

HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (SHLAA)

Minutes of Stakeholder Workshop held on 3rd September 2009
10.00 am – 5.00 pm in Committee Rooms A and B, Civic Centre,
Elstree Way, Borehamwood

Attendees:

D. Robson (DR)	Robson Planning Consultancy for Gilston Investments Limited
C. Miles (CM)	Woolf Bond for Gilston Investments Limited
H. Ward (HW)	Potters Bar in Focus
P. Bloomfield (PB)	Shire Consulting
J. Beardsell (JB)	KJD Solicitors for Potters Bar Golf Course
N. Gough (NG)	Hertfordshire County Council
T. Newland (TN)	St. Vincent's Management
M. Silverman (MS)	Hertsmere Borough Council
N. Barrett (NB)	Hertsmere Borough Council
R. Smith (RS)	Drivers Jonas
M. Covell (MC)	Planning Consultant
J. Del Mar (JDM)	Knight Frank LLP
G. Taylor (GT)	Radlett Society and Green Belt Association
A. Goddard (AG)	Elstree and Borehamwood Green Belt Society

MINUTES

1. Introduction

MS commenced the workshop by welcoming attendees and explaining that the SHLAA is being completed as part of the wider Local Development Framework (LDF) evidence base, but particularly to inform the Core Strategy evidence base. The Examination in Public (EIP) for the Core Strategy is currently in a six-month adjournment to allow for additional studies to be done, including a SHLAA. MS emphasised that there was no set way in which SHLAA workshops had to run and he was happy for this to consider suggestions and comments on the format as the workshop evolved.

2. Initial Queries/Matters

PB and DR expressed concern at the amount of information supplied by the Council on the sites to be discussed and the absence of agreed criteria against which to assess the sites. Without this information, there is a concern that the assessment undertaken during the meeting would be very basic. In response, NB stated that each site would be introduced and known constraints identified. This would be shown on a power point presentation and aerial photography. MS and NB also stated that no framework or criteria was set so that full,

unconstrained discussion could take place on the identified sites, in the spirit of the partnership approach set out in CLG's SHLAA Practice Guidance.

MS and NB emphasised that discussion of a site in the SHLAA does **not** mean that that site would necessarily be granted planning permission or allocated for housing in a DPD. MS also noted that the Council's aim was to provide as much new housing as possible within its urban areas and avoid use of Green Belt land as far as possible. PPG 2 does however state that Green Belt land could be released for housing in exceptional circumstances (e.g. an inability to find enough Urban Land to provide for RSS housing numbers).

PB asked what stage had HBC reached in the SHLAA process. NB answered Stages 6 (Estimating the housing potential of each site) and 7 (Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed).

RS noted that PPS 3 requires that a SHLAA assess the availability, suitability and viability of potential housing sites and suggested that discussion should resolve around these three matters. The attendees agreed this. A general assumption was agreed that a site put forward by a developer could be agreed as being broadly viable for development.

RS suggested discussing all sites over 10 ha first and then the smaller sites after. MC also suggested removal of all sites less than 1 ha from discussion. Both suggestions would allow discussion to focus on those sites likely to provide the greatest contribution to housing numbers in Hertsmere. All attendees agreed to discuss the sites over 10 ha first and, if time permitted, all the remaining smaller sites. The workshop followed this format.

3. Sites over 10 Acres

3.1 Site S2 - Land north of Barnet Lane and on south side of Furzehill Road and Carrington Avenue

NB introduced the site, noting that the site was put forward by the landowner, is designated Green Belt, contains no PDL and is in an Area of Search under the Core Strategy. It was stressed that the western third to half of the site is designated Common Land. It was agreed by the Attendees that this part of the site therefore couldn't be considered for housing.

GT noted that this site has been considered under both previous Local Plans and not considered suitable for housing. GT also stressed that site is Green Belt and therefore housing is inappropriate development as per PPG2. In response, RS, DR and PB noted that the Green Belt is not completely immune from consideration for housing development, particularly at a strategic level where Green Belt land may be needed for housing should RSS housing number not be capable of provision outside the Green Belt. It was also noted that CLG's SHLAA Practice Guidance, specifies that policy constraints designed to restrict housing capacity should not be considered. A general discussion followed on PPG2 and its relationship with PPS3 and the East of

England Plan; there was no total consensus on the extent to which tensions and contradictions existed between these documents.

MC noted that a Landscape Character assessment undertaken by a consultant on behalf of her client indicated that this site is relatively well wooded and that this would preclude housing development, particularly at the highest point of the site.

It was agreed that this site – **except** for the area designated as a Village Green - is deliverable, available and developable, subject to the landscape issues noted.

3.2 S7 – Kemprow Farm, Radlett

NB introduced site, noting that the site was nominated by the landowner, located within the Green Belt and contains no PDL. Based on the limited information provided to the Council on this site, NB also noted that the sites location is not sustainable given size of potential development relative to absence of employment opportunities and distance from significant public transport links. Development of the whole site would result in a very large encroachment into the Green Belt with no natural limitation particularly to northeast.

RS spoke on behalf of the sites owner, stating that development of a 10-hectare portion of the site is being considered in the southeast corner of the site, as this suits the existing site contours. The site is also in one ownership and within walking distance of Radlett train station.

MS asked if RS's client would consider provision of the remainder of the site as public open space. RS answered yes.

MC noted that the site seemed to be more than 10 minutes walk from the station. GT also commented that Radlett's social and physical infrastructure could not support more housing. This was countered by JDM, who commented that 'pro-active' planning could provide for these facilities and fund them via s106 contributions.

Overall, this site was considered deliverable and developable, if social and physical infrastructure could be provided.

3.3. S8 - Land off east side of Theobald Street, Borehamwood

NB introduced the site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located within Green Belt, contains no PDL and is a Wildlife Site in the Local Plan. Also noted that development of the site for housing would close gap between Borehamwood and Radlett and result in a large encroachment into the Green Belt without an apparent defensible boundary.

MC Spoke on behalf of the sites owner. 10 ha of the site in the southeast corner are being promoted for housing development with the remainder being allocated for public open space. At present, visual amenity of site is poor and degrading further due to fragmented ownership (i.e. over 100 separate owners) and that development for housing would address this.

Although MC indicated that fragmented ownership is not likely to be an issue due to a consortium formed by these owners, other attendees disagreed. For example, DR pointed out that he had acted for a client where ownership was spread among 9 parties and that it took 5 years to reach agreement on development. Accordingly, the sites availability for development may be later than the 0-5 year period specified by MC or not available at all.

Concerns were also expressed over transport links to the site. This site is outside a comfortable walking distance from Borehamwood Rail Station.

Overall, the site may not be available for development given the heavily fragmented ownership issue identified.

3.4 S10 - Bushey Hall Farm Site, Bushey

NB introduced the site, noting that site was nominated by a landowner, located within Green Belt, contains no PDL and housing development generally would contribute to merging of Bushey and Watford.

JDM and other attendees considered development of whole site "irresponsible" (i.e. noisy and subject to fumes), given close proximity to motorway interchange. Potential for small development in southern corner, between existing housing areas on either side. This would be consistent with surrounding built development and allow for buffer provision. However, only access to site is via Bushey Mill Lane, which is remote from southern corner.

Overall, site as a whole not suitable for development.

3.5 S19 - Land r/o The Warren, Radlett

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located within the Green Belt and contains no PDL. Housing development would also result in large encroachment into the Green Belt with no defensible boundary apparent. Development would also significantly close gap between Radlett and Shenley.

GT noted that, in addition to coalescence of Radlett and Shenley, coalescence with Harperbury Hospital development in St Albans would also occur.

Attendees also noted that access to site appears to be only via a large tree covered strip of land. This could pose issues in terms of landscape character loss should these have to be removed. The only other means of access to the site is via a site to the south, which is also being promoted by a landowner.

This could affect availability of the site due to potential ransom strip issues. Furthermore, the site is not located within a comfortable walking distance of services and transport links in Radlett.

Overall, site not considered suitable or available.

3.6 S20 - Land to West of Shenley Hospital and North of Cricket Ground, Shenley

NB introduced site, noting that site is being promoted by landowner and has the same constraints as those identified for S19. Also noted that landowner has not responded to correspondence from the council regarding the SHLAA. As such, the site may not be available.

Attendees noted that Shenley does not have the transport links, services or infrastructure to support a large-scale development, even with significant proactive investment by the Council.

Overall, site not considered suitable and possibly not available.

3.7 S21 - Metropolitan Police Sports Club, Aldenham Road, Bushey

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located in the Green Belt and contains some PDL. Development of site for housing would result in 'Landlocked' housing development not located near services and amenities of Bushey or Radlett.

Attendees noted that site is not sustainably located. AG also noted that, although a private facility, the sports grounds are heavily used by community groups. As such, the use of this site for housing would result in a loss of community amenities.

Overall, site not suitable for housing.

3.8 S22 - Land owned by Wood Hall Securities Radlett.

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located within Green Belt, contains no PDL, but does contain a regionally important geological site. Development of site would also contribute to reducing gap between Borehamwood and Radlett.

GT explained that the site is subject to a "claw back" arrangement requiring owner to offer land for sale if a planning opportunity arose. Land is also used for pheasant shooting.

JDM suspected that adjacent woodland could be Ancient Woodland.

Attendees noted that access from Williams Way could be blocked by a ransom strip and that access from main road currently blocked by woodland. Access

to site therefore may not be available although an access through part of Newberries School land could be an option.

3.9 S26 - Rear of 18 Cobden Hill, Radlett

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located within Green Belt and contains no PDL. Housing development would result in large encroachment into Green Belt with minimal defensible boundary. Access to public transport also minimal

Attendees noted that vehicular access to site currently not available and that the site is currently surrounded completely by Green Belt. Accordingly, site is not considered suitable.

3.10 S28 - Former Sports Ground, Rowley Lane, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. Site nominated by landowner, within Green Belt and contains large area of PDL on existing parking area. Site is also relatively close to Borehamwood services, amenities and transport links. However, existing parking for adjacent business area would be displaced. Housing development would result in a more defensible boundary to east (i.e. A1), although not to north.

Attendees noted that site would be remote from housing and subject to noise, pollution and traffic from adjacent employment areas. As such, the site was considered more suitable for employment than housing.

3.11 S33 - Bushey Hall Golf Club, Bushey

NB introduced site. Site nominated by landowner, within Green belt and contains some PDL. Raised concern that development of large parts of the site could erode Green Belt gap between North Bushey and Bushey. Also noted that site has low levels of access to public transport, services and amenities.

MS explained that the Golf Club is losing membership to other clubs in area and actively seeking redevelopment. Also suggested possibility of linking up with the adjoining Lincolnsfield Centre.

Attendees were doubtful about access provision into site and that the large number of club members may make it difficult to reach a consensus on development. This will affect availability of the site and it should therefore be marked as unknown. The need to preserve woodland located centrally on-site and in the southeast corner, may also constrain development.

Overall, site not considered suitable and available.

3.12 S44 – Potters Bar Golf Course, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by client landowner, is located within Green Belt and contains minimal PDL. Site is also subject to Flood Risk area 3a and 3b in parts and adjacent rail line would likely necessitate a buffer area to comply with PPG24. The site is also relatively sustainable, being located in close proximity to transport links, services and amenities.

JB provided additional information on the site, on behalf of his client. Noted that housing development would likely be confined to an 11 hectare area in south of site with the remainder being preserved as public open space. Owner is also in discussions with Environment Agency on flood mitigation measures. Unlike the Bushey Hall Golf Course discussed previously, the owner leases the site to the golf course and the lease agreement contains a break clause, allowing it to be available in approximately 2 years.

Attendees agreed that the subject site is suitable, available and viable.

3.13 S52 and S53 – Land to the north east of Borehamwood

NB introduced both sites. Both sites have been nominated by landowner, are located in Green Belt and contain no PDL, these sites also have low levels of access to services, amenities and public transport and would result in large encroachments into Green Belt with no defensible boundary apparent

DR spoke on behalf of his client, who owns both sites. A Master Plan has been created for the entire Wrotham Park Estate, which covers approximately 10% of the Borough's area. The Master Plan envisages "sustainable urban extensions" taking account of matters such as topography, access to amenities and public transport. Approximately 20 ha. of Site 52 would be developed and 15 ha. of Site 53.

In DR's view, access to public transport was adequate although this was questioned by MC, who contended that the distance from Borehamwood train station and the infrequent bus services in area indicate that public transport access is low. DR did note that the frequency of bus services could be increased to provide for additional housing.

RS did question the need to upgrade roading in this locale to provide for the level of housing proposed. This would add expense to the overall project and constrain the rate of development. Accordingly, the attendees agreed that this site would more realistically be developed in the 5-10 year timeframe, rather than the 0-5 year timeframe suggested by DR

Overall, sites are suitable, viable and available, subject to comments above regarding timing and transport.

3.14 Site S54 - Land to the South of Potters Bar (Site C), Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located within Green Belt and contains no PDL. Site is also relatively close proximity to services, amenities and public transport. Barnet Lane acts as a defensible boundary to southeast although there is little in the way of defensible boundary to the west.

DR spoke on behalf of his client, who owns this site. DR noted that spoil from railway tunnel below western boundary of site forms hill that could provide a defensible boundary. JDM said that there used to be an automatic presumption against building over tunnels. Attendees agreed this, although it was understood that modern construction methods could overcome this. 5-6 ha of the site would be developed with the remainder being used as landscape mitigation/public open space. The site is also located adjacent to a public transport link on Barnet Lane.

Attendees considered this site suitable, viable and available, although a buffer area would be needed to account for noise from M25 to south.

3.15 S55 - Land at Bentley Heath (Site D), Potters Bar¹

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located in Green Belt, contains high level of PDL and undesirable Green Belt use (e.g. car wreckers). It would bring to an end a poorly located industrial use. Although not close to amenities, services or significant levels of public transport, housing would be more desirable. It does however encroach on gap between Potters Bar and Barnet.

DR spoke on behalf of his client, who owns this site. Approximately 50 units could be sought here on areas of PDL. Bunding and landscaping will be provided to mitigate against noise from M25. Existing TPO trees would be protected.

Attendees did not think this site was sustainable given its remoteness from significant public transport, services and amenities and noted that if this site did not contain PDL, it would clearly not be appropriate for housing development. Allocating this site would also be contrary to the spatial strategy in the Core Strategy, which does not advocate rural expansion as a growth option. ~~fr~~

JDM also questioned whether the site contained PDL as the uses on-site are still active and therefore not truly previously developed.

Concerns were also raised regarding the potential displacement of employment use to elsewhere in the Green Belt. The Council indicated this location is not an employment protected site but there is an issue with the loss of employment. There is a shortage of small businesses in the Borough and there would need to be evidence provided of what the future would be for the displaced businesses. MS noted that businesses could potentially be

accommodated in an extension to the Cranbourne Road industrial estate, notwithstanding the need to overcome highways and other concerns in that location. The issue of site yields and overall viability was also raised

~~Concerns were also raised regarding the potential displacement of employment use to elsewhere in the Green Belt.~~

~~As such, this could result in a net increase in impact on the openness of the Green Belt. MS noted that it could potentially be accommodated in an extension to the Cranbourne Road industrial estate, notwithstanding the need to overcome highways and other concerns in that location.~~

Overall, this site was not considered by the group as a whole as suitable for housing.

3.16 S162 - Land to the south east of Potters Bar and north of M25, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by owner and is located within Green Belt.

JDM spoke on behalf of his client, who owns this site. Form of development would mimic that in area, with a new street running parallel to Park Avenue (located to the north west). Access would be sought from Southgate Road and Park Avenue. The area between this new road and the M25 would be left open and bunded and landscaped in parts to mitigate noise from M25. Due to existing tenancy, site would not likely be available until 10-15 year period.

NG noted that there were significant queuing issues at present on Southgate Road where it meets Junction 24 of the M25, which is adjacent to the subject site. This may preclude new access onto Southgate Road. However, attendees agreed that access through one or more sites fronting Park Avenue could be used, should these sites become available. This is a distinct possibility given 10-15 year phasing of development.

Overall, site considered suitable, viable and available, subject to comments regarding available time period and access.

4. Other Sites

Following discussion of the larger sites above, MS and NB sought comment on the following smaller sites. NB explained that a number of other sites that the Council have identified did not need to be discussed as the issues around potential development are relatively 'clear-cut'. Interest in sites other than those below was also not expressed by attendees.

4.1 S3 - Closed swimming pool and grounds, Falconer Road, Bushey

NB introduced site. Site has been put forward by landowner, is located within the Green Belt and contains PDL. Planning permission was granted for three

self-contained flats in 2007, within existing structures. Additional development considered acceptable provided it does not extend beyond PDL. The attendees had no comments on this site.

4.2 S4 - Potters Bar Bus Garage, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by public, is located in an urban context and is sustainably located. Attendees agreed, although it was noted that the site is not presently available and that the Council has previously approached Metronet (site owner) who, in the absence of an alternative site to relocate the garage, were not considering the disposal of the site. At present, availability is unknown. JDM did however note that inclusion in SHLAA might stimulate interest in site for housing.

4.3 S6 - 'Starveacres' 16 Watford Road, Radlett

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located in Green Belt and contains some PDL. Site is also presently safeguarded for housing development in Local Plan. Council view that housing is acceptable, given current safeguarded designation, history of PDL / extent of curtilage and that it is consistent with five objectives of PPG2.

Attendees thought access to site would be an issue given the presence of TPO trees in site access and its location opposite existing junction. This would limit the number of houses that can be established on-site, as might any desire to preserve the existing house. Also backland location would impact amenity of neighbours. There were no other comments by attendees.

4.4 S12 - Blackwell House, corner of Aldenham Road and Three Valleys Way

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is in a suburban context and is specified as a housing site in the Local Plan. Owner of site has had extensive pre-application discussions with Council and application will be lodged shortly. Accordingly, the attendees did not consider additional discussion necessary.

4.5 S14 - Police, Fire and Ambulance stations, and site to rear of Maxwell House, Elstree Way, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner and is in a sustainable location. However, existing services will need to be relocated and on this basis no timeframe has been given for when this site will become available. The attendees had no comment on this site.

4.6 S16 - Oaklands College Site, Elstree Way, Borehamwood

NB introduced site, noting that site has been nominated by owner and has been the recent subject of a planning permission refusal. However, the principle of developing this site for housing is acceptable given its sustainable

location and previous consideration in Urban Capacity Study. The attendees had no comment on this site.

4.7 S18 - Station Close, Darkes Lane, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is in an urban area and is an Employment Site. Use for housing would result in loss of designated employment land use contrary to current planning policy. However, parking area at rear is largely vacant and could be developed for housing provided access is maintained and PPG24 compliance proven given close proximity to rail line.

TN spoke on behalf of his client, who owns the site. Noted that the age of units on-site make them not suited to modern employment uses.

MS noted that employment uses could potentially be displaced to Cranbourne Road, notwithstanding the need to overcome highways and other concerns in that location.

Attendees also noted that the site would be better suited for housing (or potentially as mixed use development) if developed in conjunction with adjacent Potters Bar Golf Course site.

4.8 S32 and S163 - Land rear of Hartfield Avenue/south of Borehamwood

NB introduced site, noting that it has been nominated by landowner, is located in the Green Belt and contains no PDL.

Attendees noted that development of either site could impact amenity of Village Green. As such, very limited development of part of site closest to Hartfield Avenue was suggested by some attendees, to prevent any further risk of encroachment into the Green Belt, with the part closest to Village Green zoned as private open space. With regards to site s163, construction over rail line likely to constrain development.

4.9 S35 - Land to north of M25 and south of Barnet Road, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located in Green Belt and contains PDL. Site is also located next to traveller site.

Given the above and close proximity to M25, attendees did not consider this site suitable for housing development.

4.10 S37 - Old Haberdashers Association, Croxdale Road, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is in a suburban context and located in close proximity to services, amenities and public transport. This site is presently designated as Urban Open Land in Local Plan although it is not open to public. In the council's view, the site is potentially

acceptable for housing provided sports ground found elsewhere and that a significant part of the site is opened up for public open space. A brief was prepared by the Council for this site in the 1980s promoting this approach. Attendees considered site suitable but noted that need to provide replacement sports site elsewhere and move existing facilities off site mean that it should be considered in the 6-10 year timeframe, rather than the 0-5 year timeframe suggested by site owner.

4.11 S39 - BBC Elstree Studios, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner and is located in a location with high levels of access to services, amenities and public transport. However, existing Film and TV studios may need to be displaced elsewhere.

In addition to the above, the attendees questioned whether adequate access to the site could be provided from Clarendon Road and also through site onto Stratfield Road. If this could not be provided, then this would constrain housing capacity on-site. Mixed-use development also suggested. This may allow for retention of some Film and TV use. There were no other comments from attendees.

4.12 S40 - 27-31 Heath Road, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is located in Green Belt and contains no PDL. Given the sites poor links to amenities, services and public transport and the absence of an apparent defensible boundary, it is the Council's view that housing development is not appropriate.

The attendees commented that inclusion of this site and the site immediately to the south may result in a more tangible Green Belt boundary. MS and NG did however note that the site to the south is a primary school. As such, it is not available for development.

4.13 S47 - Former Sunnybank School Site, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. This site has been nominated by landowner, is in the Green Belt, contains PDL and is close to amenities, services and transport links. Disused school site

Attendees suggested that HCC (owner of this site) and Wrotham Park (owner of site S56) should look at joint development, particularly access through this site. DR indicated that this might not be acceptable as Sunnybank Road is only a small cul-de-sac.

4.14 S50 - Land to rear of 28-30 Manor Road, Potters Bar

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is in the Green Belt and has high levels of access to services, amenities and public transport. Attendees thought that development of this site should be considered in conjunction with land in Station Road and Potters Bar Golf Course.

S56 – Land to the south of Potters Bar (Site E)ⁱⁱ

This site could also be associated with the neighbouring Sunnybank School site (S47). This would increase the area to above 10Ha

4.15 S57 - Haydon Dell Industrial Estate, Bushey

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by landowner, is in the Green Belt and is safeguarded for housing in the Local Plan. Site also contains PDL. Like site S55 however, it was questionable whether this actually is previously developed given its present use.

4.16 S72 – Rossway Industrial Estate, Rossway Drive, Bushey

NB introduced site. Site has been subject of planning permission refusal, is located in Green Belt and contains wreckers yard. An SPD is currently being prepared. If used for housing, would replace undesirable use.

Attendees noted that noise from adjacent motorway would likely necessitate buffer to ensure noise was mitigated. Furthermore, decontamination of site would mean that it should be considered in the 6-10 year timeframe, rather than 0-5 years.

4.17 S129 - Station Road Gas Holders, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by owner, is in an urban area and has high levels of access to public transport, services and amenities. The gas holders and retort house are locally listed. High density flatted development has occurred in this locality in recent years.

Attendees noted that this site would require decontamination. Given the scale of likely decontamination, the attendees noted that the availability of this site should be considered in the 10-15 year period.

4.18 S136 - Land at Caldecote Gardens Bushey.

MS noted that a sheltered housing scheme associated with the statutorily listed nursing home opposite is currently being proposed, although it is not presently designated as urban open space. The site is owned by the existing nursing home and accordingly, it was considered that it would not be available for housing development.

4.19 S131 - Studio Plaza, Elstree Way, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. This site has been nominated by landowner and has good access to public transport, amenities, and services. Need to retain employment on-site as part of development will be needed given its central location in Employment Area. Attendees had no further comments to make.

4.20 S137 - Land r/o Crown Road, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. Site was considered in UCS, is located in an urban area and is traversed by pylons. Given backland nature of site, access is constrained and would likely be needed through site S142.

Attendees noted that the combination of site shape, lack of easily developable access and pylons over site make this site not suitable.

4.21 S139 - Maxwell Road, Borehamwood

This is a Council owned site, forming part of Elstree film studios. Attendees noted that absence of access and existing site contamination would make this site not suitable.

4.22 S149 - Stratfield Road Estate, Borehamwood

NB introduced site. Site has been nominated by owner and is in an area with high levels of access to services, amenities and public transport. Owner proposes erecting flats in disused parking and green areas. Attendees had no comments regarding this site.

4.23 S153 - Newberries Carpark, Watling Street, Radlett

NB introduced site, noting that the Council is considering promoting it and that it may not be suitable given close proximity to rail lines. GT noted that there is a rainwater or sewage detention tank under site that would need to be removed or require significant engineering works to accommodate. GT also thought that this area might be subject to flooding, although this proved not to be the case. Attendees were also concerned that loss of this site may result in more parking pressure in Radlett. No resolution has been made by the Council to dispose of this site and as such, it is not currently available.

4.24 S161 - Bridgefoot Farm, Potters Bar

NB introduced site, noting that it had been put forward by the sites owner and is located in the Green Belt.

DR spoke on behalf of the owner of the site, indicating that development here would round off the south western edge of Potters Bar. Although currently not serviced by public transport, DR stated that a turnaround area in Shillitoe

Avenue could be provided for buses and that through access between Shillitoe Avenue and Bridgefoot Lane could be provided.

5. **Closing Remarks**

Following discussion of the last site, MS thanked everyone for there attendance. MS also explained that he would be meeting with GO East on 8 September 2009. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss progress on the SHLAA and other items of work being completed during the Core Strategy EIP adjournment. Depending on the outcome of this meeting, the Core Strategy may be withdrawn.

ⁱ Amended from draft minutes

ⁱⁱ Reference to this site was missed from the draft minutes