

## Christine Whyte

---

**From:** Ann Darnell  
**Sent:** 02 November 2015 13:46  
**To:** Local Plan  
**Subject:** FW: Shenley Grange - representation from Eddie McGuire  
**Attachments:** SADM letter 10 April, 2014.doc

---

**From:** Eddie McGuire [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 14 September 2015 15:54  
**To:** Mark Silverman; Ann Darnell; Scott Laban  
**Subject:** RE: Shenley Grange

Dear All,

Thank you for this reminder. In the light of our recent joint progress, for which I am most grateful, the last thing I want is to pile on the misery of more negativity when I believe we are in harmony, but I understand the “rote” of lodging representations/observations/objections. Rather than enter another extensive screed of objections, not only to the revised SADM proposal (as yet unchanged from the initial proposal) but to the fundamental process as well of which we are all painfully aware, I hopefully can simply rely on the objections as outlined in my letter of 10 April 2014 (attached) and on our joint agreement to the suggestion within the penultimate paragraph.

Kind regards,

Eddie

---

**From:** Ann Darnell  
**Sent:** 01 September 2015 13:18  
**To:** 'Eddie McGuire' [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Scott Laban; Mark Silverman  
**Subject:** RE: Shenley Grange fao Eddie McGuire

Dear Eddie

Please find attached a plan showing the suggested re-alignment of the village infill boundary that from a Policy point of view we would be prepared to discuss putting forward as a proposed modification to the published Policies Map. Although on first sight this may not extend out as far as you might have liked, the proposed alignment would not preclude land outside the boundary continuing to be used as garden. We would however resist any further areas being included within the village infill boundary as we would not wish to see any built development encroaching further out into the more open area beyond.

We look forward to hearing your thoughts.

**Ann Darnell (Mrs)**  
**Planning Officer**

**Hertsmere Borough Council** | Civic Offices | Elstree Way | Borehamwood | Herts | WD6 1WA  
**t:** 020 8207 2277 ex 5800

[www.hertsmere.gov.uk](http://www.hertsmere.gov.uk)

Keep up to date with Hertsmere, receive our FREE e-alerts 'News for You', Twitter and Facebook.



[News for You](#)



[HertsmereBC](#)



[Hertsmere / Recycling in Hertsmere](#)



~~~~~  
Did you know you could save time by visiting us online at [www.hertsmere.gov.uk](http://www.hertsmere.gov.uk)

Here you can tell us information, pay bills and even apply for things. Visit us today!

~~~~~  
Hertsmere Borough Council is working towards reducing waste and becoming more energy efficient: please do not print this email or its attachments unless you really need to.  
~~~~~

The information in this message should be regarded as confidential and is intended for the addressee only unless explicitly stated. If you have received this message in error it must be deleted and the sender notified.

The views expressed in this message are personal and not necessarily those of Hertsmere Borough Council unless explicitly stated.



If the objective of exclusion is to prevent infilling on private land then there is already in place a definition of what infilling means in Hertsmere's villages such as Shenley, and this long-existing definition is incredibly restrictive. Additionally, Shenley Grange is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and Shenley Conservation Area – both major State control mechanisms.

From a personal viewpoint, the proposal is psychologically devastating and divisive, and we find unconscionable the very thought of disenfranchisement from our village, of which, in the public domain, Shenley Grange is regarded as a cornerstone – or at least the verdant frontage is which the public benefits from at private expense.

Philosophically, this proposal of effectively sequestering Shenley Grange can surely be regarded only as communistic and, in view of the State's own excesses in Shenley, utterly cynical - furthering the already communistic Section 106, Social Housing and CIL diktats.

It seems also that Porters Park (Shenley New Town) and the adjoining roads are proposed to be excluded from the Green Belt, although my brief perusal did not uncover any direct allusion to this. As with the village boundary proposed amendment, no explanation or justification seems to have been offered.

I request that the village boundary relating to Shenley Grange remains broadly on the present line, or even more rationally as a line joining the built environment on both adjoining sides. No doubt officers will be immersed in many borough-wide matters following this consultation, but I request a meeting to discuss our objections in due course.

At this stage, and with the comfort explained to me that this entire Consultation Document will be subject to amendment and re-consultation, I earnestly hope that commonsense and decency can prevail and that we are not forced into the great expense of employing Planning Consultants to defend our position.

Yours faithfully,

Eddie McGuire