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Shenley Plan and Design Code

Compliance Checklist |

Assessment Template | Version 1.1

This form shall be completed by the LPA case officer as part of a pre-application response by an Applicant and shared with the Applicant in order to assist the applicant in improving compliance with Shenley Plan Polices and Design Codes. The Assessment Checklist shall be updated as the application and designs progresses. All relevant applications in the Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Area are in scope. The final /latest available version of this Compliance Assessment Checklist shall be published online alongside other planning application related documents.

Date:

Brief Application Description:

Site Address:

Applicant:

This Shenley Plan Compliance Checklist – Assessments aims to assist applicants and officers in the proper and full interpretation of Shenley Plan Policies and Shenley Design Code, achieving better and compliant design outcomes;

| **Shenley Plan and Design Code Compliance Checklist – Assessment** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A  POLICY &  DESIGN CODE PARAMETER  REFERENCE |  | B1  POLICY REQUIREMENT | B2  DETAIL :  SHENLEY PLAN POLICY  INCL. POLICY SH 7  BUILDING FOR LIFE  REQUIREMENT | B3  MORE DETAIL:  DESIGN CODE  REQUIREMENT | C  Appropriate level of information, incl. drawings provided to assess quality of application for current  Stage?  [Y; N; N/A] | D  POLICY & CODE COMPLIANCE SCORE  Bubble chart  Description automatically generated | E  RECOMMENDATIONS/  ACTIONS TO IMPROVE  TO SCORE LEVEL  8-10 |
| SH1.1  RURAL CHARACTER |  | Development within the Green Belt areas of the neighbourhood plan will be expected to ensure that the design of the development relates positively to its surroundings and enhances the existing distinctiveness of the rural character of Shenley, by reflecting the special and valued features that are unique to the locality, the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute to that local character. | 1. Does the scheme create a place with locally inspired distinctive character? 2. Does the scheme take advantage of existing topography, landscape features (including water courses), wildlife habitats, existing buildings, site orientation and microclimates? 3. Is the scheme designed to make it easy to find your way around? | 1. Is a comparative precedent study of existing positive local examples and innovation in 21st century rural forms of sustainable development presented in the Design and Access Statement and/ or Heritage Statement? 2. Does the proposal demonstrate a thorough understanding of Shenley’s built and natural environment, and the often defining spaces in-between buildings and the wider landscape setting? 3. Does the development demonstrate simple, restraint and refined detailing with specific reference to Shenley’s statutory and locally listed buildings and spaces? 4. Does the development demonstrate careful consideration of the spaces around the buildings and structures? (Specifically, boundaries and edges to the open countryside, neighbouring properties and the streets and lanes they frame.) 5. Does the development maintain and enhance rural landscape character and visual amenity? (integration of development within the rural landscape demonstrated by applying great care in how the development and associated infrastructures is sited in the land- and street- and townscape incl. consideration such as prominence, shelter, wind and weather exposure, passive solar gain, landscape and flooding impacts are addressed at an initial stage of the design to avoid poor design decisions at a later stage.) 6. Is rural informal character demonstrated in those interfaces between public and private and shared spaces? 7. Is the integration and transition between the settlement area and open countryside and public and private spaces sufficiently demonstrated and does it support rural character by informality of rural lanes, verges, front gardens and courtyards? 8. Does the proposals avoid cramped overdevelopment by retaining significant and healthy trees and hedge systems, supporting beauty, biodiversity and flood risk prevention? 9. Does the development avoid highly engineered urban and regular boundary treatments, planting and street furniture? 10. Is the material palette for streets, street furniture and vertical street elements that commonly used in Shenley’s Conservation Area and/or are replaced ‘like for like’ as for improvement works? (Traditional lamp posts, timber bollards and benches etc.) |  |  |  |
| **SUMMARY** | | | | | |  |  |
| SH1.2  RURAL CHARACTER  SC2  DESIGN SCRUTINY |  | SH1.2 Development located within the Green Belt on January 1st 2019 should have regard to the Shenley Parish Design Principles and Code. | 1. Does the proposal meet the expectation to enhance the existing distinctiveness of the rural character of Shenley, identifies of the special and valued features that are unique to the locality, the heritage assets and architectural features contributing to the local character? | 1. Does the Design and Access Statement provide sufficient text, plans and visuals explaining the genesis, alternatives tested and reasons for the proposed layout, height and bulk? Does it contain typical elevations with façade details and roofscape? 2. Are the illustrated design principles adopted, along with an indication of the proposed materials to be used on the exterior of the building and structures? 3. Is sufficient reference /use made of the Local Precedent Study in the Shenley Plan? 4. Are the plans and illustrations broadly compliant with the Design Code requirements? |  |  |  |
| SC3  LAYOUT |  RURAL SETTLEMENT PATTERN |  | 1. Does the provided layout plan and settlement pattern consist of a rural settlement pattern akin the Code sheet 2. ‘Rural Settlement Pattern Irregular and responsive plot size pattern (acceptable via SC3)’ ? 3. Is the scheme designed to make it easy to find your way around? | 1. Major Development proposing regular and linear plots of equal size typical of suburban developments and unresponsive to site context, landscape and need for public spaces is not supported. 2. Do buildings enclose streets and spaces and turn corners well? 3. Does the proposal provide attractive public spaces, in appropriate locations? 4. Is sufficient reference /use made of the Local Precedent Study in the Shenley Plan? |  |  |  |
| SC3  LAYOUT |  RURAL SETTLEMENT PATTERN |  |  | 1. Does the proposal demonstrate a positive response to the site context? Is consideration given to quality of indoor and outdoor living environment, public spaces and potential environmental performance of the development, including, but not limited to:    1. Orientation    2. Natural light levels    3. Indoor air quality    4. Thermal comfort    5. Water consumption? 2. Is sufficient reference /use made of the Local Precedent Study in the Shenley Plan? |  |  |  |
| SC4  BUILDINGS |  LESS IS MORE. SIMPLICITY |  |  | 1. Does the development demonstrate simple, restraint and refined detailing with specific reference to Shenley’s statutory and locally listed buildings and spaces? 2. Is sufficient reference /use made of the Local Precedent Study in the Shenley Plan? |  |  |  |
| SC5  BUILDINGS |  MASSING & ROOFS |  | 1. Are sections and elevations provided that demonstrate the ability of using roof space for habitable rooms? | 1. Do buildings sited at important corners or in mixed use centres have a greater mass and height than the prevailing wider context suggests to emphasise their significance? 2. Does the proposal support the use and maximising of the space in roofs through creative design solutions? Is the architectural language and form restrained and modest, celebrating valued rural roof forms and bringing generous amounts of daylight into spaces? 3. Is sufficient reference /use made of the Local Precedent Study in the Shenley Plan? |  |  |  |
| SC6A  BOUNDARIES & EDGES |  | 1. Does the development incorporate appropriate landscaping that has regard to the principles (3-7): 2. Is sufficient reference /use made of the local Precedent Study as provided and starting point incl. the list of new planting for rural character as made available in the Shenley Plan? | 1. Informality and the use of simple, natural, low level engineered, robust and well weathering materials. 2. Use of typical planting often found in cottage gardens, kitchen gardens, orchards, allotments and the open countryside. With increasing proximity to the settlement boundary an increase in natural/wild flora is required. (with use of provided reference list) 3. A simple palette of a few materials for street surfaces and structures in new streets and lanes. 4. A shared surface approach without kerbs supporting a step-free environment for wheelchair users is considered appropriate for all residential streets and lanes. The concept of a ‘play street’ where pedestrians and children have priority over slow moving cars and other motorised vehicles should be considered, where it is appropriate to do so. 5. A rigorous approach to soft boundaries delivered through principally flush transitions between the semi-private, shared and public spaces and a restrained use of green hedges combined with less than 1.50m high see-through modestly proportioned fencing and /or picket timber fencing. |  |  |  |
| SC6B  OPEN COUNTRYSIDE |  | 1. There are two principle rural edges to the open countryside which are to shape detailed design approaches on specific sites.   (See Code Sheet SC6b) | 1. Does the development bordering the open countryside comply with one of the two defined types? 2. Please check against Code Sheet 6b and are sections provided to demonstrate compliance?   Type 1: Backing onto countryside  Generally, a minimum of 30m between boundary/ open countryside and back elevation of a building should be maintained. Narrow in plan or single storey gable ended buildings are permitted closer to the boundary.  Type 2: Front elevation onto countryside  Generally, a minimum of 10m between the boundary/open countryside and front elevations of gable ended buildings should be maintained. The design and materiality of the access lane is informal (no tarmac, kerbs or street lights) and can only be achieved by an unadopted private access status. (Local precedent: Nursery Close) |  |  |  |
| SC6C  FOLLOWING  RE-DEVELOPMENT |  | 1. Following re-development reintroducing more rural forms of edges. | 1. Following re-development, does the proposed approach to highway boundaries and use of hard features such as railings, walls and fences to define boundaries lead to an approach for green and flush front and side boundaries? 2. Where the predominant nature of front boundaries is green hedging, is this retained, or re-planted in an appropriate rural style? 3. Is where fencing is required hedging planted to soften the effect? |  |  |  |
| SC7  RURAL LANDSCAPE |  | 1. Does the development maintain and enhance rural landscape character and visual amenity? 2. Does the scheme take advantage of existing topography, landscape features (including water courses), wildlife habitats, existing buildings, site orientation and microclimates? 3. Is sufficient reference /use made of the local Precedent Study as provided and starting point incl. the list of new planting for rural character as made available in this document. | 1. Does the proposal demonstrates the retention of all healthy trees, woodland, hedge systems and ponds? 2. Does the development provide spaces and buildings that maximise opportunities for greening to create attractive resilient places that can also help the management of surface water (Sustainable Drainage Systems)? 3. Are local varieties for seasonal planting proposed which are suitable for site and soil conditions and deliver informal /green transitions between boundaries? Are they largely self-maintaining, biodiverse and/or productive (edible)? |  |  |  |
| SC8  HEALTHY TREES & HEDGES |  | 1. Does the proposal demonstrate the retention of all healthy trees, woodland, hedge systems and ponds? | 1. Is a replacement landscaping assessment as of BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction and HBC’s corresponding Biodiversity and Trees Supplementary Planning Document followed, in case removal is proposed and justified? |  |  |  |
| Shenley Parish Design Principles and Code |  | **SUMMARY** | | | |  |  |
| SH2  LOCAL GREEN SPACE |  | Spinney Woodland and connecting hedge system is Local Green Space where development will not be approved except in very special circumstances. | 1. Does the proposal demonstrates sufficient respect and distance from the Spinney Woodland and connecting hedge system facilitating its health? 2. See Policy Map SH2 for dimensions. | 1. Does the proposal demonstrate compliance with Shenley Code SC6 Type 1? |  |  |  |
| SH3  HOUSING MIX & CHOICES |  | Does the development have a mix of housing types and tenures that suit local requirements?  Is sufficient information provided which allows an assessment of the mix, size and type of homes listed? | 1. Does the proposal deliver new homes or alterations to existing buildings for residential use which increase the supply in the neighbourhood area of: 2. One to three bedroom homes; and 3. Financially more affordable homes including starter homes, shared ownership, and/or social rented family homes? 4. Affordable housing provided in a tenure blind mix and; 5. Self-build and custom-build homes; and 6. Homes and developments for more mature households (55+), elderly living alone and young families within walking distance of local amenities and community facilities; and 7. Homes meeting Building Regulations Requirement Part M4 (Category 2)\* and Wheelchair user dwellings as defined by Building Regulations Requirement Part M4 (Category 3)\*. | |  |  |  |
| SH4  CONNECTING SHENLEY VILLAGE |  | Does the scheme integrate into surroundings? Does the scheme have good accessibility to public transport?  (Note change in priority of user hierarchy in law) | 1. Does the proposal support delivery of improved walking, cycling and public transport accessibility identified in Map SH4, including walking and cycling routes through the land west of London Road and Porters Park, and between Radlett, Borehamwood, Shenleybury and Shenley? 2. Are streets designed to encourage low vehicle speeds? 3. Is resident and visitor parking sufficient and well integrated? 4. Will public and private spaces be clearly defined and designed to be attractive, well managed and safe? 5. Is there adequate external storage for bins, recycling and cycles? | 1. Does the development incorporate appropriate landscaping that has regard to the following principles:  * Informality and the use of simple, natural, low level engineered, robust and well weathering materials. * Use of typical planting often found in cottage gardens, kitchen gardens, orchards, allotments and the open countryside.  1. With increasing proximity to the settlement boundary an increase in natural/wild flora is required. (with use of provided reference list) 2. A simple palette of a few materials for street surfaces and structures in new streets and lanes 3. A shared surface approach without kerbs supporting a step-free environment for wheelchair users is considered appropriate for all residential streets and lanes. The concept of a ‘play street’ where pedestrians and children have priority over slow moving cars and other motorised vehicles should be considered, where it is appropriate to do so. 4. A rigorous approach to soft boundaries delivered through principally flush transitions between the semi-private, shared and public spaces and a restrained use of green hedges combined with less than 1.50m high see-through modestly proportioned fencing and /or picket timber fencing. |  |  |  |
| SH4  CONNECTING SHENLEY VILLAGE |  | Does the proposal reinstate and contribute to the maintenance of sustainable water features?  (Policy Map SH4 Connecting Shenley Village) | 1. Do those features such as ponds locate within the application site area and make water features a fully accessible public amenity, wherever possible? | |  |  |  |
|  | Does the development make provision to connect with the Internet? | 1. Includes installation of the necessary broadband ducting and infrastructure? | |  |  |  |
| POLICY SH5  SH5.1 EXISTING COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES |  | Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as shops, schools, workplaces, parks, play areas, pubs or cafés? | 1. Does the development retain or improve existing local community infrastructure facilities? | |  |  |  |
|  | Does the proposal have a significantly detrimental impact on or result in the loss of existing local community infrastructure?  (See list of Community Facilities in full policy text) | 1. Does the proposal demonstrate adequately that: 2. there is no longer any significant need or demand for the existing community facility; or 3. the existing community facility; is no longer economically viable; or 4. the proposal makes alternative provision for the relocation or reprovision of the community infrastructure to an equally or more appropriate and accessible location within the Parish which complies with other plan policies (Policy Map SH4). 5. will not result in unacceptable traffic movements or impact on residential amenity, and 6. will not generate a need for car parking that cannot be adequately catered for, and 7. is of a scale appropriate to the needs of the locality and conveniently accessible for residents of the village wishing to walk or cycle. | |  |  |  |
| SH5.2 NEW COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES |  | Does the proposal improve the quality and range of community infrastructure, particularly for young people and/or located in any of the Key Locations identified in Map SH5? | 1. Does the proposal support a: 2. Community Service Hub; 3. additional health services and facilities; 4. additional education services and facilities; 5. places to socialise, learn and celebrate and measures that support making community spaces more attractive and used more often; 6. outdoor play, leisure and sports facilities supporting healthy lifestyles and measures that help us make better use of our current outdoor amenities; and 7. a step change in public transport provision incl. a high frequency public bus/shuttle service to Radlett, Borehamwood, Potters Bar and St Albans? | |  |  |  |
| SH6 LOCAL KNOWLEDGE FOR GOOD DESIGN  SH6.1 GOOD DESIGN |  |  | 1. Does the application demonstrate sufficiently how they have addressed the quality of design by providing a statement of how: 2. they have had regard to the Shenley Plan Policies; 3. Shenley Design Principles and Code; and 4. made appropriate use of tools and processes for assessing and improving the design of development throughout the design process. (Community Surveys and Surveys Design Workshops and Design Review and Building for a Healthy Life Assessment etc.) | |  |  |  |
| SH6.2 DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS (DDBS) |  | Does the proposal benefit from a ‘Design and Development Brief’’ | 1. Does it include in addition to the National and Local Validation List Requirements the following: 2. More detailed Design codes and guidelines 3. Indicative timing and phasing of the proposed development including infrastructure and public transport access 4. Community benefits to be provided and when they aged to demonstrate how they have addressed the quality occur in the phasing and delivery 5. All relevant factual information explaining proposed dwelling and tenure mix, infrastructure provision and community benefits from a financial viability point of view to understand the ability of the development to deliver affordable housing | |  |  |  |
| **SUM SUMMARY MARY** | | | | | |  |  |