

Site location / address:

Address	Land adj Wilton End cottage	Post Code	
Ward	Shenley Ward	Town/ Village	Shenley

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	1.48	Current Use Class(es)	Grazing
--------------------	------	--------------------------	---------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential to the north, residential and woodland to the east, agricultural to south and west.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Rural edge of village location. Primarily open countryside to south and west, located within the quadrant formed by Porters Park to the north and Shenley to the east.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Adjoining land to the west is Green Belt and has not been put forward for development. Further west land to the south of Radlett Lane has been promoted but this does not immediately adjoin		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	n/a		

Planning status:

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

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
------------	-----

Yes	No
-----	----

### Constraints Check

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

### Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	Within Site Boundary (unless otherwise stated)
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	30.88
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	4.23
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.62
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score
30	3+	3	5	0
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The sub-area is within Green Belt Parcel (30), which was identified as performing moderately for Purpose 1 as it is connected to the south of Borehamwood, preventing its outward sprawl into open land, and for Purpose 2 as it forms part of the wider gap			

#### Stage 2

Sub- Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-28	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the eastern/southern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Eastern/southern part recommended for further consideration.					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Surface water flood risk across parts of the site.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

### Site Availability:

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

### Site Achievability:

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b>	Sequential test for flood risk.
--	---------------------------------

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Medium	Key Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.26	30dph	40dph
	49	65

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:49</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 49</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:65</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 5</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>There is a Local Wildlife site to the north of the site across Radlett Lane. However as this does not directly connect to the site it is unlikely to be impacted as part of any development.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 30 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did recommend the eastern/southern part of the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration but that does not include HEL196.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the site's Green Belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p><b>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:49</b></p> <p><b>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:65</b></p>
---	--

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL236

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Rectory Farm (inc. HEL236a & b)	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9DE
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	16.41	<b>Current Use</b>	Agriculture
------------------------	-------	--------------------	-------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Church, churchyard and Clore Shalom school to north, residential to west (across Shenleybury which abuts the site), woodland to south and fields and woodland to east		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Edge of village location where open fields and woodland meet residential development at Porters Park		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	The owner has indicated that the site could be expanded eastwards into agricultural land under same ownership		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	n/a		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	TP/05/0845 All weather and grass gallops (REFUSED); TP/85/0368 relocation of agricultural dwelling (GRANTED); TP/90/0303 Outline application to provide health resort and golf course (REFUSED) TP/92/0201 Use of land for health resort and golf club (REFUSED)
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential and commercial

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

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

Yes	No
-----	----

### Constraints Check

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

### Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	15.38
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	9
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	6.03
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification



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

**Green Belt purposes**

**Stage 1**

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

**Stage 2**

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-32	Fail	0	1	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended					
<b>Recommended</b>	No					

**Landscape Sensitivity Assessment**

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

**Officer Assessment**

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No

Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Surface water flood risk across parts of the site.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Surface water flood risk across parts of the site.
---	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
10.67	30dph	40dph
	368	491

**Deliverability / Developability:**

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:368 Delivery in 1-5 years 110 Delivery in 6-10 years 258
---	--

<b>timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:491</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 106</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There is an archeological site to the north of the site. The site also has a TPO area of trees within it. The site also adjoins Combe Wood ancient woodland, a Local Wildlife Site, which acts as a hard buffer to the southern edge of the site. A survey of potential impact upon the archeological site and tree protection plan is required for any development.</p> <p>The site fronts onto Black Lion Hill although a new primary vehicular access would need to be created. Part of the western part of the site, extending to 3.2ha, has now been promoted for commercial development. Landscape sensitivity work has concluded the site is sensitive to large scale commercial/warehouse development.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 18 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the sites Green belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:368</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:491</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0360-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land South of Radlett Lane, Shenley	<b>Post Code</b>	
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	26.41	<b>Current Use Class(es)</b>	Open countryside, Agricultural
----------------------------	-------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Open fields, agricultural, scattered dwellings		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Open countryside. Shenley Village to east, Radlett to west		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL-0348-22, HE:0348b-22, HEL-1061-22		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b>	None
---	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (Specialist Housing for Older People)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Within Site Boundary	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	No	0
Floodzone 3	No	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	Yes	12.37
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	Yes	4.4
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	Yes	1.90
Reservoir Flooding	No	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score
30	3+	3	5	0
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The sub-area lies within wider Parcel 30. This Parcel was identified as performing moderately for Purpose 1 as it is connected to the south of Borehamwood, preventing its outward sprawl into open land, and for Purpose 2 as it forms part of the wider gap			

#### Stage 2

Sub- Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-28	Fail	0	3	5	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Yes
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	Potentially
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Some flood risk across the site
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

### Site Availability:

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

### Site Achievability:

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

### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any</b>	Sequential test for flood risk
---	--------------------------------

<b>other comments / Summary</b>	
---------------------------------	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
14.53	30dph	40dph
	458	610

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p><b>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:458</b></p> <p><b>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</b></p> <p><b>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</b></p> <p><b>Delivery in 11-15 years 73</b></p> <p><b>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:610</b></p> <p><b>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</b></p> <p><b>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</b></p> <p><b>Delivery in 11-15 years 190</b></p>
--	--



**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site is within the green belt and consists of mainly agricultural land and small areas of trees. There are few environmental constraints on site, aside from the fairly significant ground level changes across parts of the site.</p> <p>Stage 1 Assessment scores the area the site is in as meeting the Purpose criteria strongly. Site also meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly in the Stage 2 assessment, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The site was not recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:458</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:610</p>
--	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL370

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land West of Shenley	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9DW
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	16.51	<b>Current Use</b>	open fields
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	-------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Open fields to the north, Wild Farm dwelling to the north west, Porters Park Golf Course to the west, Cricket club to the south, residential development at Porters Park to the east		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	This is an edge of village location and part of the gap between Shenley and Radlett. The character is rural with open fields to the north and south and the golf course to the west		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Land to the north within Harperbury hospital site (HCC) has been submitted by Bloor Homes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL350e		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

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

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

## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	Yes
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0.06
Floodzone 3	0.5
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	7.79
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1.62
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.62
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
38	Fail	0	5	3	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel meets purpose 2 and meets purpose 3 strongly. There is possible scope for sub-division at the former Harperbury Hospital site in the north of the parcel and at the garages in the west, however the boundaries around these areas are not considered durable. The parcel is not recommended for further consideration.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-30	Fail	0	5	5	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
<b>Recommended</b>	No					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	No
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Access would be needed onto Radlett Lane. There are important trees and flood zone in this location. Radlett Lane is narrow and busy.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No

Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Necessary access location has a number of associated constraints, so unlikely as per the original submission. Revised submission proposes access from Porters Park Drive.

**Site Availability:**

Has the owner said the site is available?	Not known	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	Not known		
Is the Site available?	Not known		

**Site Achievability:**

Is the Site achievable?	Unknown
-------------------------	---------

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	No
---	----

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
6.00	30dph	40dph
	207	276

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 207</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 97</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:276</p>
---	--

<b>being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 166</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
-------------------------	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>Flood zone (FZ3) and Local Wildlife Site (Porters Park Golf Course) are within and adjoining the south west of the site supporting a significant number of grassland indicators. A small part of the site, north west of the Porters Park estate, lies within an archaeological site.</p> <p>Cow Banks Wood Local Wildlife Site to the north east supports a range of woodland indicators. There are various statutory and locally listed buildings nearby within Shenley Park/Porters Park estate and at Wild Farm/White House to the north. A number of TPO trees are close to the site boundary within the Porters Park estate.</p> <p>The frontage of the site onto Radlett Lane as previously proposed is heavily planted and close to a bend in the road, as well as being in a flood zone. This would be likely to preclude the use of an access onto Radlett Lane as the principal point of access into the site.</p> <p>Consequently, a more recent masterplan submitted shows a vehicular point of access from Porters Park Drive to the north east of the cricket ground, near Hamblings Close.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the site's Green belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment (including access off Porters Park Drive being acceptable to the highway authority) as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 207</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:276</p>
--	--

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL390

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	land adj 52 Harris Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9EQ
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.69	<b>Current Use</b>	Fields/open land
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the south and east, depot/commercial premises to the north		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Edge of village location bordering open countryside to the north-east of Shenley.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	not unless further land in open countryside is utilised		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	n/a		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	14/1645/CLE Use of land as residential curtilage in association with no. 52 Harris Lane (Revised Application) REFUSED 22/0971/OUT - Construction of up to 37 dwellings with associated landscaping and open space to include access from Harris Lane. (Outline Application with Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale Reserved). (Refused, Appeal Dismissed)
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

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

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

## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	2.41
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

Green Belt purposes



## Stage 1

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

## Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-27	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but north-western part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North-western part is recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Split Site					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Small pylon on site

Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None
---	------

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.44	30dph	40dph
	50	66

**Deliverability / Developability:**

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:50
	Delivery in 1-5 years 50
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:66
	Delivery in 1-5 years 60
	Delivery in 6-10 years 6

	Delivery in 11-15 years 0
--	---------------------------

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>There are no significant topographical or environmental constraints affecting the site which comprises a field to the side (north) and rear (east) of no.52 Harris Lane. The land is immediately beyond the village envelope and south of a complex of buildings belonging to a local arboriculture business.</p> <p>Although belonging to the owners of the main house, the land is distinct from the fenced off rear garden. The field has been used by the occupants of the house but the front part has been determined as not forming part of the curtilage of the house through a refused CLE application (14/1645/CLE).</p> <p>An appeal against refusal of consent for residential development on the site was dismissed in 2023, primarily on the grounds that the quantum of new homes did not constitute very special circumstances. However, the overall suitability of the site, notwithstanding its moderate harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, was not questioned by the Inspector.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 18 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did recommend the the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the sites Green belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:50</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:66</p>
---	--

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL508

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land at 26 Woodhall Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9AT
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.74	<b>Current Use</b>	Redevelopment of site with a residential unit.
----------------------------	------	--------------------	--

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to west, Woodhall Spinney to south, farmland and cricket ground to south east, allotments to east, residential to north.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Edge of Green Belt village leading out into rural area		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	n/a		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	6/2423/FUL Demolition of existing house and construction of replacement detached 2 storey 5 bed dwelling (REFUSED); 17/1299/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of detached, 4 bed, chalet bungalow (GRANTED); 17/2357/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling, swimming pool and pump house and erection of detached, 4 bed chalet bungalow with basement accommodation, to include additional access to Woodhall Lane (REFUSED); 17/2358/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of detached, 4 bed chalet bungalow (GRANTED) 19/1804/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of detached 4 bed house. (Revision to application 17/2358/FUL) (Granted)
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

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

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

### Constraints Check

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

### Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	Yes
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	1.6
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

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

### Stage 2

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	Access onto Woodhall Lane
Is topography a constraint?	No

Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

**Site Availability:**

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Unclear, because permission for one new dwelling has been implemented and there has been no further contact since the original promotion was submitted. The new dwelling has also been constructed.		

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None
---	------

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	V.Low	Low	Key Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.63	30dph	40dph
	24	31

**Deliverability / Developability:**

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:24 Delivery in 1-5 years 24 Delivery in 6-10 years 0 Delivery in 11-15 years 0
--	---

<b>capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:31</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 31</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
------------------------------------	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The main constraint is that the site lies within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 30 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The site was not considered in the Stage 2 Green Belt assessment.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the sites Green Belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>However, since the site was originally promoted, planning permission has been granted and implemented for a single new dwelling. There has been no further promotion of the site for wider residential development and it remains unclear whether the site is available for development.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:0</p>
--	--



**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL515

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	South of Rectory Farm	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 3NU
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	5.34	<b>Current Use</b>	Agricultural field with mature trees
----------------------------	------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Ancient woodland to north, residential to south, east and west		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	This is a rural location at the edge of Shenley village, a washed over village in the Green Belt. The developed part of the village lies to the south and east of the site, with more open countryside interspersed with occasional farm, residential and occas		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	n/a		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

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

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

## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	Yes
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	2.22
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.48
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.25
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

Green Belt purposes

## Stage 1

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

## Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-32	Fail	0	1	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended					
<b>Recommended</b>	No					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	LWS and Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	The site has frontages to Rectory Lane and Shenleybury/London Road
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No

<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	LWS
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Not under current policy as the site is within the Green Belt and outside the Shenley village envelope. It is also a Local Wildlife Site.

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Low	Key villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
4.01	30dph	40dph
	138	184

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:138  Delivery in 1-5 years 110  Delivery in 6-10 years 28  Delivery in 11-15 years 0
---	--

<b>capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:184</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 74</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
------------------------------------	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site falls wholly within a Local Wildlife Site as well as adjoining a Conservation area. There is also a TPO area to the north of the site. The site also lies within Green Belt land.</p> <p>Prior to any development a full TPO assessment, ecological assessment and HIA would need to be conducted to address the above mentioned constraints.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 18 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The site was not considered as part of the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the site's Green Belt status, the site is considered be potentially available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process. However due to the number of constraints on site it is not considered suitable for development.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:0</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1053-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land South of Mimms Lane, Shenley	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9AP
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	6.86	<b>Current Use</b>	Tree Nursery
----------------------------	------	--------------------	--------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Mainly Agricultural/open fields, with isolated residential dwellings to the north.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The site is located to the north of Shenley, with a single open field separating the site with the village. Open fields surround the site, with detached dwellings located to the north along Mimms Lane.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	22/0926/FUL, Extension of existing nursery including the development of new cabin/training facility, hard standing for parking and manoeuvring to the north east of the site, 7 floodlight columns, posts for support of trees growing on the hard standing to the south of the site and unrestricted access to the site through the Mimms Road entrance (retrospective application), Awaiting Decision
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential (Private, Affordable, Custom and older persons housing)

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

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

## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	4.17
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.1
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

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

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-27	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but north-western part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North-western part is recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Split Site					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Potentially from machinery associated with existing use.
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No



Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	None
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None.
---	-------

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
5.15	30dph	40dph
	162	216

**Deliverability / Developability:**

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:162 Delivery in 1-5 years 110 Delivery in 6-10 years 52
---	---

<b>within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:216</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 106</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site lies immediately adjacent to a Conservation area as well as a listed building. Based on this an HIA may be required as part of the application process. The main constraint is that the site lies within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 18 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did recommend the the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Development of the PDL part of the site may be suitable subject to passing the openness test required by NPPF. However, currently the non-PDL part of the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable. The PDL part of the site amounting to an estimated 24 dwellings could be suitable.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the sites Green Belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:162</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:216</p>
--	--

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1034-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Shenleybury House	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9EG
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.66	<b>Current Use</b>	Carehome / Woodland
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential and Travellers site located to north of the site. Church to the south, with a churchyard to the east, and open fields to the west.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The site is land associated with Shenleybury House, a carehome located to the south of the site. The site is part of ribbon development linking the main village of Shenley with Shenleybury Cottages, with churchyard and openfields to the east and west giv		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL-350		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential / Rentention of existing Carehome

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

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

## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	30.63
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	17.94
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	11.35
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

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

### Stage 2

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

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	A new access is likely required off Shenleybury Road
Is topography a constraint?	No

<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None.
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Surface water flood risk across part of the site and a TPO area.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Surface water flood risk across part of the site
--	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	V.low	Low	Key Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.41	30dph	40dph
	53	71

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:53 Delivery in 1-5 years 53 Delivery in 6-10 years 0
--	--

<b>within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:71</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 11</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site has a TPO area covering it that would need to be assessed prior to any development taking place.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 38 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 2 (Prevent coalescence). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Development of the PDL part of the site may be suitable subject to passing the openness test required by NPPF. However, currently the non-PDL part of the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the sites Green Belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:53</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:71</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1033-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land at Wild Farm, Shenley	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9DT
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	17.74	<b>Current Use</b>	Agricultural
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	--------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Mostly open fields with some residential to the south and south east. Harperbury Hospital to the south west.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The site is largely open fields, split into two parcels, between Shenley Village, Harpbury Hospital, and the training grounds of Arsenal and Watford. The size of the site, at its located away from large settlements, gives it a open and rural characteristi		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL-0350		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

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

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



## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	Yes
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	10.84
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	4.13
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.3
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

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

### Stage 2

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

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	Yes, the only access point is likely to be a local road (Queens Way)
Is topography a constraint?	No

<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	M25 in close proximity to North
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Small area of surface water flood risk
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Small area of surface water flood risk
--	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
11.53	30dph	40dph
	363	484

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:363 Delivery in 1-5 years 110 Delivery in 6-10 years 253
--	--

<b>within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:484</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 99</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>Development of the entire site, which has been promoted by HCC, would result in a northwards expansion of Shenley/Porters Park towards the Harperbury Hospital site. However, the extent of the site which is being sought for development is unclear.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 38 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 2 (Prevent coalescence). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the sites Green Belt status, the site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:363</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:484</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0349-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Shenley Grange, Shenley	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9ER
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	7.98	<b>Current Use</b>	Open fields / woodland
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Open fields to north, south and west. Dwellings to east. Public Footpath to rear.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Open countryside. Large detached dwellings.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL348 HEL-1061-22		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	22/1826/OUTEI, Demolition of existing buildings and structures and development of the site for up to 177 dwellings, plus community hub (use class E/F2), associated parking and landscaping, sustainable drainage (SUDs) features and play areas. (Outline application to include ACCESS, with other matters of APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT and SCALE reserved), (Refused) 22/1242/EI2, Request for scoping opinion (Environmental Impact Assessment), Response Given 22/0740/EI1, Request for screening opinion (Environmental Impact Assessment - Screening), EIA Required. 16/1671/FUL, Erection of 1 No. 5 bed detached dwelling; 1 No. 5 bed detached dwelling with integral garages; 1 No. detached 1.5 storey triple garage building and associated landscaping, Permission subject to/linked to Section 106
----------------------------------	--

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential (Mixed Use, including use Class E/F2, public open space)

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

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

## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	Within Site Boundary (unless otherwise stated)
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	Yes
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	Yes

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	4
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1.03
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.25
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
30	Pass	3+	3	5	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The sub-area is within Green Belt Parcel (30), which was identified as performing moderately for Purpose 1 as it is connected to the south of Borehamwood, preventing its outward sprawl into open land, and for Purpose 2 as it forms part of the wider gap.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-28	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the eastern/southern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Eastern/southern part recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Split Site					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Conservation area, Green Belt and TPO
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No, although access would be needed onto London Road through existing shared access.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No

Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	TPO
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	TPO
---	-----

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	low	V. Low	Key Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
5.98	30dph	40dph
	224	299

**Deliverability / Developability:**

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 224 Delivery in 1-5 years 110 Delivery in 6-10 years 114
---	---



<b>timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:299</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 189</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The north east part of site, fronting London Road, lies within the Shenley Village Conservation Area and includes an archaeological site. The site is also opposite a Grade II listed church and adjacent to locally listed building at 49 London Road. There is a Local Wildlife Site to the south of the site as well as a number of TPOs on the site</p> <p>The eastern side of the site is within the Shenley Village Envelope with a significant part of the site comprising a very large rear garden / residential curtilage; beyond this the site comprises open fields which gently slope towards Woodhall Spinney, a bridleway connecting the site to Radlett Lane. The Spinney itself is a Local Wildlife Site and Local Green Space.</p> <p>The land is former parkland belonging to the original Shenley Grange estate which is the reason behind the clear difference in the character and appearance of the more sparsely developed west side of London Road from the east side opposite.</p> <p>The site was identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as forming part of a strongly performing wider Green Belt parcel, particularly with regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, the area to immediately west of London Road was identified as being more visually connected to the settlement edge and with a more limited relationship with the wider countryside and was recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further, although this does not include HEL349.</p> <p>The principle of limited additional infill development has been accepted through 16/1671/FUL.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Development of the PDL part of the site may be suitable subject to passing the openness test required by NPPF. However, currently the non-PDL part of the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the site's Green Belt status, the site could potentially be brought forward independently of the land promoted to the north and is considered to be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 228</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:304</p>
--	--

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1061-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land South of Radlett Lane and west of Wilton End Cottage, Radlett Lane, Shenley	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9BW
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	3.88	<b>Current Use</b>	Open Field (Grazing)
------------------------	------	--------------------	----------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Open Fields, with residential to north east		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Open countryside surrounding the site, with detached dwellings to north east along Radlett Lane.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL-0348-22, HEL-0360-22, HEL-0196		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

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

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

## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	7.9
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1.14
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.63
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
30	Pass	3+	3	5	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The sub-area is within Green Belt Parcel (30), which was identified as performing moderately for Purpose 1 as it is connected to the south of Borehamwood, preventing its outward sprawl into open land, and for Purpose 2 as it forms part of the wider gap.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-28	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the eastern/southern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Eastern/southern part recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Split Site					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No

Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	None
Are there any other environmental constraints?	None
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

**Site Availability:**

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	None		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None
---	------

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	v.Low	Low	Key Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
2.91	30dph	40dph
	100	134

**Deliverability / Developability:**

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:100 Delivery in 1-5 years 100 Delivery in 6-10 years 0
---	--

<b>timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:134</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 24</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There is a Local Wildlife site to the north across Radlett Lane from the site. The site also lies within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Prior to development a Local wildlife assessment would need to be submitted and approved.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 30 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did recommend the eastern/southern part of the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration. However as this site is in the north-western part of the this sub-area it was not recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the sites Green Belt status, the site is considered be potentially available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process. The site could only be considered suitable should adjacent sites come forward with it as it is currently quite isolated from Shenley village.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:100</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:134</p>
--	--

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0348-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land at London Road, Shenley (north of Shenley Grange)	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9ER
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Shenley

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	3.99	<b>Current Use</b>	Open fields / woodland / dwellings
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Open fields to north, south and west. Dwellings to east. Public Footpath to rear.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Open countryside. Large detached dwellings.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL-1062-22, HEL-0349-22, HEL0360-22		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	23/0677/OUT, Hybrid planning application comprising 1) Outline consent for up to 138 age restricted dwellings (over 55yrs) (Use Class C3) along with a community centre, vehicular and pedestrian access, internal road, landscaping, drainage and other associated works and infrastructure (All matter reserved except access and layout and, 2) Full consent for the demolition of the existing dwelling Longview and alterations to 49 London Road to include the demolition of the existing garage and erection of a replacement garage (Awaiting Decision)
----------------------------------	--

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential (Age restricted) / Community Uses Building

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

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



## Constraints Check

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

## Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	Yes
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	Yes

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	5.84
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1.84
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.77
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
30	Pass	3+	3	5	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The sub-area is within Green Belt Parcel (30), which was identified as performing moderately for Purpose 1 as it is connected to the south of Borehamwood, preventing its outward sprawl into open land, and for Purpose 2 as it forms part of the wider gap.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-28	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the eastern/southern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Eastern/southern part recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Split Site					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

## Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No although access would be needed onto London Road through across land used as an existing private driveway/house
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No

Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	None
Are there any other environmental constraints?	None
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None
---	------

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	V.low	Low	Key Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
2.99	30dph	40dph
	112	150

**Deliverability / Developability:**

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:112 Delivery in 1-5 years 110 Delivery in 6-10 years 2
---	--

<b>within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:150</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 40</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There is a Local Wildlife site to the south of the site as well as a number of TPOs on the site. A portion of the site on the north eastern boundary lies within a conservation area and archaeological site, as well as within the Shenley village envelope. The site lies within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Prior to development a full arboricultural impact assessment and Local wildlife assessment would need to be submitted and approved. An HIA and archaeological survey would also be required for the site.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 30 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did recommend the eastern/southern part of the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration. However, the site is outside of the area recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the site's Green Belt status, the site could potentially be brought forward independently of the adjacent land promoted to the south and is considered to be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:112</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:150</p>
--	---