

**Appendix 6: SHLAA site assessments**

**Site Reference: SU1**

**Site Location / Address:** New Horizons, Studio Way, Borehamwood

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Offices (B1a)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/1422 for 126 residential units (houses and flats) was withdrawn by the applicant. Planning application reference number TP/11/1332 for 125 residential units (houses and flats) has been submitted but not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X				X	X
Elstree Way Employment Area				Ground levels across the site rise from front to back	TPO reference number 171/1988

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	<p>It is considered that the existence of a TPO would not prejudice future residential development. This has been demonstrated through the submitted planning applications.</p> <p>It is noted that the site is located within the Elstree Way Employment Area. However, the site it is located on the edge of this, immediately bordering neighbouring residential properties and the Studio Plaza site, which is currently being redeveloped for residential use. As such, the site may be suitable for residential redevelopment, subject to the provisions of Revised Core Strategy (December 2010) Consultation Draft CS8.</p>
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	Two planning applications for residential redevelopment have been submitted by the owner's agent.
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional (+20%)	Higher (+20%)	High (+20%)	Mixed (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
62dph	1.4	1.4	100%	125 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	It is considered that the rising ground levels across the site would increase the cost of any redevelopment. However, the submitted planning applications have demonstrated that residential development would still be achievable.
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

X	Deliverable 1-5 years	Developable 6-10 years	Developable 11-15 years	Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU2

**Site Location / Address:** Land adjacent to 55 Siskin Close

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden/car park

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference numbers TP/08/1124 and TP/09/2087 were submitted for single dwelling houses on the site, but were refused planning permission. These refusals did not relate to the principle of residential intensification on the site.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
			X		
			The site is in close proximity to existing gas holders, a potential source of contamination		

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	The party that previously submitted planning applications for residential development owns only one part of the site. The other parts of the site appear to be owned by several parties and it is noted that the Council has had no indication from these parties that the site would be available for residential development.
Any other comments:	No

Is the site available?	No
------------------------	----

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

<b>Area type</b>	<b>Prevailing density</b>	<b>Accessibility</b>	<b>Likely type</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

<b>Density</b>	<b>Gross Ha</b>	<b>Net Ha</b>	<b>Gross to net ratio</b>	<b>Net capacity: (no. units)</b>
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
--	------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU3

**Site Location / Address:** 264 Shenley Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential dwelling house

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/0773 for the conversion of the existing dwelling house into two flats was refused. This refusal did not relate to the principle of residential intensification on the site.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	<0.0	<0.0	N/A	1 (based on refused application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU4

**Site Location / Address:** 4A & 6A Shenley Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Offices (B1a)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/1690 for the conversion of first-floor offices into four flats was refused. This refusal did not relate to the principle of the redevelopment of the site for residential use.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					
Borehamwood Town Centre					

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	<0.1	<0.1	N/A	4 (based on refused application)



**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU5

**Site Location / Address:** 98-112 Shenley Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Offices (B1a)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/1593 for the conversion of first- and second-floor offices into six flats was withdrawn by the applicant. Concerns raised by officers did not relate to the principle of the redevelopment of the site for residential use. Following the end of the 2010/11 financial year planning permission reference number TP/11/0383 for six flats was granted.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					
Borehamwood Town Centre					

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	0.1	0.1	N/A	6 (based on planning permission)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU6

**Site Location / Address:** The Directors Arms PH, Ripon Way, and garage sites to the rear

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Public house (A4)

**Relevant planning history:** None.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
				X	
				Ground levels across the site rise towards its south west corner	

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	Two separate parties own the site, one of which is the Council. Notwithstanding this, both parties have been in pre-application discussions with the Planning Department and it is considered that such joint working shows that this would not affect the availability of the site.
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Higher (+20%)	Medium (+10%)	Mixed (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
53dph	0.6	0.6	100%	32

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

X	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU7

**Site Location / Address:** St. Andrews United Reformed Church, Aycliffe Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
		X			

**Existing use:** Place of worship (D1)

**Relevant planning history:** None.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					
The site is currently a community use.					

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy S1 resists the loss of community uses. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that it is clear from pre-application discussions that any redevelopment proposal would include a new church, as well as residential development.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Higher (+20%)	Medium (+10%)	Mixed (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
53	0.2	0.2	100%	11

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU8

**Site Location / Address:** 32 Oddesey Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/0665 for 1 new dwelling house has been submitted, but is yet to be determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	<0.1	<0.1	N/A	1 (based on undetermined application)



**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU9

**Site Location / Address:** 15 Dacre Gardens

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Following the end of the 2010/11 financial year planning permission reference number TP/11/0383 for 1 new dwelling house was granted.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	<0.1	<0.1	N/A	1 (based on planning permission)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU10

**Site Location / Address:** Potters Bar Police Station, 1 The Causeway

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
			X		

**Existing use:** Police station (sui generis)

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			
Green Belt  The site is currently a community use.		The existing building is included on List of Locally Important Buildings			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy S1 resists the loss of community uses. An adequate justification would have to be submitted to justify any such loss. On the basis of pre-application discussions and the fact that the police will be seeking an alternative location for a permanent presence in the town, it is considered that there could be the basis for such a justification.  It is likely that the inclusion of the existing building on the List of Locally Important Buildings would preclude its demolition. However, it could be converted for residential use.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No

Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Low (+0%)	High (+20%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
54dph	0.1	0.1	100%	5

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

X	Deliverable 1-5 years	Developable 6-10 years	Developable 11-15 years	Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU11

**Site Location / Address:** 41 Darkes Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Hot food takeaway (A5)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning permission reference number TP/06/0313 including 1 new flat was granted, but has since lapsed.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					
Darkes Lane (Potters Bar) Local Town Centre					

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	No

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	<0.1	<0.1	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable <b>1-5 years</b>		Developable <b>6-10 years</b>		Developable <b>11-15 years</b>		Developable <b>16 years + or unknown</b>
--	---------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	---

**Site Reference:** SU12

**Site Location / Address:** 32 Oakmere Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/1107 for 4 new dwelling houses was refused and planning application reference number TP/11/0642, also for 4 new dwelling houses, was withdrawn. No objection was raised to the principle of residential intensification in relation to either of these applications. Planning application reference number TP/11/1791 for 4 new dwelling houses has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	The current applicant does not own the site. However, it is thought likely, given the current application and pre-application discussions, that an agreement is in place that would allow for the site to be developed.
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Low (+ 0%)	Medium (+10%)	Detached (+0%)



**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
36dph	0.2	0.2	100%	3 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown
<b>X</b>							

**Site Reference:** SU13

**Site Location / Address:** 10 Hatherleigh Gardens

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/1517 for 1 new dwelling house was refused. No objection was raised to the principle of residential intensification. Planning application reference number TP/11/1698 for 1 new dwelling house has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Low (+0%)	High (+20%)	Detached (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
40dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	1 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU14

**Site Location / Address:** 1 St. Michaels Way

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Outline planning application reference number TP/10/2304 for 1 new dwelling house was refused. No objection was raised to the principle of residential intensification.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low (+0%)	High (+20%)	Detached (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
40dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	1 (based on refused application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU15

**Site Location / Address:** Land rear of 85, Cranborne Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/2426 for 2 new dwelling houses was refused. No objection was raised to the principle of residential intensification.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Low (+0%)	High (+20%)	Detached (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
40dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	2 (based on refused application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU16

**Site Location / Address:** The Bridge PH, 168 Mutton Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Public House (A4)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference numbers TP/11/0233 and TP/11/0244 for 5 new dwelling houses and 8 new flats, respectively, have been submitted but have not yet been determined. Notwithstanding this, the Planning Committee agreed that both proposals should be granted permission following the completion of Section 106 agreements.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Medium high (+20%)	Very high (+35%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
73dph	0.1	0.1	100%	8 (based on submitted application)



**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU17

**Site Location / Address:** 75 The Causeway

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low (+0%)	Medium (+10%)	Detached (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
36dph	0.2	0.2	100%	6

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU18

**Site Location / Address:** Former Honeywood House Site, 261 Darkes Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Elderly persons care home (C2)

**Relevant planning history:** Various approved applications for replacement elderly care facilities/accommodation on the site.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
					X
					TPO reference number 1086/2003

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	Given the planning permission TP/11/0900 for the redevelopment of the site for a nursing home, it is not considered that the TPO would prejudice future residential development.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	The Council has been in pre-application discussions with a party interested in developing the site for extra-care accommodation.
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Low (+0)	High (+20%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
54dph	0.6	0.6	100%	32

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU19

**Site Location / Address:** Land between 49-55 Blanche Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
			X		

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
		X			
		South Mimms Conservation Area			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	No
Any other comments:	A neighbouring site included in the SHLAA was previously judged unsuitable as the only nearby bus service is infrequent.
Is the site suitable?	No

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	A SHLAA questionnaire has been submitted on behalf of a party with an option on the site.
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	0.3	0.3	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable <b>1-5 years</b>		Developable <b>6-10 years</b>		Developable <b>11-15 years</b>		Developable <b>16 years + or unknown</b>
--	---------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	---

**Site Reference:** SU20

**Site Location / Address:** Land between 39-49 Blanche Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
			X		

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** No recorded previous use

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
		X			
		South Mimms Conservation Area			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	No
Any other comments:	A neighbouring site included in the SHLAA was previously judged unsuitable as the only nearby bus service is infrequent.
Is the site suitable?	No

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	A SHLAA questionnaire has been submitted on behalf of a party with an option on the site.
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A



**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	0.1	0.1	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable <b>1-5 years</b>		Developable <b>6-10 years</b>		Developable <b>11-15 years</b>		Developable <b>16 years + or unknown</b>
--	---------------------------------	--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	---

**Site Reference:** SU21

**Site Location / Address:** Bushey Police Station, 43 Sparrows Herne

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
			X		

**Existing use:** Police station (sui generis)

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			
The site is currently a community use.		The existing building is Statutory Listed			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy S1 resists the loss of community uses. An adequate justification would have to be submitted to justify any such loss but the police are known to be providing an alternative location for a permanent presence in the town, so it is considered that there could be the basis for such a justification. On the basis of pre-application discussions, it is considered that there may be the basis for a justification.  The Statutory Listing of the existing building would preclude its demolition. However, it could be converted for residential use.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Higher (+20%)	Medium (+10%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
60dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	4

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

X	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU22

**Site Location / Address:** 128 Aldenham Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Hotel (C1)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/0746 for 11 new flats has been submitted but has not yet been determined. Notwithstanding this, the Planning Committee agreed that the proposal should be granted permission following the completion of a Section 106 agreement.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
					X
					TPO reference number 159/1988

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	It is considered that the existence of a TPO would not prejudice future residential development. This has been demonstrated through the submitted planning application.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low (+0%)	Low (+0%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
45dph	0.2	0.2	100%	11 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU23

**Site Location / Address:** 41-43 Highfield Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** Planning permission reference number TP/07/1539 for 1 new flat was granted, but has since lapsed.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	No

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	<0.1	<0.1	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU24

**Site Location / Address:** Bushey Golf and Country Club, High Street

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
				X	

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Golf Course (D2)

**Relevant planning history:** None.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					X
Green Belt  Some ancillary accommodation is currently used as a community facility					TPO reference number 17/2007

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	<p>New housing is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that there may be a case of very special circumstances that would justify the harm caused by such inappropriate development. Principally, it is noted that the use existing on part of the front of the site is also inappropriate in the Green Belt and new development could reduce the overall level of built form.</p> <p>Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy S1 resists the loss of community uses. It is likely that these uses would have to be retained as part of any redevelopment.</p>
Is the site suitable?	Yes



**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	The land is subject to some covenants and leases. However, the Council owns the site and it has been made clear that these would not prevent the site being available in the short-term.
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional (+20%)	Medium (+10%)	Medium (+10%)	Mixed (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
53dph	1.8	0.4	20%	19

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown
X							

**Site Reference:** SU25

**Site Location / Address:** Land adjoining 16 Edridge Close

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/10/0984 for 1 new dwelling house was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal. No objection was raised to the principle of residential intensification.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low density (+0%)	Low (+0%)	Detached (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
33dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	1 (based on refused application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU26

**Site Location / Address:** Land between 57 and 59 Harcourt Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low (+0%)	Low (+0%)	Detached (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
33dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	1 (based on refused application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU27

**Site Location / Address:** 26 Park Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Workshops (B1)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/1197 has been submitted but has not yet been determined. Notwithstanding this, the Planning Committee agreed that the proposal should be granted permission following the completion of a Section 106 agreement.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			
Bushey District Centre		Bushey High Street Conservation Area			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional (+20%)	Medium (+10%)	High (+20%)	Mixed (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
58dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	6 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown
<b>X</b>							

**Site Reference:** SU28

**Site Location / Address:** 22 Falconer Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference numbers TP/08/1973 and TP/10/0304 for 3 new dwelling houses were both refused. These refusals did not relate to the principle of residential intensification. Planning application reference number TP/11/1556 for 3 new dwelling houses has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Low (+0%)	Medium (+10%)	Terraced (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
43dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	2 (based on submitted application)



**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU29

**Site Location / Address:** Development Site 2-8 Hartsbourne Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/2177 for 9 new flats was refused. This refusal did not relate to the principle of residential intensification.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low (+0%)	Medium (+10%)	Mixed (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
43dph	0.4	0.4	100%	13

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU30

**Site Location / Address:** Land between 127 and 131 Merry Hill Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Agricultural

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
					X
					TPO reference number 48/2007

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	No

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	0.8	0.8	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU31**Site Location / Address:** Sandy Lane Travellers Site**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
					X

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Ancillary to existing traveller site

**Relevant planning history:** A planning application has been submitted to Hertfordshire County Council for 3 new Gypsy and Traveller pitches (Hertsmere consultation reference TP/11/1777), but is yet to be determined at the time of writing.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					
Green Belt					

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	No
Any other comments:	Although the site is poor in terms of its accessibility, it is considered that it is suitable. This is on account of the specialist nature of the accommodation proposed and the proposal being for a limited extension to an existing site.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	Government funding has been secured to deliver new pitches on the site
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural (+0%)	Low (+0%)	Low (+0%)	N/A (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
30dph	0.2	0.2	100%	3 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown
X							

**Site Reference:** SU32

**Site Location / Address:** Kingsdale Kennels, Sandy Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
				X	

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Kennels (Sui Generis)

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					
Green Belt					

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	No
Any other comments:	New housing is inappropriate in the Green Belt. The Council has not been made aware of any case of very special circumstances that would justify such inappropriate development in this location.
Is the site suitable?	No

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	0.8	0.8	N/A	N/A



**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU33

**Site Location / Address:** The Royal British Legion, 43 Melbourne Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Community facility (D1)

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			X
The site is currently a community use.		Part of the existing building is Statutory Listed  Melbourne Road Conservation Area			TPO reference number 45/2006

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	<p>Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy S1 resists the loss of community uses. An adequate justification would have to be submitted to justify any such loss. On the basis of pre-application discussions, it is considered that there may be the basis for a justification.</p> <p>The Statutory Listing of some of the existing building would preclude its total demolition. However, the relevant part could be converted for residential use.</p> <p>It is not considered that the existence of a TPO would necessarily prejudice sensitively designed future residential development.</p>
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Medium (+10%)	Medium (+10%)	Mixed (+20%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
48dph	0.2	0.2	100%	10

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU34

**Site Location / Address:** 39 London Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
		X			

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Garden centre (A1) and residential

**Relevant planning history:** A Certificate of Lawful Use Existing (reference number TP/10/1688) was granted for joint A1/A3 of the front part of the site. Planning application reference number TP/11/1484 for 11 dwelling houses has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			
Green Belt		Shenley Conservation Area			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	A large part of the site is disused, previously developed land. Although new housing is inappropriate in the Green Belt, it is considered that, on balance, such development may be acceptable, as the harm caused by low density housing relative to that caused by the existing use would represent a reduction.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	The current applicant does not own the site. However, it is thought likely, given the current application and pre-application discussions, that an agreement is in place that would allow for the site to be developed.
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Village (+0)	Low (+0)	Low (+0)	Semi-detached (+10%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
33dph	1.6	1.4	90%	9 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

X	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU35

**Site Location / Address:** North Lodge, Black Lion Hill

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
		X			

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/1489 for 5 dwelling houses has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					X
Green Belt					TPO reference number 147/88

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	<p>New housing is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, however the submitted proposal is for 100% Affordable Housing. As such, the scheme would be a rural exception site and may be acceptable in light of Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy H17.</p> <p>It is considered that the existence of a TPO would not prejudice future residential development. This has been demonstrated through the submitted planning application.</p>
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	The current applicant does not own the site. However, it is thought likely, given the current application and pre-application discussions, that an agreement is in place that would allow for the site to be developed.
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Village (+0)	Low (+0)	Low (+0)	Semi-detached (+10%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
33dph	0.1	0.1	100%	4 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU36

**Site Location / Address:** Queen Adelaide PH, 120 London Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
		X			

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Public house (A4)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/1328 for 4 dwelling houses has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			
Green Belt		Shenley Conservation Area			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	New housing is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However, for a number of reasons, including the status of the site as previously developed land, the existing pub being vacant and unviable and the proposal including restoration works to the adjacent pond, which is an important feature of the Conservation Area, it is considered that there may be a case of very special circumstances that would outweigh any harm to the Green Belt.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes



**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Village (+0)	Low (+0)	Low (+0)	Semi-detached (+10%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
33dph	<0.1	<0.1	100%	4 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

X	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU37

**Site Location / Address:** 4 Harris Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
		X			

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			
Green Belt		Shenley Conservation Area			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	New housing is inappropriate in the Green Belt. Although pre-application discussions have taken place, it is not considered that the Council has been made aware of a case of very special circumstances that would outweigh any harm that would be caused to the Green Belt.
Is the site suitable?	No

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU38

**Site Location / Address:** Gaisgill, Barnet Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/1169 for 6 flats has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
					X
					TPO reference number 17/2004

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	No
Any other comments:	Notwithstanding the poor accessibility of the site, the Council has indicated in pre-application discussions that the principle of the redevelopment of this site, which is on the edge of an existing urban area, is acceptable.  It is considered that the existence of a TPO would not prejudice future residential development. This has been demonstrated through the submitted planning application.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low (+0%)	Low (0%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
45dph	0.2	0.2	100%	5 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

X	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU39

**Site Location / Address:** Radlett Youth Centre, 2 Loom Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Youth Centre (D1)

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X		X			X
The site is currently a community use.		Radlett (South) Conservation Area  Part of the existing building is included on List of Locally Important Buildings			TPO reference number 375/1997

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy S1 resists the loss of community uses. An adequate justification would have to be submitted to justify any such loss.  It is likely that the inclusion of part of the existing building on the List of Locally Important Buildings would preclude its demolition. However, it could be converted for residential use.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	No

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	0.2	0.2	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU40

**Site Location / Address:** Burrell & Co., 199 Watling Street

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Retail (A1)

**Relevant planning history:** None

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X	X	X			
Radlett District Centre	A very small section of the rear of the site is within Flood Zone 3b	Radlett (North) Conservation Area			

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	<p>It is likely that the Council would resist the loss of the retail use on the ground-floor, in line with Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) policy T6. However, as stated in The Radlett District Centre Key Locations Planning Brief SPD, it is likely that residential development would be acceptable on the upper-floors of any new building.</p> <p>A very small section of the rear of the site is within Flood Zone 3b, but, subject to a Flood Risk Assessment, it is not thought that this would prevent the redevelopment of a significant part of the site.</p>
Is the site suitable?	Yes



**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional (+20%)	Medium (+10%)	Very High (+35%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
73dph	<0.1	<0.1	90%	4

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU41

**Site Location / Address:** 126 Watling Street

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Planning permission reference number TP/07/0985 for 1 new dwelling house was granted, but has since lapsed.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
		X			X
		Radlett (South) Conservation Area			TPO reference number 39/2004

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	The previously approved planning permission demonstrates that the TPO would not prejudice future development.
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	No
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	No

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	<0.1	<0.1	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	Deliverable 1-5 years		Developable 6-10 years		Developable 11-15 years		Developable 16 years + or unknown

**Site Reference:** SU42

**Site Location / Address:** Land adjacent 6 Beech Avenue

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
	X				

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential garden

**Relevant planning history:** Planning applications TP/10/0692 and TP/10/1286 were both withdrawn by the applicant. Concerns raised by officers did not relate to the principle of the residential intensification of the site.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Very low (+0)	Medium (+10%)	Detached (+0%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
36dph	0.2	0.2	100%	1 (based on withdrawn applications)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU43

**Site Location / Address:** Home Farm, Common Lane

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
					X

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** Agricultural

**Relevant planning history:** None.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint
X					
Green Belt					

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	No

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	N/A
---	-----

Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	N/A
Any other comments:	N/A
Is the site achievable?	N/A

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	No
Any other comments:	No

	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
--	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference: SU44**

**Site Location / Address:** Franshams, Hartsbourne Road

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
X					

**Existing use:** Residential

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/1349 for the development of 12 new residential units has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	Multiple parties own the site. However, it is known that the applicant has an option on the site.
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban (+10%)	Medium high (+20%)	Medium (+10%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
59dph	0.2	0.2	100%	3 (based on undetermined application)



**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--

**Site Reference:** SU45

**Site Location / Address:** Front of Oaklands College, Elstree Way

**Location type:**

Urban settlement PDL	Urban settlement non-PDL	Green Belt settlement PDL	Green Belt settlement non-PDL	Green Belt other PDL	Green Belt non-PDL
X					

**Redevelopment type:**

Residential Intensification	Residential Redevelopment	Other redevelopment	Conversion	Mixed use development	Other (specify below)
	X				

**Existing use:** College (D1)

**Relevant planning history:** Planning application reference number TP/11/1332 for 18 residential units (flats) has been submitted but has not yet been determined.

The Elstree Way Corridor Feasibility Study Final Report (June 2010) assumes that a College will be provided within the study area. The Council has since been advised that a college facility will be sought elsewhere in the town, following the recent demolition of the College buildings. As such, it is considered that the capacity of this site should be assessed separately from the 800 new homes expected to come forward as part of the Elstree Way Corridor.

**Constraints / Required actions:**

Existing policy conflict (specify below)	Flooding	Heritage designation	Contaminated Land	Topography	Other environmental constraint

**Suitability:**

Is the site accessible when assessed against the SHLAA methodology?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site suitable?	Yes

**Availability:**

Has the owner indicated that the site is available?	Yes
Are there any other known ownership constraints?	No
Any other comments:	No
Is the site available?	Yes

**Density multiplier (baseline 30dph):**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional (+20%)	Higher (+20%)	High (+20%)	Flats (+35%)

**Site Area:**

Density	Gross Ha	Net Ha	Gross to net ratio	Net capacity: (no. units)
83dph	0.2	0.2	100%	18 (based on submitted application)

**Achievability:**

Is there a high demand for housing in the area?	Yes
Is the site in close proximity to existing development and infrastructure?	Yes
Any other comments:	No
Is the site achievable?	Yes

**Deliverability / Developability:**

**Availability:**

Is the site deliverable / developable?	Yes
Any other comments:	No

<b>X</b>	<b>Deliverable 1-5 years</b>		<b>Developable 6-10 years</b>		<b>Developable 11-15 years</b>		<b>Developable 16 years + or unknown</b>
----------	------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	--	--