assessment will be required to established whether contaminants are presents but if at all it is expected to be limited to the farmyard and not anticipated to be significant |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Existing commercial uses to west but this site has now been approved for residential development (HEL203) |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Close to M1 at northern edge of site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if the site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 3.41 | 133 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 21/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The northern part of the site is approximately 30m from M1 motorway albeit elevated from carriageway. There are no other environmental or topographical constraints affecting the site. The land adjoins approved Rossway Drive residential developments for over 130 units, one of which has now been built out.

Access would be directly onto Little Bushey Lane. A detailed highway assessment would be required to assess the impact on the local road network and the strategic road network, taking account of other sites being promoted in the vicinity and given the proximity of the site to both the A41 and Junction 5 of the M1. Although Sandy Lane offers direct access onto the A41, it is a particularly narrow road and unsuitable for larger volumes of traffic.

Currently the site is not served by any bus routes, which is broadly equidistant from Bushey Village and Bushey Heath centres, both of which are over 1 mile away on foot. The nearest convenience shopping facilities, on Harcourt Road, are approximately 0.75 miles away.

The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment identified much of the parcel within which the site is located as scoring strongly against purpose 2 (coalescence of settlements), forming part of the essential gap between Watford and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, as well as the essential gap between those settlements and North Bushey and Elstree. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 133* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 133* homes of which 50* homes in years 1-5 and 83* homes in years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL337A, B
and C

Site source CFS 2017
Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Land east of Farm Way (sites 3,2,1) | | |
| Address | Farm Way, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey St James | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | PPML Consulting Ltd on behalf of Annington Property Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.26 (all three sites) | Current use(s) | vacant - open space (HEL337A), former tennis court (HEL337B), vacant open land (HEL337C) |
|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Sites HEL337A and HEL337C are within the residential area of Bushey, although HEL337C adjoins open countryside on the north west and north east sides. HEL337B adjoins residential on the south west but is otherwise surrounded by open fields. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The sites are in and adjoining the residential area at the edge of Bushey where open countryside meets the edge of the town. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | HEL337B is surrounded on three sides by a larger site submitted to the Call for Sites |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL181 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | HEL337b is within the current Green Belt. The parcel within which it is located forms the essential gaps between Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and Elstree. Much of the parcel has a very open and unspoilt feel, particularly the central and eastern areas of the parcel at the edge of Bushey Heath/Bushey Village. This area is characterised by large, very open pastoral fields, with the topography of the landscape curtailing views southwards towards the edge of the settlement and creating a sense of remoteness. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA60 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | HEL337B is within the current Green Belt. HEL337C is currently safeguarded for residential |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Possibly – access would be via narrow road through the estate - Sutcliffe Close |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | HEL337B is surrounded by local wildlife site Meadow north west of Tyler Farm |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | HEL337C could be suitable. HEL337B is currently not suitable under Green Belt policy. Quantum of housing insufficient to constitute exceptional circumstances to justify changing Green Belt boundary. Change to Green Belt status of this area and development in conjunction with HEL181 (were this to be suitable) could make site suitable. However HEL181 is designated local wildlife site. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 42 | 0.71 (HEL337c only) | 30 (HEL337c only) |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|---|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | The agent has requested HEL337B be included on the register. The site does not however meet the criteria in that it is not considered suitable for residential development. |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 11/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

HEL337a is a small non-PDL area of open space within the developed area containing a number of mature trees. The site is surrounded on all three sides by existing houses and the distance between the centre of the site and the elevations of surrounding properties is never more than approximately 30m. It is not considered that a satisfactory form of development could be accommodated on the site without a significant and adverse impact on the outlook and amenity of surrounding homes. As such HEL337a is not considered suitable for development.

HEL337b is a 0.25ha site in the Green Belt nearby, surrounded on three sites by a Local Wildlife Site (Meadow NW of Tylers Farm) and comprising four abandoned tennis courts. The location is identified in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment as forming part of the essential gap between Watford and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, as well as the essential gap between those settlements and North Bushey and Elstree. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration. The delivery of a small quantum of new homes in isolation in such a location is unlikely to constitute the exceptional circumstances which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF.

HEL337c is safeguarded for housing in the current Local Plan and no longer within the Green Belt. There are no environmental or topographical constraints affecting the site which is served by the 306 bus (Watford – Borehamwood). The site has previously been identified as suitable for housing (subject to a review of the plan) through its safeguarding in the SADM Plan (2015) and prior to that in the 2003 Local Plan; there are no changes in the suitability of the site and it is considered developable for 30* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following Local Plan review (HEL337c only): 30* homes in years 1-5

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL355

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | Land south of Elstree Road | | |
| Address | Elstree Road, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 1PD | Parish | Unparished |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | AM Planning on behalf of TLC Group/owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 22.06 | Current use(s) | The grassland is currently managed and cut for hay. The site is also used regularly for equestrianism by local horse riders who access the site from the public footpath. The rest of the site is not used or managed. |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | M1 to east, agriculture to south, A411 to north, residential to west | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Sandwiched between the edge of Bushey Heath and the M1 on three sides, with more open countryside and woodland to the south | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Adjoins Gravel Allotments site although there is a TPO at the boundary. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL386 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | There is an extant planning permission for a single house in the woodland - foundations in place TP/90/0941 Erection of purpose built farm house (790 square metres gross floor area) refurbishment of existing entrance and (GRANTED); 17/0091/MPO Application to modify a planning obligation dated 3rd April 1991 (to vary the occupancy obligation associated with the approved dwelling to include persons engaged in equestrianism as well as agriculture or forestry) pursuant to planning application reference TP/90/0941 (REFUSED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt

² washed over by the Green Belt

³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 2 | 3+ | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the essential gap between Bushey Village/Bushey Heath and Elstree, and the wider gap between Greater London (Stanmore) and Elstree. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA56 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt and there is a local wildlife site within its boundary. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Previous use Industrial Landfill Site – Inert waste only (prior to 1989). Land is currently available subject to land contamination investigations (due to the site history as landfill). |
| Any access difficulties. | No although secondary access identified would be through the Local Wildlife Site. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | M1 is nearby so some mitigation for noise and air pollution may be required. Also gas pumping station adjoins north east corner of site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Elstree Road Pastures Local Wildlife Site and Woodland TPO 27/2010 are within the site. Local Nature Reserve Stanmore Common adjoins the site (LB Harrow) |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy framework. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 33 | 14.34 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | n/a | 473 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 11/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

A Local Wildlife Site (Elstree Road Pastures) supporting a range of grassland indicator species and Woodland TPO (27/2010) cover much of the western part of the site. A Local Nature Reserve (Stanmore Common) adjoins the site, within LB Harrow. The site was previously used as landfill (inert waste). The eastern flank of site is within 25m of the M1 carriageway which is slightly elevated. London Loop (section 15)/footpath 50 runs through the site.

Access into the site is currently via Heathbourne Road (through an area of the woodland) although an additional access, off Elstree Road (A411) is proposed albeit through the currently designated Local Wildlife Site. An ecology report submitted by the site promoter identifies a diverse range of habitats and species within and beyond the LWS and recommends their retention and incorporation into any development scheme.

Although there are bus routes within walking distance on Elstree Road, 306 (Watford – Borehamwood) and 823 (Borehamwood to Garston) and the site is close the (private) Spire Hospital, the site is on the outer edge of Bushey Heath and approximately 1 mile from the local shops and services from Bushey Heath district centre.

The site has been specifically promoted for an estimated 473 homes comprising 375 retirement units, up to 20 self-build plots and 78 'affordable worker units', and a community/leisure/commercial hub. The most recent promotion increases the area to be included within the development, although parts of the overall site would remain within the private estate with only 52% of the overall site earmarked for development. The land is identified as part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment forming part of the essential gap between Bushey Village/Bushey Heath and Elstree, and the wider gap between Greater London (Stanmore) and Elstree. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did

not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

A preliminary ground investigation report has been provided which identified 'active pollutant linkages' on the site for which remediation would be required, although further investigation is required to provide a more complete analysis of the depth of landfill. A complete analysis would need to be reviewed and agreed by the Council before the site can be potentially considered as suitable. However, under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation and can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

The site has been amended since the last HELAA, with the total area proposed for development increasing from 6.99ha to 12.29ha, as of the 1st April 2019.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: Currently 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework and satisfactory resolution of ground conditions: 473* homes timescale unknown requires resolution of ground conditions

*** Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL357

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | Oxhey Lane | | |
| Address | Oxhey Lane, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD19 | Parish | unparished |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | CBRE on behalf of Oxhey Lane Developments Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 6.74 | Current use(s) | fields/open land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Largely surround by fields/open land. Residential development (Elm Ave) and former stables at Bucks Ave (with permission for residential redevelopment) to north west. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Countryside adjoining edge of Watford/Oxhey | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Site in Three Rivers district adjoins the site to the west. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Site in Three Rivers district adjoins the site to the west. | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 1 | 5+ | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Watford and Bushey Village/Bushey Heath, which is very small in scale, and also the wider gaps between Watford and Bushey Village/Bushey Heath, and South Oxhey and Greater London. Overall, the parcel maintains a largely rural character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA71 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the northern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The northern part is recommended for further consideration. (This site lies within the southern part of the sub-area) | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No. However a watercourse runs through the site |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | The site requires access across land (within TRDC) which the applicant has an agreement in place for, so not a constraint. This land also being promoted through TRDC Local Plan; a comprehensive development approach could be taken . |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | None identified |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy framework. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 5.06 | 174 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 11/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

A watercourse runs through the centre of the site. Otherwise, there are no significant environmental or topographical constraints to the site itself. Access would be via Oxhey Lane (in Three Rivers district) and that part of the site is being promoted through the Three Rivers Local Plan. The site forms part of a wider parcel identified as strongly performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, particularly with regard to checking unrestricted sprawl and preventing neighbouring towns from coalescing.

The site is a little over 1 mile to Bushey station on foot although the site is served by bus routes R16 (South Oxhey to North Watford Superstores), R17 (Carpenders Park – Hatch End) and W19 (Watford – Carpenders Park).

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 174* homes. The timescale of any development would depend on progressing a scheme through both Three Rivers and Hertsmere planning systems which could take longer than were the site to be solely within one authority. At present the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 174* homes in years 6-10

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL386

Site source CFS

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Gravel allotments, Heathbourne Road | | |
| Address | Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath | | |
| Postcode | WD23 1PD | Parish | unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/ Village | Bushey Heath |
| Promoter | Gravel Allotments Trust | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.94 | Current use(s) | Formerly allotments, now small holding |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Triangular site with residential on all three sides | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of settlement location. The site is opposite the built up area of Bushey Heath (residential and Spire Hospital) . Residential development adjoining the site is very low density, giving way to open countryside to the south. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Possible link to site to north east, although there is a TPO at the boundary between the 2 sites | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL355 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Possible access to adjoining site HEL355 |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 2 | 3+ | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Essential gap between Greater London (Stanmore) and Bushey and part of the essential gap between Bushey and Elstree. More substantial areas of residential development where the part of Green Belt has a semi-urban feel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA58 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO 27/2010. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but could be if its Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | low | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 0.8 | 30 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site was formerly used as allotments which fell into disrepair and has more recently been used by neighbouring landowners as a small holding/allotment use. All trees on the site are protected by the same TPO as that affecting HEL355. Around 0.3ha of the site is relatively open.

The site is approximately 0.75 miles from Bushey Heath district centre although there are bus routes approximately 600m away on Elstree Road - 306 (Watford – Borehamwood) and 823 (Borehamwood to Garston).

The site is identified as strongly performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment forming part of the essential gap between Bushey Village/Bushey Heath and Elstree, and the wider gap between Greater London (Stanmore) and Elstree. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further. Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation.

Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering a limited number of additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 30 homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 30* homes in years 1-5

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL401

Site source

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Kemp Place car park | | |
| Address | Kemp Place, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey St James | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.32 | Current use(s) | Car park |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to south and east, commercial to north and west. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the edge of Bushey High Street centre to the rear of commercial properties and adjoining a residential area. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Retention of surface parking with development above. Type of development sought yet to be determined by the Council. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Site is within an area of archaeological interest and Bushey High Street Conservation Area. It adjoins Grade II listed Ivy House and Bushey House, and locally listed 37 and 39 Bushey High Street |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Yes, depending on the use proposed |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Transitional | medium | very high | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------|
| 106.5 | 0.32 | 34 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|------------------------|
| 0.32ha employment land |
|------------------------|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|--|----------|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | Possibly |
| Reason | Brownfield land which if to be released for housing meets criteria for inclusion on register | |

Conclusion:

| |
|---|
| <p>The site is located immediately adjoining Bushey High Street District Centre where the neighbouring uses are commercial and residential. The site is accessed from Kemp Place. This is a relatively accessible location, being approximately 0.07 miles from Bushey High Street and on bus routes 142 (Watford - Brent Cross) and 258 (Watford – South Harrow). The site is within Bushey High Street Conservation Area and an area of archaeological interest; several statutory and locally listed building also adjoin the northern and eastern boundaries, all of which will constrain the use, quantum and design of development possible on the site. The amenity of residents of adjoining properties will also need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Whilst a decision on the likely future use of the site (in addition to retention of parking) has not yet been made, the site is within the urban area, in an accessible location and could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for approximately 34* dwellings should the site be put forward for residential development.</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 34* homes within years 6 -10 OR Capacity under current policy framework: 0.32 ha land for employment uses</p> |
|---|

* Capacity figures are based on a standard calculation and are an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL502

Site source Sites consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Birchville Cottage | | |
| Address | Heathbourne Road, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 1PB | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.29 | Current use(s) | Residential |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Former Care Home to south, residential to north and east, covered reservoirs to west. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Site on the edge of the built up area of Bushey. Stanmore Common (Green Belt) to the east. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Site adjoins Birchville Court which already has planning permission for residential development. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Policy SADM1, site H9 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No (although as the site is safeguarded any allocation for development would be subject to the current Plan review) |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | A narrow strip of land to the north of the house is understood to provide a means of access into the water treatment works site and must be retained although it currently forms part of the gardens to the house |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | The site is suitable, having already been safeguarded for housing in the current Local Plan. No changes to the site since its safeguarding designation. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes, in 6-10 years' time | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Suburban | Medium | Low | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 48 | 0.29 | 16 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|--|
| <p>There are no particular constraints to developing the site. It is within the larger area on Heathbourne Road currently safeguarded for residential purposes under Policy SADM2 of the adopted Local Plan and no longer within the Green Belt. It has therefore previously been identified as suitable for housing (subject to a review of the plan); there are no changes in the suitability of the site and it is considered developable for 16 homes. The owner has indicated that availability would be in 6-10 years.</p> <p>Capacity: 16* homes in 6-10 years (subject to review of the current Local Plan)</p> |
|--|

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL505

Site source Sites consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Greenacres | | |
| Address | Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath | | |
| Postcode | WD23 1PB | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/Village | Bushey Heath |
| Promoter | Preston Bennett for owners | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.78 | Current use(s) | residential |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Spire Hospital to the north, Affinity Water pumping station to the west, residential to south and east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Site on the edge of the built up area of Bushey. Mix of residential and institutional development, close to Stanmore Common |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No; although the larger area is safeguarded for residential purposes it has not all been promoted for development |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/06/1623 Part two storey part first floor extension to existing double garage/games room (GRANTED): |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No (although as the site is safeguarded any allocation for development would be subject to the current Plan review) |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Adjoining Reservoir and pumping station locally listed. Old Heathbourne opposite the site is also locally listed. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Existing access at Heathbourne Road/Clay Lane junction. New access proposed from Heathbourne Road and second access on Clay Lane, away from the junction. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Water treatment works to north of site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO – individual TPO trees across the site and two TPO groups on/near Heathbourne Road frontage – TPO/106/1986 |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | The site is suitable, having already been safeguarded for housing in the current Local Plan. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Suburban | Medium | Low | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 48 | 0.66 | 36 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | N/A |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|---|
| <p>The site is within the larger area on Heathbourne Road currently safeguarded for residential purposes under Policy SADM2 of the adopted Local Plan and no longer within the Green Belt. It has therefore previously been identified as suitable for housing (subject to a review of the plan); there are no changes in the suitability of the site and it is considered suitable for 36* homes (subject to a review of the plan).</p> <p>Capacity: 36* homes (subject to review of the current Local Plan) within 5 years</p> |
|---|

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL510

Site location / address:

Site source Sites consultation

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Melbury Stables | | |
| Address | Hilfield Lane South, Bushey Heath | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Apcar Smith Planning on behalf of Relicpride Building Co Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.41 | Current use(s) | Offices and parking |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north, west and south. Agriculture and open fields to south east along Elstree Road A411, residential and agricultural to east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Although close to the edge of Bushey the character is more rural and agricultural as the built up area gives way to farmland between Bushey and the A41/M1. These major roads are however an urbanising influence. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/A |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/07/1225 Extension to existing stables; change of use of stables and recreation room to (B1) offices; rebuilding existing barn following the demolition of existing outbuildings GRANTED ON APPEAL.TP/09/0087 Application for bat licence. 17/1071/FUL Shed (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | As a whole, the parcel meets purposes 1 and 3 moderately and purpose 2 strongly. In particular, it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA57 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | SA57 performs moderately overall but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The stage 2 assessment recommends the sub-area, within which HEL510 is located, for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site lies within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No. Grade II listed Caldecote is close by, across Hilfield Lane South. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No. Access possible onto Hilfield Lane South |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Electricity sub-station |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The site is close to, but does not directly adjoin, Elstree Road Pastures Local Wildlife Site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Development of the PDL part of the site may be suitable subject to openness test. Any non-PDL part of the site would not be suitable under current policy but could be should the Green Belt status of the site change. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Suburban | Medium | Low | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 45 | 0.41 | 21 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | N/A | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant constraints to development at the site other than the presence of a large number of trees across it (not subject to TPO). A single vehicular/pedestrian entrance to the site is shown on this illustrative layout which would enable two of the existing three vehicular access points to be closed.

The site is within the Green Belt on the outskirts of Bushey and currently used as offices and parking. Bus route 306 (Watford to Borehamwood) runs past the southern edge of the site along Elstree Road (stops within walking distance). Bushey Heath centre is approximately 1 mile away. The promoter states that this is the only non-residential use in the vicinity now that Caldecote Farm is being redeveloped for residential purposes.

Development of the PDL part of the site may be suitable subject to passing the openness test required by NPPF 2019 paragraph 145. Under the current policy framework the non-PDL part of the site is not suitable for development. Were exceptional circumstances to exist justifying a change to the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF, subject to detailed technical assessments of the impact on the locality and access, the site could potentially be developable for 21* dwellings. However, currently the non-PDL part of the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable. The PDL part of the site amounting to 7* dwellings could be suitable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 7* dwellings

Capacity following Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 21* dwellings within 5 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Site reference | HEL520a and HEL520b |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Site source | Sites consultation |
|--------------------|-----------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Costco, Hartspring Lane and Land to the South East of Costco, North Western Avenue | | |
| Address | Hartspring Lane, Watford | | |
| Postcode | WD25 8JS | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey St James | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | David Lock Associates | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 8.41 (6.52 HEL520a) | Current use(s) | HEL520a - Costco Wholesale store and associated parking. HEL520b - woodland |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | The North Western boundary of the site is defined by the A41. To the west of the sites is predominantly residential and leisure. To the North West of the site is a large employment site (Otterspool Way), with Schools and educational facilities located to the South. Directly North of the site is hotel and East of the site is Bushey Cemetery. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is located is close proximity to Otterspool Way Business park, and abuts the A41 with the Hilton Hotel directly opposite. The David Lloyd centre is directly west of the site. Opens fields and recreational grounds are to the South of the site. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 19/0601/FUL Change of use of further warehouse floor space (Sui-Generis) to allow for extension of existing area for provision of Ophthalmic Services (D1). 16/0310/FUL Construction of single storey side extension to South East elevation and relocation of fridge plant to roof. TP/11/1323 Erection of 2 x single storey extensions (South East elevation). TP/10/1096 Change of use of relevant area of warehouse from Sui Generis Warehouse Club to a use for the provision of ophthalmic services (Class D1). TP/03/0023 Two storey rear extension to provide 1,245m2 additional wholesale warehouse club floorspace and 1,313m2 of office space. FP/93/0753 Erection of a single storey retail unit FP/94/0247 Construction of first floor offices TP/94/0038 Creation of 1932 sq.m of B1 office TP/93/0150 Warehouse club for the sale of goods (including Class A3) together with tyre fitting bay, vehicle parking, access and landscaping. TP/91/1112 Construction of five buildings for class B1 use,(Amended scheme to 1198/90) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside | | | | | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 6 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Only HEL520b is located within the Green Belt. As a whole, the parcel meets purposes 1 and 3 moderately and purpose 2 strongly. In particular, it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree. However, a small area south of Little Bushey Lane plays a very limited role in preventing the merging of settlements. It is almost completely enveloped by development and separated from the wider countryside by dense planted buffers along Little Bushey Lane. This area is effectively contained within Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and has a more urban character, thus playing a more limited role in relation to purpose 3. Overall, it would make limited contribution to the Green Belt purposes if considered alone and is recommended for further consideration as a sub-area. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes, partly. Site HEL520b is within the current Green Belt, although none of HEL520a is within the Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Not for vehicles but pedestrian access to London Colney across the M25 may be difficult however there are possibilities to link up with the Watling Chase Timberland Trail with a pedestrian bridge over the M25 serving the site. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Only HEL520a as HEL520b is located within the Green Belt and is therefore not suitable under current Green Belt policy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|--|
| 8.41ha of land is potentially available for employment uses. |
|--|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|--|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | Yes, partly. |
| Reason | HEL520a is pre-developed land outside of the Green Belt. |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 06/08/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site has been solely promoted for employment related uses. Whilst the site is located outside of the flood zone, Hilfield Brook runs along the Southern boundary of the site. The site can currently be accessed by car from either Hartspring Lane or Elton Way. The site is not particularly accessible by public transport, although the 606 bus runs along Hartspring Lane (Watford – Hatfield).

HEL520a currently consists of Costco Wholesale store and associated parking. The promoter has indicated that they do not envision the principal nature of the Costco operation changing significantly in the foreseeable future. But instead suggest that there is scope to maximise the use of site and the Costco operation including additional office floorspace, the provision of a petrol station and an increased level of parking. This brownfield site would have the potential for 6.52 ha of employment land under current Green Belt policy.

HEL520b would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would provide 1.89ha of suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 6.52ha of land for employment uses (solely HEL520a).

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 8.41ha of land for employment purposes

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL521

Site source Sites consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Bushey Hall Farm Site, Bushey Mill Lane | | |
| Address | Bushey Mill Lane, Bushey | | |
| Postcode | WD23 2AB | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey North | Town/ Village | Bushey |
| Promoter | Dalcour Maclaren | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 8.89 | Current use(s) | Agricultural land and pastures |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | The northern boundary of the site is bordered by the A4008. To the South East of the site is predominately residential, to the East is Otterspool Way business park. To the North, West and South West of the site is predominantly open pastures, recreational fields, agricultural land, and woodland. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site borders Otterspool Way business park, and the A4008. Open fields and recreational grounds are to the West/South West of the site. TopGolf centre is located to the North West of the site. Highwood School and residential are located to the South east. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/01/0882 Development of a Park and Ride facility comprising 600 car parking spaces; new highway access from Stephenson Way (A4008); new highway access for buses and cycles from Bushey Mill Lane; new internal access roads and pedestrian and cycle routes; building incorporating waiting and other customer and operational facilities; landscaping works including balancing pond and landscaping bunds and other associated works and facilities.(Amended plans received 8/7/02). WITHDRAWN |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 22 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | <p>The parcel scores strongly against purpose 2. It plays an important role in maintaining the very narrow gap between Watford and North Bushey, which is very small in physical scale. Although the parcel does not meet purpose 1, it is noted that, at a more strategic level, it is physically very close to Watford and forms part of a broader Green Belt area that prevents its outward sprawl. Additionally, there is very little development throughout and the parcel plays a role in preventing the encroachment of development into the countryside.</p> <p>There is no obvious scope for sub-division and it is recommended that the parcel is not considered further.</p> | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes, conflicts with Green Belt policy. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes, the western corner of the site is within Flood Zone 2 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |

| | |
|---|--|
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not suitable under current Green Belt policy |
|---|--|

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------|
| 39 | 6.67 | Unconstrained | Constrained |
| | | 260 | 0 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|--|
| 8.89ha of land is potentially available for employment uses. |
|--|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 06/08/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

Although within ten minutes walking distance of a primary school and food shop, this site is not within the pedestrian catchments of any Town Centres, GP Surgeries or secondary schools. Furthermore, the bus services (i.e. BB1 and W19 services) in this locality are relatively infrequent, making access to other services and amenities difficult. The site is also bisected by overhead powerline cables.

The site is located within the Green Belt and serves an important purpose in maintaining the very narrow gap between Watford and North Bushey, which is very small in physical scale. Under the current policy framework, due to its Green Belt status, the site is not considered suitable other than for appropriate development within the parameters set out in the NPPF. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would provide 8.89 ha of suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.

The site has also however been promoted for residential purposes; given the relatively unsustainable location and its relationship to existing commercial areas the site is considered more appropriate for employment purposes. Were the site to be considered suitable for residential purposes it could deliver a capacity of 260* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 260* dwellings – 75 within years 1 – 5 and 195 within years 6 - 10 or 8.89ha of land for employment purposes. However as the site was promoted after 1st April 2019 this value has not been included within the 5yr or 15yr land supply figures.

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

APPENDIX 11: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - ELSTREE VILLAGE

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL171

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Centennial Land | | |
| Address | south of Watford Road, Elstree | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3BE | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree Ward | Town/ Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | Pegasus Group on behalf of Taylor Wimpey | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 7.04 | Current use(s) | Unused paddock land (historically in arable use) |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Centennial Industrial Park to the south, Composers Park/Elstree Hill Open Space to the east, Aldenham reservoir and The Fisheries PH to the north, Water Front/Lismirrane commercial premises to the west . | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The area to the north of the A411 is mainly open and rural in character, with several institutional developments - school, laboratory etc and small amounts of development within Aldenham Country Park providing visitor and sports related facilities. However the A41, M1, Water Front and Lismirrane commercial premises and Centennial Park are urbanising influences. The site is separated from Elstree village by open space. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. Adjoining open land is open space / local wildlife site | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/1302/OUT1 Outline planning application with all matters reserved, aside from access, for a residential development of up to 150 dwellings (Use Class C3), including affordable, to aid the creation of a Community Interest Company to acquire Aldenham Reservoir; acquire Aldenham Dam and undertake those arising structural works; and allow for the continued use of Aldenham Reservoir as a publically accessible destination for sport, recreation and education in perpetuity (RESUBMISSION) (REFUSED); |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the majority of the gap between Elstree and Bushey and a small part of the wider gap between Elstree and Greater London. In particular, the north of the parcel is important for preventing ribbon development along the A411 (Watford Road / Elstree Road) which would perceptually reduce the distance between these settlements. While views between Elstree and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village are currently restricted by areas of woodland across the parcel, a further intensification of development would substantially reduce the physical distance between the settlements. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA66 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | There are commercial properties close by to the south and west of the site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Adjoins Composers Park Local Wildlife Site to the east |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Should development be acceptable the site is considered to be better suited to employment development. However the site is being promoted for residential purposes. Any development of the site would only be suitable if the Green Belt status of the site changes. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | low | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 5.28 | 182 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

7.04ha of land for employment purposes

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no particular environmental or topographical constraints affecting the site which lies close to Centennial Park, Bio Products and other smaller designated Employment areas on Elstree Road Access would be from Elstree Road and Dagger Lane. Composers Park Local Wildlife Site lies to the east of the site.

The site is not particularly accessible by public transport. The 306 (Watford-Borehamwood) runs past the site on Elstree Road. However the site is approximately 1.8 miles from Elstree and Borehamwood station.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role in maintaining the actual and perceptual separation of settlements. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would provide 7.04 ha of suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.

The site has however been promoted for residential purposes; given the relatively unsustainable location and its relationship to existing commercial areas the site is considered more appropriate for employment purposes. Were the site to be considered suitable for residential purposes it could deliver a capacity of 182* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 7.04ha of land for employment purposes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 182* dwellings - 50* homes within 5 years and 132* homes within 6-10 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL212

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land off Watford Road | | |
| Address | Watford Road, Elstree | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3EU | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree Ward | Town/ Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | DLP Planning on behalf of Hamlin Estates | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 2.28 | Current use(s) | Paddocks currently used as a horse and pony sanctuary |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential, restaurants and shops to the east, residential to the south (opposite side of Watford Road) and west, open land - fields and woodland - to the north |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site lies immediately between the centre of Elstree village and the wider Green Belt beyond. It also lies between the parts of Elstree that are excluded from and washed over by the Green Belt. The road junction (A411/A5183) is a major urbanising influence with development nearby to the south. north and east |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No – the land to the north lies within wider Green Belt. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Extra care residential | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 10 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the wider gap between Elstree, Borehamwood, Radlett, and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. The very south of the parcel is less important for preventing coalescence. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA64 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | An archaeological site covers most of the site. It is also adjacent to Elstree Conservation Area and locally listed The East And Adjoining Outbuildings |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/328/1996 on the western side of site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 54 | 1.71 | 92 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The entire site is designated as an archaeological site in an area where Roman remains have been found in situ on other development sites. The land adjoins Elstree Village Conservation Area and locally listed former public house, with a TPO (328/1996) covering an area on the western edge of the site. The site comprises paddocks and associated structures and is currently in use as a horse and pony sanctuary and may need to be considered against Policy CS19 (key community facilities).

Access to the site would be taken directly off Watford Road albeit close to Elstree Crossroads, an AQMA and a heavily used junction on the local highway network. The promoter has submitted the site for extra care housing and as such car trip generation would be reduced; bus access is currently available via the 306 (Watford – Borehamwood) and 823 (Borehamwood to Garston) on Watford Road and Elstree Hill North and South via the 107 (Edgware - New Barnet) and 615 (Stanmore to Hatfield).

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site forming part of a wider parcel which was considered to be moderately performing in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment. However, the area around Elstree was identified as being south of the well-established planted buffer, making a very limited contribution to preventing encroachment and forming only a small, less essential part of the wider gap with Radlett, and so was recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site could be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 92* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 92* homes 50 within years 1 to 5 and 42 within years 6 to 10

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL238

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Land adj Elstree Road, A41 and Dagger Lane | | |
| Address | Elstree | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3BX | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey Heath | Town/ Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | DLA Town Planning on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 17.39 | Current use(s) | Vacant fields |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Lismirrane and Waterfront Industrial Parks to the south of the site (across Elstree Road), Aldenham Country Park to the east and the Bio Products Lab to the north across Dagger Lane, A41 and M1 to the west. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Pockets of development within countryside but urbanising influences of Elstree, Centennial Park, commercial development and Bushey close by, as well as M1 and A41. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. The site is surrounded by roads and Aldenham Country Park/Reservoir. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/88/0390 Development of Temple with ancillary facilities.(REFUSED) TP/88/0626 Temple community hall and ancillary facilities (REFUSED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | B1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Hotel, gym, food outlet, sports facilities |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the gap between Borehamwood and Bushey Heath/ Village. It plays an important role in maintaining the general scale and openness of these gaps. The very south of the parcel is important for preventing ribbon development along the A411 (Elstree Road / Watford Road), which would reduce the perceptual distances between these settlements. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA74 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Overhead electricity lines and pylons cross the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within the current Green Belt. Site could be suitable for employment purposes should its Green Belt status change. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential – employment uses

17.39 ha of land for employment purposes

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | N/A | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|-------------|-------------------|

Conclusion:

Apart from an overhead electricity line and pylon, there are no particular environmental or topographical constraints affecting the site which lies close to Centennial Park, Bio Products and other smaller designated Employment areas on Elstree Road Access would be from Elstree Road and Dagger Lane.

The site is not particularly accessible by public transport. The 306 (Watford-Borehamwood) runs past the site on Elstree Road. However the site is approximately 2.2 miles from Elstree and Borehamwood station.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role in maintaining the actual and perceptual separation of settlements. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would provide 17.39 ha of suitable available and deliverable land for employment purposes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 17.39ha of land for employment purposes within 15 yrs.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL274a-h

Site source I&O 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Edgewarebury farm A-H | | |
| Address | Edgewarebury House Farm, Elstree, Elstree | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree | Town/ Village | Elstree |
| Owner | Hertfordshire County Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 28.44 | Current use(s) | mixed farm land |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north and north west, Elstree Hill and recycling centre to the south west, M1 to the south, residential and hotel to the east and north east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is a site on the edge of Elstree, close to Centennial Park employment area and major traffic routes. It is, however, rural in character |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/07/0526 Change of use from a former manege to open commercial storage (REFUSED); TP/05/1230 3 metre wide x 242 metre long track with associated field ditch and hedged on both sides (GRANTED); TP/03/0299 Vehicular access to existing telecommunication equipment. (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Borehamwood and Elstree, although this gap is already severely compromised by ribbon development along the A411 (Barnet Lane). The parcel also forms a large part of the wider gap between Borehamwood, Elstree and Greater London. The parcel contains less than 5% built-form and possesses a strong unspoilt rural character overall. A composting site in the south-west detracts from the overall sense of rurality. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA65 (NE corner of site not yet assessed) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but the northern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The northern part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site lies within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. Adjoins Elstree Conservation Area. Small section in north west part of the site lies within the Conservation Area. Edgwarebury House Farm and buildings are locally listed. Other nearby locally listed buildings are St Marys Croft Fortune Lane, Summerfield House, Barnet Lane and The Edgwarebury Hotel Edgwarebury Lane. The Leys, Barnet Lane is Grade II* |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Not known |
| Any access difficulties. | Access would have to be achieved via Elstree Hill or Barnet Lane |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | An overhead power line and pylons cross the site. Telecommunications equipment is mounted on one or more. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/2/2008 adjoins the north west boundary. TPO/2/2004 is located on the northern boundary of the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Partly |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Not known |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Not known | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 34.5 | 14.2 (whole site) 8.05 (c,d,e,f,g) | 491 (whole site) 278 (c,d,e,f,g) |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The area comprises a series of parcels owned by Hertfordshire County Council with the north western area contained within Elstree Village Conservation Area. Parts of HEL274 adjoin listed building (Laura Ashley hotel) and locally listed Edgwarebury House Farm buildings. Land immediately to the north, to the rear of Hill House, contains significant tree cover and is protected by a TPO (2/2008), as well as land to east at Norwegian House (364/1984). Pylons/overhead power lines cut across the south west corner of the site.

Approximately 1ha of the site to rear of Edgwarebury House Farm contains a significant amount of previously developed land, structures and buildings. The principle of some development would be acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'. However, the previously developed part of the site contains a number of existing businesses and the extent to which this area is available for redevelopment is unknown.

The site as a whole is accessed either from Elstree Hill South (where there is currently an access into Edgwarebury House Farm and a separate access close to Centennial Park) to the west or from Fortune Lane/Barnet Lane to the north. Fortune Lane is particularly narrow with an average width of 4.5m to 5m and unlikely to be suitable as a principal access for any significant quantum of development. The south west part of the site is adjacent to a recycling centre and close to both the junction with the A41 and the northbound junction 4 of the M1. However, junction 4 has no southbound slip and so cannot be accessed from the north side of the A41; north bound access to the M1 can only be achieved by driving north from Edgware up the A41.

The site is close to Centennial Park and within walking distance of local services in Elstree Village. It is currently served by two bus routes on Elstree Hill South 107 (Edgware - New Barnet) and 615 (Stanmore to Hatfield). There are currently no buses running along Barnet Lane into Elstree Village.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site forming a significant part of a parcel identified as making a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. In particular, the parcel was identified as forming a substantial proportion of the gap between Borehamwood and London in this locality, as well as protecting the countryside from encroachment. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location, in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to detailed technical assessments, those parcels accessible via Elstree Hill South are considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable. Including just those areas to the west of Fortune Lane and closest to the M1 an area of approximately 16ha (HEL274c, d, e, f and g) is considered capable of delivering an estimated 278* homes. The capacity for the whole site under the standard methodology would be in the order of 491* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

**Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 278* homes – 75* homes in 1 -5 years
203* homes in 6-10 years**

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL503 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Site source | Sites consultation |
|--------------------|--------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---------------------|---|
| Site Name | Land adj Lismirrane Industrial Estate | | |
| Address | Elstree Road, Elstree, | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3BG | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey and Elstree & Borehamwood |
| Ward | Bushey Heath and Elstree | Town/Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | Lichfields on behalf of Lowerland (2004) Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 5.16 | Current use(s) | Dog kennels, stables and phone mast |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Centennial Industrial Park to the east, Lismirrane Employment area and vacant site to the north, A41 and M1 along south west boundary. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The area to the north of the A411 is mainly open and rural in character, with several institutional developments - school, laboratory etc and small amounts of development within Aldenham Country Park providing visitor and sports related facilities. However the A41, M1, Water Front and Lismirrane commercial premises and Centennial Park are urbanising influences. The area is separated from Elstree village by open space. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/A |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/99/0919 Erection of offices and associated car parking, alterations to access and widening of Elstree Road. (REFUSED); TP/88/0390 Business Park and Temple with ancillary facilities (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The wider parcel forms the majority of the gap between Elstree and Bushey and a small part of the wider gap between Elstree and Greater London. In particular, the north of the parcel is important for preventing ribbon development along the A411 (Watford Road / Elstree Road) which would perceptually reduce the distance between these settlements. While views between Elstree and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village are currently restricted by areas of woodland across the parcel, a further intensification of development would substantially reduce the physical distance between the settlements. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Adjoins commercial premises and A41, and pylons and overhead power lines cross the site which could be bad neighbours should the site be promoted for residential purposes |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Pylons and overhead power lines cross the site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but potentially suitable for commercial purposes should Green Belt boundary change and the existing Local Significant Employment site boundary potentially being extended. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | Yes (for residential use) |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|---------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Applicant states that existing leases can be terminated and the site could be made available for development in 3-5 years. |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | Low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 3.87 | 145 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|---------------------------|
| 5.16ha of employment land |
|---------------------------|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no particular environmental or topographical constraints affecting the site although it is crossed by overhead power lines and pylons. It adjoins Centennial Park and Lismirrane designated Employment area on Elstree Road. Access would be from Elstree Road. There is a limited area of development in the north east corner of the site (stables/kennels).

The site is not particularly accessible by public transport. The 306 (Watford-Borehamwood) runs past the site on Elstree Road. However the site is approximately 2 miles from Elstree and Borehamwood station.

Development of most of the site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role in maintaining the actual and perceptual separation of settlements. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would provide 5.16 ha of suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.

The site has also however been promoted for residential purposes; given the relatively unsustainable location and its relationship to existing commercial areas the site is considered more appropriate for employment purposes. Were the site to be considered suitable for residential purposes it could deliver a capacity of 145* dwellings.

A small part of the site, amounting to 0.06 ha, may qualify as PDL and development here may be acceptable subject to compliance with NPPF paragraph 145. This part of the site could deliver 8* dwellings. However, currently the majority of the site can only be recorded in the category of not currently acceptable

Capacity under current policy framework: 0.06ha employment land or 8* dwellings

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 5.16ha of land for employment purposes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 145* dwellings of which 50 in years 1-5 and 95* in years 6-10

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL512 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Site source | Sites consultation |
|--------------------|--------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Norwegian Barn | | |
| Address | Edgwarebury Lane, Elstree | | |
| Postcode | WD6 3RG | Parish | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |
| Ward | Elstree | Town/Village | Elstree |
| Promoter | Paras Shah for owners | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.80 | Current use(s) | Residential (single dwelling) |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north, residential and hotel to east, woodland and agricultural fields to south, agricultural fields to west |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Rural area between Elstree village, Borehamwood and M1 characterised by fields in agricultural use, woodland and pockets of development. Barnet Lane, Elstree Hill and the M1 are urbanising influences at the edges of the area. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL274 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/01/0270 Erection of detached house and detached garage with associated driveway access and landscaped bund (GRANTED); TP/02/0952 Retention of dwelling (including amendment to ridge height and basement) (REFUSED); TP/03/0535 New dwelling house (REFUSED); TP/08/2019 Appeal against Enforcement Notice - erection of a dwellinghouse without planning permission (APPEAL ALLOWED); Numerous proposals for single house withdrawn or refused |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Urban settlement ¹ PDL | <input type="checkbox"/> Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | <input type="checkbox"/> Green Belt settlement ² PDL | <input type="checkbox"/> Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | <input type="checkbox"/> Green Belt other ³ PDL | <input type="checkbox"/> Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Borehamwood and Elstree, although this gap is already severely compromised by ribbon development along the A411 (Barnet Lane). The parcel also forms a large part of the wider gap between Borehamwood, Elstree and Greater London. The parcel contains less than 5% built-form and possesses a strong unspoilt rural character overall. A composting site in the south-west detracts from the overall sense of rurality. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site lies within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. Listed buildings are close to the site: The Leys, Barnet Lane is Grade II* and The Edgwarebury Hotel Edgwarebury Lane is locally listed. Elstree village Conservation Area is close to, but does not adjoin, the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes. Would require access through adjoining land owned by HCC (HEL274) or via a private road to Edgwarebury Lane. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/364/1984 – single trees across the site, as well as the edge of the woodland covered by a group TPO to the south of the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but could be, subject to provision of access, should the site's Green Belt status change. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 33 | 1.53 | 50 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | N/A | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site lies in an area of highly performing Green Belt to the east of Elstree village. There are no known significant constraints to development although the site is currently accessed only via a private drive accessed off the private entrance to the nearby hotel, past listed and locally listed buildings onto Edgwarebury Lane and from there to Barnet Lane. The site is not particularly accessible, there currently being no buses running along Barnet Lane into Elstree Village. Elstree village centre is approximately 0.65 miles distant by road. Elstree and Borehamwood station is approximately 1.5 miles away.

Development of the entire site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site forming a significant part of a parcel identified as making a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. In particular, the parcel was identified as forming a substantial proportion of the gap between Borehamwood and London in this locality, as well as protecting the countryside from encroachment.

The site has been promoted as being a potential extension to HEL274 Edgwarebury House Farm put forward by Hertfordshire County Council. Part of that site was recommended for further consideration the Stage 2 Green Belt assessment, but this assessment did not extend to the area now promoted under HEL512.

The site contains a limited amount of development and some development here could be acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF 2019 which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites' subject to a test of openness as 'appropriate development'. However, the previously developed part of the site forms a very limited part of the site as a whole; it could be expected to provide for 7* dwellings under current policy, subject to compliance with NPPF paragraph 145.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location, in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to detailed technical assessments, the site could potentially accommodate around 50 dwellings. However, access would need to be secured through the larger adjoining site being promoted by HCC and presently there is no indication that such a potential arrangement exists.

Capacity under current policy framework: 7* dwellings

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 50* dwellings timescales unknown

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

APPENDIX 12: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - POTTERS BAR

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL161

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | land east of Southgate Road | | |
| Address | land east of Southgate Road, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 5EJ | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Oakmere | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Knight Frank on behalf of LB Enfield | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 17.4 | Current use(s) | Open countryside in the Green Belt. Fields surrounded by trees |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north, west and east of the site, M25 to the south | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the edge of the built up area of Potters Bar which is largely substantial semi-detached houses in good sized mature gardens. It forms a band of open countryside around the south eastern part of the town, between the town and the M25. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Not within Hertsmere as it is surrounded by existing homes. Land to the east in Enfield borough is open. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 41 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel has an open and rural character throughout. The parcel forms part of the wider gap between Potters Bar and Cuffley, maintaining the overall openness of the gap and ensuring its overall physical scale is maintained. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes - the northern end is within FZ3. |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes. Site is landlocked except for the western end, but any access here would be very close to the M25 junction. Potential location of access via Park Avenue is outside applicant's control. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No although the noise and pollution effects of the M25 would need to be assessed and possibly mitigated. Development may not therefore be possible across the whole site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | No |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable | Not on the basis of current information |
|-------------------------------|---|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 42 | 11.31 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | n/a | 475 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | |
|--|-----|
| | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|---|
| <p>The north west part of the site sits within the flood zone (FZ3). There are no topographical constraints within the site although the southern edge of the site slopes towards the M25. As the site abuts the M25, part of the land may be too close to motorway to develop for housing.</p> <p>The site is located within a parcel identified as strongly performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt with an open and rural character throughout and forming part of the wider gap between Potters Bar and Cuffley. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further. Under the current policy framework, none of the site would be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation alone.</p> <p>There is presently no vehicular access to the site as indicated by the promoter in their submission. However, access via Southgate Road would be highly unlikely for site of this size given immediate proximity to M25 junction. Access via Park Avenue would require acquisition of site outside of promoter's ownership and that part of the site lies within the flood zone. The Council's SFRA identifies that for new developments located in areas at risk of flooding, safe access/egress must be provided. This would be likely to preclude the use of an access onto Park Avenue as the principal point of access into the site.</p> <p>Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, resolution of access constraints would still be required in order to be able to consider the site suitable available and achievable for development, including of the unconstrained capacity figure of 475* units.</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework (constrained): 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework and resolution of access (unconstrained): 475* homes, timescale not known</p> |
|---|

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL162

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | land south of Barnet Road | | |
| Address | land south of Barnet Road, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 2SJ | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Oakmere | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Knight Frank on behalf of LB Enfield | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.41 | Current use(s) | Field/open land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential development in Dove Lane to the east, A1000 and arable farmland to the north, traveller site to the west and M25 to the east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | To the north the area is open countryside in arable use between the south western edge of Potters Bar and the M25 motorway. There is more piecemeal residential development along the south side of the A1000 between this and the M25 |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. The sites to either side are already developed. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 37 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Although the parcel is largely undeveloped, it is of a very small scale and is enclosed by the A1000 (Barnet Road) and the M25. These are a significant urbanising influence as well as the edge of Potters Bar immediately to the north, and there is little which connects the parcel to the wider countryside to the east. Overall, it maintains a semi-urban character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | unknown |
| Any access difficulties. | Applicant says yes but probably not – site can be accessed from A1000. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Close to M25 but not immediately adjacent, although the noise and pollution effects of the M25 would need to be assessed and possibly need to be mitigated. Significant screening to south would be required. Detailed noise and pollution assessment may be required. Pylons adjacent to the site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but potentially suitable for residential given existing residential uses adjoining. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Suburban | V.Low | Medium | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 49.5 | 0.41 | 20 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located close to the M25 but at a lower level than the motorway. There are pylons adjacent to the site. A detailed noise assessment is likely to be required to confirm suitability of the site but the existence of houses (which pre-date the motorway) and Gypsy and Traveller pitches on either side, would indicate that the location is potentially suitable for residential accommodation. The site was identified as poorly performing in terms of meeting Green Belt purposes in the Stage 1 assessment and so is not being considered at Stage 2.

In terms of whether the site would be attractive to the market, the land has been promoted for development and while the overall attractiveness of individual properties developed on the site may be affected by its immediate proximity to the M25, there is strong demand for housing in the area. The site promoter has indicated there are access difficulties although it is unclear why this would be the case because access can be taken directly off Barnet Road.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status but were this to change, potentially through an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in light of the Stage 1 Assessment, the site would be considered to be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 20* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 20* homes within 5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL164

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Fenny Slade | | |
| Address | The Ridgeway, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 5QS | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Oakmere | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Tetlow King on behalf of the owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.55 | Current use(s) | 2 dwelling houses and gardens and paddocks |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open countryside with occasional farm buildings and isolated commercial premises. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open countryside crossed by M25 | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/09/2229 Erection of storage building (r/o Stagg Ridge) GRANTED ON APPEAL TP/01/0530 Part two storey, part single storey front and side extensions (GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 or potential retirement village | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 27 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gap between Greater London and Potters Bar. The western edge of the parcel is particularly important for preventing ribbon development along the A111 (Stagg Hill) which would physically and perceptually reduce the scale of this gap. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt and includes local wildlife site Fenny Slade Hill |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Not for vehicles but pedestrian access to Potters Bar across the M25 would be difficult |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Includes local wildlife site Fenny Slade Hill and adjoins TPO/1070/2002. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Limited infilling on PDL part of site would be suitable but the larger site is not suitable for residential development given its isolated location and Green Belt status |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes . Pre-application request for advice about replacing one of the existing dwellings and adding a further dwelling submitted 23/2/2017. |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 33 | 3.41 | n/a | 113 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located 500 metres beyond the edge of Potters Bar built up area. It is also severed from Potters Bar by the M25 and Junction 24 of the motorway. The southern part of the site is a designated Local Wildlife Site which has been identified an area of "neutral grassland with damp areas" with Tufted Hair-grass and a range of grassland indicator species recorded including Sweet Vernal-grass, Common Knapweed and Common Sorrel. The scrub within the Local Wildlife Site support a range of species including Hawthorn and Oak.

Although the site can be accessed off both the Ridgeway and potentially off Stag Hill, wider pedestrian access across Junction 24 is difficult, particularly crossing the slip roads on/off the motorway and the very significant severance from Potters Bar due to the existence of the motorway and junction.

The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment with the western edge of the parcel being particularly important for preventing ribbon development along the A111 (Stagg Hill) which would physically and perceptually reduce the scale of this gap between London and Potters Bar. Under the current policy framework, due to its Green Belt status, the site is not considered suitable other than for appropriate development within the parameters set out in the NPPF which under paragraph 145 allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'.

The amount of development currently on the site is largely limited to a single house and a previous layout submitted to the Council for the demolition of the existing house and replace with two dwellings was considered to be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. As such, the scope to deliver a net increase in housing on the site, within the parameters of appropriate development, is considered to be limited. Given this and the wider severance of the site from Potters Bar, the site is not considered suitable for additional housing. (It is not suitable for the unconstrained capacity figure indicated.)

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Site reference | HEL177 |
|----------------|--------|

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site source CFS 2017
Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Dove Lane | | |
| Address | Dove Lane, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 2SG | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Oakmere | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Owner | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 5.38 | Current use(s) | Grazing land and woodland |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north, west and east of the site, M25 to the south | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The adjoining residential area of Potters Bar is largely 2 storey terraced houses and flats. The M25 runs along the south side of the site | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 39 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel makes little contribution to separation from London. It is almost completely undeveloped, consisting of paddocks and a dense planted buffer along the M25. However, it is of a very small scale and the hospital and M25 are a significant urbanising influence. There is little connection to the wider countryside to the south. Overall, despite the high level of openness, the site maintains a semi-urban character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Unknown |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Proximity of M25 - possible need for noise/pollution mitigation although difference in levels may avoid the need for this? |
| Any other environmental constraints? | A large part of the site (south eastern) is woodland. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but potentially suitable should Green Belt boundary change. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No. Tenant on a grazing licence. | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 42 | 4.04 | 169 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

A significant part of the site is covered by woodland which although not currently protected would potentially be assessed for the designation of a Woodland TPO were the site to be brought forward for development. The developable area would be likely to be limited to around 3ha of non-woodland area, a little over 50% of the site area.

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting most of the open part of the site with the woodland itself affording some additional screening and attenuation from the M25. The motorway is elevated from the site with bunding running parallel to the south east boundary of the site. The relative proximity of the M25 is therefore unlikely to impact on the suitability of the site, which was identified as poorly performing in terms of meeting Green Belt purposes in the Stage 1 assessment and so is not being considered at Stage 2.

Vehicular access can be achieved off Dove Lane with pedestrian and cycling access also via Byers Close and Hill Crest. The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status but were this to change, potentially through an alteration to the Green Belt boundary in light of the Stage 1 Assessment, the site would be considered to be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 169* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 169* homes in years 6-10

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL178

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Rushfield | | |
| Address | Dugdale Hill Lane, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Furze field | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Owner | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 3.59 | Current use(s) | Grazing land. Heavily treed to the boundary (particularly on south side), belts of trees running through the site. The site is a designated local wildlife site. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north and west, Bridgefoot Lane and open farmland to south, school and Dugdale Hill Lane to the east | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is in open green belt land on the edge of the built up area of Potters Bar. Adjoining houses are largely 2 storey semi-detached | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 35 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small, less essential part of the gap between Potters Bar and Greater London. The scale and character of the overall gap is such that the parcel is less important for restricting the merging of these settlements, in particular the area immediately to the south-west and west of Potters Bar, west of Baker Street and north of Sawyers Lane and Bridgefoot Lane. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt. It is also a local wildlife site Dugdale Hill Meadows |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Unknown |
| Any access difficulties. | Possibly.. Sawyers Lane/Dugdale Hill Lane are very congested at school travel times. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Local wildlife site Dugdale Hill Meadows. If any development is to take place impact would need to be avoided or mitigated. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Potentially no - wildlife site designation |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No. Tenant with Grazing License | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 42 | 2.69 | n/a | 113 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The entire site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site (Dugdale Hill Meadows) containing a number of tree belts. These effectively divide the site up into three separate meadows which are currently used for grazing. Access into the site is currently via Bridgefoot Lane although the site is bound by Dugdale Hill Lane to the east.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status.

No evidence is currently available to support any change to the Local Wildlife Site status for Dugdale Hill Meadows. As such, it is not currently considered to be suitable for development.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, the site could only be considered suitable available and achievable for development, including of the unconstrained capacity figure of 113* units, if further investigation indicated that the site no longer meets the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework, with LWS constraint: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework, without LWS constraint: 113* homes, timescale not known

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL216

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Land west of Potters Bar station | | |
| Address | Darkes Lane, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Parkfield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Network Rail | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.28 | Current use(s) | Car Parking. Leaseholder of Albany House rents the spaces for domestic use (92 spaces) rather than used by rail passengers |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential development, offices and PH to the south and west, commercial including Potters Bar Station to the north and east. Residential in Alban House above the station. Site immediately adjoins the station car park and platform area on the eastern side | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Area is mixed with residential, pub, Wyllotts Place complex to the south/west and Potters Bar station and commercial premises to the north/east. The site is in the Potters Bar Darkes Lane town centre | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. The site adjoins established developed areas and the station car park. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/1371/PD56 Change of use of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors of Albany Gate from Office (Class B1) to Residential (Class C3) to provide 39 flats (PN NOT REQUIRED); TP/11/0175 Change of use to include hand car wash & valet service (GRANTED); TP/88/1355 Extension of existing station car park to produce a net increase of 31 car spaces and diversion of existing public footpath (GRANTED); TP/85/0883 Demolition of existing station booking hall and station master's house, construction of 5 storey office block including new booking hall, rearrangement of station forecourt and car park layout (GRANTED); TP/77/0135 Replacement British Rail car park (263 spaces) (GRANTED). |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes. South east corner of site lies within FZ3 (where access onto Darkes Lane would be) |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Grade II Listed Wyllyotts Manor to the rear of the site (south west) |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Close to station platform and rail line |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Significant tree cover at the south end of the site adjacent to the entrance onto Darkes Lane. Potential issues of overlooking to adjacent properties. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | yes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|--|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes. | Is there developer interest | Yes. The applicant states that the interested developer has already sought the successful conversion of Albany House to residential use and is keen to progress a scheme in this location. Because of the terms of the lease they hold they say it is in their interests to seek a scheme in conjunction with the leaseholder. |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes - parking needed for existing Albany House flats. This would need to be resolved if any development of the site was to be allowed. The release of the land is needed through the "Station Change" and condition license 7 procedure (internal rail industry consents) whereby the disposal is subject to ORR and TOC approval – but applicant states there is no reason to suggest why this would not be forthcoming. | | |
| Is the Site available | Probably | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable | Yes, subject to being able to provide adequate parking for Albany House and proposed development. |
|------------------------|---|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Central | V.Low | Very high | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 120 | 0.28 | 34 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within Potters Bar Darkes Lane district centre where residential development would be an acceptable use in policy terms. It is however currently used as car parking for residents of Albany House so any redevelopment of the site would need to provide parking for existing residents as well as catering for new demand arising from the development. The site is accessed off Darkes Lane although this area lies within FZ3: this may limit options for the development of the site as the Council's SFRA identifies that for new developments located in areas at risk of flooding, safe access/egress must be provided.

It is in a very accessible area being within the district centre and immediately next to Potters Bar rail station (routes into London and north to Stevenage and onward). A number of bus services run past the site on Darkes Lane: 610 (Luton/Hatfield -Enfield), 398 (Watford-Potters Bar), 242 (Waltham Cross – Potters Bar/Welwyn Garden City), 84 (New Barnet-St Albans).

The owner (Network Rail) has indicated that the site is available and that there is interest in progressing a scheme for residential development of 25/50 units. Development for this purpose would be consistent with the government's aim of increasing density of development around public transport hubs. The quantum and design of any development on this site may however be heavily constrained by its shape, proximity to residential properties and listed building, proximity to the railway line, the need to provide acceptable levels of car parking, and the need to satisfy Environment Agency requirements in relation to flood risk. For these reasons it can be expected that the eventual capacity of the site would be at or below the lower end of that anticipated by the site promoter. The site could be developable for approximately 34* dwellings under the HELAA methodology for calculating capacity.

Capacity under current framework: 34* dwellings in years 1-5

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL234a

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Well Cottage, Bentley Heath (Wagon Road) | | |
| Address | Wagon Road, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN4 0PH | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Parkfield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | King and Co on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.68 | Current use(s) | Garden . |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Cricket ground to the west, pub and car park to north, residential to the east. The site lies within the triangle formed by Wagon Road, Dancers Hill Road and the A1000. The Wyevale garden centre lies to the north of Dancers Hill Road. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Largely rural in character with a few individual houses in large gardens, farms, a small residential development at Bentley Heath and a garden centre. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/03/1250 Demolition of house and construction of two storey detached 6-bedroom house with indoor pool and double garage (GRANTED). TP/02/0040 Demolition of existing house and outbuildings and construction of detached 5-bedroom house with indoor swimming pool and detached double garage (GRANTED). TP/07/0058 Demolition and reconstruction of stable block, garage and conservatory (GRANTED); TP/99/0642 Existing use of land as domestic residential curtilage serving Well Cottage (CLE GRANTED); TP/99/0230 Construction of tennis court and 2.77m high chain link fence enclosure (GRANTED). |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 21 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the majority of the wider gaps between Greater London and Potters Bar. The parcel maintains the general openness and scale of these gaps, preventing development along the A1000 (Barnet Road), Kitts End Road and the A1081 (St Albans Road), which may physically and perceptually reduce the gap between these two settlements. There is a particular cluster of buildings around Dancers Hill Road in the north of the parcel. However, despite the presence of built form, the parcel maintains an unspoilt rural character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site is adjacent to the Grade II listed Duke Of York PH, Ganwick Corner |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt or Settlement hierarchy policy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 0.58 | 22 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no specific environmental constraints affecting the site which forms part of an triangular parcel of land bound by Wagon Road, Dancers Hill Road and Barnet Road. The Grade 2 listed Duke of York pub is located within this parcel.

The majority of the site comprises a paddock to the rear of Well Cottage and is located in a relatively isolated location, between Barnet and Potters Bar, notwithstanding the proximity of the public house and Wyevale garden centre. The 84 bus (Barnet – St Albans) runs nearby along Barnet Road with Potters Bar High Street approximately 1 mile away on foot and High Barnet town centre 2 miles away on foot.

Notwithstanding the overall low level of accessibility of the site to local services, the site is physically capable of accommodating a modest quantum of development. Rural exceptions affordable housing would not be suitable in this location under the current planning policy framework given that Bentley Heath is not identified as a settlement suitable for development.

The site forms part of a larger Green Belt parcel which itself forms the majority of the wider gaps between Greater London and Potters Bar. The parcel maintains the general openness and scale of these gaps, preventing development along the A1000 (Barnet Road), Kitts End Road and the A1081 (St Albans Road). There is a particular cluster of buildings around Dancers Hill Road in the north of the parcel but despite the built form here, the parcel maintains an unspoilt rural character.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development given its location within the Green Belt. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 22* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 22* homes within 5 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL234b

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Well Cottage, Bentley Heath (White House, Dancers Hill Road) | | |
| Address | Dancers Hill Road, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN4 OPH | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Parkfield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Owner | King and Co on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.02 | Current use(s) | 1 dwelling and Garden . Vacant or very short tenancies |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the west, open fields with tree and shrub boundaries to north and south, garden centre to east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Largely rural in character with a few individual houses in large gardens, farms, a small residential development at Bentley Heath and the garden centre. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Possibly |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Site adjoins garden centre. However a significant amount of development would not be appropriate in this hamlet location. |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/1982/FUL Demolition of existing house and erection of 3 no. dwellings (GRANTED); |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 21 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the majority of the wider gaps between Greater London and Potters Bar. The parcel maintains the general openness and scale of these gaps, preventing development along the A1000 (Barnet Road), Kitts End Road and the A1081 (St Albans Road), which may physically and perceptually reduce the gap between these two settlements. There is a particular cluster of buildings around Dancers Hill Road in the north of the parcel. However, despite the presence of built form, the parcel maintains an unspoilt rural character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site adjoins locally listed Strafford Cottages |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/91/1985 to the eastern boundary |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt or Settlement hierarchy policy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No. The site is currently vacant or has very short term tenancies | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 0.87 | 33 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no specific environmental constraints affecting the site which adjoins a new development to the west which was previously a small industrial estate. To the east is the Wyevale garden centre separated by a number of TPO protected trees. Planning permission was granted in 2017 for 3 units on the site.

The site itself comprises a large single dwellinghouse, outbuildings and its large garden, with planning permission located in a relatively isolated location, between Barnet and Potters Bar, notwithstanding the proximity of the public house and Wyevale garden centre. The 84 bus (Barnet – St Albans) runs nearby along Barnet Road with Potters Bar High Street approximately 1 mile away on foot and High Barnet town centre 2 miles away on foot.

Notwithstanding the overall low level of accessibility of the site to local services, the site is physically capable of accommodating a modest quantum of development. However, rural exceptions affordable housing would not be suitable in this location under the current planning policy framework given that Bentley Heath is not identified as a settlement suitable for development.

The site forms part of a larger parcel which itself forms the majority of the wider gaps between Greater London and Potters Bar. The parcel maintains the general openness and scale of these gaps, preventing development along the A1000 (Barnet Road), Kitts End Road and the A1081 (St Albans Road). There is a particular cluster of buildings around Dancers Hill Road in the north of the parcel but despite the built form here, the parcel maintains an unspoilt rural character.

Under the current policy framework, the site is considered to have a capacity for a net additional 2 units, given that planning permission has been granted for the demolition of the existing house and construction of 3 new units (16/1982/FUL). However, a greater quantum of development utilising the wider site, would not be suitable under the current policy framework given its Green Belt status. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in

this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 30* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 2 homes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 33* homes within 5 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL251

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Potters Bar Golf Club | | |
| Address | Darkes Lane, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 1DE | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Parkfield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Owner | Lichfields on behalf of CEG | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 40.23 | Current use(s) | Golf Course |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This site is located on the outer edge of Potters Bar. Where it adjoins residential dwellings in the south-eastern corner it is close to shops on the main Darkes Lane High Street, schools and buses that link to other services and amenities in the surrounding area, in addition to being in close proximity to Potters Bar Train Station. However, the areas that are located to the north and west of the site would be harder for accessing links and services. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | The site adjoins HEL375 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 47 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the wider gap between Potters Bar and Brookmans Park | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes. Part of the site lies in FZ3 which will affect the area which might potentially be developable. |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Adjoins the Conservation Area |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The train line is situated to the west of the site – noise attenuation measures may be required.. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but may be should the site's Green Belt status change |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No - there is a break clause in the tenancy agreement which means the owner could achieve vacant possession. | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Medium | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 48 | 12.68 | 608 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The entrance to the site, which is accessed off Darkes Lane, is located close to the town centre. The Darkes Lane (West) Conservation Area abuts the site to the north and east with the western boundary formed by the East Coast Main Line railway. A public right of way, footpath 5, run east-west across the centre of the site which also contains a number of locally listed structures from the second world war.

Potters Bar Brook and several smaller watercourses run through the site. Hertsmere's recently updated SFRA, which for this area is based on the EA's Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea), indicates that the site falls within FZs 1, 2 and 3. In the absence of detailed hydraulic modelling having been undertaken for any of these watercourses, the EA's mapping of flood zones affecting the site relies upon national generalised modelling. Under these circumstances the approach set out in the SFRA for greenfield sites is that a developer must be able to demonstrate that any proposed development lies outside the 1 in 20 year flood extents, if development is to be considered acceptable within 20m of a watercourse.

Modelling undertaken by the owners' consultants indicates that the flood zone is contained within the central portion of the site adjacent to the water course. The rest of the site is indicated as lying outside the 1 in 20 year flood extents. The EA has accepted both this baseline assessment of flood risk and also additional modelling relating to proposed development of the site, subject to several specific points being addressed subsequently in a FRA supporting either a planning application or proposed site allocation. The site promoter has advised that any development itself would be within Flood Zone 1. However, a range of mitigation would need to be included within any final layout, including addressing the existing access into the site which is already located within the flood zone.

The lower half of the site, in particular, is located within close proximity of the town centre and station. A number of bus routes stop close to the site entrance on Darkes Lane including the 84 (Barnet – St Albans) and 398 (Watford – Potters Bar).

Development of the site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. The site forms part of a parcel identified as moderately performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The parcel as a whole maintains the scale and openness of the gap between Potters Bar and Brookmans Park. However, the golf course is identified as being

less important for preventing coalescence given that it is boundary to the east, west and south by development and a densely planted buffer to the north. On this basis, it was recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site could be developable for 608* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 608* homes, 500* within 6-10 years and 108* within 11-15 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL318

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | former Sunny Bank Primary School | | |
| Address | Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 2NE. | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Parkfield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Hertfordshire County Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 2.29 | Current use(s) | Vacant school and playing fields |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north, west and east. To the south east of the site a remaining school building is remaining in education use and open fields adjoin the rest of the southern boundary to the site. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is located at the edge of the built up area of Potters Bar within walking distance of a primary school, a GP, retail centre and a food store. In addition to bus services providing access to other services and amenities. The area is largely semi detached properties on fairly narrow residential roads. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Adjoins land to the south submitted to C4S by Wrotham Park. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL362 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 18/1475/OUT: Sunny Bank Junior & Infant School: Demolition of existing Sunnybank School building and former caretaker's house, removal of hardstanding areas, and development of up to 30 new homes with associated access arrangements and ancillary works. (Outline application to include access, all other matters reserved) (PENDING) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 35 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small, less essential part of the gap between Potters Bar and Greater London. The scale and character of the overall gap is such that the parcel is less important for restricting the merging of these settlements, in particular the area immediately to the south-west and west of Potters Bar, west of Baker Street and north of Sawyers Lane and Bridgefoot Lane. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Adjoins Royds Conservation Area |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Some development of PDL part of site could be appropriate. Development of remainder of site not suitable under current policy but could be should the site's Green Belt status change (subject also to policy CS19) |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Suburban | Low | Low | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 46.5 | 1.72 | 80 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|---|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | part yes |
| Reason | PDL. Applicant requested inclusion on register. |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site adjoins the Roys Conservation Area and as proposed would be accessed via Field View Road although additional pedestrian and cycle access could be achieved via Meadow Way and Sunnybank Road. The site promoter has indicated that the existing community facility (Pupil Referrals Unit) would be retained. The scope to undertake development under paragraph 145 of the NPPF, which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development', is limited to the remaining former school building on the site, with a footprint of approximately 1100sq m. Based on an equal number of 3 and 4 bedroom houses, this would amount to the equivalent of 16 dwellings.

The site has previously been considered for release from the Green Belt with the public examination for the current Local Plan recognising the scope for the site to be developed but with a greater quantum of open space being retained than was acceptable to the landowner.

Although the site forms part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment, HEL318 forms one of a small number of sub-areas as being of less significance. The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were justification to exist to amend the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to the necessary technical assessments, the site can be considered to be developable for an estimated 80* homes. A requirement for the provision of public open space on the site may reduce this figure significantly.

Capacity under current policy framework: 16* homes within 6-10 years

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 80* - 50*homes within 1-5 years and 30 homes within 6-10 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL361

Site source I&O 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Site Name | Wrotham Park Land West of Baker Steet I&O | | |
| Address | Land West of Baker Street, Potters Bar, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | unparished area of PottersBar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Furzeffield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Owner | Woolf Bond on behalf of Wrotham Park | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 101.94 | Current use(s) | Open fields, farm buildings |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Solar farm, A1(M) and South Mimms services to the west, residential and school to the east , M25 to the south, open fields/ farm land north | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location adjoining the western edge of Potters Bar, but being a large expanse of farmland the character is rural open countryside. The M25, A1(M) and South Mimms services are urbanising influences. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | The site adjoins the Dugdale Hill site promoted through the Call for Sites | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL178 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1338/CLE Change of use of agricultural land to allow the parking of vehicles for business purposes (Bridgefoot Farm) (REFUSED); TP/04/0370 Change of use of redundant piggery building to offices (GRANTED); TP/01/1209 Telecommunications mast to replace existing (GRANTED); |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Local centre, new primary school, new parkland, allotments, strategic open space. Part of the site is also being considered for employment purposes. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 35 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Parcel forms a small less essential part of the gap between Potters Bar and Greater London. Scale and character of the overall gap is such that the parcel is less important for restricting the merging of these settlements. The parcel maintains a largely open character particularly of the far west. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA9 AND SA12 | 0/0 | 1/1 | 4/5 | 0/0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | Sub-area SA9 meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. Sub-area SA12 meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Flood Zone 3 runs up the western edge of the site |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. Bridgefoot Farm House, cottage 30m south, grade II listed. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Sawyers Lane is narrow and congested particularly at school peak times. Access road to Swanland Lane (South Mimms) in the west is proposed |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Communications tower on site (affects local area only). Overhead power lines across lower part of the site. Site abuts M25. Noise and air quality mitigation measures would be required. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Bridgefoot House Local wildlife site lies within the site. Also adjoins Dugdale Hill Meadows local wildlife site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but could be if its Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 37.85 | 1306 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

The site as a whole has not been promoted for employment use but there may be development potential for employment purposes. Further work would be required to identify an appropriate location and size of site which could have development potential for employment purposes.

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|-------------|-------------------|

Conclusion:

There are some environmental constraints affecting part of the site including flood zone (FZ3) and Local Wildlife Sites (Wash Lane and Bridgefoot House) to the far west of the site and pylons/overhead power lines running through the lower part of the site. The site abuts M25 and is further from the railway station and Darkes Lane centre than HEL362.

The masterplan indicates the provision of a possible central spine road linking Baker Street with Swanland Road. Additional pedestrian access onto Sawyers Lane to the south east of HEL361 and Windmore Avenue to the north is proposed, although land is in separate ownership immediate south of Windmore Avenue and is not current achievable.

Although a local centre is proposed within the central part of the site, together with a primary school, detailed assessments of the impact on the local highway network would be necessary. The central part of the site is approximately 1.5 miles from Potters Bar station and a similar distance from both Darkes Lane and the High Street town centres. A limited number of bus routes serve the runs close to the eastern part of the site along Dugdale Hill Lane (242 Waltham Cross - Potters Bar) although a number of routes only run once a day as school buses serving Dame Alice Owens. Additional bus routes would also need to run through the site to ensure higher take up of public transport rather than relying on stops on Baker Street and Barnet Road.

The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment particularly with regard to its role in preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside. A small number of sub-areas were identified as being of less significance, including Wroxham School and the paddocks norther of Bridgefoot Lane, which are in separate ownership. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-areas within which the site is located for further consideration.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. However, were exceptional circumstances exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site can be considered to be developable for an estimated 1306* homes in total. A part of the site could also be suitable for employment development. This would reduce the area available for residential development.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 1306* homes. 425* within 6-10 years, 750* within 11-5 years and 131* beyond that.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: employment land TBC (Releasing land for employment purposes would reduce the capacity for residential development)

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL362

Site source I&O 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Site Name | Wrotham Park West Barnet Road East Baker Street (incorporating HEL377 and HEL378) | | |
| Address | Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | unparished area of PottersBar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Parkfield and Oakmere | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Owner | Woolf Bond on behalf of Wrotham Park | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 63.5 | Current use(s) | open fields |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Baker Street and school to the west, residential to the north, Barnet Road and residential development to the east, M25 to the south. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Whilst the site itself is open and rural in character it is surrounded by Potters Bar to the north and east, and the M25 to the south. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Former Sunnybank School has been submitted to the Call for Sites | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL318 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/93/0429 Use of land for car boot sales on 14 Saturdays per year (REFUSED); TP/03/0676 Change of use of land from informal open space to agriculture (REFUSED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | local centre, community centre, sports facilities and play provision, primary school, care home, allotments and recreational amenity space, including access from Barnet Road and Baker Street. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 35 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Parcel forms a small less essential part of the gap between Potters Bar and Greater London. Scale and character of the overall gap is such that the parcel is less important for restricting the merging of these settlements. The parcel maintains a largely open character particularly to the far west. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA15 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Flood zone 3 in eastern part of site |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. The Royds Conservation Area adjoins the northern boundary of the site |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Rail tunnel runs under the site |
| Any access difficulties. | No. Applicant states development would provide a road link between Baker Street and Barnet Road. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | M25 runs along the southern boundary of the site. Noise and air quality mitigation measures would be required. Pylons and power lines run across the site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Tree Preservation Order TPO/13/1981 |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but could be if its Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 24.38 | 951 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant topographical constraints across the site but an area of flood risk affects some of the eastern fringe of the site close to Barnet Road. That part of the site also has a railway tunnel with the East Coast Main Line running through it and there are pylons/overhead power lines running along the southern part of the site. The site also abuts M25 although the proposed masterplan indicates that any development would avoid environmentally sensitive areas, with a significant buffer adjacent to the motorway. The Royds Conservation Area abuts the northern boundary of the site.

The masterplan indicates the provision of a central spine road linking Barnet Road and Baker Street with two new roundabout junctions on each road. Detailed assessments of the impact on the local highway network would be necessary. The central part of the site is approximately 1 mile from Potters Bar station and a similar distance from both Darkes Lane and the High Street town centres. Scope for improved cycle and bus connections, particularly to Potters Bar station/Darkes Lane, exist along Baker Street. A limited number of bus routes serve the outer edges of the site including 84 (St Albans – Barnet) on the Barnet Road side of the site. None of the buses running along Baker Street currently stop near the site many of the routes along or close to the western side of the run once a day as school buses serving Dame Alice Owens school. Additional bus routes would also need to run through the site to ensure higher take up of public transport rather than relying on stops on Baker Street and Barnet Road.

The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment particularly with regard to its role in preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside. A small number of sub-areas were identified as being of less significance, including the former Sunny Bank school/playing fields site which abuts HEL362. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site can be considered to be developable for an estimated 951* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 951* homes - 350* homes within 6-10 years, 500* homes within 11-15 years and 101* homes beyond that.

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL375

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Manor Road | | |
| Address | Manor Road, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 1DQ | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Parkfield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | King and Co on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.91 | Current use(s) | Equestrian use - fields and building. The buildings on the site are used for stabling, tack rooms etc |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Railway to the south, golf course to the north and west, residential (Potters Bar) to the east | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The area is at the edge of Potters Bar urban area (mainly semi-detached and detached properties), partly surrounded by the golf course. Although the area is largely open the surrounding residential and railway uses are urbanising influences. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL251 Potters Bar Golf course | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/1268/VOC variation of condition 6 by the omission of the words ' by the applicant and their family' following grant of planning permission TP/02/0214 (GRANTED); 17/0859/FUL relocation of 3 no. car parking spaces used in association with equestrian use of land (GRANTED); 88/0065/TP Demolition of 28, 29, 30 Manor Road and erection of 24 x 2 bedroomed flats for the elderly (REFUSED); TP/02/0214 3 loose boxes, improved vehicular access and provision of 3 car parking spaces (GRANTED); TP/88/1565 Demolition of three existing dwellings and the erection of 16 retirement dwellings, wardens accommodation, communal facilities (GRANTED ON APPEAL); |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 47 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel maintains the overall openness and scale of the gap, though the southwestern area around the Potters Bar Golf Club is less important for preventing merging between settlements. It is effectively enclosed within the settlement and visually separated from the countryside to the north by dense planted buffers. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - most of the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Access would be at the end of Manor Road cul de sac through existing property. Applicant states 'The proposal includes a highways feasibility layout which illustrates that a 4.1m shared surface route can be provided'. There is a telegraph pole across the proposed entrance |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The site adjoins the railway line – there will be a need to protect any development from noise/vibration. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/323/1995 The applicant states that although there is a protected tree close to the access, the access can be created without any adverse effects to the tree or its root protection area. However this is a TPO covering a number of trees on the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Suitability of this site, in particular, depends on noise impact from the railway, the ability to provide a satisfactory means of access, as well as an ability to avoid adversely affecting trees covered by the TPO. Also currently contrary to Green Belt policy. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | Yes . Feasibility work - highways, drainage and planning. Promoter states that the early market evidence is that this would be an attractive proposition in the market and would be delivered quickly . |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | The use is by the landowner- the promoter understand that the use can be ceased immediately. | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 57 | 0.77 | 44 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 14/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

| |
|--|
| <p>There are no topographical constraints but the site has an irregular shape comprising a main paddock with some associated buildings with some smaller parcels either side of the rear garden of 29 Manor Road. Given the proximity of those smaller parcels to 29 Manor Road, only the main paddock is considered to be potentially capable of accommodating development.</p> <p>The land is located immediately adjacent to the railway with an existing tree buffer, outside of the site boundary, between the site and the railway. An area TPO (323/1995) covers all trees within 28 Manor Road including in or abutting the proposed access. A telegraph post also currently blocks vehicular access onto the proposed access road. The site promoter has indicated a shared surface of approximately 4m would provide the required access.</p> <p>The site is located within close proximity of the town centre and station with a number of bus routes stopping nearby on Darkes Lane including the 84 (Barnet – St Albans) and 398 (Watford – Potters Bar).</p> <p>The site itself adjoins a much larger area being promoted under HEL251 which would have its own principal access via Darkes Lane. However, the sites have not been promoted together.</p> <p>Development of the site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework forming part of a parcel identified as moderately performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The parcel as a whole maintains the scale and openness of the gap between Potters Bar and Brookmans Park. However, HEL375 (and the golf course) is identified as being less important for preventing coalescence given that it is bound to the east, west and south by development and a densely planted buffer to the north. On this basis, the sub-areas was recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site could be developable for 44* homes. Yet, due to the constraints stated above, the site is unlikely to be developable within the first 5 years. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.</p> |
|--|

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 44* homes in years 6-10

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL394

Site source Safeguarded

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Cranborne Road safeguarded site | | |
| Address | Cranborne Road, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | unparished area of Potters bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Furzefield | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Local Plan allocation | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 2.48 | Current use(s) | Recycling centre/open field |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Cranborne Industrial estate to east and south east, fields to south west, west and north, solar farm to north east. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where open countryside meets the built up area of Potters Bar. A large area to the north is covered by a solar farm which detracts from the overall rural character of the area. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/07/1115 Construction and operation of a waste transfer station for biodegradable waste (RAISE NO OBJECTIONS) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No. However part of the site is a recycling centre so contamination is a possibility |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| 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 / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|------------------------------------|
| 2.48ha of land for employment uses |
|------------------------------------|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Conclusion:

| |
|--|
| <p>There are no particular environmental or topographical constraints although the possibility of some ground contamination exists. The site has previously been identified as suitable for employment development (subject to a review of the plan) through its safeguarding in the SADM Plan (2016); it is within the urban area of Potters Bar, having previously been removed from the Green Belt. There are no changes in the suitability of the site and it is considered developable for employment purposes.</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 2.48ha of land for employment purposes within 15 yrs.</p> |
|--|

HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM

Site reference HEL404

Site source

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|-----------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Barnet Road car park | | |
| Address | Barnet Road, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Oakmere | Town/ Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|--------------------|------|----------------|----------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.13 | Current use(s) | Car park |
|--------------------|------|----------------|----------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|---|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Commercial to north, west and south (retail/office/DIY), residential to the east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the southern edge of Potters Bar High Street District Centre. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|--|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|--|------|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Retention of surface parking with development above. Type of development sought yet to be determined by the Council. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Yes, depending on the use proposed |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Central | medium | High | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 106.5 | 0.13 | 14 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

0.13ha of land for employment use

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|--|----------|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | Possibly |
| Reason | Brownfield land which if to be released for housing meets criteria for inclusion on register | |

Conclusion:

The site is located at the southern end of Potters Bar High Street district centre. The site is surrounded by existing development, mainly commercial town centre uses but including residential particularly to the south. There are no significant physical constraints to development but the relationship to adjoining uses and the need to retain public parking provision would need to be taken into account. Access would be available from Barnet Road which runs along the western edge of the site. The site is accessible, being within Potters Bar High Street district centre. Bus route 84 (St Albans – New Barnet) passes the site on Barnet Road.

Whilst a decision on the likely future use of the site (in addition to retention of parking) has not yet been made, the site is within the urban area, in an accessible location and if brought forward for housing purposes could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for approximately 14* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 14* homes within 1 – 5 years

OR

Capacity under current policy framework: 0.13 ha land for employment uses

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL513 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Site source | Sites consultation |
|--------------------|--------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Oakfield Close | | |
| Address | Oakfield Close, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 2BE | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Furzeffield | Town/Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Abbey Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.28 | Current use(s) | Amenity grassed area |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Railway to east, residential to all other sides | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Residential area in northern part of Potters Bar, estate built in 1990s. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/88/0181 Residential development (DETERMINED); TP/93/0492 Erection of 48 two-storey houses and 20 two-storey/three-storey (split level) houses (GRANTED); TP/91/0539 residential development (adjoining housing estate) (GRANTED); 18/2197/FUL Construction of detached 2 storey 3 bed house (GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Stage 1 Comment | n/a | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Stage 2 Comment | n/a | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | The site was identified as Minor Amenity Land (PB72) in the 2012 Green Spaces Assessment and presently needs to be considered against Policy SADM36 |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Suitable access arrangements have not been demonstrated, although promoter indicates current roads serving existing houses could be extended. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The site immediately abuts the railway line; noise and vibration impacts would need to be investigated and potentially mitigated |
| Any other environmental constraints? | None indicated |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits of development to the area clearly outweigh the loss of amenity. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Not known | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Not known | | |
| Is the Site available | Not known | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Transitional | Medium | High | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 81 | 0.28 | 23 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is within the urban area of Potters Bar and comprises amenity land at the edge of a residential area, separating the existing estate from the main railway line. It is an irregular shaped site and can only be accessed through the existing housing area, although it is not clear exactly how vehicular access could be gained. Footpath 69 runs through the site, along its length.

Pieces of amenity land such as this which contribute to the character and visual amenity of an area are protected under policy SADM36; development proposals which would result in their loss will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the benefits of development to the area clearly outweigh the loss. Planning permission has been granted (18/2197/FUL) for the erection of one dwelling on a proportion of the site, at the end of Pinewood Drive. Whilst it may be that a case for development of the whole site can be made and sufficient protection to both the amenity of existing and future residents provided, there is currently insufficient information to enable such a conclusion to be reached.

For the purposes of the HELAA the site could deliver 23* dwellings but in the absence of further information there is uncertainty over the timescale within which this might be possible.

Capacity: 23* dwellings, post 16 years.

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL501

Site source Sites consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Site Name | Land adj Fenny Slade | | |
| Address | The Ridgeway, Potters Bar | | |
| Postcode | EN6 5QS | Parish | Unparished area of Potters Bar |
| Ward | Potters Bar Oakmere | Town/Village | Potters Bar |
| Promoter | Bidwells on behalf of the owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 2.35 | Current use(s) | Agricultural barn, land formerly used as storage and parking |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north and east, farmland to the west and south | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open countryside crossed by M25 | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Owner indicates yes | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL164 Fenny Slade | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 18/2017/CLE Erection of agricultural storage building GRANTED; 17/1247/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of eight 2-storey dwellings REFUSED; 15/2002/FUL Conversion and extensions to existing greenhouse and shed to form a self-contained 1 bed dwelling REFUSED; 14/2108/PRAP Erection of storage building GRANTED; 14/1270/PRAP Erection of storage building GRANTED; TP/09/2229 (Agricultural Prior Determination APPEAL ALLOWED. |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 27 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gap between Greater London and Potters Bar. The western edge of the parcel is particularly important for preventing ribbon development along the A111 (Stagg Hill) which would physically and perceptually reduce the scale of this gap. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. Site is within the current Green Belt and contains Fenny Slade Hill Local wildlife site |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Not for vehicles but pedestrian access to Potters Bar across the M25 would be difficult |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Includes local wildlife site Fenny Slade Hill and TPO/1070/2002. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | The site is not suitable for residential allocation given its detached location and severance from Potters Bar south west of J24 of the M25 |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Not known |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | None | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Very low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 34.5 | 1.76 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | n/a | 66 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located 400 metres beyond the edge of Potters Bar built up area. It is also severed from Potters Bar by the M25 and Junction 24 of the motorway. The site is a designated Local Wildlife Site which has been identified an area of “neutral grassland with damp areas” with Tufted Hair-grass and a range of grassland indicator species recorded including Sweet Vernal-grass, Common Knapweed and Common Sorrel. The scrub within the Local Wildlife Site supports a range of species including Hawthorn and Oak.

Although the site can potentially be accessed off Stagg Hill, wider pedestrian access across Junction 24 is difficult, particularly crossing the slip roads on/off the motorway and the very significant severance from Potters Bar due to the existence of the motorway and junction. Bus routes 298 (Potters Bar to Arnos Grove) and 610/611 (Luton/Hatfield-Enfield) stop close to the site on Stagg Hill. The 313 (Potters Bar to Chingford) passes the site on The Ridgeway but the stop is some distance away.

The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment with the western edge of the parcel being particularly important for preventing ribbon development along the A111 (Stagg Hill) which would physically and perceptually reduce the scale of this gap between London and Potters Bar. Under the current policy framework, due to its Green Belt status, the site is not considered suitable other than for appropriate development within the parameters set out in the NPPF which under paragraph 145 allows for ‘limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt’ as ‘appropriate development’. Whilst the applicant indicates that ‘the site can be considered to be brownfield land due to the previous use as a public highway’ only kerb, footpaths and signpost are on site so any built development would fail this openness test. The agricultural barn does not constitute PDL as defined by the NPPF.

Given that there is little scope to deliver an increase in housing on the site within the parameters of appropriate development, and the wider severance of the site from Potters Bar the site is not considered suitable for housing. (It is not suitable for the unconstrained capacity figure indicated.)

Capacity: 0*

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0* dwellings

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

APPENDIX 13: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - RADLETT AND NEARBY VILLAGES

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL180

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Kemprow, between White House and Adelaide Lodge | | |
| Address | Radlett Road, Aldenham | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Aldenham |
| Promoter | Preston Bennett on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.81 | Current use(s) | Vacant |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open land to the north-east. Small settlements of Kemprow and High Cross to the west. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This site is located surrounded by open Green Belt countryside. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 13/1953/FUL Demolition of existing storage building & erection of new replacement storage building & reinstatement/retention of track (REFUSED); 16/0895/FUL. Construction of detached, 2 storey, 4 bed dwelling. (REFUSED); 16/2406/FUL Demolition of existing sheds and construction of detached 2 storey, 4 bed dwelling utilising existing access (GRANTED); 17/0593/DOC discharge Of conditions of 16/2406/FUL; |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 26 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gaps between Watford, North Bushey and Radlett. The wider parcel maintains the openness and scale of the wider gap. There are long vistas across the open land, though no inter visibility between settlements. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA39 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly but makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Unknown |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy or settlement hierarchy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 0.69 | 26 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Kemprow is a small hamlet within 400m of the edge of Radlett. It is primarily centred on High Cross with Adelaide Lodge physically and visually detached from Kemprow. Planning permission was granted for 1 house on the site adjacent to White House, maintaining gap from Adelaide Lodge. There are no environmental constraints and so the site can be considered deliverable and achievable. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration. The site is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its location in the Green Belt and position in the settlement hierarchy. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 26* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 26* homes within 1-5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL198

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | land at Brickfields (adj Moses Dell) | | |
| Address | Watling Street, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Vigor & Co on behalf of the owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.97 | Current use(s) | No visible uses - vacant land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open fields to south. Small number of houses to east, west and north. Track leading north to residential area of Radlett. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Rural; edge of settlement | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL367 directly adjoins to east and HEL346 to south (small gap between these) | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None relevant |
|---|---------------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The Parcel prevents the ribbon development between Radlett and Elstree village at Cobden Hill and Watling Street. Parcel protects open land, which has a strong connection to the historic core. Historic field pattern. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA42 (western part not yet assessed) | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Potentially - no direct highway access. Access is currently via bridleway, or narrow track then bridleway |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Trees/woodland across the site |
| 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 / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 33 | 0.82 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | n/a | 27 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There is significant tree coverage across the site which currently has no public highway access. Current vehicular access to the site limited to use of rights of way network including Aldenham 71 footpath with either landowner permission or private access rights. Although not designated as a wildlife site or with TPOs, an ecological and arboricultural assessment would be required in order to establish its full biodiversity and amenity value.

A number of other sites in the vicinity have been promoted all of which are accessed via the rights of way network. Most of the sites are in different ownerships and the scope for land assembly in this location is limited.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. However, notwithstanding the expected ecological/arboricultural value of the site, given the limited vehicular access into the site, it is not considered to be suitable and therefore developable for the quantum of housing which might otherwise be considered under paragraph 2.4 of the HELAA methodology.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, resolution of access and biodiversity constraints would still be required in order to be able to consider the site suitable available and achievable for development. (This includes the unconstrained capacity figure of 27* units).

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL213

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Land at rear of The Ridgeway | | |
| Address | The Ridgeway, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | WD7 8PR | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.82 | Current use(s) | Vacant |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north and east, open land, including Moses Dell woodland to south and west | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the edge of the built up area of Radlett where countryside meets housing at the edge of the settlement. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes. The site adjoins land at Home Farm that has been submitted. Other small sites which are not physically joined to the site but are close by have also been submitted to the Call for Sites | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL346 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 38 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Radlett and Shenley. 6% of the parcel is covered by built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA36 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes - narrow entrance between two existing houses. Limited vehicular access to the location |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy . Access restrictions limit suitability independently of current Green Belt policy. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) | |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------|---------------|
| 37.5 | 0.7 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | n/a | 26 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site comprises a field of approximately 0.8ha with a narrow access of between 3.7 and 6m in width between two existing houses. Although there are no significant topographical or environmental constraints affecting the main part of the site, access to the location is via footpath 71 which currently has limited vehicular use via either landowner permission or private access rights.

A number of other sites in the vicinity have been promoted all of which are accessed via the rights of way network. Most of the sites are in different ownerships and the scope for land assembly in this location is limited.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. However, given the limited vehicular access into the site, it is not considered to be suitable and therefore developable for the quantum of housing which might otherwise be considered under paragraph 2.4 of the HELAA methodology.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, resolution of access constraints would still be required in order to be able to consider the site suitable available and achievable for development. (This includes the unconstrained capacity figure of 26* units).

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and removal of constraints: 26* homes, timescale unknown

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL214

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Land south of Theobold Street, | | |
| Address | Radlett | | |
| Postcode | WD7 7LP | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Star Planning for High Moon Developments Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 3.16 | Current use(s) | Agricultural pasture |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north and east, railway line and tennis club with courts to the west, open fields to the south. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the edge of the built up area of Radlett where countryside meets housing at the edge of the settlement. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 28 | 3+ | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Borehamwood and Radlett. It is important in preventing ribbon development along Theobald Street. Ribbon development on Theobald Street and the railway line detract from the overall sense of rurality. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA40 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | The southern tip of the site is within FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Ownership of land adjoining highway is not in the applicant's ownership |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | 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 |
| Any other environmental constraints? | There is a group tree preservation order affecting some of the trees adjacent to the northern boundary with Theobald Street (TPO/28/2006) |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but may be should the site's Green Belt status change and access be resolved. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes. Ownership of verge over which access to Theobald Street required | | |
| Is the Site available | If access is resolved | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Is the Site achievable | yes subject to access |
|------------------------|-----------------------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 54 | 2.37 | 128 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

A small area of around 600 sq m at the far south western end of the site is within flood zone (FZ3) due to Tykes Water running through that part of the site. Overhead power lines cross the western part of the site which abuts the railway to the west. Access to the site would be taken directly off Theobald Street although there is presently no vehicular access into the site other than via an area of verge and a gate.

The proximity of the Midland Main Line (Thameslink) line would limit the area which could potentially be developed due to both the likely need to retain an access strip for maintenance and to ensure that an adequate buffer for noise attenuation is able to be provided. A strip of highway verge land, typically around 9m in depth, between the site and the carriageway on Theobald Street is not within the ownership of the site owner, but the site promoter has engaged with the highway authority and has entered into an agreement under the provisions of Section 278 of 1980 Highways Act.

The site is an accessible location, within 400m of the edge of the district centre in Radlett and 800m of the station. Two bus routes also serve the site the 398 (Watford – Potters Bar), 601 (Welwyn GC - Borehamwood).

The land is located at the northern end of a parcel identified as performing strongly in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, particularly with regard to its role in maintaining the gap between Borehamwood and Radlett and preventing ribbon development along Theobald Street.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering a significant quantum of growth in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 128* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 128* homes – 50 homes within 1 – 5 years and 78 within years 6-10

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL220

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Porters Park Golf Club | | |
| Address | Shenley Hill, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | WD7 7AZ | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Porters Park Golf club Properties Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.76 | Current use(s) | Clubhouse and ancillary buildings for Porters Park Golf Club |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to south and west, golf course to north and east | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is on the edge of Radlett built up area, adjoining the open golf course | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no – adjoining areas are residential area or the golf course itself | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/12/1679 Proposed Machinery Storage Shed (GRANTED); TP/95/0828 replacement greenkeeper's store (GRANTED); TP/92/0218 Erection of 8.5 metre high safety fence (supported on 10 metre high post) on south west boundary (REFUSED AND APPEAL DISMISSED); TP/89/0922 Alterations and extension to Porters Park Golf Club buildings & car Park (GRANTED); TP/79/0321 Extensions to golf club (GRANTED); TP/74/0420 Erection of 2 2-storey estate houses as residential accommodation for the exclusive occupation of golf club staff (REFUSED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 38 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Shenley and Radlett - development would significantly reduce actual and perceived distance between settlements. It is largely rural character but there are urbanising influences. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA35 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt, although the proposal could fall within the PDL exception to Green Belt policy. The clubhouse etc would need to be reprovided (CS19) and this would be within the Green Belt. Southern, eastern and northern edges of the site are within Porters Park Golf Course Local Wildlife Site. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Southern eastern and northern edges of site are within Porters Park Golf Course Local Wildlife Site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Redevelopment of the PDL element of the site could be suitable. However the clubhouse would need to be reprovided. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes - restrictive covenant in existence. It is in the Golf Club's control as to when the site is made available. | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Is the Site available | Yes probably |
|------------------------------|--------------|

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | High | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 64.5 | 0.65 | 42 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 08/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

Parts of the eastern half of the site are located within a Local Wildlife Site (Porters Park Golf Course) although the Local Wildlife Site designation affects the entire golf course. Although an ecological assessment would be required were the site to be considered further for development, the part of HEL220 which falls within the designation largely comprises a manicured grassed area including a putting green and so may itself have relatively low ecological value. There are no other environmental constraints affecting the site.

The site itself can be accessed directly off Shenley Hill and is located between two bus stops served by the 602 (Hatfield – Watford), as well as being within 800m of Radlett station and the district centre on Watling Street.

The area being promoted for development comprises approximately 0.4ha of previously developed land and buildings including a dwelling house, large clubhouse/function room and car park. The substantive playing part of the golf course itself is not included and it has previously been indicated that the club would seek the provision of a smaller clubhouse elsewhere on the site.

The principle of some development is acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'.

Under the current policy framework, the quantum of 'appropriate development' within the Green Belt would be guided by an assessment of building footprint and volume, rather than red line boundary submitted, as well as the impact on Green Belt openness. The capacity of local roads and scale/position of new clubhouse will also determine precise number of units which could be accommodated.

The current footprint of development amounts to 350 sq m. On the assumption that a smaller clubhouse would have a significantly reduced footprint, for the purposes of this assessment, a developable area of 250 sq m will be used.

The site is available within the next five years having been promoted by the owners of the land and based on an equal mix of 3 and 4 bed houses reflecting the surrounding pattern of development, the site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable for an estimated 4 homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 4 units within 5 years

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework (red line area): 42* homes within 5 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL222

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Cobden Hill | | |
| Address | r/o 5-15 Cobden Hill, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | WD7 7JL | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Vigor and Co on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.38 | Current use(s) | Part unused and informal garden land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north, west and south. Open land and playing fields to the east, running up to the railway line |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of Radlett location. The site is largely contained within the urban area, but immediately adjoining surrounding Green Belt/open countryside. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/92/0009 Construction of 6 no.two bedroom houses and 5 no.three bedroom houses (REFUSED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|---|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No (adjoins FZ3) |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. The site is within Radlett South Conservation Area and is immediately to the rear of the locally listed 5-15 Cobden Hill |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No although access would be through the current drive to the side of 5 Cobden Hill |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | yes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|-----------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | High | Urban brownfield houses |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 60 | 0.38 | 23 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within the Radlett South Conservation Area and abuts Radlett Brook and the associated flood zone. The site is immediately to the rear of the locally listed 5-15 Cobden Hill with access required through the current drive to the side of no.5.

The site is not located within the Green Belt, following a minor adjustment to the boundary in the SADM Policies Plan. Although there are no bus routes running past the site, it is well located within 400m of the centre of Radlett and 750m from the station. However, its suitability to be developed depends on an ability to satisfactorily create a new access into the site to the side of no.5 and to deliver a scheme which complies with the detailed design and layout requirements, as currently set out in the Planning and Design Guide.

A scheme was recently developed to the rear of Nos. 25 – 27 Cobden Hill and it is considered HEL222 is likely to be capable of accommodating a limited amount of development subject to providing a suitable access and acceptable design and layout. The site is therefore considered to be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 23 homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 23* homes within 5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL225

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | SE of track between Loom Lane and Brickfields | | |
| Address | Radlett | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Vigor & Co on behalf of the Trustees of the Phillimore Trust | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.72 | Current use(s) | Vacant land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential and green field land. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Residential dwellings to the north, mostly surrounded by greenbelt land. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Not directly. Site is opposite HEL226 but does not directly adjoin | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the wider gap between Radlett, Borehamwood, Elstree and Bushey where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. The parcel protects open land which has a strong connection to the historic core. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA42 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes - accessed via track |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Significant tree cover. Adjoins archaeological area to the north |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy framework. Access and environmental issues may also preclude development |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Is the Site achievable | Probably not given access difficulties |
|-------------------------------|--|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 34.5 | 0.61 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | 0 | 21 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There is significant tree coverage across the site which has no highway access. Although not designated as a wildlife site or with a TPO, an ecological and arboricultural assessment would be required in order to establish full biodiversity impact. Current vehicular access to the site is limited to use of Aldenham 71 footpath with either landowner permission or private access rights.

A number of other sites in the vicinity have been promoted all of which are accessed via the rights of way network. Most of the sites are in different ownerships and the scope for land assembly in this location is limited. Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. However, notwithstanding the expected ecological/arboricultural value of the site, given the limited vehicular access into the site, it is not considered to be suitable and therefore developable for the quantum of housing being considered under paragraph 2.4 of the HELAA methodology.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, resolution of access and biodiversity constraints would still be required in order to be able to consider the site suitable available and achievable for the unconstrained capacity figure of 21* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL226

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | NW of track between Loom Lane and Brickfields | | |
| Address | Radlett | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Vigor & Co on behalf of the Trustees of the Phillimore Trust | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.39 | Current use(s) | Vacant land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the wider gap between Radlett, Borehamwood, Elstree and Bushey where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. The parcel protects open land which has a strong connection to the historic core. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA42 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes accessed via track |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Significant tree cover |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy framework. Access and environmental issues may also preclude development |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Is the Site achievable | Probably not given access difficulties |
|-------------------------------|--|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 34.5 | 0.39 | 0 | 13 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There is significant tree coverage across the site, which has no public highway access. Although not designated as a wildlife site or with a TPO, an ecological and arboricultural assessment would be required in order to establish its full biodiversity and amenity value. Current vehicular access to the site limited to use of Aldenham 71 footpath with either landowner permission or private access rights.

A number of other sites in the vicinity have been promoted all of which are accessed via the rights of way network. Most of the sites are in different ownerships and the scope for land assembly in this location is limited.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. However, notwithstanding the likely ecological/arboricultural value of the site, in light of the access constraints, these sites are not considered to be suitable and therefore developable for the quantum of housing which might otherwise be considered under paragraph 2.4 of the HELAA methodology.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, resolution of access and biodiversity constraints would still be required in order to be able to consider the site suitable available and achievable for the unconstrained capacity figure of 13* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL231

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Starveacres | | |
| Address | 16 Watford Road, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | WD7 8LD | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Phillips Planning Services on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 3.1 | Current use(s) | Single residence |
|----------------------------|-----|-----------------------|------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential and green field land around. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of built up area location. To the north/west is open countryside. The land to east mostly residential | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/01/1067. Single storey side extension. (GRANTED). TP/04/0511. Single storey side extension (to replace existing) and conservatory. (GRANTED). |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 26 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gaps between Watford, North Bushey and Radlett. 3% covered by Built form | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA33 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Only in a very small area at the northern edge which is in the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO280/2010 in the vicinity of the entrance onto Watford Road |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | The main part of the site is suitable, having already been safeguarded for housing in the current Local Plan. The small area in the Green Belt is not suitable under current policy framework due to location in the Green Belt. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 54 | 2.33 | 126 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The majority of the site is safeguarded for housing in the current Local Plan and no longer within the Green Belt. A small part of the area submitted lies outside of the safeguarded area with considerable tree coverage including an area of woodland protected by a TPO (280/2010). Those parts of the site would not be suitable for development but the larger area (2.8ha) has previously been identified as suitable for housing (subject to a review of the plan) through its safeguarding in the SADM Plan (2015) and prior to that in the 2003 Local Plan; there are no changes in the suitability of the site and it is considered developable for 126 homes. The promoter indicated that site will likely to be delivered in 6-10 yrs.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following review of Local Plan, Green Belt and change to policy framework: 126* dwellings within 6 – 10 years.

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL346

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|
| Site Name | Home Farm, Radlett | | |
| Address | Common Lane, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | WD7 8PL | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham East and Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Beaulieu Land Consultancy Ltd on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 45.19 | Current use(s) | Agriculture and open fields |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north, otherwise open farmland |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open farmland at edge of Radlett. Part of wider green belt. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Site adjoins and is close to several other sites in the area. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL367, HEL213, |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The Parcel maintains 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 particularly unspoilt countryside. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA36 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site adjoins listed Barn and Cowhouse At Little Kendals Farm and Farm House and Barns at Batlters Green Farm. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes. Narrow tracks leading to Watling St and Common Lane. Woodland TPO and Local Wildlife site immediately adjoin area where access onto Watling Street would be located |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Adjoins Cobdenhill Dell Local Wildlife site and TPO 18/2008 |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy. Access difficulties also possibly an issue |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|---------|
| Is the Site achievable | Unknown |
|------------------------|---------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 33 | 15.63 | 516 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

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 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. An additional piece of land has been included in the site by the applicants with the aim of providing access to Watling Street adjacent to Footpath 71 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 WPO. This piece of land is understood to be in a separate ownership, potentially restricting the ability to create a new access on the east side of the site.

Although there are no bus routes serving the Common Lane side of the site, the access onto Common Lane is close to Battlers Green Farm 'shopping village and tea rooms' and approximately 0.5m from the local shops on Battlers Green Drive.

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.

The site cannot be developed 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 access into the site could be secured, the site could potentially be developable for 516* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 516* homes, 350* homes in years 6-10 and 166* homes in years 11-15

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL358

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Land south of Shenley Road | | |
| Address | Shenley Road, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Boyer Planning on behalf of Fairfax Acquisitions/Wood Hall Estate | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 8.67 | Current use(s) | Farmland |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the west, woodland to the east and south, school to the south west. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | 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. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/02/0773 New gallop (GRANTED); TP/08/1167 open air manege (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is at the edge of Borehamwood and forms the wider gap between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. The far northern area of the parcel is particularly important for preventing ribbon development along Radlett Lane which may lead to both perceptual and physical reductions in the scale of these gaps. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA75 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site lies within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site is a designated RIG (puddingstone). |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Adjoins Theobald Street Wood local wildlife site to the south.Site is a designated RIG |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy This may change if its Green Belt status changes but RIG status and access would also need to be resolved. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 6.48 | 254 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

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. The very far south west of the site lies within the edge of the Local Wildlife Site (Theobald Street Wood).

An initial 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. This has been validated by the Hertfordshire RIGS Group who have indicated that the RIGS site should be delisted and limited access allowed to the Radlett Plantation site in order to conserve what was deemed to be a more critical geological site.

The site is relatively close to the centre of Radlett despite being located beyond the south west edge of the built up area and the centre of HEL358 is approximately 0.75m on foot from Radlett station as well as being close to the 602 (Watford-Hatfield) which runs along Shenley Road. There is scope to create a pedestrian access through Williams Way into Radlett. Although vehicular access would potentially be via Shenley Road and the site promoter has indicated this is presently achievable, a narrow strip of land between the site and Shenley Road is not currently within the ownership of the site promoter. This would need to be properly addressed to secure access into the site.

However, the area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site forms part of a wider parcel which makes up the wider gap between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley where the scale of the gap is such that there is little overall risk of settlements coalescing, but where overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. The gap between Radlett and Borehamwood is at its narrowest in this area, amounting to approximately 1 mile. The far northern area of the overall parcel is particularly important for preventing ribbon development along Radlett Lane which may lead to both perceptual and physical reductions in the scale of these gaps.

However, the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment identified the north west of the Parcel (i.e. HEL358) as potentially scoring less strongly and was recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Were access/land ownership onto Shenley Road to be satisfactorily addressed and the wider policy framework to change in relation to the Green Belt, with the impact needing to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering a significant quantum of growth in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 254* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 254* homes, 75* homes within 5 years and 179* homes within 6-10 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL365

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Site Name | land adj Bridgefoot Cottages | | |
| Address | Watling Street, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | DLA Town Planning on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.12 | Current use(s) | open land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Commercial to south, residential to north, A5183 to west, garden /open land to east | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Mixed uses to east of main road - this and railway are urbanising influences. Open countryside to west. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/04/0289 terrace of 3 dwellings (REFUSED); TP/84/5740 8 terraced houses with garages (REFUSED); |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Residential/mixed use/employment |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 43 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Radlett and Colney Street. Development would significantly visually and physically reduce the perceived and actual distance between these settlements.. Existing piecemeal development along the A5183 has already reduced the sense of separation between the 2 settlements. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Commercial premises to the south could be a source of noise disturbance to any residential development |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but could be if its Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 40.5 | 0.12 | 0 | 5 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no particular environmental or topographical constraints. This is a small site adjoining the main A5187 Watling Street in an area which is outside any settlement but just south of commercial development at Colney Street and set between an isolated terrace of houses and a small commercial development.

The site is not particularly accessible; one bus route, the 601 (Welwyn Garden City-Borehamwood), runs past the site on Watling Street. The site is approximately 1.3 miles from Radlett rail station.

It is unlikely that the Council's policies, including the key principles set out in Policy SP1 (Creating sustainable development) would change to the extent that development would be permitted on small non-PDL land sites unable to deliver wider sustainability benefits which could outweigh Green Belt harm. This would be likely to be contrary to paragraph 138 of the NPPF. As such, the site is not considered suitable for development. (This includes development of the unconstrained capacity figure identified above).

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL367

Site source I&O 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Site Name | Land west of Watling Street | | |
| Address | Radlett | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Catesby Estates | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 11.16 | Current use(s) | Arable farmland |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | The site is virtually surrounded by fields and areas of woodland, albeit that it is close to the southern (residential) boundary of Radlett | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where Radlett meets open countryside. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | The site adjoins others submitted | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL346 to the south and HEL225 to the north | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/0340/FUL Provision of new sports facilities (application withdrawn) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gap between Radlett and Bushey although the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing. The parcel prevents ribbon development along Watling Street. Very open agricultural feeling with long views and little development. Strong connection to historic core, contributing to immediate historic setting | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA42 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt. Part of the site is covered by Local Wildlife Site Cobdenhill Dell |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes. Access to Watling Street would be through Local Wildlife Site and TPO. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | 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. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy or with access constraints |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|----------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | unknown | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | unknown | | |
| Is the Site available | Probably | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|---------|
| Is the Site achievable | unknown |
|------------------------|---------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 33 | 6.92 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | n/a | 228 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

No significant environmental or topographical constraints affect the majority of the site but an area of woodland adjacent to Watling Street, Cobden Hill Dell, is a designated Local Wildlife Site and covered by a Woodland WPO, supporting a variety of ancient specimens and other trees. Footpaths 47 and 71 run through the site. Part of the site fronts onto Cobden Hill but vehicular access to the site is currently limited to use with either landowner permission or private access rights. Access of the required standard to serve a residential development here would only be possible through the Local Wildlife/Tree Preservation order part of the site. Supporting technical information subsequently submitted relates to a previous, withdrawn application for sports facilities at the site rather than residential development.

The site was identified as part of a wider, strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, which makes up a wider gap between Radlett and Bushey. Although the gap is of such a size that there is little risk of settlement coalescing, the parcel does prevent ribbon development along Watling Street. The parcel was also identified as supporting the historic setting of Radlett. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Given the limited current vehicular access from both Cobden Hill and Loom Lane, and the protected Cobden Hill Dell restricting the ability to create a new vehicular access from Watling Street, the site is not considered to be suitable or achievable on its own given that access across other land would be required.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, resolution of access and biodiversity constraints would still be required in order to be able to consider the site suitable available and achievable for development. This includes the unconstrained capacity figure of 228* dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Site reference | HEL 379 incorporating H172a |
|-----------------------|--|

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Site source | CFS 2017 and Issues & Options |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Crown Estate land at Kemprow Farm | | |
| Address | Land at Kemprow Farm, north of Watford Road, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | (WD25 8NR) | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Savills on behalf of the Crown Estate | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 35.86 | Current use(s) | Agriculture |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to south and east, green field around. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Residential to south east, open fields to north-east, small settlements to north-west and west. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Possible school and employment area |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 26 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gaps between Watford, North Bushey and Radlett. 3% is covered by Built form | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA38, PART NOT ASSESSED | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Not at the location itself but there are listed buildings at Kemprow Farm and Blackbirds Farm whose setting should be considered. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | There are pylons across the centre of site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Tree Preservation Area (TPO/22/2008), 2x Local Wildlife Sites (Dellfield Wood and Copse by Watford Road). Public footpath to eastern boundary. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Potentially but not under current policy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | Yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden suburbs |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 14.58 | 503 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting the entirety of the site. HEL172a comprises the southern portion of the site, owned by the Crown Estate, fronting onto Watford Road; HEL379 comprises the entire area owned by the Crown Estate bound by Oakridge Lane to the north west.

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. Pylons/overhead power lines run north-south through the centre of the site.

The site can be accessed directly from Watford Road which would be the principal points of ingress/egress. 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.

The southern portion of the site, in particular, is in an accessible location, opposite Fairfield Primary School, on two existing bus routes 398 (Watford – Potters Bar) and 602 (Hatfield to Watford), within one mile of the station and Radlett district centre. A public right of way also connects the eastern edge of site with Watford Road via Dellfield Close. Mini-roundabouts at junctions are proposed between Watford Road and Willow Way and Watford Road and New Road. However, a detailed assessment of the impact on local highway network would be required were the site to be considered further.

Although available and achievable, the area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site could be developable for 503* homes. However, presently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently suitable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 503* homes - 350* homes within 6 to 10 years and 153* homes in 11-15 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL402

Site source

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|
| Site Name | Aldenham depot | | |
| Address | Oakridge Lane, Aldenham | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Aldenham |
| Promoter | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 7.75 | Current use(s) | Vehicle storage |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Sewage works to south and west, open land to north west, agriculture to north and east | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The area is rural in character although the sewage works and a number of individual commercial sites are urbanising influences. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/05/0049 Certificate of Lawful Development (existing) for the use of part of Area A for the parking, processing and storage of vehicles (DETERMINED); TP/07/2132 Certificate of Lawful Development (existing) Use for deliveries, daytime parking, waiting and turning of lorries and other vehicles and the storage of vehicles (GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 26 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gaps between Watford, North Bushey and Radlett, as well as the essential gap between Radlett and Colney Street, and part of the wider gaps between Radlett and Bricket Wood, How Wood and Park Street. There are long vistas across open land. It maintains a strong level of openness throughout and largely comprises of large arable and pastoral fields, interspersed with woodland and densely planted hedges. Overall the parcel maintains an unspoilt rural character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No. However the site has been used for parking and storage of vehicles so contamination is a possibility |
| Any access difficulties. | Access is from an unmade track off Oakridge Lane which is itself narrow |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Only the PDL part of the site would be suitable under current Green Belt policy. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|---|
| 0.08 ha of land for employment purposes |
|---|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|--|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | part may be eligible |
| Reason | PDL part of site may meet criteria for inclusion on register |

Conclusion:

| |
|--|
| <p>The site is located within the current Green Belt to the north of Blackbirds Farm Sewage Treatment works. A relatively small part of the site is PDL but it is for the most part vacant. Apart from its Green Belt designation there are no specific environmental constraints to development although access is currently only available via an unmade track which itself comes off the narrow Oakridge Lane.</p> <p>This is a relatively inaccessible area, being over a mile to Radlett Road which is the nearest bus route. Routes 602 (Hatfield – Watford) and 398 (Watford – Potters Bar) run on Radlett Road.</p> <p>The site is proposed for commercial use. The site is physically detached from existing settlements and unlikely to be considered an appropriate location for additional development either under current policy or following any review of the Green Belt. Under the current policy framework, due to its Green Belt status, the site is not considered suitable other than for appropriate development within the parameters set out in the NPPF which under paragraph 145 allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'. The site is not considered suitable for development other than in respect of the PDL part.</p> <p>Capacity under current policy framework: 0.08 ha of land for employment purposes</p> <p>Additional capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: n/a</p> |
|--|

| |
|--|
| HELAA 2018 SITE ASSESSMENT FORM |
|--|

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL403 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Site source | |
|--------------------|--|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|
| Site Name | Newberries car park | | |
| Address | Watling Street, Radlett | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Owner | Asset Management, Hertsmere Borough Council | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.97 | Current use(s) | Car park |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Railway to east, Theobald Street to south, residential and town centre commercial to west, garages and station to north | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The area is at the edge of Radlett district centre, between the rear of shops and other commercial premises on Watling Street and the railway line to the east. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | no | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Retention of surface parking with development above. Type of development sought yet to be determined by the Council. |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 1 Comment | N/A | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Stage 2 Comment | N/A | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | No |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Part of the site is within FZ3 and part within FZ2. Development will adopt a sequential approach |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | No. Radlett North and Radlett South Conservation Areas are both on the opposite site of Watling Street in this part of the district centre. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | There is an underground water storage facility |
| Any access difficulties. | Access is from Watling Street but is down a steep ramp currently giving access to the car park. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The railway line runs the length of the eastern boundary of the site. Noise and vibration mitigation may be required. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Yes, depending on the use proposed and subject to complying with flood risk Sequential and Exception tests |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Central | medium | very high | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------|
| 126 | 0.82 | 104* |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|--|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | yes |
| Reason | Brownfield land which meets criteria for inclusion on register |

Conclusion:

The site is located within Radlett District centre where the neighbouring uses are commercial and residential. The site is accessed via a steeply sloping ramp down from Watling Street. This is a relatively accessible location, being approximately 0.09 miles from Watling Street in the centre of Radlett and on bus routes 398 (Watford – Potters Bar) and 601 (Welwyn Garden City – Borehamwood). The site is close to but does not adjoin the Radlett Conservation Areas. Part of the site is within Flood Zone 3, and a smaller part within the functional flood plain FZ3b. This will constrain both the proposed uses and layout, which will need to pass the sequential and potentially exception tests in order to be acceptable. The relationship to adjoining uses and the need to retain public parking provision will also need to be taken into account in considering the quantum and design of any development proposed.

Whilst a decision on the likely future use of the site (in addition to retention of parking) has not yet been made, the site is within the urban area, in an accessible location and if brought forward for residential use could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for approximately 104 dwellings.

Capacity under current policy framework: 104* homes timescale unknown

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL343

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Site Name | Land south of Letchmore Heath | | |
| Address | Aldenham Road, Letchmore Heath | | |
| Postcode | WD25 8EW | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Letchmore Heath |
| Promoter | Owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 31.69 | Current use(s) | Agriculture. |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Although the villages of Patchetts Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the Green Belt. There is a local wildlife site on the western boundary |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Bhaktivedanta Manor to the north of site is listed. The site adjoins Letchmore Heath Conservation Area. There are listed buildings at Aldenham School across Aldenham Road to the east of the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no (except local roads are rural/narrow) |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Electricity sub station adjoins the site. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Land by Elstree Sub Station - local Wildlife Site is located on the western boundary of the site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if site's Green Belt status changes and deemed acceptable in terms of settlement hierarchy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site available | yes |
|------------------------------|-----|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 31.5 | 15.8 | 498 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

A small part of the site is within Local Wildlife Site (Land by Elstree Sub Station), a moderately diverse area of neutral grassland supporting a number of species. The site adjoins Letchmore Heath Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Bhaktivedanta Manor. Access to the site is from Aldenham Road, presently via a short u-shaped track. There are a number of drains running across the site as well as public footpaths running along the northern boundary (footpath 29) and south west across the site (footpaths 30 and 14).

The site forms part of a moderately performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment with a largely open character. Notwithstanding this designation, the development of any significant quantum of development is also likely to be dependent on the capacity of Aldenham Road to accommodate additional traffic movements, the impact on the adjoining Conservation Area and the sustainability of directing growth to Letchmore Heath, which is one of the smallest villages in the local settlement hierarchy.

Under the current policy framework the site is not suitable for development. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, subject to detailed technical assessments of the impact on the locality, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 498 homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 498* homes – 75* homes within 5 years, 375* homes within 6 to 10 years and 48* homes in 11-15 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL345

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------|
| Site Name | Aldenham Glebe | | |
| Address | Roundbush Nursery, Aldenham | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Aldenham |
| Promoter | Bidwells on behalf of The Diocesan Board of Finance | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.17 | Current use(s) | Garden centre/nursery |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/06/0219 and TP16/1608. Use for residential purposes (Application for Certificate of Lawful Development - existing use) (REFUSE); TP/08/0005. Retention of mobile home for personal residential use of applicant (GRANTED). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is not at the edge of a distinct built up area. It forms part of the gap between radlett and borehamwood, elstee. Only 3% approx. of the land is built. It preserves the historic setting of the area, defined by the field pattern and soft edge between the settlement and countryside in the north-east of the parcel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes. The site is within Roundbush Conservation Area. There are locally listed buildings on round Bush Lane outside the site, and opposite the site on Radlett Road. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if site's Green Belt status changes and deemed acceptable in terms of settlement hierarchy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Low | Low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 0.98 | 34 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|------|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a. |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within Roundbush Conservation Area, accessed directly off Roundbush Lane. A garden centre/nursery, there are various areas buildings, structures and areas of hardstanding including small car parks. The principle of some development would be acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites...which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt' as 'appropriate development'.

Notwithstanding the above, Roundbush is a small hamlet and development over and above what could be accommodated as 'appropriate' in the Green Belt, would also be contrary to the current policy framework including the principle of directing significant development to the most sustainable locations, as set out in the NPPF.

The site is not considered suitable other than for appropriate development within the parameters set out in the NPPF which based on the current footprint of development, an estimated 700 sq m developable area, would yield 10 units based on an equal mix of 3 and 4 bed houses.

Were additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be developable for 34 homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 10* units in 6-10 years

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 34* homes in 6-10 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL179

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Hilfield Lane | | |
| Address | Hilfield Lane, Aldenham | | |
| Postcode | WD25 8DN | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey North | Town/ Village | Aldenham |
| Promoter | Faybrook Ltd on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.17 | Current use(s) | Open fields |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north, open land on either side (Patchetts Green Equestrian Centre being redeveloped for housing to the north-west) | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open green belt land near Patchetts Green residential area | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the gap between Borehamwood and Bushey Heath/ Village. 7% is covered by built form | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site is within Patchetts Green & Delrow Conservation Area |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Potential impact on future occupiers due to proximity of M1 motorway |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Potentially but not under current policy (Green Belt and Settlement hierarchy) |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 31.5 | 0.99 | 31 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is located within Patchetts Green Conservation Area, close to the Camphill Village Trust and adjacent to the M1, albeit elevated from the motorway. Development of the site would result in a further expansion of Patchetts Green whose bricks and mortar housing is being expanded by approximately 50% following redevelopment of the equestrian centre. Although two bus routes (398 Watford - Potters Bar, 602 Hatfield - Watford) run along Hartspring Lane at the entrance to Patchetts Green, the stops are approximately 900m from the site.

Up to 50 additional dwellings in a location with limited accessibility and services would raise sustainability issues including scale of trip generation. Further growth of Patchetts Green which is one of the smallest villages in the local settlement hierarchy would, in part, be dependent on the extent to which these can be addressed as well as consideration of the settlement layout itself.

Only a rural-exceptions scale and type of housing (approximately 5 units) would be suitable under the current policy framework. The area is not suitable for additional development on this scale under the current planning policy framework. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line

with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 31* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable other than for rural exception development.

Capacity under current policy framework: 5* homes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 31* homes within 5 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL199

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | land at Church Lane | | |
| Address | Church Lane/Radlett Road, Aldenham | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Aldenham |
| Promoter | Barton Willmore LLP on behalf of Mikproud Assets Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.49 | Current use(s) | Vacant scrubland |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Housing adjoins the site to the north. Nursery School to the north-west. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open fields, situated next to residential sites | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a | | |

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 26 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The village of Aldenham encompasses a small cluster of residential properties and other low density structures, however it does not detract from the wider rurality. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes - Aldenham Conservation Area |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy other than for rural exception scale and type of housing. Could be suitable if policy including Green Belt status of site changes. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 33 | 0.49 | 16 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting the entirety of the site. The site is located within Aldenham Conservation Area but due to its small size, its ability to satisfactorily accommodate development is likely to be dependent on visual impact/amenity as much as any wider Green Belt impact considerations. Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development other than for rural exceptions scale and type of housing.

Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 16 homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable other than for rural exception development.

Capacity under current policy framework: 5 homes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 16* homes within 5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM (DRAFT)**

Site reference HEL219
and HEL252

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Site Name | Pegmire Lane, including plots 47 and 48 | | |
| Address | Pegmire Lane/Summershouse Lane, Patchetts Green, Aldenham | | |
| Postcode | WD25 8DR | Parish | Unparished area of Bushey |
| Ward | Bushey North | Town/ Village | Aldenham |
| Promoter | Aldenham Parish Council and various owners | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.26 | Current use(s) | Vacant land |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a small part of the gap between Borehamwood and Bushey Heath/ Village. 7% is covered by built form | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - The site lies within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site lies within Patchetts Green and Delrow Conservation Area |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Close to Local Wildlife site Paddock by Summerhouse Lane. TPO 1089/2003 lies within the site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy unless restricted to Rural Exception development of affordable homes. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes - covenants on each building plot to say that only one dwelling can be built on it | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes probably | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Probably |
|------------------------|----------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|--|
| 33 | 1.07 | 35 (however covenants limit development to 12) |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | No |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 30/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Adjoining/overlapping sites close to the Camphill Village Trust, immediately adjacent to Conservation Areas. Development of the site would result in a further expansion of Patchetts Green whose bricks and mortar housing is being expanded by approximately 50% following redevelopment of the equestrian centre. Two bus routes 398 (Watford - Potters Bar) and 602 (Hatfield - Watford) run along Hartspring Lane at the entrance to Patchetts Green although the stops are approximately 750m from the site.

Additional dwellings in a location with limited accessibility and services would raise sustainability issues including scale of trip generation. Further growth of Patchetts Green which is one of the smallest villages in the local settlement hierarchy would, in part, be dependent on the extent to which these can be addressed as well as consideration of the settlement layout itself.

Only a rural-exceptions scale and type of housing (approximately 5 units) is likely to be suitable under the current policy framework. Further development would require consideration against paragraph 138 of the NPPF including the extent to which there would be coalescence between Patchetts Green and Letchmore Heath.

The site has no significant physical constraints but there are understood to be covenants restricting development to one dwelling per plot and so the capacity of the site, were the policy framework to change, would be no more than 12 based on information provided by Aldenham PC.

Capacity under current policy framework: 5 homes

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 35* homes within 5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM

Site reference **HEL507**

Site source Sites
consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|-----------|---|------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Land rear of Kendall Hall Farm | | |
| Address | Watling Street | | |
| Postcode | WD7 7LH | Parish | Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Radlett |
| Promoter | Fortress Land and Property for Star Property Ltd and landowners | | |

Site size / use:

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

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Rail line to the east, Kendal Wood to the west, school to the south west, agricultural fields to south, scrub and cricket pitch to north | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is a rural setting close to the southern edge of Radlett. The area largely comprises of fields in agricultural use. A school and the Tabard sports ground are located close by but the area is otherwise largely undeveloped. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/A | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|--|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|--|------|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Care village, special needs housing for young adults, market housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nursery school |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 13 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel is connected to the large built-up area of Borehamwood, preventing outward sprawl into open land. It forms the wider gap between Borehamwood and Radlett maintaining the overall openness of the gap and ensuring its overall physical scale is maintained. The parcel prevents ribbon development along the A5100 (Watling Street) between Borehamwood and Radlett, thus ensuring that this gap is not reduced perceptually. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes. SE corner of the site is in FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Radlett Prep School to the south west is Grade II listed. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Applicant states access would be available via private road off Watling Street. Details have not been provided. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Rail line runs along the eastern boundary of the site. Mast in north east corner of site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Adjoins Kendal Wood Local Wildlife Site to the west. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy. Ability to provide suitable access would need to be demonstrated. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Probably |
|-------------------------------|----------|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 31.5 | 4.22 | 133 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | N/A |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Date | |
|-------------|--|

Conclusion:

Notwithstanding its Green Belt designation, the site itself is not subject to any substantial environmental constraints. However the proximity of the rail line immediately to the east, the telecommunications mast in the north east corner, and flood zone at the southern edge would limit the developable area and require mitigation.

The site is just under a mile from the centre of Radlett and approximately 1.3 miles from Radlett station. The site is not particularly accessible and is physically removed from Watling Street which is the nearest public highway and the point at which the private access indicated by the applicant would link into the local highway network. Details of this access have not however been provided. Footpath 18 runs along the south and west edges of the site. No buses serve this section of Watling Street.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development, forming part of a Green Belt parcel identified in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment as strongly performing, maintaining the gap between Borehamwood and Radlett. The possibility of providing adequate access to the site has not yet been demonstrated. For the purposes of the HELAA, the site could yield around 133 new homes were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location and access issues were to be satisfactorily resolved. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 133* homes timescale unknown

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL509

Site source Sites
consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Site Name | Little Simpsons | | |
| Address | Common Lane, Letchmore Heath | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Aldenham |
| Ward | Aldenham West | Town/ Village | Letchmore Heath |
| Promoter | Apcar Smith Planning for Cobstar Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.40 | Current use(s) | Previous orchard, now unused |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Choose an item. | | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 19 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The wider 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. It is recommended that the parcel is not considered further. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site is within the Letchmore Heath Conservation Area and adjoins Grade II listed buildings at Four Trees, Common Lane to the west. There are other locally listed buildings close by but not immediately adjoining the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Access would be onto Common Lane |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but could be if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Not known |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----------|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural/suburban | Very low | Low | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 33 | 0.40 | 13 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | N/A |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site lies within the Letchmore Heath Conservation Area, at the edge of the small rural settlement of Letchmore Heath. There are no significant constraints to developing the site itself although it is only accessed via narrow rural lanes.

The site is not in a particularly accessible area. It is not served by public transport and is 1.6 miles from Radlett station. It is 1.4 miles from Radlett centre and the services offered there.

Under the current policy framework the site is not suitable for development. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, subject to detailed technical assessments of the impact on the locality and access, the site could potentially be developable for 13* dwellings. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0*

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 13* dwellings within 5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

APPENDIX 14: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - SHENLEY

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Site reference | HEL174a-c, HEL350a-e, HEL389a-b HEL350x and HEL350y |
|-----------------------|--|

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Site source | CFS I&O 2017 |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Site Name | Harperbury Hospital | | |
| Address | Harper Lane, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9HH | Parish | Shenley CP, Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Shenley, Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | PPML Consulting and Bloor Homes on behalf of Dept of Health and Bloor Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 39.52 (31.71 North and 7.81 South) | Current use(s) | Sporting facilities, agricultural and amenity land, open fields |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mixed use – could include residential, health, sports facilities, possible school, although this would presumably be more likely were a larger area to be developed |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside | | | | | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 38 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Shenley and Radlett. 6% of it is built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA31. HEL389A , HEL174B, HEL350B and part of HEL174A/H EL350A/not yet assessed | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. Nine Acres Local Wildlife Site and TPO 47/2007 are located on the western side of HEL174B/ HEL350B. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Archaeological area covers part of HEL350D. Archaeological site (Ancient Monument) at western end of HEL350E. Listed White House adjoins southern edge of whole site, east of HEL174B/HEL350B and west of HEL350E |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Small part of HEL174A/HEL350A has been restored following previous mineral workings |
| Any access difficulties. | No - access would be through larger development incorporating land in SADC |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/33/2006 lies on the west side of HEL174A/ HEL350A/ HEL389A. Nine Acres Local Wildlife Site and TPO 47/2007 are located on the western side of HEL174B/HEL350B. Local Wildlife Sites Porters Park golf course and Porters Park Wood lie immediately to the s |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes and subject to technical assessments |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Part of HEL174A/HEL350A/HEL389A is leased to St Albans Rangers Football Club but they will be relocated | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Garden village |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 30 | 21.71 (15.86 North and 5.86 South) | 652 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|-------------|-------------------|

Conclusion:

This is a large area of land to the east, south and south west of Harperbury Hospital which itself has planning permission for 206 homes, granted by St Albans Council. The original submission was made by Department of Health (HEL174) covering three parcels (A, B and C) but Bloor Homes who own the land subsequently submitted a more detailed indicative layout (HEL350) covering A, B, C, D and E (D and E being owned by HCC and promoted under HEL350).

An archaeological site covers part of Site D and adjoins Site A. The Grade II listed White House and an archaeological site adjoin Sites B and E to the south. TPO 33/2006 is on the west side of Site A. Local Wildlife Site (Nine Acres Wood) and TPO 47/2007 are along the western edge of Site B. Two other Local Wildlife Sites Porters Park Golf Course and Porters Park Wood adjoin to the south west. TPO 15/2007 is adjacent to Site C.

Amended layout submitted under HEL389 proposes 23.6ha of development both within Site A and within an area to the west, in St Albans district which already has planning permission. Northern part of site would be accessed via a clearing which would be required between existing housing, within St Albans, as well as connecting to the approved development which is accessed further along Harper Lane. The site could also potentially be accessed directly off Harper Lane using an access which runs between existing homes on Harper Lane/Hadleigh Close (within St Albans) although the access road would need to be widened. The southern part of Site A would be accessed through the approved development.

St Albans Rangers FC sports pitches are within the proposed development area and so subject to Policy CS19 (Key Community Facilities) as part of any development; the promoter has indicated the pitches would be relocated within the site's overall green infrastructure provision which would potentially address this.

The northern part of Site A (HEL389A) would be within the tree line and overall boundary of the hospital and adjoining landscaped/recreational areas. The southern part of Site A (HEL389B) would extend beyond this towards Shenley within 350m of Shenleybury and 500m of the Porters Park estate.

The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to preventing coalescence between settlements. The land is located between Shenley and London Colney, as well as within close proximity of Radlett. The Stage 1 assessment considered further sub-division of the Green Belt parcel was possible at Harperbury Hospital as the boundaries in this locality are not considered durable. However, the development of the southern part of Site A (HEL389B) would lead to encroachment beyond the existing tree line and towards Shenleybury/Porters Park, further narrowing the gap between Harperbury and Shenley and the overall gap between London Colney and Shenley. The northern part of Site A (HEL389A), comprising approximately 5ha in Hertsmere, together with an adjacent area to the west of the tree belt, in St Albans, is more self-contained and may have a reduced impact on the purpose of the Green Belt. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

The promoter has submitted its own Green Belt assessment which concluded that sub-area 31, within which the land promotion is located, scored weakly and weakly/relatively weakly against Purposes 2 and 3 respectively compared to the moderate performance against these purposes in the Council-commissioned study. The technical work submitted has been carefully reviewed but the findings of the study commissioned by the Council are considered to be valid.

No bus routes currently serve Harper Lane and other than Radlett Lodge, a specialist school, there are no community facilities, shops or other local services within walking distance of the site. Additional development at the site, coupled with the implementation of the extant permission for 206 homes, has the potential to increase the sustainability of the site were it to deliver public transport and other infrastructure improvements. However, this would ultimately depend on the quantum of additional development at the site.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the northern part of Site A is considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable for an estimated 110* homes.

The site has been significantly amended since the last HELAA, with the total site area increasing from 11.14ha to 39.52ha, and the area proposed for development increasing from 7.24ha to 21.71ha, as of the 1st April 2019.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 652* homes across HEL350x & HEL350y, 125* homes in years 1-5, 501* homes in years 6-10 and 26* homes in years 11 - 15. Were HEL390y to be considered in isolation, its capacity would be 476* homes

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL196

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | land adj Wilton End cottage | | |
| Address | Radlett Lane, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9AJ | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.48 | Current use(s) | Grazing |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north, residential and woodland to the east, agricultural to south and west. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Rural edge of village location. Primarily open countryside to south and west, located within the quadrant formed by Porters Park to the north and Shenley to the east. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Adjoining land to the west is Green Belt and has not been put forward for development. Further west land to the south of Radlett Lane has been promoted but this does not immediately adjoin |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The Parcel forms the wider gaps between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley - scale of the gap means there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. Northern area is particularly important for preventing ribbon development along Radlett Lane -could lead to perceptual and physical reductions in the scale of the gaps. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA28 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the eastern/southern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The eastern/southern part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Shenley Conservation Area immediately adjoins the site to the east. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/30/2009 to east of site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 1.26 | 49 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 08/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site adjoins the Shenley Village Conservation Area and land covered by TPO 30/2009 (Woodland TPO). There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting the site which is located close to a number of local services, including the primary school, health practitioners, Andrew Close shops and community hall. A number of bus routes run nearby - 602 (Hatfield – Watford, connecting to Radlett Station), 658 (St Albans – Borehamwood) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only). Access into the site would be taken directly off Radlett Lane.

The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, the area immediately west of London Road was identified as being more visually connected to the settlement edge and with a more limited relationship with the wider countryside and was recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended part of the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

The draft Shenley Neighbourhood Plan (June 2019, Regulation 16) supports in principle the future expansion of the village onto land between London Road, the Spinney and Radlett Lane should the new local plan signal the need for village growth. The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status.

However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary/creating a village inset in this location in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site can be considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable for an estimated 49* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 49* homes within 5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL236a
and
HEL236b

Site source CFS 2017
and I&O
2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | Rectory Farm | | |
| Address | East of Black Lion Hill, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Savills on behalf of Comer Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 20.48 | Current use(s) | Agriculture |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Church, churchyard and Clore Shalom school to north, residential to west (across Shenleybury which abuts the site), woodland to south and fields and woodland to east. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of village location where open fields and woodland meet residential development at Porters Park |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | The owner has indicated that the site could be expanded eastwards into agricultural land under same ownership. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/05/0845 All weather and grass gallops (REFUSED); TP/85/0368 relocation of agricultural dwelling (GRANTED); TP/90/0303 Outline application to provide health resort and golf course (REFUSED) TP/92/0201 Use of land for health resort and golf club (REFUSED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents the outward sprawl of Borehamwood. It forms the gap between Borehamwood and London Colney . It prevents ribbon development along London Road, ensuring that the gap is not reduced perceptually. The majority of the parcel is open fields with long views and maintains an unspoilt rural character. Less than 5% of the parcel is built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA32 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | St Botolph's church (grade II*) and archaeological area lie to the north of the site |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/29/2009. Adjoins Combe Wood Ancient woodland and Local Wildlife Site, Adjoins Dell Grove Local Wildlife Site and TPO/230/1990. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but may be should the site's Green Belt status change |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 10.6 | 366 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 08/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting the majority of the site although there is an area of woodland in the north east part of the site, protected by TPO/230/1990. The site also adjoins Combe Wood ancient woodland, a Local Wildlife Site, which acts as a hard buffer to the southern edge of the site.

The site fronts onto Black Lion Hill although a new primary vehicular access would need to be created. The site has been promoted in two parts, one of which (HEL236B) can only be accessed if the other (HEL236A) were to be developed. The site is close to a number of bus routes, with the 602 (Hatfield – Watford, connecting to Radlett Station), 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only) within walking distance. Local services including shops, health practitioners and two schools are within walking distance, with Andrew Close shops approximately 600m from the centre of the site.

The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing, large Green Belt parcel which prevents sprawl and maintains the gaps between Borehamwood, Radlett, London Colney, Potters Bar and Greater London. The majority of the parcel comprises open fields with long views and maintains an unspoilt rural character. HEL236 prevents ribbon development along London Road, ensuring that the gap is not reduced perceptually. Although the Stage 1 assessment identified the sub-area around Shenley (to the south of HEL236A and HEL236B), as being more densely developed and playing a more limited role in preventing encroachment into the countryside, this applied to the old village, south of Porters Park. Expansion of Shenley to the east of Black Lion Hill however would lead to significant 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.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, HEL236 is considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable for an estimated 75* in the first 5 years and 291* homes developable beyond this.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 366* homes – 75* homes within 5 years, 291* homes within 6-10 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL348

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | Shenley Grange (north) | | |
| Address | 43a London Road, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9ER | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley Ward | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Owner of adjoining site | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.31 | Current use(s) | Applicant states residential. Much of site however is fields |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential properties in Shenley to the east, open fields to the north and west, Shenley Grange residential and adjoining fields to the south | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open countryside adjoining Shenley village | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Applicant states adjoining land to south is available | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL349 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | <p>TP/08/1541. Two storey side/rear extension together with alterations to roof including front and rear dormers and alterations to elevations. TP/09/0933. Erection of garden room to rear and extension to single storey detached building following demolition of conservatory and four outbuildings. (GRANTED) TP/10/0833. Permitted development extensions to existing dwelling house (Lawful Development Certificate - Proposed). TP/10/0937. Erection of single storey front extension and single storey side and rear extensions to include accommodation in roof space and new chimney (Amended Plans received 19/7/2010). TP/98/0963. Two storey side/rear extension together with alterations to roof including front and rear dormers and alterations to elevations (renewal of planning permission ref: TP/93/0926)</p> |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gaps between the non-Green Belt settlements of Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley, where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. The southern and northeastern parts of the parcel are less important for preventing coalescence. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA28 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the eastern/southern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The eastern/southern part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site adjoins Shenley Conservation Area and an archaeological area. It adjoins locally listed 49 Shenley Road and is opposite a Grade II listed church |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no although access would be needed onto London Road through through existing shared access |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if the site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | no but understood to be available | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | two separate ownerships | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural/suburban | V.Low | Low | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 3.23 | 121 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Located close to the centre of the old village, the site is outside of but adjacent to the Shenley Village Conservation Area, village envelope, archaeological site boundary and locally listed building at 49 London Road.

Approximately 3ha of the site is within the Shenley Village Envelope. Over 30% of the site comprises a very large rear garden and open space, some of which could be regarded as residential curtilage; beyond this the site comprises open fields which gently slope towards Woodhall Spinney, a bridleway connecting the site to Radlett Lane. The Spinney itself is a Local Wildlife Site. The land is former parkland belonging to the original Shenley Grange estate which is the reason behind the clear difference in the character and appearance of the more sparsely developed west side of London Road from the east side opposite.

The site is in separate ownership to HEL349 although the owner of HEL349 has promoted them jointly. The site is within walking distance of a number of local services, including the primary school, health practitioners, shop and community hall. A number of bus routes can be accessed close to the site, namely 602 (Hatfield – Watford), 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only). Vehicular access into the front of the site is currently via a private road off London Road which serves a number of properties. There is presently no other means of vehicular access into the site.

The site is understood to be available but this has not yet been confirmed by the owner.

The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and protecting its openness.

However, the area to immediately west of London Road was identified as being more visually connected to the settlement edge and with a more limited relationship with the wider countryside and was recommended for further consideration.

The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended part of the sub-area within which the site is located could

be considered further.

The draft Shenley Neighbourhood Plan (June 2019, Regulation 16) supports in principle the future expansion of the village onto land between London Road, the Spinney and Radlett Lane should the new local plan signal the need for village growth.

However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary/creating a village inset in this location in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site can be considered to be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of 121* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 121* homes – 50* homes within 1-5 years, 71* homes within 6-10 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL349

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | Shenley Grange (south) | | |
| Address | 43 London Road, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9ER | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley Ward | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 7.79 | Current use(s) | Applicant states residential. Much of site however is fields |
| Current use(s) | Applicant states residential. Much of site however is fields | | |

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential properties in Shenley to east, rest surrounded by agricultural land | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Open countryside adjoining Shenley village | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Applicant states adjoining land to NW could also be available | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL348 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/0896/CLE. Continued use of properties as residential dwellings (Certificate of Lawful Development – Existing; 15/2118/CLE. Continued use of properties as residential dwellings (Certificate of Lawful Development - Existing). 16/1671/FUL. Erection of 1 No. 5 bed detached dwelling; 1 No. 5 bed detached dwelling with integral garages; 1 No. detached 1.5 storey triple garage building and associated landscaping (GRANTED sub/link to S106). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gaps between the non-Green Belt settlements of Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley, where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. The southern and northeastern parts of the parcel are less important for preventing coalescence. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA28 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the eastern/southern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The eastern/southern part is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site adjoins Shenley Conservation Area and an archaeological area. It adjoins locally listed 41 Shenley Road. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no although access would be needed onto London Road through existing access to 43 London Road |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Woodhall Sprinney Local Wildlife site to southern boundary |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if site's Green Belt status changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Rural/suburban | Low | Low | Urban brownfield mixed |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 45 | 5.84 | 263 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 18/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Located close to the centre of the old village, the north east part of site, fronting London Road, lies within the Shenley Village Conservation Area and includes an archaeological site. The site is also opposite a Grade II listed church and adjacent to locally listed building at 49 London Road.

Approximately 3ha of the land is within the Shenley Village Envelope with over 30% of the site comprising a very large rear garden and open space, some of which could be regarded as residential curtilage; beyond this the site comprises open fields which gently slope towards Woodhall Spinney, a bridleway connecting the site to Radlett Lane. The Spinney itself is a Local Wildlife Site. The land is former parkland belonging to the original Shenley Grange estate which is the reason behind the clear difference in the character and appearance of the more sparsely developed west side of London Road from the east side opposite.

The site is located within walking distance of a number of local services, including the primary school, health practitioners, shops and community hall. The following bus routes run through Shenley - 602 (Hatfield – Watford, connecting to Radlett Station), 658 (St Albans - Borehamwood) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only). Vehicular access into the site is presently limited to the entrance to 43 London Road.

The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, the area to immediately west of London Road was identified as being more visually connected to the settlement edge and with a more limited relationship with the wider countryside and was recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

The principle of limited additional infill development has been accepted through 16/1671/FUL. The draft Shenley Neighbourhood Plan (June 2019, Regulation 16) supports in principle the future expansion of the village onto land between London Road, the Spinney and Radlett Lane should the new local plan signal the need for village growth.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary/creating a village inset in this location in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site can be considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable for an estimated 75* homes within 5 years. A further 188* homes could be developable within 10 years.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 263* homes – 75* homes within 5 years, 188* homes 6-10 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL354

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | Land north of Fox Hollows | | |
| Address | Rectory Lane, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9AW | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | David Watson architects for owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 3.22 | Current use(s) | Vacant field and agricultural sheds. Residential at front of site. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Fields/open countryside. Residential to SE of site | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Rural, open farmland. Sporadic farm house/ residential development along Rectory Lane | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No but it is immediately north of the Rabley Garden Village site submission | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL221 Rabley village | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/05/0347 Detached garage (REFUSED); TP/05/1481 Detached garage (REFUSED); TP/12/0042 Confirmation of use class as residential by persons not involved in agriculture (GRANTED); TP/96/0037 Retention of use of land and buildings for the sale and distribution of hay and straw (REFUSED); TP/94/0006 Demolition of barn and erection of two storey extension to house (REFUSED); TP/91/0422 Retention of two free range poultry houses and an egg grading and packing building (GRANTED); TP/90/1142 Change of use of barn from agricultural to residential use to form extension to existing house (ALLOWED ON APPEAL); TP/87/0534 Change of use of part of barn to residential use and alterations (GRANTED). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt² washed over by the Green Belt³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Parcel forms the wider gap between Borehamwood and London Colney and part of wider gap between Borehamwood, London Colney, Potters Bar and London. It maintains the overall openness of the gap and protects its physical scale. The majority of the parcel consists of open fields with long views and an unspoilt rural character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Garden village E | 0 | Not scored – see Green Belt report | | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area forms part of the wider gap between London Colney and Shenley and plays an important role in maintaining the separation of these settlements. It has strong visual links with the surrounding countryside. Release of the area would be likely to have an adverse impact on the wider strategic Green Belt | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | no |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | There is a former chalk pit on the site |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO.77/1984 lies within the site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Unlikely to be suitable, due to isolated location and absence of PDL |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Garden village |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| 31.5 | 2.42 | n/a | 76 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 08/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Part of the site is located on a former chalk pit, although the area proposed for development is indicated as being apart from this part of the site. Additional ground surveys would be required given the relative proximity of the site to the former chalk pit (within 50m). The small area of woodland within the eastern part of the site is subject to TPO 77/1984. The site would be accessed via an existing entrance into the site off Rectory Lane. Right of Way, Footpath 21, runs along the western boundary of the site.

There are no services or bus routes serving this relatively isolated location and Rectory Lane is a narrow lane, with the site approximately a mile from the centre of Shenley Village.

The existing buildings are not part of HEL354; as such no redevelopment could take place which could be defined as acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF i.e. 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites'.

The site is not suitable under the current planning policy framework and is unlikely to constitute a suitable location for additional growth, given the isolated location. It is unlikely that the Council's policies, including the key principles set out in Policy SP1 (Creating sustainable development) would change to the extent that development would be permitted on small non-PDL land sites unable to deliver wider sustainability benefits which could outweigh Green Belt harm. This would be likely to be contrary to paragraph 138 of the NPPF. As such, the site is not considered suitable. (It is not considered suitable for the unconstrained capacity figure indicated above).

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL360

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|------------|
| Site Name | Land south of Radlett Lane | | |
| Address | Radlett Lane, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9 | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Boyer Planning on behalf of Wood Hall Estate/Fairfax Acquisitions | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 10.31 | Current use(s) | agricultural |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Agricultural to east, south and west. To the north (across Radlett Lane) is Shenley Park. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of Shenley village and adjoining Shenley Park and Porters Park residential estate. Area to the south of Radlett Lane is however primarily open undulating farmland. The site lies in the gap between Shenley and Radlett. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. Land to south is open Green Belt farmland. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/10/1654 access road to the Woodhall Estate (GRANTED following several refusals); TP/08/1167 Open air manege (GRANTED); TP/07/0895 Erection of a 4 bedroomed replacement dwellinghouse (REFUSED); TP/02/0773 New gallop (GRANTED); |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Parcel forms the wider gaps between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley - scale of the gap means there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. Northern area is particularly important for preventing ribbon development along Radlett Lane -could lead to perceptual and physical reductions in the scale of the gaps. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA29 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No but some flooding is referred to in the submitted documents |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site is immediately opposite Shenley Conservation Area and listed and locally listed buildings in Shenley Park. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Possible small areas of contamination |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/14/2010 adjoins the western boundary of the site. Shenley Park woodland and meadow Local Wildlife site is opposite the site (other side of Radlett Lane). |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 6.70 | 231 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 08/04/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant topographical or environmental constraints affecting the land itself which slopes from north west to south east. The site is opposite Shenley Park and the listed kitchen garden wall, as well as an associated group of locally listed buildings. TPO 14/2010 adjoins the site to the south west.

The site is relatively close to local services, including Andrews Close shops and health practitioners and approximately 0.75 miles from the village school. The 602 (Hatfield – Watford) stops on Radlett Lane connecting to Radlett Station. The 658 (St Albans - Borehamwood) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only) are also within walking distance. Access into the site would be directly off Radlett Lane with Woodhall Spinney bridleway running along the eastern flank of the site.

A number of supporting technical documents submitted by the site promoter contain additional information which in some instances, identify potential constraints in relation to small areas of land contamination and flood risk within parts of the site. The draft LVIA submitted is incomplete but none of the reports submitted point to technical barriers which would preclude some development from coming forward within parts of the site.

The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site lies just beyond the area as being more visually connected to the settlement edge and with a more limited relationship with the wider countryside. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF, the site can be considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable for an estimated 50* homes. A further 181* homes could be developable within 10 years. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: n/a

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 231* homes – 50* homes within 5 years, 181* homes in 6-10 years.

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL370

Site source I&O 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Site Name | Land West of Shenley | | |
| Address | off Porters Park Drive, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Shenley CP and Aldenham CP |
| Ward | Shenley and Aldenham East | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Heronslea | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 16.28 | Size (ha) Net | 6.00 |
| Current use(s) | open fields | | |

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open fields to the north, Wild Farm dwelling to the north west, Porters Park Golf Course to the west, Cricket club to the south, residential development at Porters Park to the east. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of village location and part of the gap between Shenley and Radlett. The character is rural with open fields to the north and south and the golf course to the west. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Land to the north within Harperbury hospital site (HCC) has been submitted by Bloor Homes | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL350e | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | possible recreation and /or community facilities, primary school |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 38 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the essential gap between Shenley and Radlett. 6% of it is built form | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA30 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site lies within the current Green Belt and an archaeological area. Porters Park Golf course local wildlife site also crosses the south east corner of the site. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes at the very southern edge |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The very south east edge of the site adjoining Radlett Lane lies within Shenley Conservation Area. The Site also immediately adjoins Shenley Conservation Area on its eastern boundary. Locally listed Pavilion at Shenley Cricket Centre adjoins the site, as does Porterslea at Shenley Park. Grade II listed Wild Farm and an archaeological area lie at the northern edge of the site. Locally listed Auriol Lodge lies opposite the site on Radlett Road. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | Access would be needed onto Radlett Lane. There are important trees and flood zone in this location. Radlett Lane is narrow and busy. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | The site adjoins local wildlife sites Cow Banks Woods to the north east and Porters Park Golf Course to the west (which also covers the very south west corner of the site). There are a number of trees around the eastern and southern edges of the site that |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy or with access constraints |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Not known | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Not known | | |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site available | Not known |
|------------------------------|-----------|

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| Is the Site achievable | unknown |
|-------------------------------|---------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 34.5 | 6.00 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | 0 | 207 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 08/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

Flood zone (FZ3) and Local Wildlife Site (Porters Park Golf Course) are within and adjoining the south west of the site supporting a significant number of grassland indicators. A small part of the site, north west of the Porters Park estate, lies within an archaeological site. Cow Banks Wood Local Wildlife Site to the north east supports a range of woodland indicators. There are various statutory and locally listed buildings nearby within Shenley Park/Porters Park estate and at Wild Farm/White House to the north. A number of TPO trees are close to the site boundary within the Porters Park estate.

The centre of the site is approximately a mile on foot, along Radlett Lane, to local shops and services although the 602 (Hatfield – Watford) stops on Radlett Lane connecting to both Andrews Close shops and Radlett Station.

The frontage of the site onto Radlett Lane as originally proposed is heavily planted and close to a bend in the road. The Council's SFRA identifies for new developments located in areas at risk of flooding, safe access/egress must be provided. This would be likely to preclude the use of an access onto Radlett Lane as the principal point of access into the site. Consequently, the latest masterplan submitted shows a vehicular point of access from Porters Park Drive to the north east of the cricket ground, near Hamblings Close. The site area has reduced from approximately 32ha to 16ha. The area being sought for development comprises around 48% of the overall site.

The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to preventing coalescence between settlements. Development to the west of Porters Park would lead to a narrowing of the gap between Shenley and Radlett. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did

not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for 207 homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

The site has been amended since the last HELAA, with the total area proposed for development reducing from 15.96ha to 6ha, as of the 1st April 2019.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 207* dwellings timescale unknown.

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL390

Site source CFS

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Site Name | land adj 52 Harris Lane | | |
| Address | Harris Lane, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9EG | Parish | Shenley |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Heronslea on behalf of owner | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.69 | Current use(s) | Field |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the south and east, depot/commercial premises to the north |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of village location bordering open countryside |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | not unless further land in open countryside is utilised |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | n/a |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 14/1645/CLE Use of land as residential curtilage in association with no. 52 Harris Lane (Revised Application) REFUSED |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms the wider gap between Borehamwood and London Colney. It maintains the overall openness of the gap and ensures its overall physical scale is protected. There are urbanising influences but the majority of the parcel consists of open fields with long views and maintains an unspoilt rural character. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA27 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly but the north-western part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The north western part is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site is opposite the edge of Shenley Conservation Area |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | There is a small pylon on site |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Key villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 1.44 | 50 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 12/11/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant topographical or environmental constraints affecting the site which comprises a field to the side (north) and rear (east) of no.52 Harris Lane. The land is immediately beyond the village envelope and south of a complex of buildings belonging to a local arboriculture business. Although belonging to the owners of the main house, the land is distinct from the fenced off rear garden. The field has been used by the occupants of the house but the front part has been determined as not forming part of the curtilage of the house through a refused CLE application (14/1645/CLE).

The frontage of the site is within 400m from the centre of the old village which contains a school and other local amenities and stops for both the 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood) and 358 (Borehamwood – Oaklands College, school days, twice daily only) bus services. The site is approximately 1,000m from the shops at Andrew Close.

The site lies within a strongly performing Green Belt parcel that forms a wider gap between Borehamwood and London Colney. However, the sub-area around Shenley Village itself, being more densely developed, is identified as performing a more limited role in preventing encroachment into the countryside and being more connected with the settlement edge than the wider countryside and is at the outer edge of the area recommended for further consideration. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development other than for rural exceptions scale and type of housing. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF, the site is considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable for an estimated 50* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 50* homes within 5 years.

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL508 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Site source | Sites consultation |
|--------------------|--------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Site Name | 26 Woodhall Lane | | |
| Address | 26 Woodhall Lane, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | WD7 9AT | Parish | Shenley |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | DGH Realty Group | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.74 | Current use(s) | Vacant, formerly residential, garden and paddock |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to west, Woodhall Spinney to south, farmland and cricket ground to south east, allotments to east, residential to north. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of Green Belt village leading out into rural area |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/A |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 16/2423/FUL Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached 2 storey 5 bed dwelling (REFUSED); 17/1299/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of detached, 4 bed, chalet bungalow (GRANTED); 17/2357/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling, swimming pool and pump house and erection of detached, 4 bed chalet bungalow with basement accommodation, to include additional access to Woodhall Lane (REFUSED); 17/2358/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of detached, 4 bed chalet bungalow (GRANTED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 30 | 3+ | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | Parcel forms the wider gaps between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley - scale of the gap means there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes – the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Adjoins Shenley Conservation Area and within approximately 100m of several locally and statutorily listed buildings. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Access onto Woodhall Lane |
| Any existing ‘bad neighbours’ which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Adjoins Woodhall Spinney Local Wildlife Site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy but could be should this change |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 0.63 | 24 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

Most of the site lies outside the Shenley Village Envelope, with only the existing house lying within it. The Spinney Local Wildlife Site lies on the southern edge of the site. Shenley Conservation Area lies to the east of the northern part of the site.

The site is reasonably accessible, being located on the south west edge of the settlement of Shenley and within walking distance of local services in the village. The Spinney footpath (footpath 10) runs along the southern edge of the site and links into a network of local footpaths. Bus route 657 (Borehamwood to Harpenden) runs close to the site along Green Street. Shenley is not served by the rail network, the nearest stations being in Radlett and Borehamwood.

The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment identified the area within which the site is located as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Most of the site, with the exception of the existing house, is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary/creating a village inset in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site can be considered to be suitable, achievable and deliverable for an estimated 24* homes within 5 years. However, currently the majority of the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable. The site of the existing house could potentially deliver 3 dwelling units on PDL subject to meeting the requirement of the NPPF 2019 paragraph 145.

Capacity under current policy framework: 3* dwellings

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 24* homes within 5 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL515

Site source Sites consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Site Name | Land south of Rectory Farm | | |
| Address | Black Lion Hill, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | Shenley |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Savills for The Comer Group | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 5.34 | Current use(s) | Agricultural field with mature trees |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Ancient woodland to north, residential to south, east and west |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is a rural location at the edge of Shenley village, a washed over village in the Green Belt. The developed part of the village lies to the south and east of the site, with more open countryside interspersed with occasional farm, residential and occasional commercial buildings to the north and east. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | N/A |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Or Primary school in conjunction with S3 |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents the outward sprawl of Borehamwood. It forms the gap between Borehamwood and London Colney . It prevents ribbon development along London Road, ensuring that the gap is not reduced perceptually. The majority of the parcel is open fields with long views and maintains an unspoilt rural character. Less than 5% of the parcel is built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA-32 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Local Wildlife Site Rectory Lane pasture (whole site) |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | SW corner in Shenley conservation area. The conservation area wraps around the south, east and west sides of the site, with an ancient woodland along the northern boundary. There is an Archaeological area to the south. Locally listed 1&2 Warwick Cottages and Arden Cottage Rectory Lane lie outside adjoining the southern edge of the site. Shenley Hall and 1,2,3 Manor Cottages (Grade II) lie to the south east of the site |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | The site has frontages to Rectory Lane and Shenleybury/London Road |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Combe Wood Ancient woodland/TPO/230/1990 to north of site. Local Wildlife Site Hillcrest lies to the south of the site across Rectory Lane. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy as the site is within the Green Belt and outside the Shenley village envelope. It is also a Local Wildlife Site. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No |
| Is the Site available | Yes |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------|
| 34.5 | 4.01 | Unconstrained | Constrained |
| | | 138 | 0 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | N/A |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is covered by a Local Wildlife Site designation. The Shenley Conservation Area adjoins and covers the south west corner of the site. The site also adjoins ancient woodland and listed buildings. Development potential therefore would be significantly constrained unless a reassessment of the LWS found the site to be of little ecological value.

Shenley is served by two regular bus services; the 602 and 658. Although rail services are not available in the village the buses offer links to the nearby Thameslink stations at Radlett and Elstree & Borehamwood stations. Local retail, medical and childcare services at Andrew Close in Shenley are within 0.2 miles. The primary school is approximately 0.4 miles away.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. The site lies within the Green Belt and comprises part of a sub-area which meets green belt purposes strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is also covered by a Local Wildlife Site.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments the site could be suitable for the delivery of 138* homes. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable. Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, the site could only be considered suitable available and achievable for development, including of the unconstrained capacity figure of 138* units, if further investigation indicated that the site no longer meets the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review change to policy framework (with LWS constraint): 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review change to policy framework (without LWS constraint): 138* dwellings timescale unknown.

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

APPENDIX 15: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - SOUTH MIMMS

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL173

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Site Name | Greyhound Lane | | |
| Address | Greyhound Lane, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 3PZ | Parish | South Mimms CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | DLA Town Planning on behalf of Oakbridge Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.38 | Current use(s) | Rough grazing. Parts of it have tree cover. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential development to the west, St Giles school and its associated playing fields and designated open space to the north, further residential development on St Giles Ave and St Albans Road to the east and very low density residential development to the south. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is at the edge of the main part of South Mimms village. The village is particularly spread out with a mix of small concentrations and ribbon development. The area lies between developed areas and is bounded on three sides by roads. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No. The site is bounded by roads, primary school and playing fields/open space. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the less essential gap between Potters Bar, Shenley, Borehamwood and Greater London which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. The parcel has ribbon development throughout its centre at the washed over village of South Mimms. However the parcel does play a role in preventing further development that could reduce the actual and perceived gap between settlements. The village is weakly bounded with ribbon development resulting in a lack of distinction between the settlement and the surrounding countryside. The M25 and A1M are urbanising influences throughout the parcel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA21 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Yes The site is within South Mimms Conservation Area. Parish Room Blanche Lane is locally listed. The site adjoins White House and Cedar House Grade II listed which are opposite. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Local Wildlife sites Meadow by St. Albans Road and Grassland west of Greyhound Lane are close to the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Not known | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Probably | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 3.29 | 123 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is wholly within South Mimms Conservation Area, opposite two Grade II listed buildings (White House and Cedar House) and adjoining an archaeological site, the village envelope and locally listed building (Parish Room, Blanche Lane). A number of Local Wildlife Sites are sited nearby (Meadow by St Albans Road and Grassland west of Greyhound Lane) although HEL173 is not designated. Footpath 46 runs across the southern portion of the site.

Access could be taken off Greyhound Lane or St Albans Road, although there is currently no vehicular access into the site and the carriageway on Greyhound Lane is relatively narrow being a little over 5m wide in places. On the eastern side of the village, the site is within 600m of local amenities comprising the local school, public house and playground as well as the bus stop for the 398 (Watford - Potters Bar) and 303 (Borehamwood – Hatfield, school days only, twice daily).

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development. The site forms part of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel, identified in the Green Belt Stage 1 assessment as forming part of the less essential gap between Potters Bar, Shenley, Borehamwood and Greater London which is of sufficient scale and character that development itself would be unlikely to cause merging between settlements. However, the parcel is identified as assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

For the purposes of the HELAA, a site area of 4.4ha could yield around 123* new homes were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location. However, additional development would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and would need to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering a significant quantum of growth in South Mimms, one of the larger villages in the borough and a location which may be suitable for some additional growth.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 123* homes – 50*homes within 5 years and 73* homes in 6-10 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL205

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Site Name | land at Town Farm | | |
| Address | Blackhorse Lane, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 3PS | Parish | South Mimms CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | JB Planning on behalf of Gascoyne Holdings Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 2.18 | Current use(s) | Redundant agricultural land, farm house, agricultural storage and scrubland. The land is vacant. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Arable farmland to the north and east, and residential properties the Black Horse PH and Blackhorse Lane to the west. To the south a heavily treed band runs along the northern side of Catherine Bourne brook, the other side of which are residential properties in Brookside. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is a rural, edge of village location where the village merges into open fields and farm houses. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes – this site, adjoining land to the east and land across the road to the west (including HEL228a and HEL228b) and south west are covered by the larger HEL385. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL385, HEL228a and HEL228b | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/96/0831 Change of use and minor external alterations to agricultural barn to use for swimming facilities for rehabilitation of dogs (REFUSED); TP/72/1672 Residential development (REFUSED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 42 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield, where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. There is very little development throughout the parcel with ribbon development from South Mimms being amongst the most significant. Overall the parcel is very open and largely consists of arable farming fields. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA26 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes A significant part of the site is within FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Town Farm House Blackhorse Lane is locally listed. Grade II listed Black Horse pub adjoins the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No known contamination issues – very minor risk of low level |
| Any access difficulties. | No, but Blackhorse Lane is narrow |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Promoter indicates the site is within SSSI Impact Zone and Northern Thames Basin National Character Area. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes and access is resolved |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No. The applicant states the farmstead site is 'in hand' within the direct control of Gascoyne Cecil Estates. The grazing is let on an annual 12 month grazing licence. The site is thus available and considered capable of delivery within five years. | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 39 | 1.64 | 64 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

A significant part of the site is in FZ3 with Catherine Bourne running close to the southern boundary of the site. Town Farm House Blackhorse Lane is locally listed and the site is adjacent to the Grade II listed Black Horse pub. The site adjoins the village envelope and is currently accessed through Town Farm House off Blackhorse Lane. Together with the house, the site includes some redundant agricultural storage structures and open land to rear. The site is set significantly below the surrounding arable farmland and slopes towards Blackhorse Lane and Catherine Bourne. A public footpath crosses the site. The indicative layout submitted proposes to site the built area of any development 80-90 metres to the north of the brook.

At the far northern end of the village, the centre of the site is approximately 400m from the bus stop for the 84 (Barnet – St Albans) and 398 (Watford – Potters Bar) and 700m from the primary school. A small playground on Brookside is close by.

The carriageway along Blackhorse Lane varies in width but in places is less than 5m and narrows to less than 4m close to where the site promoter has indicated a vehicular entrance would be sited, as well as being on a bend. The carriageway further narrows as Blackhorse Lane extends into the open countryside to the north. There would need to be an assessment undertaken of the suitability of the road to accommodate additional vehicle movements and/or the scope to improve vehicular access along the lane.

The site forms part of a much larger and strongly performing parcel which makes up a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield. The scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Although development of the site would not be suitable under the current policy framework, South Mimms is one of the larger villages in the borough and were it to be considered a suitable location to accommodate growth through the review of the Local Plan and subject to a highways assessment, the site would be suitable, available and achievable for the delivery of a total of 64* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 64* homes – 50* homes within 5 years and 14* homes in 6-10 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL228a

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Site Name | St Albans Road, South Mimms | | |
| Address | St Albans Road, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 3PS | Parish | South Mimms CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Owner | King & Co on behalf of BW Field and Partners | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.06 | Current use(s) | Vacant field, area of tree cover in one part and also along the Catharine Bourne brook which runs along the northern edge of the site. |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential on the north and east sides of the site. To the west and on the south side of St Albans Road the land is open fields in agricultural use (arable) | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where the northern edge of South Mimms meets open countryside. It is not close to any major shopping areas. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes - the adjoining land to the north has also been submitted to the Call for Sites. The site also lies within the larger HEL385 | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL228b, HEL385 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 42 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield, where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. There is very little development throughout the parcel with ribbon development from South Mimms being amongst the most significant. Overall the parcel is very open and largely consists of arable farming fields. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA25 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes A significant part of the site is within FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Locally listed The Old Police Station Blackhorse Lane adjoins the site. It is close to South Mimms Conservation Area boundary but not immediately adjoining. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Yes Access outside flood zone 3 will need to be provided. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No except there is a small copse at the front of the site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy (unless for rural exception scale and type of housing) but may be should the site's Green Belt status change. Development needs to follow the sequential approach and avoid areas of flood risk. The proposals include open space in the Flood Zone area. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 52.5 | 0.9 | 47 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The Catherine Bourne watercourse runs through the site and a significant part of HEL228a lies within the floodzone. Less than 1ha of the area lies outside the floodzone. The northern area would not be suitable for development due to the flood risk. A public footpath runs parallel to Catherine Bourne through the site. The locally listed Old Police Station Blackhorse Lane adjoins the site which is also close to the boundary of the South Mimms Conservation Area.

The land is close to the centre of the village, accessed off St Albans Road and within 400m of a bus stop served by the 84 (Barnet – St Albans).

The site forms part of a larger Green Belt parcel which makes up a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield. The parcel was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing. However, the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing and there is very little development throughout the wider parcel with ribbon development from South Mimms being amongst the most significant. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development other than for rural exceptions scale and type of housing. However, South Mimms is one of the larger villages in the borough and were it to be considered a suitable location to accommodate some additional growth through the review of the Local Plan, the site could be brought forward with HEL228b.

The area of HEL228a which is not within FZ3 is approximately 0.5ha. There are no Local Wildlife Sites across the site although an area to the front of the site comprises an area of vegetation include a small copse. The site promoter has indicated that this incorporates hardstanding and is previously developed although the basis for this conclusion is unclear. An ecological assessment of the site would be required and the possibility exists that it would need to be retained due to its biodiversity value, which would limit development to approximately 0.2ha of land to the east of the copse. However, were this not the case, based on the HELAA methodology the site as a whole could be suitable for the delivery of 47* homes although this could be further reduced in the light of the outcome of a flood risk assessment.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 47* homes within 5 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL228b

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Site Name | St Albans Road, South Mimms | | |
| Address | St Albans Road, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 3PS | Parish | South Mimms CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | King & Co on behalf of BW Field and Partners | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 4.15 | Current use(s) | Agriculture |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | The site abuts residential development in the south east corner, and adjoins vacant fields to the south of Catharine Bourne to the south. The remaining boundaries adjoin open countryside in agricultural (arable) use. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | This is an edge of settlement location where the northern edge of South Mimms meets open countryside. It is not close to any major shopping areas. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes - the adjoining land to the south has also been submitted to the Call for Sites. The site also lies within the larger HEL385 | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL228a, HEL385 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | none |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 42 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield, where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. There is very little development throughout the parcel with ribbon development from South Mimms being amongst the most significant. Overall the parcel is very open and largely consists of arable farming fields. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA25 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | yes |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Town Farm House Blackhorse Lane is locally listed. It is close to the south east boundary of the site, as is the Black Horse PH which is Grade II listed. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | No although the secondary access proposed off Blackhorse Lane may not be acceptable. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy (unless for rural exception scale and type of housing) but may be should the site's Green Belt status change. The site is bordered by watercourse (Catherine Bourne) which is in flood zone 3, so development would have to avoid this |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 3.11 | 117 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

1.38ha of land for employment purposes

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

Part of 228b lies within the floodzone site with approximately 3.5ha of the site remaining beyond this. Locally listed building (Town Farm house) nearby with the Grade II listed Black Horse public house a little further to the south east.

The site can be accessed off St Albans Road although currently this is limited to a dropped kerb for agricultural machinery. The creation of a secondary access off Blackhorse Lane is indicated by the site promoter although this is a particularly narrow road, no more than 3m wide in places. It is unlikely to be suitable for any significant increase in traffic.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development. The site forms part of a larger parcel which makes up a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield and was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing. However, the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing and there is very little development throughout the wider parcel with ribbon development from South Mimms being amongst the most significant. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

The delivery of 228b is not wholly dependent on 228a although it would lead to a more detached form of development if brought forward in isolation. The site has been promoted for residential and employment development with approximately 2ha indicated for housing. Although development of the site would not be suitable under the current policy framework, South Mimms is one of the larger villages in the borough and were it to be considered a suitable location to accommodate growth through the review of the Local Plan, the site could accommodate 117* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 117* homes (the part of the site promoted for residential) – 50 homes within 5 years and 67 * homes in 6-10 years

Capacity for employment development following review and change to policy framework: 1.38 ha

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL254 and HEL255

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|---------------------|----------------|
| Site Name | land r/o Altus, 4 Blanche Lane | | |
| Address | 4 Blanche Lane, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 3N2 | Parish | South Mimms CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | Owner/occupier of one of the properties on behalf of both owner/occupiers | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.63 | Current use(s) | Vacant open land, grazing, scrub and shrubs |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | The site is to the rear of residential properties which lie to the south. The M25 lies to the west. remaining sides are surrounded by fields. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site lies between the western edge of South Mimms village and the M25 with open countryside in arable use to the north. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | The submission is made jointly with neighbours. The site also adjoins land submitted by Gascoyne Cecil | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL385 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the less essential gap between Potters Bar, Shenley, Borehamwood and Greater London which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. The parcel has ribbon development throughout its centre at the washed over village of South Mimms. However the parcel does play a role in preventing further development that could reduce the actual and perceived gap between settlements. The village is weakly bounded with ribbon development resulting in a lack of distinction between the settlement and the surrounding countryside. The M25 and A1M are urbanising influences throughout the parcel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA23 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site adjoins South Mimms Conservation Area and an area of archaeological interest |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The site is close to the M25 - noise mitigation may be required. |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but may be should the site's Green Belt status change and developed in conjunction with adjoining sites |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 37.5 | 1.39 | 52 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The two sites have been promoted jointly and adjoin each other. They lie adjacent the South Mimms Village Conservation Area, an Archaeological Site and part of the village envelope boundary. At its closest the land almost abuts the embankment of the M25 although there is significant planting along the boundary of the site affording screening between the two.

The site contains various equestrian buildings and structures but is predominantly open in character. At the south western end of the village, the site is within 400m of local amenities comprising the local school, public house and playground as well as the bus stop for the 398 (Watford - Potters Bar).

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development other than for rural exceptions scale and type of housing. The site forms part of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel, identified in the Green Belt Stage 1 assessment as forming part of the less essential gap between Potters Bar, Shenley, Borehamwood and Greater London which is of sufficient scale and character that development itself would be unlikely to cause merging between settlement. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

The parcel is identified as assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and additional development would lead to encroachment into relatively open countryside. However, South Mimms is one of the larger villages in the borough and were it to be considered a suitable location to accommodate growth through the review of the Local Plan, the site could be suitable, available and achievable for 52* homes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 52* - 50 homes within 5 years and 2 homes in years 6 to 10.

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL320

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Site Name | Land Formerly Part of Earl and Cross Keys Farm, (north site) | | |
| Address | Cecil Road, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 | Parish | South Mimms CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | Daniel Watney LLP on behalf of The Brewers Company | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.82 | Current use(s) | Agricultural, short term tenancy |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to north, roads to west and south, farmland to east |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Outskirts of South Mimms village adjoining farmland |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Possibly in conjunction with part of site to the south. Site is also close to (but not directly joined to) HEL385. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL321 in same ownership as HEL320. Northern part possibly could be developed alongside HEL320. Southern part of HEL321 more detached/not suitable |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 42 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield, where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. There is very little development throughout the parcel with ribbon development from South Mimms being amongst the most significant. Overall the parcel is very open and largely consists of arable farming fields. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA19 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but the western part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The western part is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The south west corner of the site immediately adjoins the South Mimms Conservation Area, Church Of St Giles, Blanche Lane is grade I listed, Brewers Almshouses grade II and the The White Hart PH grade II. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | no |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy (unless for rural exception scale and type of housing)but may be should the site's Green Belt status change |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 52.5 | 1.547 | 81 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|--|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints. The site adjoins South Mimms Conservation Area - currently the Conservation Area boundary is shown as slightly overlapping with the western part of the site but this is likely to be a drafting error with St Albans Road forming the north eastern boundary of the Conservation Area. The site is close to the Grade 1 listed Church of St Giles, Grade II listed Brewers Almshouses and Grade II White Hart Public House. Access could be taken off Cecil Road although there is currently no vehicular access into the site.

The centre of the site is within 600m of local amenities comprising the local school, public house and playground as well as the bus stop for the 84 (Barnet – St Albans) and 398 (Watford – Potters Bar).

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development other than for a rural exceptions scale and type of housing. It forms part of a wider Green Belt parcel identified as strongly performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, particularly with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and protecting its openness. The site is visually and physically separate from the land promoted to the south of St Albans by the same party. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

For the purposes of the HELAA, the site could yield around 81* new homes were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location. However, additional development would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and would need to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional growth in South Mimms, one of the larger villages in the borough and a location which may be suitable for some additional growth.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 81* homes – 50* homes within 5 years and 31* homes within 6-10 years

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL321

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|----------------|
| Site Name | Land Formerly Part of Earl and Cross Keys Farm, (south site) | | |
| Address | Cecil Road, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 | Parish | South Mimms CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | Daniel Watney LLP on behalf of The Brewers Company | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 6.18 | Current use(s) | Agricultural, short term tenancy |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Road to the north and west, farmland to the east. There is a pocket of residential development to the south west. A1M to the south east | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Outskirts of South Mimms village leading out into farmland | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Northern part could possibly be developed perhaps alongside HEL320. Southern part of 321 more detached/not suitable. Site is also close to (but not directly joined to) HEL385. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL320 across Cecil Road to the north of HEL321 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel plays a role in preventing further development that could reduce the actual and perceived gap between settlements. 4% of it is developed. The M25 and A1M are urbanising influences throughout the parcel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA20 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately but the western part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The western part is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes The site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No but there is risk of surface water flooding. |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The southern and western edge of the northern part of the site adjoining St Albans Road lies within the South Mimms Conservation Area, which also adjoins the site. There are locally listed properties in St Giles Ave. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Local wildlife site 'Meadow by St Albans Road' adjoins the southern part of site |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but part may be should the site's Green Belt status change |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | no |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | High | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------|
| 52.5 | 4.635 | 243 |

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant topographical or environmental constraints within HEL321 itself. The site adjoins the Conservation Area and a number of locally listed buildings on St Giles Avenue. The southern part of the site adjoins a Local Wildlife Site (Meadow by St Albans Road).

HEL321 comprises two distinct and visually separate parts but the southern area could only be accessed through the northern area, other than via footpath 33 which runs through the northern area and around the eastern edge of the southern area. Given the limited access and its detachment from the village, the southern area is not considered suitable for development.

The northern area can be accessed from St Albans Road or Cecil Road although there is currently no vehicular access into the site and is served by the 398 (Watford - Potters Bar) and 303 (Borehamwood – Hatfield, school days only, twice daily). It is also within 700m of local amenities comprising the local school, public house and playground.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development, forming part of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel, identified in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment and identified as assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

For the purposes of the HELAA, the whole site could yield around 243* new homes were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location. However, additional development would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and would need to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional growth in South Mimms, one of the larger villages in the borough and a location which may be suitable for some additional growth.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 243* homes – 50* homes within 5 years and 193* homes in 6-10 years - although given the unsuitability of the southern section of the site any eventual figure would be likely to be lower than this.

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL352

Site source CFS2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Land at White House, Greyhound Lane, (main) | | |
| Address | White House, Greyhound Lane, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | EN6 3NX | Parish | South Mimms |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | Owner/occupier | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 0.25 | Current use(s) | Dwelling and outdoor kitchen /garden |
|----------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | The site is surrounded by roads. Residential to west and south, playing fields/open space to east. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The site is within the village, bordering open land/playing field. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | The site is surrounded by roads so no. A small piece of detached garden has also been submitted – this is on the opposite side of Greyhound Lane but is too small to be considered under the HELAA methodology. | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL353 | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/72/1231 Outline for residential development (REFUSED); TP/72/1559 Extensions (GRANTED); TP/72/4521 Extension (GRANTED); TP/81/0237 Extension (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the less essential gap between Potters Bar, Shenley, Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. The parcel has ribbon development throughout its centre at the washed over village of South Mimms. However the parcel does play a role in preventing further development that could reduce the actual and perceived gap between settlements. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA21 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the existing Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | South Mimms Conservation Area. White House is grade II listed. Close to a number of other statutory and locally listed buildings and area of Archaeological interest |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | no |
| Any access difficulties. | no |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Tree Preservation Order TPO/42/2007 |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | No. The site is constrained - Green Belt and Heritage policies |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable | Possibly not - significant constraints to development |
|------------------------|---|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 39 | 0.25 | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| | | 0 | 11 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site occupies a prominent position in the centre of village, on an 'island' at the point where New Road meets Blanche Lane. The Grade II listed White House occupies the northern part of the site, which is located within the Conservation Area and an archaeological site. HEL352 is located close to a number of other statutory and locally listed buildings. The entire site comprises the curtilage of the White House with the boundary of the site containing significant screening; there are also a number of TPO trees, on all three sides of the site. HEL353 opposite the main site is too small to be considered, being below the minimum size for inclusion in the HELAA as set out in the published methodology.

The potential to develop on the site is considered to be extremely limited and the site is considered to be too constrained to accommodate any quantum of development which might be considered suitable under the HELAA methodology. (This includes the unconstrained capacity figure indicated above).

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL385a-c

Site source I&O 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Site Name | South Mimms area – St Albans Road/Blackhorse Lane | | |
| Address | South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | South Mimms, Ridge |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | JB Planning on behalf of Gascoyne Cecil Estates and BW Field | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 58.05 | Current use(s) | Agriculture |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Open space, residential to the south east and south, agriculture/open fields to the north and west, M25 to the west |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Edge of village location bordering open countryside in arable use |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Site overlaps with individual sites submitted by Gascoyne Cecil Estates and BW Field. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | HEL228a, HEL228b, HEL205 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/96/0831 Change of use and minor external alterations to agricultural barn to use for swimming facilities for rehabilitation of dogs (REFUSED) |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Eastern (HEL385a) and western (HEL385b) plots are within Parcel 42. southern (HEL385c) plot is within Parcel 40 | 0 | 3/1 | 4/3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | <p>Parcel 42 forms a significant part of the wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield, where the scale of the gap is such that there is little risk of settlements coalescing, but where the overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. There is very little development throughout the parcel with ribbon development from South Mimms being amongst the most significant. Overall the parcel is very open and largely consists of arable farming fields.</p> <p>Parcel 40 forms part of the less essential gap between Potters Bar, Shenley, Borehamwood and Greater London, which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. The parcel has ribbon development throughout its centre at the washed over village of South Mimms. However the parcel does play a role in preventing further development that could reduce the actual and perceived gap between settlements.</p> | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA24, SA25, SA26 | 0/0/0 | 1/1/3 | 4/4/4 | 0/0/0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | All sub-areas meet Purposes assessment criteria strongly and make an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. They are not recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site is within the current Green Belt |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes A significant part of the site is within FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Town Farm House and The Old Police Station Blackhorse Lane are locally listed. Grade II listed Black Horse pub adjoins the site. Part of the site lies within South Mimms Conservation Area and an archaeological site. The site is close to grade II listed The White Hart PH, 99 - 109 Brewers Almshouses, grade I listed Church of St Giles and locally listed Garden Wall And Gate Piers At The Vicarage Blanche Lane |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No known contamination issues – very minor risk of low level |
| Any access difficulties. | No, but Blackhorse Lane is narrow |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |

| | |
|---|---|
| Any other environmental constraints? | Promoter has stated that part of the site is within SSSI Impact Zone and the Northern Thames Basin National Character Area. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes access is resolved and development on this scale if deemed acceptable in settlement hierarchy terms. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes. Part of the area has not been promoted by owners but they are understood to be in agreement | Is there developer interest | Not known |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low (Medium for 385c) | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|--------------|--------|--|
| 34.5 average | 29.03 | Whole site HEL385a-c 1018 HEL385a only – 236 (incl HEL228a and b) HEL385b only – 288 (incl HEL205) HEL385c only – 494 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 16/03/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

HEL385 comprises a series of sites to the north and west of South Mimms village, in different ownerships, promoted on behalf of Gascoyne Cecil Estates (GCE). 385A is owned by GCE with 358B owned by Wrotham Park Estates and BW Field and Partners, and 358C largely owned by Hertfordshire County Council. Most of the individual sites have also been promoted separately by or on behalf of the landowners although not all of the land owned by BW Field and Partners has been submitted.

The area is split by the B556 St Albans Road. The promotion of the area as a whole extends to approximately 58ha of land and has been submitted on the basis of South Mimms potentially being capable of accommodating a greater amount of development than that originally promoted at Town Farm. An extension of South Mimms village to the north and west on this scale would, in addition to needing to satisfy a range of technical and infrastructure requirements, require an agreed and co-ordinated approach from different landowners. This is not presently the case although it is understood that some of the parties involved are working together. It is not possible to treat this larger area as available for more comprehensive growth. It is also unlikely that any significant development to the north of the village could be accessed without the construction of new links from St Albans Road.

The overall area covered by HEL385 forms part of two wider Green Belt parcels which play an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside particularly to the north of St Albans Road. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-areas within which the site is located for further consideration.

Exceptional circumstances would need to exist to justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location to accommodate growth. South Mimms is one of the larger villages in the borough and a potential location for additional growth to meet the housing and infrastructure needs of the village and wider area. However, the Council has emphasised in its Issues and Options report that it also wishes to ensure that villages retain their own distinct and separate identities and HEL385 is likely to comprise a larger area than that would be required or appropriate for the needs of the village and wider area. Although some of the sites within HEL385 – potentially HEL385a (which includes HEL205 Town Farm) and the parts of HEL385b promoted for BW Field (HEL228a and HEL228b) - are likely to be deliverable within the next 5 – 10 years, it is not possible to conclude that the entirety of HEL385, including the land to the north of the village, is suitable, available or achievable. The capacity figure indicated below therefore relates to the part of HEL385a outside Town Farm only. Capacity figures for HEL205, HEL228a and HEL228b are included in the assessments for those sites.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: HEL385a - 236* homes – 50* homes within 5 years and 186* homes in 6-10 years, HEL385b – 288* homes – 75* homes within 5 years and 213* homes in 6-10 years, HEL385b – 494* homes – 75* homes within 5 years, 375* homes in 6-10 years, and 44* homes in 11-15 years

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Site reference | HEL504 |
|-----------------------|---------------|

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Site source | Sites consultation |
|--------------------|--------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Land east of St Albans Road | | |
| Address | South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | South Mimms |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | DLA Town Planning for Oakbridge Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 1.31 | Current use(s) | Open land – grass and trees |
|------------------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north, farmland to south and east, St Albans Road to west |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Outskirts of South Mimms village leading out into open farmland |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | Yes |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Site adjoins southern part of HEL321 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|------|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | None |
|---|------|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel plays a role in preventing further development that could reduce the actual and perceived gap between settlements. 4% of it is developed. The M25 and A1M are urbanising influences throughout the parcel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA20 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets Purpose 3 moderately but the western part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The western part is recommended for further consideration | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within the current Green Belt and almost entirely a Local Wildlife Site |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Adjoins South Mimms Conservation Area to north and east. There are locally listed properties in St Giles Avenue. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Access would be onto St Albans Road. Could also provide access to southern part of HEL341 should that site be suitable for development. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Virtually the whole site is Local Wildlife Site 'Meadow by St Albans Road' |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but may be should the site's Green Belt status change. However a re-assessment of the value of it as a Local Wildlife Site would also be required. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
|---|-----|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no |
| Is the Site available | yes |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* | |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------|
| 34.5 | 1.11 | Unconstrained | Constrained |
| | | 42 | 0 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site adjoins the South Mimms Conservation Area and a number of locally listed buildings on St Giles Avenue. It is also almost entirely covered by Local Wildlife Site 'Meadow by St Albans Road'. The site is not served by public transport and is approximately 2.3 miles from Potters Bar rail station. There are no shops within walking distance, although the school, playground and pub in the village would be walkable from the site..

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development, forming part of a Green Belt parcel identified in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment as moderately performing and as assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further, although the site itself does not lie within the part recommended for further consideration.

Additional development here would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and would need to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional growth in South Mimms, one of the larger villages in the borough and a location which may be suitable for some additional growth. However, the site's status as a Local Wildlife Site would be likely to preclude it from development and/or constrain the amount of development possible. For the purposes of the HELAA, the site could yield around 38 new homes were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location and a re-assessment of the value of the Local Wildlife Site found in favour of development being acceptable. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites not currently acceptable.

Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, the site could only be considered suitable available and achievable for development, including of the unconstrained capacity figure of 42* units, if further investigation indicated that the site no longer meets the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework (with LWS constraint): Currently 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review, acceptable impact on LWS and change to policy framework: 42* homes timescale currently unknown

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL516

Site source Sites
consultation

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|
| Site Name | Land south of Greyhound Lane | | |
| Address | Land south of Greyhound Lane, South Mimms | | |
| Postcode | | Parish | South Mimms |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | South Mimms |
| Promoter | DLA Town Planning on behalf of Oakbridge Homes | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 12.30 | Current use(s) | Residential, paddock, scrubland |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Residential to the north, residential and M25 to the west, and M25 junction to the south, A1M to south east, field and sports ground to north east |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The south lies between the southern edge of South Mimms village and the A1(M) / M25 to the south. Whilst the motorways and south Mimms services to the east are urbanising influences and South Mimms village is quite dispersed, the character is still predominantly rural. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | However HEL173 across Greyhound Lane is understood to be in the same ownership as most of this site |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/88/1140 Replacement dwelling (Oak Farm); (DETERMINED); TP/94/0178 15m high telecommunications tower (REFUSED); 15/1817/HSE 2 storey side extension to The Cottage Annexe (GRANTED); TP/07/0850 Replacement barn following demolition of existing buildings. (ALLOWED ON APPEAL); TP/11/0356 Erection of building as shelter for pigs (REFUSED); TP/08/1792 conversion of existing garage into granny annexe (GRANTED); TP/01/1117 Creation of lake (REFUSED); TP/78/0559 2 houses (REFUSED); TP/83/0557 CHANGE OF USE TO NURSERY (REFUSED); TP/12/0466 Animal shelter (REFUSED); TP/92/0013 Removal of agricultural occupancy condition (GRANTED); TP/92/0655 extensions to Blanche Farm Bungalow (GRANTED); TP/93/0659 Demolition of existing house and outbuildings and erection of 4 bedroom detached house and detached double garage (GRANTED); TP/96/0009 change of use of the land to use for the open storage of materials (APPEAL DISMISSED); TP/98/0190 Erection of detached 3 car garage (APPEAL DISMISSED); |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open space and community facilities |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside | | | | | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel forms part of the less essential gap between Potters Bar, Shenley, Borehamwood and Greater London which is of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. The parcel has ribbon development throughout its centre at the washed over village of South Mimms. However the parcel does play a role in preventing further development that could reduce the actual and perceived gap between settlements. The village is weakly bounded with ribbon development resulting in a lack of distinction between the settlement and the surrounding countryside. The M25 and A1M are urbanising influences throughout the parcel. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| SA-22 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-area meets green belt purpose assessment criteria weakly, and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes the site is within the current green belt. Part of the site is covered by Local Wildlife Site Grassland W. of Greyhound Lane |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | South Mimms Conservation Area overlaps the easternmost corner of the site and adjoins the east and north sides of the site. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | The only points at which the site adjoins a highway onto which access could in theory be taken are on Greyhound Lane. At the north east corner of the site this would require access to be taken through the Local Wildlife Site; further south access would need to be taken through the current Oak Farm. The practicality of either location has not been demonstrated. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The site adjoins M25 and A1(M) |
| Any other environmental constraints? | None identified |

| | |
|---|---|
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy. Could be suitable if Green Belt status of site changes access is resolved and development on this scale if deemed acceptable in settlement hierarchy terms. |
|---|---|

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Part. Area around Ludlow's Lake not owned by promoter | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Part of the site is not under the control of the promoter | | |
| Is the Site available | Not known | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | Very low | Medium | Other villages |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 34.5 | 8.00 | 300 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 12/06/2019 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

The site is partially covered by a Local Wildlife Site and the South Mimms Conservation Area. Apart from these there are no significant known topographical or environmental constraints to development although the ability to provide acceptable access to the site has not been demonstrated and the proximity of the A1(M) and M25 would require consideration of measures to minimise noise and air pollution affecting the site..

The site is served by bus route 398 Watford - Potters Bar but South Mimms does not have a rail station. Potters Bar station and town centre are approximately 2.7 miles away. Bridleway 50 crosses the site. The school, playground and public house in the village would however be walkable from the site.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development, forming part of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel (Green Belt stage 1 assessment) and identified as assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.

The site contains a limited amount of development and some development here could be acceptable under paragraph 145 of NPPF 2019 which allows for 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites' subject to a test of openness as 'appropriate development'. However, the previously developed part of the site forms a very limited part of the site as a whole; it could be expected to provide for 8* dwellings under current policy, subject to compliance with NPPF paragraph 145.

For the purposes of the HELAA, the site could yield around 276* new homes were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location. However, additional development would lead to encroachment into the Green Belt and would need to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional growth in South Mimms, albeit that it is one of the larger villages in the borough and a location which may be suitable for some additional growth. Development in this area would also extend what is already a dispersed pattern of development further southwards and into the area bounded by 2 motorways. Given uncertainties over the availability of part of the site, and lack of demonstrably acceptable access arrangements and impact on the LWS, the timescale within which delivery might be achievable is currently uncertain. Even were the Green Belt status of the site to change through a review of the policy framework, the non-PDL part of the site could only be considered suitable available and achievable for development, including of the unconstrained capacity figure of 300* units, if further investigation indicated that the site no longer meets the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site. Should this not be the case the capacity of the site could be reduced or even removed if access to the site is thereby precluded.

Capacity under current policy framework: 8* dwellings

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 300* homes , timescale unknown.

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

APPENDIX 16: INDIVIDUAL SITE ASSESSMENTS - OTHER LOCATIONS

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference HEL221

Site source CFS 2017

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Site Name | Rabley Green | | |
| Address | Mimms Lane/Packhorse Lane/Rectory Lane, Shenley | | |
| Postcode | EN6 3LY | Parish | Shenley CP/ Ridge CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | Shenley |
| Promoter | Aurora Properties Ltd | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Size (ha) Gross | 83.26 | Current use(s) | Residential and agriculture |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

| | |
|---|--|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | TP/05/0845 All weather and grass gallops (REFUSED); TP/81/0718 change of use of cottage at St Catherine's Farm to path lab.(GRANTED - personal); TP/84/0474 Demolition of existing house and erection of one 2 storey detached house (Falcon Cottage) (GRANTED). |
|---|--|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | C3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | New village associated facilities and services |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 18 | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | The parcel prevents outward sprawl of Borehamwood. Forms gap between Borehamwood and London Colney. It prevents ribbon development along Mimms Lane, ensuring that the gap is not reduced perceptually. Majority of the parcel is open fields with long views and maintains an unspoilt rural character. Less than 5% of the parcel is built form. | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Garden village G, H, I | 0/0/0 | Not scored – see Green Belt stage 2 report | | 0/0/0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The sub-areas make a limited contribution to Purpose 2, forming a less essential part of the gap between Shenley and Potters Bar, and at the eastern end (sub-area I) also between London Colney and Potters Bar. Sub-areas G and I have a strong unposit rural character with the area in the middle having a largely rural character. Sub-areas G and I – at either end of the site – make a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt and their release would be likely to harm the performance of the wider strategic Green Belt. Sub-area H, in the centre, plays a less fundamental role and could be considered further. | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes - the site lies within the current Green Belt. Dovers Green Lane, Packhorse Lane Pits and Shenley Chalk Pit Wildlife sites lie within the area. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | Yes - flood zone 3 in southern part of site. |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | The site adjoins Shenley Hall, Manor Cottages and Elliots Farm House (all grade II listed) and Shenley Conservation Area. A small area on the western edge of the site lies within Shenley Conservation Area. Rabley Park Farm House and Barn are grade II listed buildings at |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Possibly. All roads around the site are narrow country lanes. Access to B556 cannot be guaranteed. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | no |
| Any other environmental constraints? | Dovers Green Lane, Packhorse Lane Pits and Shenley Chalk Pit Wildlife sites lie within the area. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes . However the site promoter is not the only owner and other owners have not indicated that their land is available. | Is there developer interest | Yes |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes - land in multiple ownership |
| Is the Site available | Cannot be said to be available |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not known |
|-------------------------------|-----------|

Estimated development potential - residential**(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

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

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 30 | 41.63 | 1249 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|------------|
| Date | 08/04/2018 |
|-------------|------------|

Conclusion:

There are no significant environmental or topographic constraints within the wider area promoted which adjoins Shenley Village Conservation Area to the west. There are various Grade II listed buildings adjacent to the boundary of the land promoted as well as one listed building within the site, adjacent to the eastern boundary at Rabley Farm.

Access into the majority of the land is currently achieved via Rectory Lane, Mimms Lane and Packhorse Lane which serve the limited number of properties within the site. It is unlikely that these narrow country lanes could support any significant increase in traffic and road traffic accidents are understood to have occurred, particularly in winter, including at the junction of Rectory Lane and the B556. The northern edge of the site, between Manor Lodge School and Southridge Animal Centre, runs parallel to the B556. However, the land within this part of the site appears not to be within the ownership of the four parties identified by the site promoter as owning the promoted land. Unless this land becomes available, access to the B556 would not be achievable. Furthermore, Land Registry searches have indicated that there are more than 15 land parcels in different ownerships with no indication that all of these parties would make their land available.

Indications from the findings of the independent Green Belt stage 2 study are that the central part of the whole area submitted could play a less fundamental role in the strategic Green Belt; however this area on its own would not be of a size that could support a new village.

Under the current policy framework the site is not suitable for development. Were this to change and additional

development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, subject to detailed technical assessments of the impact on the locality, the site could potentially be developable for 1250 homes if all the land was to come forward. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not available and not currently acceptable.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 1249* homes, timescale unknown as site is currently unavailable.

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Site reference | HEL332a /HEL382C and HEL332B/HEL382A |
|-----------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Site source | CFS 2017 and I&O 2017 |
|--------------------|-----------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------|
| Site Name | Tyttenhanger estate sites a and b | | |
| Address | Tyttenhanger estate, main site south of Coursers Road (HEL332A /HEL382C) and site north east of Coursers Road (HEL332B/HEL382A), | | |
| Postcode | AL4 0PG | Parish | Ridge and Shenley |
| Ward | Shenley Ward | Town/Village | |
| Promoter | Turleys/Savills on behalf of Tyttenhanger Estate | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|
| Size (ha) Gross | 449.31 | Current use(s) | Mainly agricultural with some mineral extraction and inert landfill |
|----------------------------|--------|-----------------------|---|

Surrounding area:

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

Planning history:

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

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Garden village |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| HEL332A/ HEL382C: Parcel 42. HEL332B/ HEL382A: Parcel 51 | 0/0 | 3/3 | 4/3 | 0/0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | <p>Parcel 42 forms a significant part of wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield. Scale of gap is such that there is little risk of coalescence, but where overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. Overall parcel is open and largely consists of arable farming fields. Large wooded areas create a sense of enclosure in central parts of the parcel.</p> <p>Parcel 51 forms part of the wider gap between London Colney, St Albans and Hatfield. Little risk of coalescence of settlements, but overall openness is important to protecting perceived gap between settlements. Largely rural character.</p> | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Garden village A (HEL332A/HEL382C) & Garden village C (332B/HEL382A) | 0/0 | Not scored – see Green Belt stage 2 report | | 0/0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | <p>Areas A and the western part of C make a significant contribution to Purpose 2 preventing the merging of London Colney with Colney Heath to the north and Shenley to the south. If a smaller part of area c is released from the Green Belt in isolation, in particular the northern and central areas, there would be more limited harm to the wider Green Belt. Locating development within the dipped topography to the southern central part of the site could help to limit visual impacts on the wider countryside and maintain separation between the garden village site and surrounding settlements</p> | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt. There are local wildlife sites and SSSI within the site. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | North and west edges of HEL332B/HEL382A are affected by FZ3 |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | HEL332A/HEL382C: Three archaeological sites within the site. Grade II listed barn north of Coursers Farm. HEL332B/HEL382A: Adjoins grade I listed Tyttenhanger House, and grade II listed stable block and kitchen wall at Tyttenhanger House |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | Yes – there are mineral workings and landfill within the site. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Any access difficulties. | No |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | Mineral workings. In-vessel composting facility (anaerobic digestion facility operated by Agrivert Ltd, at Coursers Farm. SA236 Land at Redwell Wood Farm, Ridge strategic waste site. M25 adjoins the site and may require noise/polution mitigation |
| Any other environmental constraints? | HEL332A/HEL382C: Local Wildlife sites Coursers Farm, Coursers Road Gravel Pit, Cobs Ash; SSSI Redwell Wood; Ancient Woodlands Redwell.Hawkshead Woods and Cobs Ash/Cangsley Grove. Potwells local wildlife site adjoins the site. HEL332B/HEL382A: Local wildlife sites The New Plantation and Tyttenhanger Gravel Pits North lie within the site. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current policy but could be suitable should the site's Green Belt status change. Consideration will need to be given to safeguarding the mineral resource and strategic waste processing infrastructure. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | yes | Is there developer interest | yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | no | | |
| Is the Site available | yes | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable | yes |
|-------------------------------|-----|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Very low | Garden village |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 30 | 168.9 | 5067 |

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|------------------------------------|
| Up to 40ha for employment purposes |
|------------------------------------|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | | |
|---|-----|----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | | no |
| Reason | n/a | |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Date | 17/05/2019 |
|-------------|-------------------|

Conclusion:

Two areas, the larger being 332A south of Coursers Road (387ha) with a considerably smaller site (56ha) to the north of Coursers Road (HEL332B). A number of environmental constraints affect different parts of the overall site. South of Coursers Road, an SSSI (Redwell Wood) is located in the southern part of HEL332A. Two areas of Ancient Woodland (Cobs Ash/Cangsley Grove and Redwell Wood/Hawkshead Wood) and a Local Wildlife Site (Coursers Road Gravel Pit, Cobs Ash) are also located to the south of Coursers Road, with Potwells adjoining the site. There is also a Grade 2 listed barn north of Coursers Farm as well as two archaeological sites on Coursers Farm and a much larger archaeological site to the west.

Various public rights of way run through the site, some of which have or are proposed to be diverted or extinguished due to the ongoing sand and gravel extraction. The northern part of the area to the south of Coursers Road is subject to various extant minerals planning consents for sand and gravel extraction.

To the north of Coursers Road within HEL332B are two Local Wildlife Sites, The New Plantation containing old woodland with a variety of species and a small part of Tyttenhanger Gravel Pits North whose sand pits are understood to be of particular importance in Hertfordshire with several nationally notable/rare species previously recorded. Colney Heath Nature Reserve is nearby in St Albans district. Grade I listed Tyttenhanger House is west of the site. The site adjoins an area of Flood Zone arising from the River Colne to the west (FZ3) and to the north east (FZ2).

Various bus routes run along the northern and western boundaries of the site - 84 (Barnet – St Albans) and 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood) and 200 (Essendon Mill – London Colney, once a week only) on Coursers Road. The nearest existing centre is Colney Fields (approximately 1 mile from centre of proposed developed area).

HEL332A forms a significant part of a Green Belt parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing, particularly with regard to preventing encroachment into the countryside. The parcel is not at the edge of a distinct large built-up area and therefore cannot be considered to meet purpose 1 (to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas). HEL332B forms part of a separate Green Belt parcel which was also identified as strongly performing, particularly with regard to preventing encroachment into the countryside. It is also identified as performing moderately with regard to forming part of the wider gap between London Colney, St Albans and Hatfield.

The size of the site means that sizeable areas are subject to actual or potential environmental constraints. However, significant proportions of the site are considered developable, subject to adequate mitigation and supporting infrastructure. However, the entirety of both sites, being wholly located within the Green Belt, means that development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 5067* homes – 500* homes within 6-10 years, 1000* homes within 11*-15 years, and 3567* homes beyond that.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 40ha of land for employment purposes. (Releasing land for employment purposes would reduce the potential capacity for residential development).

* Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Site reference | HEL332C-G south of M25/B556 including HEL382D |
|-----------------------|--|

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Site source | CFS 2017 and I&O 2017 |
|--------------------|-----------------------|

Site location / address:

| | | | |
|------------------|--|---------------------|-------------------|
| Site Name | Tyttenhanger estate sites c-g | | |
| Address | Tyttenhanger estate, south of M25/B556, | | |
| Postcode | AL4 0PG | Parish | Ridge and Shenley |
| Ward | Shenley Ward | Town/Village | |
| Promoter | Turleys/Savills on behalf of Tyttenhanger Estate | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 138.55 | Current use(s) | Mainly agricultural with some mineral extraction and inert landfill. Residential at Salisbury Hall. Several farms. |
| Current use(s) | Mainly agricultural with some mineral extraction and inert landfill. Residential at Salisbury Hall. Several farms. | | |

Surrounding area:

| | |
|--|---|
| Neighbouring land uses | Mainly agricultural. Aircraft museum adj Salisbury Hall. Manor Lodge School also within/adjoining the area. |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | Area is close to the built up area of London Colney, and the A1081 and M25 are also urbanising influences. However the character of the immediate area is rural/agricultural. |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | There are adjoining pieces of land north of the M25 in the same ownership which are in the main area being promoted. |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | Rest of site HEL332/HEL382 |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 79/0357 Land reclamation and fill for agricultural use (REFUSED); TP/10/0353 Retention of 3 no. steel storage containers at land and paddocks (GRANTED); various applications associated with Manor Lodge School (including use of agricultural land for playing fields) and Keepers Lodge; TP/93/0506 Use of land for model aircraft flying (GRANTED); TP/09/1961 Retention of polytunnel, portable control cabin, toilet hut and lean to tractor store (used in connection with microlight flying) (GRANTED); TP/01/0756 Erection of five micro-light aircraft hangars and two storage containers (GRANTED) |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | Employment (B class) | Mixed use (specify below) | Other (specify below) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| Urban settlement ¹ PDL | Urban settlement ¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement ² PDL | Green Belt settlement ² non-PDL | Green Belt other ³ PDL | Green Belt other ³ non-PDL |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ outside the Green Belt ² washed over by the Green Belt ³ isolated sites and open countryside

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Parcel 18 & (HEL332G) Parcel 48 | 3+/0 | 3/1 | 4/4 | 0/0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | <p>Parcel 18 prevents the outward sprawl of Borehamwood and forms the wider gap between Borehamwood and London Colney and part of the wider gap between Borehamwood, London Colney, Potters Bar and Greater London. It maintains the overall openness of the gap and ensures its overall physical scale is protected. It prevents ribbon development along Mimms Lane thus ensuring that the gap is not reduced perceptually. The majority of the parcel consists of open fields with long views and maintains an unspoilt rural character.</p> <p>Parcel 48 forms a small part of the less essential gaps between Potters Bar and London Colney, and Potters Bar and Shenley, which are of sufficient scale and character that development is unlikely to cause merging between settlements. Whilst free of development the close proximity to road infrastructure on all sides detracts from the sense of rurality.</p> | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Garden village D, E and F | 0/0/0 | Not scored – see Green Belt stage 2 report | | 0/0/0 |
| Stage 2 Comment | The areas to the south of the M25 form part of the wider gap between London Colney and Shenley. Additional development may contribute to a perceived reduction in the scale of the gap. The areas are most important for preventing encroachment as a result of their unspoilt rural character and strong visual linkages to the wider countryside | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|---|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. The site is within the current Green Belt. There are local wildlife sites within the site. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | no |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Listed buildings adjoining HEL332C at Salisbury Hall (grade II*), The Old Coach House, Barns 70M NW Salisbury Hall, Granary 80M NW Salisbury Hall, Bridge, Gateposts And Revetment To Moat, Nell Gwynne Cottage, Manor Lodge School (grade II). Archaeological area around Salisbury Hall Farm. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | The site is adjacent to B556 |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | The M25 adjoins the site and may require noise/pollution mitigation |
| Any other environmental constraints? | TPO/77/1984 covers groups of trees across the site. HEL332C - Local Wildlife Sites Salisbury Hall Farm Copse, Shenley Lodge Farm Wood. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy. |

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Sites not currently being promoted | Is there developer interest | unknown |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | unknown | | |
| Is the Site available | Not at present | | |

Site Achievability:

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Is the Site achievable | Not at present |
|-------------------------------|----------------|

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Garden village |

(b) Net capacity

| Density dph | Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units)* |
|-------------|--------|----------------------------|
| 31.5 | 69.28 | 2182 |

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | no |
| Reason | n/a |

Conclusion:

This is a group of land parcels in the Tyttenhanger estate mainly to the south of the M25, the largest being HEL332C which incorporates an archaeological site around Salisbury Hall (Grade 2*) and other listed buildings nearby. The eastern area of HEL332C contains listed buildings at Shenley Lodge Farm/Manor Lodge School (Grade 2) as well as two Local Wildlife Sites (Shenley Lodge Farm Wood, Salisbury Hall Farm Copse) containing ancient woodland and a range of associated indicators. A number of TPO groups exist across HEL332C. The other parcels have no environmental or heritage designations. The entire area slopes down to the M25 from its highest point near Shenley Lodge Farm.

St Albans Road is served by the 84 (Barnet – St Albans) and Bell Lane is served by the 602 (Hatfield – Watford, connecting to Radlett Station) and 658 (St Albans to Borehamwood).

The western and southern edge of the area is approximately 1,000m from the edge of the developed area of Shenley.

The area is wholly contained within a strongly performing Green Belt parcel which in particular safeguards the countryside from encroachment with its open fields, long views and undulating topography. The parcel also forms part of the wider gap between Borehamwood and London Colney.

Approximately 139ha of the land in the estate's ownership makes up a contiguous area with a significant proportion potentially developable. However, the entirety of the land, being wholly located within the Green Belt, means that development would not be suitable under the currently planning policy framework and the majority of it is not currently being promoted for development.

This site is no longer being actively pursued for development, with the promoters focusing their efforts on the sites north of the M25.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 0

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

**HELAA 2018
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**
Site reference**HEL519a
and
HEL519b****Site location / address:****Site source**Sites
consultation

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------|
| Site Name | Land South East and West of Junction 22 of the M25, London Colney | | |
| Address | Bell Lane, St Albans | | |
| Postcode | AL2 1BU | Parish | Shenley CP |
| Ward | Shenley | Town/ Village | London Colney |
| Promoter | David Lock Associates | | |

Site size / use:

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| Size (ha) Gross | 15.78 (1.67 HEL519a and 14.11 HEL519b) | Current use(s) | HEL 519a is currently green open fields with pylons running through the site. HEL519b is currently agricultural land. |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|

Surrounding area:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Neighbouring land uses | The northern (HEL519a&b) and western (HEL519b) boundaries of the sites are defined by the M25. To the south of HEL519b is Salisbury Hall, a Grade II* listed building and the De Havilland Aircraft Museum. To south of HEL519a and west of HEL519b are the Watford and Arsenal Training Grounds; and the University College of London Sports Ground. | | |
| Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape | The majority of the land surrounding these sites is agricultural, there are a few residential premises located along Bell Lane south of HEL519a and at Salisbury Hall, south of HEL519a. | | |
| Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site? | No | | |
| If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable | | | |

Planning history:

| | |
|---|---|
| Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues) | 15/1287/FUL Erection of a ground mounted solar photo-voltaic array and associated infrastructure (Refused). 15/1024/EI1 Request for Screening Opinion (Environmental Impact Assessment). 15/0937/EI1 Request for screening opinion (Environmental Impact Assessment). |
|---|---|

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

| Residential | | Employment (B class) | | Mixed use (specify below) | | Other (specify below) | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Choose an item. | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Leisure and tourism |

Location type (tick relevant box):

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Urban settlement¹ PDL | Urban settlement¹ non-PDL | Green Belt settlement² PDL | Green Belt settlement² non-PDL | Green Belt other³ PDL | Green Belt other³ non-PDL |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| ¹ outside the Green Belt | | ² washed over by the Green Belt | | ³ isolated sites and open countryside | |

Green Belt purposes:

| Stage 1 | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Parcel number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| 49 (519a) | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 18 (519b) | 3+ | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| Stage 1 Comment | <p>49. Although the parcel scores weakly against purpose 2, playing only a limited role in preventing the merging of settlements, it maintains a strong level of openness immediately to the south of London Colney, meeting purpose 3 moderately by preventing encroachment into open countryside. The parcel is not recommended for further consideration as there is no scope for sub-division to identify weaker performing areas and the parcel of a similar character throughout.</p> <p>18. The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should be considered further.</p> | | | |
| Stage 2 | | | | |
| Sub-area number | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
| Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed | Not yet assessed |
| Stage 2 Comment | Not yet assessed | | | |

Site Suitability:

| | |
|--|--|
| Conflict with existing policy. | Yes. Sites are within the current Green Belt. |
| Flood Zone 2 or 3? | No |
| Any heritage designations within or adjoining the site. | Salisbury Hall, a Grade II* listed building and 5 Grade II listed buildings at Salisbury Farm are located to the south of HEL519b. |
| Site promoter indicated evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards. | No |
| Any access difficulties. | Not for vehicles but pedestrian access to London Colney across the M25 may be difficult however there are possibilities to link up with the Watling Chase Timberland Trail with a pedestrian bridge over the M25 serving the site. |
| Any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use. | No |
| Any other environmental constraints? | No |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use? | Not under current Green Belt policy |
|---|-------------------------------------|

Site Availability:

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available | Yes | Is there developer interest | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | Yes, a part of HEL%19a is located within St Albans' Borough. | | |
| Is the Site available | Yes | | |

Site Achievability:

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

Estimated development potential – employment uses

| |
|---|
| 15.78ha of land is potentially available for employment uses. |
|---|

Deliverability / Developability:

| What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed taking into account suitability, availability, achievability and constraints, plus anticipated lead in times and build out rates | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Deliverable 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 11-15 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | Developable 16 years + or unknown |

Brownfield Register:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Should the site be considered for inclusion on the Brownfield Site Register? | No |
| Reason | N/A |

Survey undertaken:

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Date | |
|-------------|--|

Conclusion:

The major environmental or topographical constraints with both sites are due to their proximity to the M25. HEL519a also has an overhead electricity line and pylons running across the site. The sites are not particularly accessible by public transport however there is a bus stop located on Bell Lane which serve the 357 (Borehamwood to Harpendon) and 602 (Hatfield to Watford) bus services and a footpath over the M25 which runs along the western boundary of HEL519a. HEL519b is also located in close proximity to Salisbury Hall, a Grade II* listed building and 5 Grade II listed buildings at Salisbury Farm and further consideration will need to be given to the impact on these heritage assets if the scheme is to be considered further.

Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays a role in maintaining a strong level of openness immediately to the south of London Colney. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would provide 15.78 ha of suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.

Capacity under current policy framework: 0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework: 15.78ha of land for employment purposes

*** Capacity figure is based on a standard calculation and is an indication only. It does not mean that this number of homes would be built were the site to be taken forward for development.**

APPENDIX 17: EXTANT PLANNING PERMISSIONS AS AT 1ST APRIL 2019

| PP Ref | Application Type | Address | Description | Granted | Lapses | Proposed Gain | Proposed Loss | Proposed Net Gain |
|--------------|------------------|--|---|------------|------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 15/1399/PD56 | Prior Approval | Unit 4 The Lodge, Hollies Way, High Street, Potters Bar, EN6 5BH | Change of use from Class B1 (office) to Class C3 (residential) to create 2 x 2 bed & 1 x 1 bed self contained apartments. | 16/10/2015 | 16/10/2018 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 18/1757/PD56 | Prior Approval | Key Point, 3-17 High Street, Potters Bar, EN6 5AJ | Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create 8 x studio, 24 x 1 Bed & 47 x 2 Bed apartments. | 30/10/2018 | 30/10/2023 | 79 | 0 | 79 |
| 18/1802/FUL | Full | 88, High Street, Potters Bar, EN6 5AT | Conversion of first floor to provide 1 x 1 bed self contained flat, internal alterations to existing second floor 1 x 2 bed flat with designated car parking, cycle & refuse storage at ground floor. | 21/11/2018 | 21/11/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/2230/PD56 | Prior Approval | Reliant House, Oakmere Mews, Oakmere Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 5DT | Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create 10 apartments (7 studio flats & 3 x 1 bed flats). Revised Application. | 11/01/2019 | 11/01/2024 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 18/2336/FUL | Full | Key Point, 3-17 High Street, Potters Bar, EN6 5AJ | Alterations and roof extension to the building to create 3 x 2 bed flats. | 25/03/2019 | 25/03/2022 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 15/1419/FUL | Full | 203-205, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7AQ | Erection of roof extensions at first and second floor levels to create 7 x 2 bed flats with associated parking within existing basement. | 26/04/2016 | 27/04/2019 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| 16/0180/FUL | Full | 52, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7NN | Part first floor; part two storey rear extension with external staircases & loft conversion with rear dormer, reconstruction of two chimneys & 2 No. front rooflights to create 1 x 2 bed flat & 1 x 3 bed flat, associated landscaping, and reconstruction o | 19/05/2016 | 20/05/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/1446/FUL | Full | 2B Station Road, Radlett, WD7 8JX | Demolition of existing building and erection of a terrace of 3 x 2 bed houses with associated landscaping. | 12/09/2017 | 12/09/2020 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 18/1290/FUL | Full | 84, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7AB | Erection of a rear 2-storey attached dwelling, first floor rear extension to existing building with part change of use of ground floor from A2 to C3 to create 3 x 2 bed flats. | 29/11/2018 | 29/11/2021 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 18/1468/FUL | Full | 201 Watling Street Radlett Hertfordshire | Change of use of ground floor from D1 (Non-Residential Institutions)/A1 (Retail) to C3 (Residential) to create 4 x 1 bed flats (Additional plan received 10/09/2018; additional information received 16/11/2018 and amended by plan received 04/12/2018). | 18/12/2018 | 18/12/2021 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 18/1569/PD56 | Prior Approval | 1st & 2nd floors, 221 Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7AJ | Change of use of 1st and 2nd floor office space (B1) to residential (C3) to create 3 x 1 bed flats. | 28/09/2018 | 28/09/2023 | 3 | 0 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 17/1383/FUL | Full | 37 High Street, Bushey, WD23 1BD | Change of use of first floor from B1 (Office) to C3 (Residential 1 x 2 Bed Flat) replacement of exterior staircase, extension to first floor walkway with new canopy over; installation of new window to East elevation. (Amended description 18.08.17) | 04/09/2017 | 04/09/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/2386/PD56 | Prior Approval | The Red House, 72A-72B High Street, Bushey | Change of use from offices (B1) to residential (C3) to provide 4 self contained units. | 07/03/2018 | 07/03/2021 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 18/1983/FUL | Full | Ivy House, 35 High Street, Bushey, WD23 1BD | Conversion and change of use of Grade II Listed Building from Use Class B1 to six flats(Use Class C3), with external and internal alterations to the listed building. Demolition of modern extension and erection of 3 townhouses, relocated access, parking an | 15/03/2019 | 15/03/2022 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 18/0173/VOC | Variation of Condition | Chess House Studio Way Borehamwood WD6 5NN | Application for variation of condition 2 (plans) and 16 (communal areas) following grant of planning permission 16/1035/FUL | 24/04/2018 | 24/04/2021 | 53 | 0 | 53 |
| 17/0867/PD56 | Prior Approval | Hemini Complex, Stirling Way, Borehamwood, WD6 2BT | Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create 42 studio apartments. | 27/06/2017 | 27/06/2020 | 42 | 0 | 42 |
| 17/1063/FUL | Full | Hemini Complex, Stirling Way, Borehamwood, WD6 2BT | Rooftop extension to create an additional floor to accommodate 9 self contained flats (3 x studio, 2 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed) and external alterations to the elevations. | 02/08/2018 | 02/08/2021 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 18/2349/PD56 | Prior Approval | Churchill House, Stirling Way, Borehamwood, WD6 2HP | Partial change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create 31 dwellings. | 30/01/2019 | 30/01/2024 | 31 | 0 | 31 |
| 13/2614/COU | Full | 7-8 Furzehill Parade, Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DX | Change of use to 1st & 2nd floors from B1 (Offices) to C3 (Residential 2 No. 2 bedroom maisonettes) | 08/07/2014 | 08/07/2017 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 15/1191/FUL | Full | 85-89 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1AG | Conversion of 1st floor storage area and construction of a 3rd floor to form 4 residential units (1x3 bed, 2x2 bed & 1x1 bed), including external alterations to existing building, associated amenity space and landscaping. | 01/10/2015 | 01/10/2018 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 16/0349/FUL | Full | 98 - 112, Shenley Road, Borehamwood | Construction of roof extension to create 4 x 2 bed apartments with terraces and communal amenity space on the roof; Erection of 4 storey side extension to provide access to new apartments and bin and cycle storage (Amended Plans received 10/05/16). | 01/06/2016 | 02/06/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 16/1259/FUL | Full | Wellswood House, Fairway Avenue, Borehamwood, WD6 1PU | Change of use and conversion of the first floor from mixed use pharmacy and D1 to residential to provide 2 apartments (1 x 1 bed & 1 studio); raising of the ridge height and conversion of the second floor/loft to provide a further 2 studio apartments (stu | 05/10/2016 | 06/10/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 17/1447/PD56 | Prior Approval | National Westminster House, 225 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1TE | Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to provide 95 studio flats. | 18/09/2017 | 18/09/2020 | 95 | 0 | 95 |
| 17/2252/FUL | Full | 191 - 195 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1AW | Erection of first floor infill extensions, alterations to existing flats, enclosure of external staircase and creation of an additional 1 bed flat (Revised application following refusal of 17/1477/FUL). | 19/01/2018 | 19/01/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0164/MA | Full | Gasworks Station Road, Borehamwood | Application for a non-material amendment following the grant of planning permission reference 16/1932/FUL | 27/02/2018 | 27/02/2021 | 78 | 0 | 78 |
| 18/0668/REM | Reserved Matters | Land To The Rear Of The Wellington Public House, Theobald Street, Borehamwood, WD6 4SE | Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to landscaping, following approval of 17/1570/OUT - Erection of a two storey detached building comprising 6 flats (5 x 1 bed & 1 x 2 bed) Outline application to include access, appearance, layout & | 12/07/2018 | 12/07/2021 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 18/0799/FUL | Full | Vision House, Station Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DE | Refurbishment & change of use of ground & first floors from D1 to B1 (Office Use) & construction of a second floor to create 1 x 2 bed self contained flat.(Additional information received 08/06/18) | 20/08/2018 | 20/08/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0964/VOC | Variation of Condition | 6 - 8A Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DL | Variation of condition 10 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 17/1343/FUL - To remove the basement and the roof terrace and replace with new floor layout. | 10/08/2018 | 10/08/2021 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 18/1006/FUL | Full | Land Adjacent To The Wellington PH, Theobald Street, Borehamwood, WD6 4SE | Erection of a two storey building to accommodate 2 x 1 & 7 X 2 bed self contained residential flats (Amended plans received 30.08.2018 RE: Alterations to front elevation, side elevations, addition of ground-floor terrace and documentation RE- building mat | 17/10/2018 | 17/10/2021 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 18/1490/FUL | Full | 34A Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DR | Conversion of existing HMO on first & second floors into 2 self-contained studio flats. | 18/09/2018 | 18/09/2021 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 18/1761/PD56 | Prior Approval | 99 To 101 And 111 To 125 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1AG | Change of use of 1st floor offices (B1) to Residential (C3) to create 9 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed apartments. (Revised Application) | 31/10/2018 | 31/10/2023 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| 18/1848/FUL | Full | 140, Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1EQ | Construction of 2 storey rear extension & alterations & extension to the roof to create a 3rd floor to provide an additional 2 bed flat & provide increased floor space to current apartments (Revised plans received 22nd November 2018). | 28/11/2018 | 28/11/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 19/0073/FUL | Full | 20-22 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DR | Loft conversion of existing first floor duplex to create a new 2 bed apartment at third floor level with 4 front rooflights and 2 rear dormer windows. | 27/03/2019 | 27/03/2022 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 15/1648/PD56 | Prior Approval | Metropolitan House, 9 - 11 Darkes Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 1AL | Change of use to floors 5, 6 & 7 from B1 (Office) to C3 (Residential) to create 27 self contained flats (12 x 2 Bed & 15 x 1 Bed) | 10/11/2015 | 10/11/2018 | 27 | 0 | 27 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---|--|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 16/0247/FUL | Full | 33A The Broadway, Darkes Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 2HX | Conversion of 1 bed maisonette into 2 studio flats. | 19/04/2016 | 20/04/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 16/1953/FUL | Full | 136A, Darkes Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 1AF | Rear extension to existing first floor flat and conversion of loftspace to create an additional 1 bed flat with front dormer window and rooflight. | 12/12/2016 | 13/12/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/1090/FUL | Full | 1st Floor, 47 - 49 Darkes Lane, Potters Bar | Change of use of first floor & loft from A1 (retail) to C3 (residential dwelling) to create 1 x 1 bed flat with construction of a mansard roof. Construction of rear walkway to form new access route via new door at first floor level. Construction of deckin | 07/09/2017 | 07/09/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1708/FUL | Full | 15 And 15A The Broadway, Darkes Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 2HX | Erection of single storey rear extension to retail unit following demolition of existing outbuilding; Conversion of existing first floor 2 bed flat (over 2 levels) into 2 x studio flats and creation of external staircase to rear to provide access with shared amenity terrace. | 06/03/2018 | 06/03/2021 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/2273/FUL | Full | 114A Darkes Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 1AE | Conversion of loft space to provide an additional 1 bed flat with front and rear dormers and 1st floor rear extension to existing flat with relocated entrance (as amended by plans received 12/02/2018 and e-mail dated 12/02/2018; additional Flood Risk Assessment received on 12/02/2018 and additional refuse plan received on 22/02/2018 and e-mail dated 22/02/2018). | 02/03/2018 | 02/03/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 19/0001/PD56 | Prior Approval | 22A - 22B The Broadway Mutton Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 2HT | Change of use of 1st and 2nd floor offices from (B1) to (C3) to create 4 self contained units | 20/02/2019 | 20/02/2024 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 13/2017/FUL | Full | 37 Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EJ | Demolition of existing house & erection of 7 bedroom house with associated rooms in basement & roof space. Erection of detached single storey gym/spa building in garden ancillary to use of the house. | 14/01/2014 | 14/01/2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 14/0430/FUL | Full | Land South Of Merry Hill Road And, St Margarets School, Merry Hill Road, Bushey | Development works to create 26 residential units through the conversion of existing locally listed buildings, grade II listed barn & erection of new build houses & flats. Demolition of locally listed former stables building, outbuildings & the preparatory | 27/11/2014 | 27/11/2017 | 26 | 0 | 26 |
| 14/0547/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of, 85, Cranborne Road, Potters Bar | Erection of detached, two storey, 3 bedroom dwelling (Revised Application). | 28/08/2014 | 28/08/2017 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 14/0721/FUL | Full | Bayshill Cottage, Barnet Lane, Elstree, WD6 3QU | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, 7 bed detached dwelling with loft accommodation. Demolition of existing detached garage and outbuildings. | 08/07/2014 | 08/07/2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---|---|------------|------------|-----|---|-----|
| 14/0964/FUL | Full | Adj, 2 Turner Road, Bushey, WD23 3PJ | Demolish existing garage and construct new 2 storey, 3 bed detached dwelling on land adjacent to 2 Turner Road. | 28/11/2014 | 28/11/2017 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 14/1111/FUL | Full | Land South Of, Elstree And Borehamwood Station And, Adjacent To Coleridge Way And, Byron Avenue,, Borehamwood | Development for 43 residential units (Class C3) with associated access, parking, amenity space and landscaping. | 28/11/2014 | 28/11/2017 | 43 | 0 | 43 |
| 14/1181/FUL | Outline | 34 - 36 The Ridgeway, Radlett, WD7 8PS | Demolition of existing properties and construction of 2 no 6 bed replacement dwellings (Revised Application). | 24/11/2015 | 24/11/2018 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 14/1456/FUL | Full | The Fortune, Fortune Lane, Elstree, WD6 3RY | Construct new detached 8 bed dwelling (Revised Application) | 26/06/2015 | 26/06/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 14/1550/FUL | Full | Nicoll Farm Stables, Allum Lane, Elstree, WD6 3NP | Demolition of 2 no. existing dwellings together with some residual structures associated with the former use of the land as riding stables and erection of 2 x 4 bed, detached, replacement dwellings to include basement levels, associated car parking and bi | 06/11/2014 | 06/11/2017 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 14/1567/FUL | Full | Wood Edge, The Warren, Radlett, WD7 7DS | Erection of 3 new three storey, detached dwellings (1 x 4 bed & 2 x 5 bed) all to include basement level, integral garage and with associated landscaping. | 28/01/2015 | 28/01/2018 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 14/1697/FUL | Full | Elton House, Bushey Hall Road, Bushey, WD23 2HJ | Demolition of existing building and erection of two new buildings to provide 22 No: residential units (6 x 1 bed flat and 16 x 2 bed flat), and communal amenity area, basement parking, cycle parking and refuse / recycling stores (Amended plans received 21 | 27/11/2015 | 27/11/2018 | 22 | 0 | 22 |
| 14/1767/FUL | Full | Hertswood School, Thrift Farm Lane, Borehamwood, WD6 1TS | Demolition of existing school buildings (Use Class D1), Ark Theatre (Use Class Sui Generis) and 2 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and erection of 301 residential units comprising 68 x 3 bed houses, 81 x 4 bed houses, 39 x 1 bed flats and 113 x 2 bed | 09/11/2016 | 10/11/2019 | 301 | 2 | 299 |
| 14/1775/PD56 | Prior Approval | 5 Theobald Court, Theobald Street, Borehamwood, WD6 4RN | Change of use of three storey office building (B1) to residential (C3) to provide four private flats (2 x 1 bed & 2 x 2 bed). | 29/12/2014 | 29/12/2017 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 15/0197/FUL | Full | 25 The Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 1EG | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement detached 6 bed dwelling house to include accommodation within the roof space and garage at basement level. Revised Application. (Amended Plans received 30/3/15). | 12/06/2015 | 12/06/2018 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 15/0257/FUL | Full | 14 Park Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 5EJ | Demolition of existing garage and construction of a new detached single storey 3 bed dwelling at rear of 14 Park Avenue. | 17/04/2015 | 17/04/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 15/0656/FUL | Full | Land Adjacent To, 98-100, Brook Road, Borehamwood, WD6 5HA | Construction of new one bedroom dwelling attached to existing pair of semi detached maisonettes, associated parking to the front, new parking to the rear, following the demolition of the existing garage. (AMENDED PLANS & DESCRIPTION) | 04/07/2016 | 04/07/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 15/0783/FUL | Full | Prestige House, Station Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DF | Demolition of existing building and erection of 3 storey building comprising 8 apartments (2 x 2 bed & 6 x 1 bed) with undercroft parking for 6 cars, amenity space and bin store. | 17/06/2016 | 18/06/2019 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| 15/0836/FUL | Full | Kendal Hall Farm,, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7LH | Demolition of redundant farm/equestrian buildings and erection of 3 x 4 bed detached dwellings, each to include detached car ports and refuse stores; Installation of entrance gates and timber fencing. | 28/07/2017 | 28/07/2020 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 15/0883/FUL | Full | Cedar Chalet, Kendal Hall Farm, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7LH | Demolition of existing bungalow & erection of replacement detached 3 bedroom bungalow with basement level | 10/08/2015 | 10/08/2018 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 15/0918/PD56 | Prior Approval | Orchard House, Mutton Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 3AX | Change of use from offices (B1A) to residential (C3) to provide 14 self contained flats (4 x studio, 6 x 1 bed & 4 x 2 bed). | 30/07/2015 | 30/07/2018 | 14 | 0 | 14 |
| 15/1237/FUL | Full | Land adj, 14 Pinewood Close, Borehamwood, WD6 5NW | Erection of 2 storey, end of terrace, 3 bedroom dwelling to include habitable loft accommodation with the insertion of 2 front rooflights and a rear dormer; Relocation of front entrance to number 14. | 08/10/2015 | 08/10/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 15/1258/FUL | Full | Land adj, 31 Chace Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 5LY | Erection of 2 storey, end of terrace, 2 bedroom dwelling and single storey rear extension to no.31. | 02/10/2015 | 02/10/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 15/1342/FUL | Full | Garages At Land Rear Of, 12 The Walk, Potters Bar, EN6 1QL | Demolition of existing garages and construction of detached, two storey, two bedroom dwelling with associated works. | 23/12/2015 | 23/12/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 15/1433/FUL | Full | Patchetts Equestrian Centre, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham, WD25 8PE | Demolition of equestrian facility, removal of hard standing, buildings and structures and the redevelopment of the site to provide 46 new dwellings (with 20 affordable units), parking, gardens and village green. The redevelopment will include the conversi | 14/06/2016 | 15/06/2019 | 50 | 2 | 48 |
| 15/1563/FUL | Full | 17 Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EH | Erection of a 2 storey detached 6 bed dwelling with basement level to include swimming pool / and spa, accommodation within the roof space and a triple detached garage. | 18/12/2015 | 18/12/2018 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 15/1708/VOC | Variation of Condition | The Marians, Barnet Lane, Elstree | Variation of condition 19 attached to planning permission reference TP/13/1143 to change drawing references to reflect new designs for building & landscape | 16/08/2016 | 17/08/2019 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------|---|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 15/1829/FUL | Full | Land To The Rear Of, 2-12, Hatfield Road, & 254-256 High Street, Potters Bar, EN6 1HP | Demolition of existing storage units and erection of detached 3 bed chalet bungalow | 18/02/2016 | 18/02/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 15/2151/FUL | Full | 70, Coldharbour Lane, Bushey, WD23 4NX | Demolition of existing detached dwelling and garage and construction of 2 x 4 bed semi-detached houses with accommodation within the roof space with roof lights to the rear elevation, parking, ancillary works and landscaping. (Revised Application) | 12/02/2016 | 12/02/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 15/2174/FUL | Full | 41, Barham Avenue, Elstree, WD6 3PW | Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of replacement detached dwelling with basement. | 03/03/2016 | 04/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 15/2232/FUL | Full | 8, Watford Road, Radlett, WD7 8LD | Demolition of Existing Dwelling and Erection of 2 Storey Building with Roof and Basement Accommodation Comprising 7 x 2 Bed Apartments with Underground Car Parking and Bin Store. Closure of Existing Vehicular Access and Formation of New Vehicular Access. | 28/11/2016 | 29/11/2019 | 7 | 1 | 6 |
| 15/2260/FUL | Full | 53, The Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 1ED | Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of replacement 2 bed detached bungalow with mezzanine floor and associated works. | 01/03/2016 | 02/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/0127/FUL | Full | 2 And 4 Steeplands And, 1 And 3, Claybury, Bushey | Demolition of 2 & 4 Steeplands and 1 & 3 Claybury and erection of a part 3, part 4 storey building comprising 24 flats with basement car parking (Revised scheme to 15/1478/FUL). | 29/06/2017 | 29/06/2020 | 24 | 4 | 20 |
| 16/0160/FUL | Full | Caldecote Farm, Caldecote Lane, Bushey, WD23 4EF | Demolition of existing equestrian facility, removal of hardstanding, buildings and structures. Redevelopment of site to provide 5 no. detached four bedroom dwellings and 4 no. three bedroom apartments together with new access from Hilfield Lane South, as | 13/04/2017 | 13/04/2020 | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| 16/0277/FUL | Full | 21 And 23, London Road, Shenley, WD7 9EP | Construction of new 4 bed detached dwelling following removal of detached garage on land next to existing dwelling. (Revised Application) (as amended by plan received 01/11/16) | 26/01/2017 | 27/01/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/0280/FUL | Full | 220 & 222, Park Avenue, Bushey, WD23 2BD | The demolition of two existing dwellings and the erection of a three storey building that will accommodate 16 flats, (7 x 1 bed, 8 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) with parking and landscaping. (Amended Plans received 22/03/16 and 26/4/2016 and Amended Site Plan & | 12/01/2017 | 13/01/2020 | 16 | 2 | 14 |
| 16/0300/FUL | Full | 8, Beech Avenue, Radlett, WD7 7DE | Demolition of existing 4 bedroom dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bedroom dwelling with basement level to include an integral garage and habitable loft accommodation with front rooflight and rear balcony. | 04/05/2016 | 05/05/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/0342/FUL | Full | 33, Loom Lane, Radlett, WD7 8AB | Erection of 2 storey, detached, 5 bedroom dwelling and detached double garage. | 18/05/2016 | 19/05/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 16/0402/FUL | Full | Woodhall Farm Office, Woodhall Lane, Shenley, WD7 9AA | Change of use from offices [B1] to residential [C3] to provide 2 x 2 bedroom bungalows. Revised Application | 11/05/2016 | 12/05/2019 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 16/0424/FUL | Full | 130, Little Bushey Lane, Bushey, WD23 4SA | Demolition of existing 2 storey detached dwelling and erection of 2, two storey semi-detached 3 bed dwellings. | 11/05/2016 | 12/05/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 16/0532/PD56 | Prior Approval | Grange Studio, 43, London Road, Shenley, WD7 9ER | Change of use from (B1) Office to 2 bed residential dwelling (C3). | 16/05/2016 | 17/05/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/0608/FUL | Full | 132, Ashwood Road, Potters Bar, EN6 2PW | Construction of New 2 bed semi-detached dwelling and single storey rear extension to existing property. | 17/06/2016 | 18/06/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/0643/FUL | Full | 16A The Warren, Radlett, WD7 7DX | Demolition of existing 5 bed, detached, dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 5 bedroom dwelling to include basement level and habitable loft accommodation with 2 rear dormer windows (Amended plans received 24/06/16). | 19/07/2016 | 20/07/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/0761/FUL | Full | A1 Shooting Ground, Barnet By-pass Road, Borehamwood, EN5 3GZ | Removal of existing structures and erection of pavilion with basement level and residential 2 bedroom flat at first floor level with side dormer windows; Upgrade of existing access from the A1. | 24/06/2016 | 25/06/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/0771/FUL | Full | 28 Watford Road, Radlett, WD7 8LE | Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of 2 new detached, 5 bed dwellings with accommodation within the roof space. (Amended plans received 23/05/16 and 5/8/2016) | 26/10/2016 | 27/10/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 16/0881/VOC | Variation of Condition | 111, High Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1JA | Application for variation of condition 16 (amendments to approved plans) to allow a reconfiguration of internal layout following grant of planning permission TP/09/1433 & Ext of Time TP/12/2671. | 29/11/2016 | 30/11/2019 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 16/0966/FUL | Full | Land adj, 17 Rowley Lane, Borehamwood, WD6 5PA | Erection of 2 storey, end of terrace, 3 bedroom dwelling. | 05/08/2016 | 06/08/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1030/VOC | Variation of Condition | Hillside, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1PD | Variation to condition 7 and 8 of planning permission 13/2608/FUL - To remove a trees and amend design of the house. | 19/08/2016 | 20/08/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1074/FUL | Full | 61-63 Bushey Hall Road, And, Abbeyfield Society Walker Lodge, Ashlyn Close, Bushey | The demolition of the existing building at 61-63 Bushey Hall Road and Walker Lodge off Ashlyn Close and the erection of a 3.5 storey building that will front onto Bushey Hall Road and a 2.5 storey building that will front onto Ashlyn Close, the proposed n | 14/07/2017 | 14/07/2020 | 25 | 0 | 25 |
| 16/1154/FUL | Full | Land adj, 7 Milton Drive, Borehamwood, WD6 2BA | Erection of part single, part two storey rear extension to existing property and construction of new, 2 storey, end of terrace, 3 bedroom dwelling to include habitable loft accommodation with two rear roof lights. | 16/08/2016 | 17/08/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|---|---|---|
| 16/1289/FUL | Full | Land adj, 10 Deacons Hill Road, Elstree, WD6 3LH | Erection of new detached 5 bed house adjacent to main dwelling following demolition of existing detached garage (as amplified by plan received 24/08/2016 and tree report received 24/08/2016). | 30/09/2016 | 01/10/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1293/FUL | Full | 20 Aldenham Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8HX | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bedroom dwelling to include basement level, habitable loft accommodation with side and rear dormer windows at first and second floor levels and detached double garage/home o | 09/11/2016 | 10/11/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1294/FUL | Full | 60, Aldenham Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8HY | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement, 2 storey, detached, 6 bedroom dwelling to include loft accommodation with rear balcony and basement. | 22/03/2017 | 22/03/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1380/FUL | Full | 25 Micklefield Way, Borehamwood, WD6 4LG | Erection of two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension to facilitate the conversion of the existing 3 bed dwelling into 2 x 3 bed self contained flats. (Amended and Additional plans received 14/9/2016). | 07/10/2016 | 08/10/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 16/1383/FUL | Full | 89 Newberries Avenue, Radlett, WD7 7EN | Demolition of existing 4 bed dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling to include an integral garage, basement level and habitable loft accommodation with rooflights to both side elevations. | 07/10/2016 | 08/10/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1413/FUL | Full | Land adj, 1 Updale Close, Potters Bar, EN6 3HP | Relocation of existing entrance from side to front to enable the erection of a 2 storey, end of terrace, 3 bed dwelling with habitable loft accommodation to include front rooflights and a rear dormer window. | 19/06/2017 | 19/06/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1469/CLE | Certificate of Lawful Use | Land At Caldecote Hill, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath | Implementation of approved (TP/90/0941) purpose built farm house & refurbishment of existing entrance and driveway (Certificate of Lawful Development Existing)(amended plans received demonstrating land ownership). | 30/11/2016 | 30/11/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1481/FUL | Full | Land To The Rear Of 95 And 97, High Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1EL | Construction of detached 3 bed dwelling with associated amenity space, landscaping and access. (Amended description and plans 25/11/16). (Amended description 19/12/16). | 10/02/2017 | 11/02/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1553/FUL | Full | 2 Gills Hill Lane, Radlett, WD7 8DD | Demolition of existing 5 bed dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling to include basement level and habitable loft accommodation with rooflights to front and side elevations and 2 rear dormer windows. Second vehicular cross | 04/10/2016 | 05/10/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1571/VOC | Variation of Condition | 22 Barham Avenue, Elstree, WD6 3PN | Application for variation of condition 10 to allow for amendments to approved plans to include removal of approved basement level, provision of a platform lift, internal alterations and minor amendments to all external elevations following grant of planni | 19/10/2016 | 20/10/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 16/1599/FUL | Full | 57A, Glencoe Road, Bushey, WD23 3DP | Part single, part two storey side extension; re-configuration of existing roof and installation of new door and windows to provide 1 x live/work units. (Amended plan received 11/11/16) | 07/12/2016 | 08/12/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1605/FUL | Full | 117, Theobald Street, Borehamwood, WD6 4PT | Erection of a detached self contained 3 bed bungalow in the rear garden of existing property (Amended Plans received 16/11/16). | 24/11/2016 | 25/11/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1649/PD56 | Prior Approval | Europcar House, Aldenham Road, Bushey, WD23 2QQ | Change of use from office (B1) to 61 residential units (C3). | 17/11/2016 | 18/11/2019 | 61 | 0 | 61 |
| 16/1671/FUL | Full | Land At Shenley Grange, 43, London Road, Shenley, WD7 9ER | Erection of 1 No. 5 bed detached dwelling; 1 No. 5 bed detached dwelling with integral garages; 1 No. detached 1.5 storey triple garage building and associated landscaping (Additional Plan received 27/9/16) (Amended Plans received 14/10/16) (Amended description). | 05/12/2017 | 05/12/2020 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 16/1756/FUL | Full | 1, Cotton Road, Potters Bar, EN6 5JT | Single storey rear extension to existing dwelling and part single, part two storey side extension to form new 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling | 13/12/2016 | 14/12/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/1937/FUL | Full | 8 - 9, Heathfield Close, Potters Bar, EN6 1SW | Conversion of 1 flat into 2 x 1 bed self-contained flats. | 24/01/2017 | 25/01/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 16/1982/FUL | Full | The White House, Dancers Hill Road, Bentley Heath, EN5 4RY | Demolition of existing house and erection of 3 no. dwellings (1 pair of 4 bed semi detached dwellings and 1 detached 4 bed dwelling) with associated access, parking and landscaping. | 24/01/2017 | 25/01/2020 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 16/2099/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of 32, Grantham Green, Borehamwood, WD6 2JJ | Erection of 2 storey terrace, comprising 4 x 3 bed houses to include access, parking and landscaping. (As amended by plan received 09/12/16) | 15/12/2016 | 16/12/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 16/2196/FUL | Full | 22, The Rise, Elstree, WD6 3JU | Part retrospective application for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement detached 5 bedroom house with accommodation in the roof space. (Revised application) | 20/01/2017 | 21/01/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/2203/FUL | Full | 2, Lands End, Elstree, WD6 3DL | Demolition of existing house and construction of a replacement 6 bed dwelling with detached outbuildings, associated access and landscaping. Revised application following planning approval 16/0569/FUL | 06/01/2017 | 07/01/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/2311/VOC | Variation of Condition | Land South Of Merry Hill Road And St Margarets School, Merry Hill Road, Bushey, WD23 1DT | Variation of condition 22 attached to planning permission reference 16/1023/VOC to amend the approved plans to allow for the demolition of Hillbrow and construction of a two storey, detached dwelling with habitable loft accommodation. | 26/05/2017 | 26/05/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|------------|------------|---|---|----|
| 16/2358/FUL | Full | 23 Shenley Hill, Radlett, WD7 7AU | Demolition of existing detached house and garage and erection of 3 x 4 bed, 2 storey, detached dwellings, all to include an integral garage and 3 car parking spaces with formation of new crossovers onto Shenley Hill, to include associated landscaping. | 30/05/2017 | 30/05/2020 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 16/2373/FUL | Full | 40, The Ridgeway, Radlett, WD7 8PS | Demolition of existing property and construction of replacement 3 bedroom detached dwelling. | 10/02/2017 | 11/02/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/2392/FUL | Full | The Hollybush, High Street, Elstree, WD6 3EP | Change of use from A4 (Public House) to C3 (Residential) to create 3 x 1 bed flats at ground floor level and 1 x 2 bed flat at first floor level, to include demolition of beer store and outside WC block and erection of single storey side and rear extensi | 08/05/2017 | 08/05/2020 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 16/2404/FUL | Full | 111, Rossington Avenue, Borehamwood, WD6 4LB | Construction of a 2 storey, 3 bed dwelling adjoining No 111 to form an end of terrace with parking, storage and amenity space. (Amended by plans received 23/02/17). | 02/03/2017 | 02/03/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 16/2466/FUL | Full | Palmer's Lodge, 79, Allum Lane, Elstree, WD6 3NN | Conversion of existing garage block with accommodation above to form a new self contained 3 bed dwelling and single storey extension to enlarge porch, with associated bin storage and amenity space. | 10/03/2017 | 10/03/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/2467/FUL | Full | 3 - 4, Wall Hall Farm Cottages, Pelham Lane, Aldenham, WD25 8AS | Construction of a part single, part two storey rear extension, insertion of rooflights to rear and both side elevations to facilitate use of loft, insertion of 4 x first floor dormer windows to both side elevations. The conversion of the existing no. 2 co | 08/03/2017 | 08/03/2020 | 1 | 2 | -1 |
| 16/2479/FUL | Full | The Field House, Barnet Lane, Elstree, WD6 3QU | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 1 x 5 bed house with integral garage, accommodation in the roof space and at basement level with swimming pool (House 1) and 1 x 4 bed house with accommodation in the roof space (House 2). | 25/05/2017 | 25/05/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 16/2481/FUL | Full | 5 Stamford Close, Potters Bar, EN6 5NW | Construction of a 2 storey 1 bed house with accommodation in the roof space to include installation of solar panels on the front elevation, and associated hardstanding and landscaping on land adjacent to No 5 to form an end of terrace dwelling. (Amended D | 23/05/2017 | 23/05/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/0033/VOC | Variation of Condition | 1 - 21 High Firs, Gills Hill, Radlett,, WD7 8BH | Application for variation of condition 7 (amendments to approved plans) to allow alterations to the built form following grant of planning permission 14/1149/FUL. | 12/05/2017 | 12/05/2020 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 17/0065/FUL | Full | 1, 3 And 5, Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EH | Demolition of existing dwellings at No's 1, 3 & 5 Newlands Ave and erection of 3 x 4 bed detached houses all with accommodation in the roof space and at basement level (Amended description 09.03.17). | 15/03/2017 | 15/03/2020 | 3 | 3 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------|---|--|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 17/0078/FUL | Full | 25 London Road, Shenley, WD7 9EP | Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 6 dwellings (2 x 5 bed detached dwellings and 2 pairs of 4 bed semis) each to include an integral garage with associated landscaping and access. | 03/07/2017 | 03/07/2020 | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| 17/0175/FUL | Full | 24 Wren Crescent, Bushey, WD23 1AN | Conversion of garage to habitable room, single storey rear extension to facilitate the conversion of existing dwelling to 2 x 2 bed self contained flats. | 27/04/2017 | 27/04/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/0245/FUL | Full | 19, Chiltern Avenue, Bushey, WD23 4PX | Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of 2 No. detached 5 bed dwellings (Amended Description). | 27/03/2017 | 27/03/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/0292/FUL | Full | 47 Oakridge Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EW | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling to include habitable loft accommodation with side and rear rooflights and dormer windows, parking and landscaping (Revised Application) (Amended location plan r | 08/06/2017 | 08/06/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/0410/FUL | Full | 82 Balmoral Drive, Borehamwood, WD6 2RB | Conversion of existing dwelling to 1 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed flats. | 04/05/2017 | 04/05/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/0470/OUT | Outline | Land adj, Hillside, Potters Lane, Borehamwood, WD6 5NX | Division of plot and erection of a self-contained 2 bedroom chalet style bungalow with attached single garage and hard standing (Outline planning application including details of scale, layout, access & formation of new access to service the existing dwelling) | 09/03/2018 | 09/03/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/0539/FUL | Full | 6 Watford Road, Radlett, WD7 8LD | Demolition of existing house and erection of apartment building containing 10 apartments, with basement parking, access, amenity and landscaping. | 05/01/2018 | 05/01/2021 | 10 | 1 | 9 |
| 17/0545/FUL | Full | Land adj, Fir Spring Cottage, The Pathway, Radlett, WD7 8JB | Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of 2 storey, detached, 3 bed dwelling adjacent to main house (amended site plan to include access road received 11.05.2017 & Highway Assessment received 10.10.2017) | 19/03/2018 | 19/03/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/0556/FUL | Full | Preston Grange Home, Barnet Road, Potters Bar, EN6 2SJ | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 20-bed dementia care home (Class C2). | 24/05/2018 | 24/05/2021 | 0 | 1 | -1 |
| 17/0604/FUL | Full | 139 Auckland Road, Potters Bar, EN6 3HF | Demolition of existing detached house and garage and construction of 1 pair of semi-detached 2 storey, 3 bedroom houses and 1 x 2 storey 3 bedroom detached house with associated access, amenity space and parking. (Revised Application) (Amended Proposed | 25/05/2017 | 25/05/2020 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 17/0667/FUL | Full | Land R/O, 32 Oddesey Road, Borehamwood, WD6 5JP | Erection of detached two storey, 2 bed house incorporating a sunken basement; associated landscaping, car parking and access on the land to the rear of existing dwelling. | 26/06/2017 | 26/06/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 17/0826/FUL | Full | Land At Rear Of 40, Clive Close, Potters Bar, EN6 2AE | Demolition of garage/workshop and construction of a detached 3 bed dwelling to include access, amenity space and parking. | 16/11/2017 | 16/11/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/0899/FUL | Full | Site Of Former Oaklands College, Borehamwood Campus, Elstree Way, Borehamwood | Erection of a part three/part four storey mixed use building comprising a 300.15m2 ground floor education facility and 13no. residential apartments (8no. private and 5no. shared ownership) above with associated car parking and landscaping. | 29/11/2017 | 29/11/2020 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| 17/0903/FUL | Full | Hillcrest, Oakmere Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 5ED | Erection of 2 storey side extension and single-storey front porch extension to facilitate conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 2 bed semi detached dwellings (Plans received 10.07.17 - Amended proposed rear elevation & ground-floor plan RE: rear doors, | 01/08/2017 | 01/08/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/0946/VOC | Variation of Condition | 24 Hartsbourne Avenue, Bushey Heath, WD23 1JL | Variation of condition 12 attached to planning permission reference 16/2409/FUL to amend the approved plans to reduce the proposed area by 88sqm and alter the garden access in the rear elevation. | 10/07/2017 | 10/07/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1010/FUL | Full | Land At 1 & 1A Drayton Road And Associated Neighbouring Prem, 48,50,52 & 52A Shenley Road, Borehamwood | Conversion of the first floor of the existing buildings and construction of a second floor with eleven dormer windows rooflights to accommodate 10 new residential units (1 studio apartment and 7no. 1 bed apartments, 2no. 2 bed apartments) with second floor | 07/06/2018 | 07/06/2021 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 17/1011/FUL | Full | Elangeni,, Loom Lane, Radlett, WD7 8AB | Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of replacement 6 bed detached dwelling with integral garage & lower ground accommodation with underground swimming pool and outdoor hot tub. | 28/09/2017 | 28/09/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1040/FUL | Full | Land Adjacent To, 1, Black Lion Hill, Shenley, WD7 9DE | Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of a 4 bed detached dwelling with amenity space, parking access and associated works | 31/07/2017 | 31/07/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1042/FUL | Full | Land Between, 82 And 84, Stanborough Avenue, Borehamwood | Erection of a 2 storey detached 2 bed dwelling with accommodation in the roof space on land between nos. 82 and 84 Stanborough Ave. | 31/08/2017 | 31/08/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1049/FUL | Full | The Old Engine Shed, Brickfields, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 8BS | Conversion of existing workshop to create new detached single storey one bedroom residential dwelling | 07/09/2017 | 07/09/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1052/VOC | Variation of Condition | 18 Watford Road, Radlett, WD7 8LE | Application for variation of condition 2 to amend the approved plans following grant of planning permission 16/1931/FUL. | 02/02/2018 | 02/02/2021 | 10 | 0 | 10 |
| 17/1088/FUL | Full | Land At Rear Of, 73 And 75, Rushfield, Potters Bar | Erection of a terrace of 3 x 3 bed dwellings together with associated car parking and amenity space (Amended by plan received 28/07/2017). | 21/08/2017 | 21/08/2020 | 3 | 0 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---|--|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 17/1103/FUL | Full | 183 Balmoral Drive, Borehamwood, WD6 2QP | Removal of existing rear extension and erection of part single, part two storey rear extension to facilitate conversion of existing 1 bed house to 2 x 1 bed flats. (Revised Application). | 21/07/2017 | 21/07/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/1110/FUL | Full | 8 Hamilton Close, South Mimms, EN6 3PG | Internal and external alterations to include new windows and doors to facilitate the conversion of existing office to 4 residential units (1 x bedsit, 2 x 1 bed & 1 x 2 bed) | 11/07/2018 | 11/07/2021 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 17/1137/FUL | Full | 11 The Avenue, Radlett, WD7 7DG | Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached 2 storey, 5 bed dwelling with accommodation in the roof space to include swimming pool, and detached single garage with retention of existing access, landscaping and ancillary works (Am | 18/09/2017 | 18/09/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1192/FUL | Full | 23 Woodlands Road, Bushey, WD23 2LS | Construction of detached, 2 storey 5 bed dwelling with accommodation in the roof space, to include parking, landscaping and amenity space. | 31/08/2017 | 31/08/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1257/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of Grove House, High Street, Bushey, WD23 1BB | Demolition of 2 existing garage blocks and erection of two blocks of 2 x 2 bed semi-detached 1.5 storey residential dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping | 27/10/2017 | 27/10/2020 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 17/1260/FUL | Full | 37 Bucks Avenue, Watford, WD19 4AR | Redevelopment of site to provide 27 dwellings comprising: 1 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed apartments; 14 x 3 bed and 8 x 4 bed houses with associated parking, informal play area and open space, all to be served by modifying the existing access from Bucks Avenue/Sherwood Road (Amended Plans received 17/10/2017 - Amendments to some of the house designs). | 16/03/2018 | 16/03/2021 | 27 | 0 | 27 |
| 17/1268/PD56 | Prior Approval | 1 Walton Road, Bushey, WD23 2HR | Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create a 3 bed dwelling. | 15/08/2017 | 15/08/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1351/FUL | Full | Birchville Court And Adjacent Haulage Depot, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1PB | Redevelopment of former nursing home and haulage yard to include erection of 41 dwellings, including 5 detached houses and 36 flats (of which 14 affordable units), basement to provide car parking, cycle storage and leisure facility for market units and new access roads, car parking, garaging, landscaping, open space and bin storage and collection points. | 22/12/2017 | 22/12/2020 | 41 | 0 | 41 |
| 17/1352/FUL | Full | 6 Hatfield Road, Potters Bar, EN6 1HP | Single storey rear extension, partial conversion of ground retail unit and conversion of first floor offices to create 1x1 bed and 1x2 bed flats | 14/09/2017 | 14/09/2020 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 17/1382/FUL | Full | Kendal Hall Farm, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7LH | Erection of 3 x 4 bed detached dwellings. (Revised Application). | 12/09/2017 | 12/09/2020 | 3 | 0 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---|---|------------|------------|---|---|---|
| 17/1522/FUL | Full | Land Adjacent To, 4 Cedar Crescent, Bushey, WD23 2FS | Erection of detached 3 bed dwelling, with associated vehicular access, hardstanding and landscaping. | 04/01/2018 | 04/01/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1573/FUL | Full | 5 Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EH | Demolition of existing 2 storey dwelling and construction of replacement detached 6 bed house to include accommodation in the roof space. | 02/10/2017 | 02/10/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1576/PD56 | Prior Approval | Herkomer House, 156-158 High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Change of use of office (B1a) to residential (C3) to provide 4 flats. | 26/10/2017 | 26/10/2020 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 17/1624/FUL | Full | 17 Williams Way, Radlett, WD7 7EZ | Demolition of existing bungalow and garage and construction of replacement detached, 2 storey 5 bed house with integral garage. | 10/11/2017 | 10/11/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1638/FUL | Full | 64 Park Crescent, Elstree, WD6 3PU | Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached 6 bed dwelling to include accommodation in the roof space. | 05/10/2017 | 05/10/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1665/FUL | Full | Wilton End Cottage, Radlett Lane, Shenley, WD7 9AJ | Conversion of existing agricultural barn to a detached 3 bed dwelling with associated amenity space, parking and landscaping involving demolition of existing lean to and replacement with single storey rear extension. | 01/11/2017 | 01/11/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1674/FUL | Full | Marston, High Street, Elstree, WD6 3EY | Erection of 1 pair of 3 bed semi-detached dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping. | 14/12/2017 | 14/12/2020 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/1705/FUL | Full | 4 Park Crescent, Elstree, WD6 3PU | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling with habitable loft accommodation to include insertion of rooflights to both side elevations and 2 rear dormer windows (Amended plans received 1st November 2017). | 02/11/2017 | 02/11/2020 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1849/FUL | Full | Land adj, 2 Hill Crest, Potters Bar, EN6 2RT | Part single, part two storey side extension with new entrance porch and access to form new 1 bed dwelling and single storey rear extension to existing dwelling. | 25/05/2018 | 25/05/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1891/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of 2-16, The Grove, Potters Bar, EN6 5LJ | Demolition of 2 existing garage blocks and erection of detached 2 storey 3 bed dwelling with to include access, parking and amenity space. | 13/12/2017 | 13/12/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/1896/FUL | Full | Spylaw House, Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EL | Demolition of existing 2 storey dwelling and erection of replacement detached 7 bed house to include lower ground floor level with pool and accommodation in the roof space. (Revised Application) | 15/01/2018 | 15/01/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1912/FUL | Full | 2 Furzehill Road, Borehamwood, WD6 2DF | Demolition of existing detached dwelling & erection of replacement apartment block comprising 1 x 2 bed & 3 x 3 bed flats with basement car park, cycle store & associated landscaping. | 26/03/2018 | 26/03/2021 | 4 | 1 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|--|--|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 17/1950/FUL | Full | Crown Road Garages, Crown Road, Borehamwood | The erection of 18 x 2 bed units and 10 x 1 bed units with associated parking, cycle storage, refuse storage and landscaping in 2 storey modular units for people with urgent housing need. | 15/02/2018 | 15/02/2021 | 28 | 0 | 28 |
| 17/2011/VOC | Variation of Condition | 99 High Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1EL | Application for variation of condition 2 to allow for revised drawings following Appeal APP/N1920/W/16/3150498 (15/1376/FUL) for removal of basement level parking, crossover to frontage and minor changes to elevations. | 22/03/2018 | 22/03/2021 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 17/2081/FUL | Full | Land East Of Rossway Drive And, Adjacent To The Lodge Rossway Drive, Bushey | Demolition of existing buildings and construction of new buildings comprising 32 houses (11 x two bedrooms and 21 x three bedrooms) and 23 flats (5 x one bedrooms and 18 x two bedrooms) with associated new access road, landscaping, parking, pedestrian acc | 06/07/2018 | 06/07/2021 | 55 | 0 | 55 |
| 17/2140/FUL | Full | Willow Tree Cottage, Hartspring Lane, Watford, WD25 8AD | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement detached 3 bed dwelling. | 23/03/2018 | 23/03/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2156/FUL | Full | Butley Mead, The Warren, Radlett, WD7 7DS | Demolition of existing 4 bedroom house with integral garage and erection of a 5 bedroom dwelling including accommodation within the roof space, rear balcony at first floor level and detached double garage. Extension to existing driveway and installation of new sliding entrance gate. | 22/01/2018 | 22/01/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2177/VOC | Variation of Condition | Walnut Green Garages And Land At The Rear Of 301 303 And 313 Park Avenue Walnut Green Bushey | Application for variation of conditions 1 and 11 to allow for changes to windows following grant of planning permission 15/1303/FUL. | 20/04/2018 | 30/11/2019 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 17/2221/FUL | Full | 26 Deacons Hill Road, Elstree, WD6 3LH | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 5 bed house to include habitable loft accommodation with rooflights to all elevations, a rear dormer window and rear roof projection (Revised Application) (Plans Received 30.01.18 RE: Rear projection and roof height & 31.01.18 RE: Streetscene & Topographical Survey) | 06/02/2018 | 06/02/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2271/FUL | Full | 63 Goodyers Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8AZ | Demolition of existing house and erection of replacement 2 storey detached six bed dwelling with habitable loft and basement accommodation. | 29/01/2018 | 29/01/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2281/FUL | Full | Garages At The Rear Of, 27-47 Claybury, Bushey | Proposed demolition of existing garages and construction of 2 x 1 bed apartments, 4 x 2 bed apartments and 1 x 3 bed apartment including landscaping and parking provision for 13 spaces (Revised application following withdrawal of 17/1381/FUL). | 12/07/2018 | 12/07/2021 | 7 | 0 | 7 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------|---|--|------------|------------|---|---|---|
| 17/2361/FUL | Full | Crossekeys, Barnet Lane, Elstree, WD6 3QU | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling to include an integral double garage and swimming pool. | 06/03/2018 | 06/03/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2374/FUL | Full | Elstree Road Garage, 44 - 46 Elstree Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 4GL | Demolition of commercial workshop premises and dwelling house and construction of 3 x 3 bed townhouses with accommodation in the roof space to include parking, access and amenity space (Amended plans received 12th March 2018). | 19/03/2018 | 19/03/2021 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 17/2401/FUL | Full | 58 Nicoll Way, Borehamwood, WD6 2PS | Conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 1 bed flats. (Revised Application) | 24/10/2018 | 24/10/2021 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 17/2403/FUL | Full | 93 - 95 Blanche Lane, South Mimms | Demolition of existing rear out-houses, erection of single rear extensions and creation of new side access to provide entrance to no. 95 Blanche Lane together with a new canopy over and side gate, new windows and doors and associated internal alterations to facilitate the existing properties into 2 x 2 bed cottages. (Revised drawings submitted - 27/03/2018 and 30/4/2018). | 18/05/2018 | 18/05/2021 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 17/2429/FUL | Full | 30 The Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 1EB | Demolition of existing dwelling (retrospective) and erection of replacement 6 bed detached dwelling with basement & associated landscaping with raised rear patio. | 20/04/2018 | 20/04/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2442/FUL | Full | Land Adjacent To, 49A Harcourt Road, Bushey, WD23 3PD | Erection of end of terrace 2 bed house (Amended plans received 1st March 2018). | 13/03/2018 | 13/03/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17/2445/PD56R | Prior Approval | 137-139 Sparrows Herne, Bushey, WD23 1AQ | Change of use from ground floor shop (A1) to 1 x residential 2 bed (C3) flat (as amended by plans received on 23/02/2018 and e-mail dated 23/02/2018). | 27/02/2018 | 27/02/2023 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0039/PD56 | Prior Approval | Herkomer House, 156-158 High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Conversion of office (B1a) to residential (C3) to provide 7 x 1 bed & 2 x 2 bed apartments. | 05/03/2018 | 05/03/2021 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 18/0045/FUL | Full | 70 Rosebery Road, Bushey, WD23 1DA | Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of 2 No. 3 bed semi-detached dwellings with accommodation within the roof space & associated parking & landscaping. | 20/04/2018 | 20/04/2021 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18/0053/VOC | Variation of Condition | 31 The Ridgeway, Radlett, WD7 8PT | Application for variation of condition 4 to allow for roof alterations and changes to fenestration following grant of planning permission 17/0909/FUL | 08/03/2018 | 08/03/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0065/FUL | Full | Keepers Lodge, Rectory Lane, Shenley, WD7 9BE | Construction of detached 2 storey 4 bed residential dwelling following demolition of existing residential dwelling, shed and swimming pool. | 29/03/2018 | 29/03/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------|---|--|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 18/0079/FUL | Full | 20 Christchurch Crescent, Radlett, WD7 8AH | Construction of 1 pair of semi-detached 4 bed dwellings and 1 detached 5 bedroom dwelling with accommodation within the roof space & at basement level with associated parking & landscaping. | 03/05/2018 | 03/05/2021 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 18/0100/FUL | Full | Land North Of, 2 Windmore Avenue, Potters Bar | Construction of a 2 storey detached 3 bed dwelling (Amended Plan received 12/2/2018 and 22/02/2018). | 10/04/2018 | 10/04/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0114/FUL | Full | Orchard View, Theobald Street, Radlett, WD7 7LT | Demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage, and construction of a replacement detached six-bed house to include integrated garage, swimming pool, front courtyard with associated parking and landscaping. | 15/03/2018 | 15/03/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0117/FUL | Full | Selbourne, 241 Mutton Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 2AT | Division of existing dwelling house containing former unauthorised dental surgery into 1 x 1 bed flat and 1 x 3 bed house. Alterations to existing crossover to provide 1 x additional car parking space. Demolition of existing detached rear outbuilding. | 16/04/2018 | 16/04/2021 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18/0155/FUL | Full | The Green Man, 238, High Street, Potters Bar, EN6 5DB | The construction of 18 no. flats (to include the provision of 9 x 1 bed and 9 x 2 bed) with car parking and landscaping, together with alterations to the C20th additions to the Former Green Man Public House, with refurbishments, and Change of Use to B1(a) | 15/01/2019 | 15/01/2022 | 19 | 1 | 18 |
| 18/0213/FUL | Full | Dancers Hill House, Dancers Lane, Barnet, EN5 4RX | Conversion of Dancers Hill House into three flats (1 x 2 bed, 2 x 3 bed) to include single storey rear extension, front basement terrace and bridge, alterations to fenestration, internal layout and landscape. Two storey side extension to detached Cottage | 12/04/2018 | 12/04/2021 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 18/0217/FUL | Full | 1 Beech Drive, Borehamwood, WD6 4QU | Erection of two storey rear extension with first floor balcony to facilitate the conversion of single dwelling house to 2 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed flats; installation of 2 additional rooflights to side roof slope; repositioning of main front entrance; removal | 12/04/2018 | 12/04/2021 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 18/0256/FUL | Full | 86 Baker Street, Potters Bar, EN6 2EP | Demolition of existing detached garage and construction of a single-storey rear extension to facilitate conversion from a six bed care facility to 4 x 1 bed self-contained units based on the supported living model, with on site care staff facilities. | 15/10/2018 | 15/10/2021 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 18/0265/FUL | Full | Thatched Cottage, Silver Hill, Borehamwood, WD6 5PW | Demolition of existing fire damaged building & erection of a replacement 3-bed detached dwelling with accommodation within the roof space (Amended description Plans 10.04.2018 proposed site plan and 3D plans 16.04.2018). | 30/04/2018 | 30/04/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0288/FUL | Full | Europcar House, Aldenham Road, Bushey, WD23 2QQ | Application to regularise the creation of 2 new residential units at ground floor level. | 01/06/2018 | 01/06/2021 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|---|
| 18/0416/FUL | Full | 55 Cobden Hill, Radlett, WD7 7JN | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement detached 4 bed house. | 21/05/2018 | 21/05/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0421/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of Summerhill And Northfields, King Edward Road, Shenley | Construction of detached 2 storey 4 bed house with accommodation within the roof space with associated landscaping, parking, refuse provision and bike store (Revised application). (Amended Plans Received 22/05/18) | 06/06/2018 | 06/06/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0449/VOC | Variation of Condition | 19 Newberries Avenue, Radlett, WD7 7EJ | Application for variation of conditions 7 (windows) and 8 (approved plans) to allow for: omission of basement; erection of single storey rear extension; omission of side chimneys; increase in width of rear dormer; window alterations; addition of 3 rooflig | 18/05/2018 | 18/05/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0518/FUL | Full | 36 - 38 Watford Road, Radlett | Demolition of existing building and construction of 2 x 2 bed flats within a new 2 storey building (Amended plans received 14.05.2018: increased separation from boundary with No.34 Watford Road and alteration to first-floor windows (north-east elevation) | 21/06/2018 | 21/06/2021 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 18/0592/FUL | Full | Ganwick Corner Yard, Barnet Road, Barnet, EN5 4SG | Demolition of existing buildings and storage containers and erection of a single storey, detached, 4 bed dwelling with an integral garage, habitable loft accommodation to include front and side dormer windows and rear rooflights together with landscaping | 16/11/2018 | 16/11/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0608/FUL | Full | North Block Parkside, High Street, Potters Bar, EN6 5AU | Alterations to roof of existing residential block to provide 3 additional flats (2x1 bed & 1x2 bed) together with ancillary bin storage and bicycle/general storage facilities and car parking (Additional Ecology Report received on 31/07/2018 and amended pl | 14/12/2018 | 14/12/2021 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 18/0621/FUL | Full | 37 Williams Way, Radlett, WD7 7HB | Construction of detached 5 bed dwelling following demolition of existing house. (Part Retrospective) | 15/06/2018 | 15/06/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0725/FUL | Full | 126, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7JH | Demolition of existing detached garage, and erection of a detached house comprising basement, ground floor, first floor and accommodation in attic. | 12/12/2018 | 12/12/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/0781/FUL | Full | 12 Watford Road, Radlett, WD7 8LD | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a new building to provide 10 x 2 bed self-contained flats with associated basement and surface parking, cycle and refuse store, amenity areas and landscaping. (Amended plans and documents received 27/4/18) | 03/10/2018 | 03/10/2021 | 10 | 1 | 9 |
| 18/0784/VOC | Variation of Condition | 25 London Road, Shenley, WD7 9EP | Variation of condition 23 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 17/0078/FUL - To facilitate amendments to plots 1, 2 & 3 (continuing the lower roof slope to the side elevations to the rear) (additional plans received 12/06/18 and 13/08/2018) | 17/09/2018 | 17/09/2021 | 4 | 0 | 4 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 18/0835/FUL | Full | Former Residential Accommodation, The Cannon Public House, Thirsk Road, Borehamwood, WD6 5AY | Change of use to a dwelling house for the purpose of the provision of temporary accommodation. | 20/08/2018 | 20/08/2021 | 0 | 1 | -1 |
| 18/0843/FUL | Full | 1 - 1A Furzehill Road, Borehamwood, WD6 2DG | Conversion of detached property with ground and first floor flats back into a single four bed dwelling with minor alterations to front elevation. | 20/07/2018 | 20/07/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0860/VOC | Variation of Condition | Bushey Hall Golf Club, Bushey Hall Drive, Bushey, WD23 2EP | Application for variation of condition 17 attached to planning permission 16/1579/FUL - To amend the approved plans. | 20/07/2018 | 20/07/2021 | 31 | 0 | 31 |
| 18/0972/FUL | Full | 136 Sunnybank Road, Potters Bar, EN6 2NQ | Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of 2 x 3 bed semi detached bungalows with associated parking and landscaping (Revised plans received 7th August 2018). | 07/09/2018 | 07/09/2021 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18/0980/FUL | Full | Woodhall Gate Lodge, Radlett Lane, Shenley, WD7 9AG | Erection of 2 x 4 bed semi-detached dwellings following the demolition of the existing buildings and amendments to access | 07/09/2018 | 07/09/2021 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 18/1044/FUL | Full | 79 The Causeway, Potters Bar, EN6 5HL | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2.5 storey building comprising 4 x 2 bed, 3 x 1 bed & 1 x studio flats with dormer windows & rooflights, first floor balconies to front and rear elevations, basement parking, forecourt parking, bike and refu | 20/08/2018 | 20/08/2021 | 8 | 1 | 7 |
| 18/1268/FUL | Full | 90 Rossington Avenue, Borehamwood, WD6 4LD | Construction of 3 bed end of terrace dwelling & 2No. new vehicle crossovers. | 14/08/2018 | 14/08/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/1285/FUL | Full | 45, Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EJ | Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of detached 7 bedroom dwelling with basement & accommodation within the roof space (Amended Plans received 14/11/2018). | 16/11/2018 | 16/11/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/1381/FUL | Full | 24 St Francis Close, Potters Bar, EN6 2RH | Erection of a two storey side extension and addition of first floor to the existing bungalow to facilitate subdivision to create 2 x 2 bed residential dwellings. | 10/10/2018 | 10/10/2021 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18/1547/FUL | Full | Ridge Hill Stables, Rectory Lane, Shenley, WD7 9BG | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 6 x 3 bed semi detached houses with accommodation within the roof space, and 3 x 4 bed detached houses with parking, gardens and amenity space. (Revised Application) | 27/02/2019 | 27/02/2022 | 9 | 1 | 8 |
| 18/1598/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of 67-73 Strafford Gate, Potters Bar, EN8 1PR | Construction of 1 x 3 bed detached dwelling & 1 pair of semi-detached 4 bed dwellings with associated access and landscaping & parking (Amended plans received 02.01.2018 RE: Bin storage and insertion of obscurely glazed side window to plot 1) (Amended met | 26/10/2018 | 26/10/2021 | 3 | 0 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 18/1628/FUL | Full | Land At Lincolnsfield Off, Bushey Hall Drive, Bushey, WD23 2ES | Demolition of buildings to south of Lincolnsfield Centre and redevelopment to provide 55 residential dwellings including alterations and improvements to the existing internal roads, associated vehicular parking, watercourse enhancement, refuse and amenity | 28/02/2019 | 28/02/2022 | 55 | 0 | 55 |
| 18/1634/FUL | Full | 27 High Street, Elstree, WD6 3EZ | Erection of 1 x 2 bed detached dwelling and part conversion of rear commercial premises to 1 x 1 bed dwelling (as amended by plans received on 15/11/2018 and 20/12/2018) | 14/02/2019 | 14/02/2022 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 18/1642/FUL | Full | Former Patchetts Equestrian Centre, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham | Conversion of the existing buildings in order to create 4 new residential dwellings (4 x 4+ bedrooms) at Lims Barn, The Coach House and the toilet block, and the erection of extensions to the Barn and Stables building following partial demolition of Lims | 20/03/2019 | 20/03/2022 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 18/1654/FUL | Full | 7 Hartsbourne Avenue, Bushey Heath, WD23 1JP | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of detached 5 bed house with integral garage, accommodation in the roof space to include dormers to the front and rear and roof lights to both side elevations (Amended plans received 02.01.2019: Removal of | 22/03/2019 | 22/03/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/1679/FUL | Full | 88, Newberries Avenue, Radlett, WD7 7EP | Demolition of existing property & erection of replacement 5 bed detached dwelling with integral garage (as amended by plan received 19/12/2018). | 11/01/2019 | 11/01/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/1682/FUL | Full | Elstree Lawns Nursing Home, Barnet Lane Elstree, WD6 3RD | Demolition of existing residential care home and the erection of a 2 storey residential development with accommodation in the roof, comprising 16 self contained apartments with surface level parking, concierge building, bin stores and landscaping and asso | 19/02/2019 | 19/02/2022 | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| 18/1716/FUL | Full | 60 Williams Way, Radlett, WD7 7HB | Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached, 2 storey 3 bed dwelling to include access, parking and amenity space. | 29/10/2018 | 29/10/2021 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/1804/REM | Reserved Matters | Land To The Rear Of 52, Stratfield Road, Badminton Close, Borehamwood, WD6 1UJ | Application for the approval of Reserved Matters relating to appearance and landscaping following the approval of outline consent reference 16/2117/OUT for the erection of a 2 storey, detached 2 bed dwelling. | 13/11/2018 | 13/11/2020 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/1851/PD56O | Prior Approval | Arlingham House, St Albans Road, South Mimms, EN6 3PH | Change of use from class B1(a) office use to class C3 residential to provide 13 self contained flats. | 12/11/2018 | 12/11/2021 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| 18/1875/VOC | Variation of Condition | 44 Loom Lane, Radlett, WD7 8NZ | Variation of condition 11 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 17/2155/FUL - To vary the plans to include basement level to all dwellings (Revised plans received 3rd December 2018). | 13/02/2019 | 13/02/2022 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|
| 18/1961/FUL | Full | Herkomer House, 156 - 158 High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Construction of roof extension with 5 new dormer windows and 10 roof lights to enlarge Units 10 & 11, and changes to fenestration and access following approval under application 18/1389/PD56 to convert former office building for residential use (Amended p | 21/12/2018 | 21/12/2021 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| 18/1994/FUL | Full | The Royal British Legion, Cotton Road, Potters Bar, EN6 5JG | Demolition of existing building & redevelopment to provide 6 x 2 bed flats on the upper floors with retention of a community use on the ground floor, together with associated landscaping, car parking & cycle spaces. | 14/01/2019 | 14/01/2022 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 18/2007/FUL | Full | Jasmin House, 160 - 162 High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Change of use & construction of 3 storey rear extension to provide undercroft parking, 2 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed flats (revised plans received 21st November, 29th November 2018 and 11th December 2018). | 07/03/2019 | 07/03/2022 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 18/2032/FUL | Full | Land Adjoining Twin Cottage, Common Lane, Radlett, WD7 8PJ | Construction of a detached 5 bed dwelling with basement parking and associated landscaping. (Revised Application) | 15/02/2019 | 15/02/2022 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/2068/VOC | Variation of Condition | Land South Of Geddes Road And Adjacent To 7Sutcliffe Close, Bushey | Application for variation of condition 2 to allow for the addition of a basement following grant of planning permission 17/1125/FUL | 18/12/2018 | 18/12/2021 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/2146/VOC | Variation of Condition | Gaisgill, Barnet Lane, Elstree, WD6 3QZ | Application for variation of condition 2 to amend the plans to improve the exterior aspect, interior layout and functionality of the building following refusal of planning permission TP/11/1169, overturned on Appeal APP/N1920/A/12/2171834/NWF. | 31/01/2019 | 31/01/2022 | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| 18/2157/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of 46-48, High Street, Bushey | Construction of 2 bed detached dwelling to include parking, access, bin and cycle storage. | 29/01/2019 | 29/01/2022 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/2172/FUL | Full | 45, Homefield Road, Radlett, WD7 8PX | Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached 5 bed dwelling to include accommodation within the roof space. | 10/01/2019 | 10/01/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/2176/VOC | Variation of Condition | 41 Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EJ | Application for a variation of condition 13 (approved plans) to allow for revised drawing numbers following grant of planning permission under reference 17/2044/FUL and subsequent variation 18/1380/VOC. | 14/02/2019 | 14/02/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/2204/PD56 | Prior Approval | 147 - 151, The Walk, Potters Bar, EN6 1QD | Change of use from (B1) office to (C3) residential to create 1 x 1 bed & 1 x studio flats. | 07/01/2019 | 07/01/2024 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 18/2206/FUL | Full | 33A - 33B Park Road, Bushey, WD23 3EE | Construction of first floor side and rear extensions together with internal reconfiguration to facilitate conversion of 33C to a 1 x 1 bed house and creation of additional 1 x 2 bed house with retention of 33A and 33B as 2 x 1 bed flats and provision of p | 27/02/2019 | 27/02/2022 | 4 | 3 | 1 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|--|---|------------|------------|---|---|---|
| 18/2220/PD56 | Prior Approval | Jasmin House 160 - 162, High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Change of use from office (B1a) to residential (C3) to create 9 x 1 bed apartments. | 09/01/2019 | 09/01/2024 | 9 | 0 | 9 |
| 18/2245/FUL | Full | 6 Loom Lane, Radlett, WD7 8AD | Demolition of existing house and outbuildings and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 4 bed dwelling to include basement level with integral garage and indoor swimming pool and habitable loft accommodation with front and rear dormer windows and ro | 15/02/2019 | 15/02/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/2250/FUL | Full | Land To The Rear Of, 29Cobden Hill, Radlett, WD7 7UL | Demolition of existing garage and alterations to car parking for No 29 to facilitate new access and construction of a 2 storey, 5 bed detached house with accommodation within the roof space, separate garage and associated parking. (Revised Application) | 12/03/2019 | 12/03/2022 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/2252/FUL | Full | 145 Merry Hill Road, Bushey, WD23 1DF | Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and construction of a replacement detached, 5 bedroom house. | 07/02/2019 | 07/02/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/2288/FUL | Full | 316, Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1TT | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a pair of semi-detached dwellings (2 x 4 bedroom houses) with associated car parking. | 16/01/2019 | 16/01/2022 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 18/2353/FUL | Full | Land Rear Of, 75 And 77 Trafford Gate, Potters Bar | Construction of a pair of 2 x 3 bed semi detached dwellings with access from Birch Grove. (Amended Description) | 01/03/2019 | 01/03/2022 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 18/2368/FUL | Full | Buckettsland Farm, Buckettsland Lane, Borehamwood, WD6 5PN | Demolition of the studio building and erection of a replacement 4 bed detached dwelling with bin storage, associated landscaping and parking. | 15/02/2019 | 15/02/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/2389/FUL | Full | Buckettsland Farm, Buckettsland Lane, Borehamwood, WD6 5PN | Conversion of the pool house and stables to a detached 4 bed house with bin store, associated landscaping and parking. | 15/02/2019 | 15/02/2022 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 18/2390/FUL | Full | 18 Magnaville Road, Bushey, WD23 1PP | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a replacement single storey 2 bed bungalow with detached garage. (Revised Application) | 22/02/2019 | 22/02/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 19/0018/FUL | Full | Old Barn House, St Marys Terrace, High Street , Elstree, WD6 3HA | Change of use from office to residential to create 1 studio flat. | 04/03/2019 | 04/03/2022 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 19/0048/FUL | Full | 6 Richfield Road, Bushey, WD23 4LQ | Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached, 2 storey, 5 bed dwelling with habitable loft and basement accommodation. | 22/03/2019 | 22/03/2022 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| TP/04/0510 | Full | Garden Cottage Farmyard, Dancers Hill Road, Potters Bar | COU OF BARN & STABLES INTO 2 DWELLINGS | 12/08/2004 | 12/08/2009 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------|---|--|------------|------------|-----|---|-----|
| TP/08/0153 | Full | Salperton, Merry Hill Road, Bushey, WD23 1DP | Erection of replacement dwelling | 10/06/2008 | 10/06/2011 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| TP/09/2048 | Full | Caradene, Gills Hill Lane, Radlett | Conversion of 1 dwelling into 2 dwellings | 19/01/2010 | 19/01/2013 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| TP/10/1758 | Full | 29 Aldenham Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8HZ | Demolition of existing detached house and detached garage and erection of 2 No. detached dwellings, 1 No. 6 bedroom house with basement accommodation and 1 No. 5 bedroom house.(Amended plans received 9/11/10) | 08/02/2011 | 08/02/2014 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| TP/13/0120 | Full | Haydon Ridge, Merry Hill Road, Bushey, WD23 1DP | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bedroom dwelling to include an integral garage, basement level and habitable loft accommodation with the insertion of 2 rear dormer windows (Revised Application). | 19/04/2013 | 19/04/2016 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| TP/13/0795 | Full | 21 Williams Way, Radlett, WD7 7HA | Demolition of existing & erection of detached, two storey, 5 bedroom dwelling with habitable basement & loft accommodation, associated landscaping & parking (amended plans received 17.5.13). | 06/06/2013 | 06/06/2016 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| TP/98/0620 | Full | International University, The Avenue, Bushey | Redevelopment of site to provide over 200 dwellings | 06/06/2001 | 06/06/2006 | 245 | 3 | 242 |

APPENDIX 18: SITES UNDER CONSTRUCTION AS AT 1ST APRIL 2019

| PP Ref | Address | Description | Granted | Started | Prop Units | Lost | Net Gain | U/C | N/S |
|--------------|--|---|------------|------------|------------|------|----------|-----|-----|
| 15/1419/FUL | 203-205, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7AQ | Erection of roof extensions at first and second floor levels to create 7 x 2 bed flats with associated parking within existing basement. | 26/04/2016 | 08/03/2019 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 16/0180/FUL | 52, Watling Street, Radlett, WD7 7NN | Part first floor; part two storey rear extension with external staircases & loft conversion with rear dormer, reconstruction of two chimneys & 2 No. front rooflights to create 1 x 2 bed flat & 1 x 3 bed flat, associated landscaping, and reconstruction o | 19/05/2016 | 08/03/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 17/1446/FUL | 2B Station Road, Radlett, WD7 8JX | Demolition of existing building and erection of a terrace of 3 x 2 bed houses with associated landscaping. | 12/09/2017 | 08/03/2019 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 17/0867/PD56 | Hemini Complex, Stirling Way, Borehamwood, WD6 2BT | Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create 42 studio apartments. | 27/06/2017 | 06/03/2019 | 42 | 0 | 42 | 42 | 0 |
| 17/1063/FUL | Hemini Complex, Stirling Way, Borehamwood, WD6 2BT | Rooftop extension to create an additional floor to accommodate 9 self contained flats (3 x studio, 2 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed) and external alterations to the elevations. | 02/08/2018 | 06/03/2019 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 13/2614/COU | 7-8 Furzehill Parade, Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DX | Change of use to 1st & 2nd floors from B1 (Offices) to C3 (Residential 2 No. 2 bedroom maisonettes) | 08/07/2014 | 29/03/2017 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 15/1191/FUL | 85-89 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1AG | Conversion of 1st floor storage area and construction of a 3rd floor to form 4 residential units (1x3 bed, 2x2 bed & 1x1 bed), including external alterations to existing building, associated amenity space and landscaping. | 01/10/2015 | 29/03/2017 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 16/0349/FUL | 98 - 112, Shenley Road, Borehamwood | Construction of roof extension to create 4 x 2 bed apartments with terraces and communal amenity space on the roof; Erection of 4 storey side extension to provide access to new apartments and bin and cycle storage (Amended Plans received 10/05/16). | 01/06/2016 | 11/03/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 16/1259/FUL | Wellswood House, Fairway Avenue, Borehamwood, WD6 1PU | Change of use and conversion of the first floor from mixed use pharmacy and D1 to residential to provide 2 apartments (1 x 1 bed & 1 studio); raising of the ridge height and conversion of the second floor/loft to provide a further 2 studio apartments (stu | 05/10/2016 | 31/03/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 18/0164/MA | Gasworks Station Road, Borehamwood | Application for a non-material amendment following the grant of planning permission reference 16/1932/FUL | 27/02/2018 | 29/05/2018 | 78 | 0 | 78 | 78 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|---|---|
| 18/0668/REM | Land To The Rear Of The Wellington Public House, Theobald Street, Borehamwood, WD6 4SE | Application for the approval of reserved matters relating to landscaping, following approval of 17/1570/OUT - Erection of a two storey detached building comprising 6 flats (5 x 1 bed & 1 x 2 bed) Outline application to include access, appearance, layout & | 12/07/2018 | 11/03/2019 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 18/0799/FUL | Vision House, Station Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1DE | Refurbishment & change of use of ground & first floors from D1 to B1 (Office Use) & construction of a second floor to create 1 x 2 bed self contained flat.(Additional information received 08/06/18) | 20/08/2018 | 11/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/1006/FUL | Land Adjacent To The Wellington PH, Theobald Street, Borehamwood, WD6 4SE | Erection of a two storey building to accommodate 2 x 1 & 7 X 2 bed self contained residential flats (Amended plans received 30.08.2018 RE: Alterations to front elevation, side elevations, addition of ground-floor terrace and documentation RE- building mat | 17/10/2018 | 11/03/2019 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 16/0247/FUL | 33A The Broadway, Darkes Lane, Potters Bar, EN6 2HX | Conversion of 1 bed maisonette into 2 studio flats. | 19/04/2016 | 31/03/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 13/2017/FUL | 37 Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EJ | Demolition of existing house & erection of 7 bedroom house with associated rooms in basement & roof space. Erection of detached single storey gym/spa building in garden ancillary to use of the house. | 14/01/2014 | 30/11/2016 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 14/0430/FUL | Land South Of Merry Hill Road And, St Margarets School, Merry Hill Road, Bushey | Development works to create 26 residential units through the conversion of existing locally listed buildings, grade II listed barn & erection of new build houses & flats. Demolition of locally listed former stables building, outbuildings & the preparatory | 27/11/2014 | 08/03/2016 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 2 | 0 |
| 14/0721/FUL | Bayshill Cottage, Barnet Lane, Elstree, WD6 3QU | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, 7 bed detached dwelling with loft accommodation. Demolition of existing detached garage and outbuildings. | 08/07/2014 | 31/03/2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 14/1181/FUL | 34 - 36 The Ridgeway, Radlett, WD7 8PS | Demolition of existing properties and construction of 2 no 6 bed replacement dwellings (Revised Application). | 24/11/2015 | 22/03/2017 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 14/1550/FUL | Nicoll Farm Stables, Allum Lane, Elstree, WD6 3NP | Demolition of 2 no. existing dwellings together with some residual structures associated with the former use of the land as riding stables and erection of 2 x 4 bed, detached, replacement dwellings to include basement levels, associated car parking and bi | 06/11/2014 | 15/03/2016 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---|------------|------------|-----|---|-----|-----|----|
| 14/1567/FUL | Wood Edge, The Warren, Radlett, WD7 7DS | Erection of 3 new three storey, detached dwellings (1 x 4 bed & 2 x 5 bed) all to include basement level, integral garage and with associated landscaping. | 28/01/2015 | 15/03/2016 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 14/1697/FUL | Elton House, Bushey Hall Road, Bushey, WD23 2HJ | Demolition of existing building and erection of two new buildings to provide 22 No: residential units (6 x 1 bed flat and 16 x 2 bed flat), and communal amenity area, basement parking, cycle parking and refuse / recycling stores (Amended plans received 21 | 27/11/2015 | 04/03/2019 | 22 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 0 |
| 14/1767/FULEI | Hertswood School, Thrift Farm Lane, Borehamwood, WD6 1TS | Demolition of existing school buildings (Use Class D1), Ark Theatre (Use Class Sui Generis) and 2 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and erection of 301 residential units comprising 68 x 3 bed houses, 81 x 4 bed houses, 39 x 1 bed flats and 113 x 2 bed | 09/11/2016 | 19/02/2017 | 301 | 2 | 299 | 153 | 83 |
| 15/0197/FUL | 25 The Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 1EG | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement detached 6 bed dwelling house to include accommodation within the roof space and garage at basement level. Revised Application. (Amended Plans received 30/3/15). | 12/06/2015 | 31/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 15/1342/FUL | Garages At Land Rear Of, 12 The Walk, Potters Bar, EN6 1QL | Demolition of existing garages and construction of detached, two storey, two bedroom dwelling with associated works. | 23/12/2015 | 31/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 15/1433/FUL | Patchetts Equestrian Centre, Hilfield Lane, Aldenham, WD25 8PE | Demolition of equestrian facility, removal of hard standing, buildings and structures and the redevelopment of the site to provide 46 new dwellings (with 20 affordable units), parking, gardens and village green. The redevelopment will include the conversi | 14/06/2016 | 22/03/2017 | 50 | 2 | 48 | 2 | 2 |
| 15/1563/FUL | 17 Newlands Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EH | Erection of a 2 storey detached 6 bed dwelling with basement level to include swimming pool / and spa, accommodation within the roof space and a triple detached garage. | 18/12/2015 | 10/03/2016 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 15/1708/VOC | The Marians, Barnet Lane, Elstree | Variation of condition 19 attached to planning permission reference TP/13/1143 to change drawing references to reflect new designs for building & landscape | 16/08/2016 | 31/03/2017 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|----|---|
| 15/2151/FUL | 70, Coldharbour Lane, Bushey, WD23 4NX | Demolition of existing detached dwelling and garage and construction of 2 x 4 bed semi-detached houses with accommodation within the roof space with roof lights to the rear elevation, parking, ancillary works and landscaping. (Revised Application) | 12/02/2016 | 04/03/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 15/2174/FUL | 41, Barham Avenue, Elstree, WD6 3PW | Demolition of existing dwelling & erection of replacement detached dwelling with basement. | 03/03/2016 | 05/06/2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/0277/FUL | 21 And 23, London Road, Shenley, WD7 9EP | Construction of new 4 bed detached dwelling following removal of detached garage on land next to existing dwelling. (Revised Application) (as amended by plan received 01/11/16) | 26/01/2017 | 05/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/0280/FUL | 220 & 222, Park Avenue, Bushey, WD23 2BD | The demolition of two existing dwellings and the erection of a three storey building that will accommodate 16 flats, (7 x 1 bed, 8 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) with parking and landscaping. (Amended Plans received 22/03/16 and 26/4/2016 and Amended Site Plan & | 12/01/2017 | 16/11/2018 | 16 | 2 | 14 | 16 | 0 |
| 16/0608/FUL | 132, Ashwood Road, Potters Bar, EN6 2PW | Construction of New 2 bed semi-detached dwelling and single storey rear extension to existing property. | 17/06/2016 | 31/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1030/VOC | Hillside, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1PD | Variation to condition 7 and 8 of planning permission 13/2608/FUL - To remove a trees and amend design of the house. | 19/08/2016 | 21/03/2018 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1413/FUL | Land adj, 1 Updale Close, Potters Bar, EN6 3HP | Relocation of existing entrance from side to front to enable the erection of a 2 storey, end of terrace, 3 bed dwelling with habitable loft accommodation to include front rooflights and a rear dormer window. | 19/06/2017 | 05/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1469/CLE | Land At Caldecote Hill, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath | Implementation of approved (TP/90/0941) purpose built farm house & refurbishment of existing entrance and driveway (Certificate of Lawful Development Existing)(amended plans received demonstrating land ownership). | 30/11/2016 | 30/11/2016 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1481/FUL | Land To The Rear Of 95 And 97, High Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1EL | Construction of detached 3 bed dwelling with associated amenity space, landscaping and access. (Amended description and plans 25/11/16). (Amended description 19/12/16). | 10/02/2017 | 21/03/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|----|---|
| 16/1553/FUL | 2 Gills Hill Lane, Radlett, WD7 8DD | Demolition of existing 5 bed dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling to include basement level and habitable loft accommodation with rooflights to front and side elevations and 2 rear dormer windows. Second vehicular cross | 04/10/2016 | 08/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1605/FUL | 117, Theobald Street, Borehamwood, WD6 4PT | Erection of a detached self contained 3 bed bungalow in the rear garden of existing property (Amended Plans received 16/11/16). | 24/11/2016 | 20/03/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/1649/PD56 | Europcar House, Aldenham Road, Bushey, WD23 2QQ | Change of use from office (B1) to 61 residential units (C3). | 17/11/2016 | 21/03/2018 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 60 | 0 |
| 16/2196/FUL | 22, The Rise, Elstree, WD6 3JU | Part retrospective application for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement detached 5 bedroom house with accommodation in the roof space. (Revised application) | 20/01/2017 | 31/03/2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/2203/FUL | 2, Lands End, Elstree, WD6 3DL | Demolition of existing house and construction of a replacement 6 bed dwelling with detached outbuildings, associated access and landscaping. Revised application following planning approval 16/0569/FUL | 06/01/2017 | 06/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 16/2311/VOC | Land South Of Merry Hill Road And St Margarets School, Merry Hill Road, Bushey, WD23 1DT | Variation of condition 22 attached to planning permission reference 16/1023/VOC to amend the approved plans to allow for the demolition of Hillbrow and construction of a two storey, detached dwelling with habitable loft accommodation. | 26/05/2017 | 04/12/2017 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/0033/VOC | 1 - 21 High Firs, Gills Hill, Radlett,, WD7 8BH | Application for variation of condition 7 (amendments to approved plans) to allow alterations to the built form following grant of planning permission 14/1149/FUL. | 12/05/2017 | 08/03/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 17/0078/FUL | 25 London Road, Shenley, WD7 9EP | Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of 6 dwellings (2 x 5 bed detached dwellings and 2 pairs of 4 bed semis) each to include an integral garage with associated landscaping and access. | 03/07/2017 | 05/03/2019 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 17/0292/FUL | 47 Oakridge Avenue, Radlett, WD7 8EW | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling to include habitable loft accommodation with side and rear rooflights and dormer windows, parking and landscaping (Revised Application) (Amended location plan r | 08/06/2017 | 08/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|------------|------------|----|---|----|----|---|
| 17/0539/FUL | 6 Watford Road, Radlett, WD7 8LD | Demolition of existing house and erection of apartment building containing 10 apartments, with basement parking, access, amenity and landscaping. | 05/01/2018 | 08/03/2019 | 10 | 1 | 9 | 10 | 0 |
| 17/0667/FUL | Land R/O, 32 Oddesey Road, Borehamwood, WD6 5JP | Erection of detached two storey, 2 bed house incorporating a sunken basement; associated landscaping, car parking and access on the land to the rear of existing dwelling. | 26/06/2017 | 20/03/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/0826/FUL | Land At Rear Of 40, Clive Close, Potters Bar, EN6 2AE | Demolition of garage/workshop and construction of a detached 3 bed dwelling to include access, amenity space and parking. | 16/11/2017 | 31/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1137/FUL | 11 The Avenue, Radlett, WD7 7DG | Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached 2 storey, 5 bed dwelling with accommodation in the roof space to include swimming pool, and detached single garage with retention of existing access, landscaping and ancillary works (Am | 18/09/2017 | 08/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1192/FUL | 23 Woodlands Road, Bushey, WD23 2LS | Construction of detached, 2 storey 5 bed dwelling with accommodation in the roof space, to include parking, landscaping and amenity space. | 31/08/2017 | 04/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1260/FUL | 37 Bucks Avenue, Watford, WD19 4AR | Redevelopment of site to provide 27 dwellings comprising: 1 x 1 bed and 4 x 2 bed apartments; 14 x 3 bed and 8 x 4 bed houses with associated parking, informal play area and open space, all to be served by modifying the existing access from Bucks Avenue/Sherwood Road (Amended Plans received 17/10/2017 - Amendments to some of the house designs). | 16/03/2018 | 10/01/2017 | 27 | 0 | 27 | 5 | 0 |
| 17/1576/PD56 | Herkomer House, 156-158 High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Change of use of office (B1a) to residential (C3) to provide 4 flats. | 26/10/2017 | 04/03/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| 17/1674/FUL | Marston, High Street, Elstree, WD6 3EY | Erection of 1 pair of 3 bed semi-detached dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping. | 14/12/2017 | 28/03/2018 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 17/1705/FUL | 4 Park Crescent, Elstree, WD6 3PU | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling with habitable loft accommodation to include insertion of rooflights to both side elevations and 2 rear dormer windows (Amended plans received 1st November 2017). | 02/11/2017 | 06/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/1849/FUL | Land adj, 2 Hill Crest, Potters Bar, EN6 2RT | Part single, part two storey side extension with new entrance porch and access to form new 1 bed dwelling and single storey rear extension to existing dwelling. | 25/05/2018 | 31/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17/2011/VOC | 99 High Road, Bushey Heath, WD23 1EL | Application for variation of condition 2 to allow for revised drawings following Appeal APP/N1920/W/16/3150498 (15/1376/FUL) for removal of basement level parking, crossover to frontage and minor changes to elevations. | 22/03/2018 | 04/03/2019 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| 17/2361/FUL | Crossekeys, Barnet Lane, Elstree, WD6 3QU | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bed dwelling to include an integral double garage and swimming pool. | 06/03/2018 | 06/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2401/FUL | 58 Nicoll Way, Borehamwood, WD6 2PS | Conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 1 bed flats. (Revised Application) | 24/10/2018 | 06/03/2019 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 17/2429/FUL | 30 The Avenue, Potters Bar, EN6 1EB | Demolition of existing dwelling (retrospective) and erection of replacement 6 bed detached dwelling with basement & associated landscaping with raised rear patio. | 20/04/2018 | 31/03/2019 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2442/FUL | Land Adjacent To, 49A Harcourt Road, Bushey, WD23 3PD | Erection of end of terrace 2 bed house (Amended plans received 1st March 2018). | 13/03/2018 | 04/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 17/2445/PD56R | 137-139 Sparrows Herne, Bushey, WD23 1AQ | Change of use from ground floor shop (A1) to 1 x residential 2 bed (C3) flat (as amended by plans received on 23/02/2018 and e-mail dated 23/02/2018). | 27/02/2018 | 04/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0039/PD56 | Herkomer House, 156-158 High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Conversion of office (B1a) to residential (C3) to provide 7 x 1 bed & 2 x 2 bed apartments. | 05/03/2018 | 04/03/2019 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| 18/0053/VOC | 31 The Ridgeway, Radlett, WD7 8PT | Application for variation of condition 4 to allow for roof alterations and changes to fenestration following grant of planning permission 17/0909/FUL | 08/03/2018 | 31/03/2018 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0079/FUL | 20 Christchurch Crescent, Radlett, WD7 8AH | Construction of 1 pair of semi-detached 4 bed dwellings and 1 detached 5 bedroom dwelling with accommodation within the roof space & at basement level with associated parking & landscaping. | 03/05/2018 | 08/03/2019 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 18/0100/FUL | Land North Of, 2 Windmore Avenue, Potters Bar | Construction of a 2 storey detached 3 bed dwelling (Amended Plan received 12/2/2018 and 22/02/2018). | 10/04/2018 | 05/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0217/FUL | 1 Beech Drive, Borehamwood, WD6 4QU | Erection of two storey rear extension with first floor balcony to facilitate the conversion of single dwelling house to 2 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed flats; installation of 2 additional rooflights to side roof slope; repositioning of main front entrance; remova | 12/04/2018 | 11/03/2019 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---|------------|------------|----|---|----|----|---|
| 18/0256/FUL | 86 Baker Street, Potters Bar, EN6 2EP | Demolition of existing detached garage and construction of a single-storey rear extension to facilitate conversion from a six bed care facility to 4 x 1 bed self-contained units based on the supported living model, with on site care staff facilities. | 15/10/2018 | 31/03/2019 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| 18/0288/FUL | Europcar House, Aldenham Road, Bushey, WD23 2QQ | Application to regularise the creation of 2 new residential units at ground floor level. | 01/06/2018 | 04/03/2019 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 18/0421/FUL | Land Rear Of Summerhill And Northfields, King Edward Road, Shenley | Construction of detached 2 storey 4 bed house with accommodation within the roof space with associated landscaping, parking, refuse provision and bike store (Revised application). (Amended Plans Received 22/05/18) | 06/06/2018 | 05/03/2019 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18/0784/VOC | 25 London Road, Shenley, WD7 9EP | Variation of condition 23 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 17/0078/FUL - To facilitate amendments to plots 1, 2 & 3 (continuing the lower roof slope to the side elevations to the rear) (additional plans received 12/06/18 and 13/08/2018) | 17/09/2018 | 05/03/2019 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 18/1851/PD56O | Arlingham House, St Albans Road, South Mimms, EN6 3PH | Change of use from class B1(a) office use to class C3 residential to provide 13 self contained flats. | 12/11/2018 | 31/03/2018 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 13 | 0 |
| 18/1961/FUL | Herkomer House, 156 - 158 High Street, Bushey, WD23 3HF | Construction of roof extension with 5 new dormer windows and 10 roof lights to enlarge Units 10 & 11, and changes to fenestration and access following approval under application 18/1389/PD56 to convert former office building for residential use (Amended p | 21/12/2018 | 04/03/2019 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 0 |
| TP/04/0510 | Garden Cottage Farmyard, Dancers Hill Road, Potters Bar | COU OF BARN & STABLES INTO 2 DWELLINGS | 12/08/2004 | 31/03/2006 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| TP/08/0153 | Salperton, Merry Hill Road, Bushey, WD23 1DP | Erection of replacement dwelling | 10/06/2008 | 31/03/2010 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TP/09/2048 | Caradene, Gills Hill Lane, Radlett | Conversion of 1 dwelling into 2 dwellings | 19/01/2010 | 19/01/2013 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| TP/13/0120 | Haydon Ridge, Merry Hill Road, Bushey, WD23 1DP | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2 storey, detached, 6 bedroom dwelling to include an integral garage, basement level and habitable loft accommodation with the insertion of 2 rear dormer windows (Revised Application). | 19/04/2013 | 13/03/2015 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TP/13/0795 | 21 Williams Way, Radlett, WD7 7HA | Demolition of existing & erection of detached, two storey, 5 bedroom dwelling with habitable basement & loft accommodation, associated landscaping & parking (amended plans received 17.5.13). | 06/06/2013 | 22/03/2017 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|------------|------------|-----|---|-----|----|---|
| TP/98/0620 | International University, The Avenue, Bushey | Redevelopment of site to provide over 200 dwellings | 06/06/2001 | 31/03/2009 | 245 | 3 | 242 | 86 | 5 |
|------------|--|---|------------|------------|-----|---|-----|----|---|