

Hertsmere Local Plan

**Site Allocations and
Development Management Policies**
(Volumes 1 and 2)

July 2015



Volume 1: April 2013 Call for Sites and Topics

Preface

This document outlines how Hertsmere Borough Council has engaged stakeholders and the local community in the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD).

It explains:

- who was consulted and how;
- the issues raised by the community and stakeholders
- the sites that have been identified; and
- how the results have been taken into account.

The Report of Consultation is set out in separate volumes:

Volume 1: Call for Sites and Topics

Volume 2: Consultation Draft

This is Volume 1.

Notes:

Edited 17 May 2014: correction to Council response to Rep 4 in Appendix B. The Council supports the open use proposed in the Consultation Draft of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.

Edited 11 June 2015: correction to Council response to Rep 19 in Appendix B. Delete reference to Green Belt in 'Existing Site Use' column. The site is safeguarded land.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Hertsmere's Statement of Community Involvement.....	4
3. Summary of Consultation.....	5
4. Summary of Site Representations.....	6
5. Summary of Key Issues.....	7
6. Conclusions.....	8

Appendices

Appendix A: Notification text sent 17 April 2013.....	9
Appendix B: Summary of Representations made during the Call for Sites and Topics.....	11

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document outlines how Hertsmere Borough Council has engaged stakeholders and the local community in the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD forms the second part of the new Local Plan, following the adoption of the Local Plan Core Strategy in January 2013: it must complement the Core Strategy and should assist its delivery.
- 1.2 The Council began the task of replacing the 2003 Local Plan in 2005. The Core Strategy was prepared over several years and was the subject of an ongoing process of consultation. Comments and representations on the Core Strategy (and the Council's response) are recorded in a series of documents:
- Statement of Consultation March 2009
 - Statement of Representations March 2009 [i.e. on the first Submission Draft of the Core Strategy]
 - Statement of Consultation February 2012 [i.e. consultation on a revised Core Strategy after March 2009]
 - Statement of Representations February 2012 [i.e. on the revised Submission Draft of the Core Strategy].
- 1.3 The Council undertook a consultation exercise in 2006: 'Looking ahead to 2021: Hertsmere Local Development Framework Issues and Options' (2006). This consultation included correspondence with 1,500 consultees and other stakeholder involvement. The results of the consultation are reported in the Core Strategy Statement of Consultation March 2009. The consultation not only provided an important input to the Core Strategy, but also was relevant to site allocations and development management issues.
- 1.4 Relevant issues arising from that consultation were taken into account when formulating the Consultation Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. Key points were:
- the desire for continued protection of the Green Belt;
 - concern over traffic and parking provision;
 - the visual impact of new buildings in a local context;
 - implications for infrastructure; and
 - the protection of trees.
- 1.5 The purpose of the April 2013 call for sites and topics was to refresh the information collected in the 2006 'Issues and Options' results. The new round of consultation updated the status of various sites and the importance of particular topics.
- 1.6 This Report of Consultation effectively begins with the Call for Sites and Topics consultation in 2013. It has been prepared in line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as a record of the continuous and extensive community and stakeholder involvement that was undertaken throughout the development of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.

1.7 The Report of Consultation covers:

- who was consulted and how;
- the issues raised by the community and stakeholders
- the sites that have been identified; and
- how the results of consultation have been taken into account.

2. Hertsmere's Statement of Community Involvement

- 2.1 The Council recognises the benefits of effective community and stakeholder participation and has sought to pro-actively engage the wider community from the outset in the preparation of its Local Plan. This approach is reflected in the main objectives of its Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which are to:
- set out how the Council will involve the community and stakeholders in the development of each DPD and the Local Plan;
 - outline who should be involved in the Local Plan and particularly the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD at each stage, including a list of the statutory and non-statutory consultees who make up the Council's database;
 - provide information on the range of documents that the Council would be consulting on.
- 2.2 The SCI is important in providing an overall framework, ideas and measures that can be used to reach the community, so that consultation can be effective for the entire process. The Council intends that consultation on the Site Allocations and Development Policies DPD should accord with its policy on public consultation and engagement.
- 2.3 The Council adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) in 2006, following independent examination. That SCI has been reviewed by the Council. The review was consulted on in early 2013, and a revised version is programmed to be adopted by the Council in January 2014.

3. Summary of Consultation

- 3.1 The notification inviting representations on sites and topics was sent on 17 April 2013 (see Appendix A). This was extended to statutory and general consultees in line with the requirements of Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and for a period of more than six weeks.
- 3.2 Overall 27 representations were received, 19 were in relation to a site allocation and 13 referenced topics that should appear in the document. Where there was an overlap, the topics suggested were linked to the site. Some of the topics and sites had been previously suggested in earlier consultation responses.
- 3.3 The sites and topics mentioned related to housing, employment, Green Belt, water supply, sports provision and flood risk. Some of the sites mentioned were new, and for some additional information was received. This has helped to update the Council's knowledge on the status of sites, particularly on availability.
- 3.4 Before drafting, an audit of the adopted Local Plan 2003 was carried out with Development Management colleagues within the Council to assess the effectiveness of its policies. The following questions were considered:
 1. Was there a policy that was saved?
 2. Is there a relevant replacement in the Core Strategy policy and does that replacement policy have direct development management application?
 3. Are there other policies in the Core Strategy that complement a saved Local Plan policy?
 4. Are there any relevant national planning policy changes since 2003?
 5. How often was the Local Plan policy used in decisions?
 6. Has the policy been known to cause conflict for officers, for example on appeal?
 7. Is there an equivalent policy necessary as a development management policy? Does the policy need to be changed or improved?
- 3.5 A working draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD was sent to the Development Team Managers and the Highway Authority for their input and comment. The views of Chief Officers and the Council's Management Board were sought in July 2013, when changes to the proposed wording and particular allocations were considered.

4. Summary of Site Representations

4.1 The following sites were submitted to the Council following the call for sites in April 2013. Some are sites (or needs) which have been presented previously, and there are a number of new sites that have been brought to the Council's attention.

1. Elstree Distribution Park, Borehamwood
2. Potters Bar Delivery Office, 123-5 Darkes Lane, Potters Bar
3. Borehamwood Delivery Office, 23 Shenley Road, Borehamwood
4. Need identified for sports provision – no specific site
5. Old Haberdashers Sports Ground, Borehamwood
6. Land at Birchville Court, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath
7. Land at Fortune Oaks, Fortune Lane, Elstree
8. Bushey Hall School Former Swimming Pool and Land at First Place Nurseries, Falconer Road, Bushey
9. Charleston Paddocks, South Mimms
10. Radlett Preparatory School, Radlett
11. Aldenham School, Letchmore Heath
12. Land south of Potters Bar
13. Land adjacent to Bryon Avenue and south of Elstree and Borehamwood Station
14. Starveacres, 16 Watford Road, Radlett
15. Land east of Theobald Street, Borehamwood
16. Land at High Cross, Aldenham
17. Garden Centre Group, Dancers Hill, Bentley Heath,
18. Land at Lincoln Field, Bushey
19. Former Sunny Bank School, Potters Bar

4.2 For potential housing sites, a comparable assessment to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has been undertaken. In addition, sites have been considered in the relevant technical report, e.g. the Green Belt Sites Report.

5. Summary of Key Issues

- 5.1 A number of issues was raised in the representations received. Some were new issues – i.e. they had not been included in the Core Strategy or in existing studies. A summary of the issues and comments follows:
- a. The relocation of essential services and specific commercial facilities should be acceptable in order to enable the redevelopment of sites for housing development;
 - b. Policy was suggested for the protection of playing fields and outdoor sports facilities;
 - c. Policy was suggested in order to protect existing community facilities (giving a description of ‘community facilities’ and a set of parking standards for these uses), to deliver infrastructure requirements, and to address community infrastructure levy and planning obligations;
 - d. Wind farms should not be located within the primary surveillance radar for Heathrow Airport;
 - e. The policy for Key Green Belt Sites (KGBS) should be more flexible to allow for expansion of schools in the Green Belt: a similar representation suggests that ‘envelopes’ at KGBSs are not necessary and applications should be determined on their own merits;
 - f. Natural England recommend an evidence based approach on promoting biodiversity, identification of key ecological networks, and going beyond conserving and enhancing by identifying on-site opportunities, recognising the different status of sites, considering green infrastructure, open and green spaces, climate changes, renewable energy, access and rights of way, landscape assessment, and allocating land for development with the least environmental value;
 - g. Policy suggestions covering flood risk and Sustainable Urban Drainage systems were provided by the Lead Local Flood Authority;
 - h. Encourage economic growth in rural areas;
 - i. Previously developed land in the Green Belt will need to be redeveloped in the future; and
 - j. Text and policy for the provision of waste water and water supply services for new development was suggested.
- 5.2 Comments were addressed with reference to the NPPF and the Core Strategy, and through supporting technical studies and reports as appropriate.
- 5.3 Some of the matters listed above, such as the relocation of essential services to enable housing development and the redevelopment of previously developed land in the Green Belt, would be consistent with existing planning policy. It was therefore not necessary for a specific policy to address the point or designate a site for particular uses.
- 5.4 Specific advice from stakeholders was integral in informing replacement planning policies for the proposed replacement policies, particularly on playing pitches, the natural environment, waste water, water supply, flood risk and SUDS.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1 The call for sites and topics undertaken in April 2013 complemented the results of the Issues and Options Consultation in 2006 (see 1. Introduction above). It updated the information gained on sites over the last seven years and has provided more recent information on statutory obligations on the local planning authority, such as protecting wildlife sites and managing flood risk.
- 6.2 The sites and topics raised through the 'Call for Sites and Topics' consultation period were used to inform the Consultation Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD. This DPD will in due course replace all extant Local Plan 2003 policies (i.e. those existing after the adoption of the Core Strategy in January 2013).

Appendix A: Notification text sent 17 April 2013

Dear Sir/Madam

As you will be aware, the Hertsmere Local Plan Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in January 2013. Work is underway on the forthcoming Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). The Council seeks to consult on the DPD over Summer 2013. The document will be produced in line with the adopted Core Strategy.

The Council is seeking suggestions for topics or sites that you wish to be considered for production of the Plan. Many sites suggested previously as part of the SHLAA, Core Strategy representations and call for sites or other topic reports will be considered for a proposed designation or policy.

The Council will shortly be publishing an updated Local Development Scheme on its website which will illustrate the production timetable for this DPDs, the Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan, CIL and future Local Plan Review.

Please send your policy and site suggestions to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk

Yours faithfully

Simon Warner

Interim Local Plan Team Leader

Appendix B: Summary of Representations made during the Call for Sites and Topics

Rep no.	Name	Organisation	Site representation	Existing site use	Proposed site use	DM representation	Council response
1	Kevin Goodwin	CGMS	Elstree Distribution Park	Employment	Residential	-	In the centre of an established employment area, contrary to the CS. Not recommended for housing allocation
2	Claire Davies	DTZ	Potters Bar Delivery Office, 123-5 Darkes lane, Potters Bar	Employment	Residential, potentially mixed use	Redevelopment subject to the relocation of essential services	The CS would support the approach of relocating essential services for the redevelopment of the sites for housing in existing urban areas - neither site would contribute greatly to housing supply and therefore not included. (NB Response links to Rep. 3)
3	Claire Davies	DTZ	Borehamwood Delivery Office, 23 Shenley Road, Borehamwood	Employment	Residential, potentially mixed use	Redevelopment subject to the relocation of essential services	The CS would support the approach of relocating essential services for the redevelopment of the sites for housing in existing urban areas - neither site would contribute greatly to housing supply and therefore not included.
4	Jessica Mehigan	URS Global	Old Haberdashers sports ground	Sport facilities	Residential and sports facilities	-	The Council supports the open use of this site, effectively maintaining its policy on urban open land.
5	Roy Warren	Sport England	Suggested allocation of sports facilities as key community facilities; Consideration given to the need for new/expanded sports facilities	-	-	Suggested policy for the protection of playing fields and outdoor sports facilities	Commitment to review open spaces study as resources permit; consideration of allocations - limited availability of land, although outdoor sports use is in principle compatible with the Green Belt, subject to the scale and essential nature of any new buildings. Policies will protect green space and important community/leisure facilities.

Rep no.	Name	Organisation	Site representation	Existing site use	Proposed site use	DM representation	Council response
6	Rose Freeman	Theatres Trust	-	-	-	Suggestions include: a policy to protect existing community facilities; a description for the term 'community facilities'; a chart for parking standards; infrastructure delivery details relating to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan; and details of the community infrastructure levy and planning obligations	Policy CS18 already provides protection for community uses with a list of facilities that are considered as a community facility. CIL considered separately
7	Simon Vince	Heathrow Airport Limited	-	-	-	Suggest wind farms are not located within the Primary Surveillance Radar for Heathrow	Acknowledged. Little interest to date in wind farms in Hertsmere
8	Sarah King	AKT Planning and Architecture	Land at Birchville Court, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath	Care home, haulage yard	Residential	-	Review of safeguarded land to take place. Site benefits from PDL, SHLAA assessment to be undertaken
9	Graeme Free	DLA Town Planning	Land at Fortune Oaks, Fortune Lane, Elstree	Green field	Residential	-	Green field and Green Belt, with no PDL. Not suitable as beyond existing urban areas.
10	Graeme Free	DLA Town Planning	Bushey Hall School, former swimming pool, Falconer Road	Closed swimming pool, residential and grounds	Residential	-	Review of the Green Belt; note previous planning history and ability of the site to accommodate a level of housing. Site would not contribute an additional defensible boundary. Occupied by nursery (school). Also see Rep. 25.
11	William Shearer	Bidwell's	Charleston Paddocks, South Mimms	Field, small building	Proposed to be retained in existing policy for South Mimms Special Policy Area	-	Review undertaken of existing policies and sites in the Green Belt
12	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Radlett Preparatory School	Primary School	Proposed as a Key Green Belt Site		Review undertaken of sites in the GB, including primary schools.

Rep no.	Name	Organisation	Site representation	Existing site use	Proposed site use	DM representation	Council response
13	Michael Fearn	Shire Consulting	Aldenham School Charity	Secondary School	Retention of KGBS status	More flexibility in the KGBS policy to allow for expansion of schools in the Green Belt	Review undertaken of key sites in the GB and of the DM aspects of the existing policy
14	Paul Bloomfield	Shire Consulting	-	-	-	Does not consider that envelopes for appropriate infilling are necessary or acceptable under the NPPF and applications at large sites in the Green Belt should be determined on their own merits	Review of MDS / KGBS undertaken. The identification of infilling areas helps to manage sites in accordance with the purposes of the Green Belt
15	Steve Baker	CPRE	-	-	-	DM policies linked to Core Strategy and NPPF Green Belt policies - in particular criteria for assessing planning applications and making a distinction between green field and PDL	Inclusion of principles in the forthcoming DM policies and future site allocations
16	Matt Claxton	Knight Frank	Land south of Potters Bar on behalf of Enfield Borough Council	Greenfield / Green Belt	Residential	-	Land is green field, agricultural and Green Belt, not suitable at present for housing development
17	Jamie Wallace	Rapleys	Land adjacent to Byron Avenue and south of E&B Station	Vacant	Residential	-	Existing urban area, SHLAA assessment, significant vegetation on site, consider inclusion as housing allocation

Rep no.	Name	Organisation	Site representation	Existing site use	Proposed site use	DM representation	Council response
18	John King	Natural England	-	-	-	Broad comments provided on delivering sustainable development, promoting biodiversity, identification of key ecological networks, and going beyond conserving and enhancing by identifying on-site opportunities; Identify and distinguish between status of different sites; be in accordance with Para 118 of the NPPF; with additional consideration given to the Green Infrastructure plan; open and green spaces, climate change, renewable energy, access and rights of way, landscape character assessments; allocating land with the least environmental value; and be evidence based.	Inclusion of principles in the forthcoming DM policies
19	Dilys Pryor	Philips Planning	16 Watford Road, Radlett	Two dwellings; Safeguarded land	Residential redevelopment	-	Review of safeguarded land to take place. Site is primarily green field with little PDL and does not benefit from having a boundary which would be any more defensible than it is at present
20	Jon Dowty	Edwards Covell Architecture and Planning	Land east of Theobald Street, Borehamwood	Green field; Green Belt	Green Burial grounds / Cemetery	-	Such a proposed use is compatible with the Green Belt, subject to the scale of new buildings
21	Kim Harding	Hertfordshire County Council - Strategic Planning and Land Use	-	-	-	Flood risk recommendations on a draft policy	Inclusion of a policy for flood risk and SUDs management
22	Nick Stafford	Preston Bennett	Land at High Cross, Aldenham	Green field; Green Belt	Residential	-	No allocation. Proposed site would be contrary to the NPPF and the Core Strategy, and there is sufficient land supply in existing urban areas

Rep no.	Name	Organisation	Site representation	Existing site use	Proposed site use	DM representation	Council response
23	Joanna Male	GGA Planning Policy	Garden Centre Group, Dancers Hill, Bentley Heath	Garden Centre	Tourism / leisure / business	Policy to encourage economic growth in rural areas, in line with the NPPF	The Core Strategy Policy CS15 contains principles to promote recreational access to open spaces and the countryside. The proposals are not clear enough to understand the particular use. There is some PDL at the site, and applications for such use should be considered in light of the CS and the NPPF. It is likely there will be a policy to protect rural character and its economy.
24	Gary Thomas	Planning Works	Land at Lincoln Field	Previously Developed Land; Green Belt	Key Green Belt Site	Need for the site to be developed in the future	Previous permission for school and boarding at the site due to amount of PDL at the site - buildings currently vacant, and the redevelopment for housing would not be inconsistent with the NPPF. Undertake SHLAA assessment and consideration of the site as a housing allocation
25	Graeme Free	DLA Town Planning	First Place Nurseries, Falconer Road	Green field; hard standing	Housing site	-	No significant PDL at the site, would not create a boundary that is any more defensible, and would also conflict with the purpose of including land within the Green Belt - very narrow gap between Watford/Bushey
26	Russell Monck	HCC Development Services	Former Sunny Bank School	Former school with playing pitches, part used for education support centre	Housing site	-	PDL in the Green Belt has scope to be allocated for housing in line with the SHLAA assessment, subject to the re-provision of community/education facilities currently provided at the school.
27	Christopher Colloff	Thames Water	-	-	-	Waste water and supply policy recommendations	Inclusion of a policy for waste water and supply

Volume 2: March 2014 Consultation Draft

Preface

This document is the second of a two volume report outlining how Hertsmere Borough Council has engaged stakeholders and the local community in the preparation of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan

It explains:

- who was consulted and how;
- the issues raised by the community and stakeholders; and
- how the results have been taken into account.

The full Report of Consultation is set out in separate volumes:

Volume 1: Call for Sites and Topics (April 2013)

Volume 2: Consultation Draft (March 2014)

This is Volume 2. It should be read in conjunction with Volume 1: Call for Sites and Topics

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Hertsmere’s Statement of Community Involvement	3
3. Notification and Publicity	5
4. Summary of Representations and Responses	7
5. Conclusions.....	25
Appendix A: Statement of Community Involvement 2014	26
Appendix B: Notification letter inviting representations	27
Appendix C: Summary Leaflet	28
Appendix D: List of Consultees	30
Appendix E: notification to properties adjoining proposals sites - maps.....	40
Appendix F: Notification to all residents - Hertsmere News Spring 2014.....	53
Appendix G: Consultation Drop-In Sessions	54
Appendix H – Press releases and press articles.....	55
Appendix I: Twitter posts - examples	65
Appendix J: Facebook posts - examples	66
Appendix K: Individual responses received and Council response	

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This is Volume 2 of the Report of Consultation on the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan ('SADM').
- 1.2. It outlines the consultation on the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Consultation Draft Plan. It has been prepared in line with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as a record of the continuous and extensive community and stakeholder involvement that was undertaken throughout the development of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.
- 1.3. It includes:
 - who was consulted on the Consultation Draft and how;
 - the issues raised by the community and stakeholders; and
 - how the results of consultation have been taken into account.
- 1.4. It also refers to revisions to the Statement of Community Involvement, the Council's consultation policy which guides the process of consultation on planning documents.

2. Hertsmere's Statement of Community Involvement

- 2.1. Consultation on the Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan has been undertaken in line with the Council's revised Statement of Community Involvement.
- 2.2. The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), first adopted in 2006, has been revised paying particular regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), the Localism Act (2011) and Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations (2012). The revised version was adopted in January 2014 and takes account of
- the consultation requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012).
 - the most recent update of the Local Development Scheme (September 2013);
 - the Duty to Cooperate, which was introduced by the Localism Act 2011. This requires Hertsmere Borough Council to make every effort to secure cooperation on strategic cross boundary matters (in addition to continuing to consult with statutory groups set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations (2012));

Minor adjustments (from the 2006 version) to the detail of how local residents, businesses and other stakeholders will be given the opportunity to engage with the process are included in the revised adopted document.

- 2.3. The Council aims, through its SCI, to continue to promote effective and wherever possible additional public involvement in the planning system. The aim is to ensure that all sections of the community, including people who do not normally get involved in the planning process, have the opportunity to contribute to all aspects of plan-making. We aim to involve local residents, businesses, landowners, groups and organisations, along with other stakeholders such as national and regional organisations, in the process. We are committed to making information widely accessible in all formats, and to using the Internet, the local press and existing networks of communication.
- 2.4. The SCI is based on the principle that community involvement in the Local Plan is a continuous process involving all stages of preparing documents and that effective community involvement and participation in the planning process will give people the opportunity to make their views heard and say what sort of place they want to live in. The SCI sets out
- when people and organisations can get involved
 - how people and organisations can get involved (including examples of ways in which we will seek to involve the community)
 - who the Council will consult (including examples of methods for engaging hard to reach groups); a list of the statutory and non-statutory consultees who make up the Council's database forms part of the adopted SCI.
- 2.5. It indicates that the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD "will have a wide consultation process commensurate with its subject matter. Developers who regularly act as agents in Hertsmere will be among the key people we consult, along with other council departments, external contacts who are regularly involved in the development management process, including parish and town councils and local community organisations and other key

stakeholders such as landowners and residents.” A copy of the table summarising consultation procedures and methods for Local Plan documents is attached at Appendix A.

- 2.6. Publicity concerning the revised adopted SCI outlining arrangements for ensuring as many people as possible have an opportunity to engage with the planning process in Hertsmere was included in the Spring 2014 edition of the Council’s Hertsmere News magazine which is delivered to all households in the Borough.

3. Notification and Publicity

- 3.1. The Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan was approved by the Council's Executive for public consultation on 15 January 2014. The consultation period ran for the six week period 3 March 2014 to 14 April 2014.
- 3.2. In excess of 4,240 consultation notifications were sent out via letter and/or email to:
 - a) statutory consultees, including
 - o Government departments
 - o neighbouring and other local authorities
 - o parish and town councils of Hertsmere
 - b) a range of business, residents' and other organisations
 - c) neighbours adjoining proposals sites
 - d) individuals who had previously expressed a desire to be consulted on planning issues

A copy of the notification letter is attached at Appendix B. An explanatory leaflet summarising the document was enclosed with the letter in order to enable greater distribution of the document within the consultation bodies (copy at Appendix C). This leaflet was also available on the website. Lists of those invited to submit representations, together with maps showing the extent of consultation around the proposals sites are attached at Appendix D and E respectively.

- 3.3. The majority of letters inviting representations on sites and topics were sent on 28 February 2014 with a smaller number following during the week commencing 3 March 2014.
- 3.4. Following detailed scrutiny by officers at the end of the consultation period a limited number of organisations were found not to have been directly consulted at this initial stage. They were invited on 16 April 2014 to submit representations by 29 May 2014. Several additional umbrella organisations were subsequently contacted on 2 May 2014. These organisations are all listed in Appendix D.
- 3.5. The notification fulfilled Hertsmere's responsibilities to extend invitations to relevant consultees under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.
- 3.6. Publicity about and dissemination of information for the consultation is described below:
 - Copies of all documents were available on the Hertsmere BC website
 - Documents were available at four local libraries (Oakmere Potters Bar, Radlett, Bushey and Borehamwood), Aldenham Parish Council Office, the Civic Offices in Borehamwood, and Hertsmere local Area Offices in Potters Bar and Bushey
 - A two page article, explaining the background to the production of the Consultation Draft, advising people how to find out more and inviting comments, was published in the Council's Hertsmere News magazine; an independent distribution company is employed to deliver the magazine to every household in Hertsmere. The period within which delivery was planned to take place was between 10 and 21 March 2014 (see copy of article attached at Appendix F).

- Drop in sessions were held in five different locations across the Borough – Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Radlett, Bushey and Shenley; a series of posters summarising the main issues and proposals covered by the Draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD and copies of the proposals maps were on display, and Planning officers were in attendance throughout in order to answer questions. The drop-in sessions were open during both afternoon and evening (until 8pm) at all locations. A copy of the timetable is attached at Appendix G. The sessions were advertised in notification letters (see Appendix B), the Hertsmere News article (see Appendix F), and via the Hertsmere Borough Council website, press releases, Twitter and Facebook. It is difficult to be accurate as to how many people attended these sessions because signing in by attendees was not consistent; it is, however, estimated that approximately 300 people in total attended.
- Press releases were issued
 - following the decision by the Executive to go to public consultation,
 - at the beginning of the consultation period, and
 - during the consultation period, particularly in relation to the drop-in sessions.

Copies are attached at Appendix H. Scanned copies of newspaper articles which appeared in the press are also attached.

- Twitter was used in order to reach those local people who follow the Council (see examples attached at Appendix I)
- The Council's Facebook page was also used in order to promote the consultation exercise (see examples attached at Appendix J)

3.7. People were encouraged to submit their representations electronically or on paper; a response/comments form was available on-line on the Council's website, and hard copies were available at the Drop In sessions.

3.8. Within Hertsmere Borough Council, the Consultation Draft has been developed in the context of the Council's Corporate Policy Network - an internal working group, established to enhance and complement our approach to policy development across all services. The membership of the Corporate Policy Network includes staff who have responsibility for engagement with the Local Strategic Partnership. In addition, Development Management staff have provided input to the development of and commented on the Consultation Draft.

4. Summary of Representations and Responses

Representations received

- 4.1. A total of 291 individuals or organisations submitted representations. Of these 44 were submitted by organisations including statutory consultees, 208 by individuals including residents and 39 by or on behalf of other landowners/developers in the Borough; one of the 'organisation' submissions included a petition signed by 54 people objecting to the proposed development at the former Sunny Bank school and one was a collated response covering points (already) made by people objecting to H3. All representations received by 30 April 2015, including those which were submitted late after the deadline of 14 April 2014, have been considered and are included in the summary tables and appendices of this report.
- 4.2. Representations submitted raised a wide variety of issues, ranging from the overall direction and content of policies to the detail of specific site based requirements. For the purposes of analysing representations and determining the Council's response to them representations were broken down into separate comments which addressed different aspects of the Plan and its policies.
- 4.3. A total of 679 separate such comments were identified and grouped according to the relevant policy, site or section of supporting text in the SADM Consultation Draft. The numbers of comments and type of responder are summarised in the following table:

Section	Total	Objection				Comment				Support			
		Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total
Whole document	13			1	1	4		6	10	2			2
Chapter 1 Introduction													
Introduction	1							1	1				
Duty to Cooperate	2					2			2				
Consultation	2					1	1		2				
Total Chapter 1	5								5				
Chapter 2 Housing													
Housing Supply and Table 1	12		1	4	5	4		3	7				
Housing Allocations	3					3			3				
Policy SADM1	9		4		4	4			4	1			1
Site H1	7		2		2	3	2		5				
Site H2	9		3		3	4	1		5			1	1
Site H3	79	1*	71		72	4	2		6			1	1
Site H4	3					2			2			1	1
Site H5	8		2	1	3	4			4			1	1
Site H6	11	1	2		3	6	2		8				
Site H7	8			1	1	6			6			1	1
Site H8	3					2		1	3				
Site H9	29	2*	14		16	5	8		13				
Site H10	5					3			3			2	2
Site H11	10		2		2	3	2		5		3		3
Sites not allocated for housing	28			12	12	2		12	14		2		2
Safeguarded land	1			1	1								

Section	Total	Objection				Comment				Support			
		Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total
Policy SADM2	3					3			3				
Land east of Farm Way	3					3			3				
Land bounded by Heathbourne Road etc	2					2			2				
Starveacres	2			1	1	1			1				
Housing sites not safeguarded	4			2	2			2	2				
Housing development	5	1			1	1	3		4				
Policy SADM3	4			1	1	1			1	2			2
Gypsies and Travellers	2	1			1	1			1				
Policy SADM4	8	3			3	4			4	1			1
Site GT1	3	2			2	1			1				
Site GT2	1	1			1								
Site GT3	1	1			1								
Total Chapter 2	263				137				110				16
Chapter 3 Employment & Economy													
Employment and Economy	1					1			1				
Elstree Way Employment Area	1			1	1								
Cranborne Road Employment Area	1					1			1				
Wrotham BP Locally Significant ES	2					2			2				
Hollies Way Locally Significant ES	2					2			2				
Beaumont Gate Locally Significant ES	1					1			1				
Farm Close Locally Significant ES	2					2			2				
Employment site – proposed new	1										1		1
Policy SADM8	1					1			1				
Land adj Cranbourne Road	1					1			1				
Land on Rowley Lane	6	1		2	3	2			2	1			1
Total Chapter 3	19				4				13				2
Chapter 4 Open Land & the Environment													
Open Land and the Environment	3					2	1		3				
Natural Environment	10					8	2		10				
Policy SADM9	3					3			3				
Policy SADM10	3					3			3				
Trees and Landscaping	4					2	2		4				
Policy SADM11	8			5	5	1			1	2			2
Water Drainage and Flood Risk	12					11			11	1			1
Policy SADM12	1					1			1				
Policy SADM13	8			1	1	5			5	2			2
Policy SADM14	9			3	3	4			4	2			2
Watercourses Policy (new)	1					1			1				
Policy SADM15	4					3			3	1			1
Minerals and Waste	3					2			2	1			1
Land Contamination	1					1			1				
Policy SADM17	2					2			2				
Green Belt	7			2	2	4		1	5				
Oakbank adjustment	2					1			1	1			1
29-37 Heath Road adjustment	31	2	28	1	31								
Bushey Hall Golf Club adjustment	1										1		1
Sunnybank School adjustment	4	1			1		2		2	1			1
Rowley Lane	1			1	1								

Section	Total	Objection				Comment				Support			
		Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total
Policy SADM19	6		1	3	4					1	1		2
Elstree village and boundary	3			1	1	1		1	2				
Shenley village and boundary	4			1	1	1	2						
South Mimms village and boundary	5			4	4	1							
Key Green Belt sites	2					1		1					
Policy SADM21	7	1		2	3	3				1			1
Specific KGBS sites	29			2	2	23		3				1	1
Policy SADM22	2					2							
Policy SADM23	10			2	2	3		3		2			2
Policy SADM24	4					1		3					
Policy SADM25	2					1				1			1
Historic Environment	4					3	1						
Policy SADM26	4	1		1	2	2							
Total Chapter 4	200				63				118				19
Chapter 5 Building Sustainable Communities													
Building Sustainable communities	1					1							
Design Principles	3					2	1						
Policy SADM27	2					1					1		1
Policy SADM28	3									3			3
Key Community Facilities	5					5							
Policy SADM29	6			2	2	1				3			3
Site C1	9		3		3	2	3			1			1
Site C2	5	1			1	3	1						
Additional proposal primary school	1					1							
Additional proposal Aldenham Reservoir	1							1					
Green spaces	7					4	1			2			2
Policy SADM30	5			1	1	3				1			1
Policy SADM31	2		1	1	2								
The Paddock	71**			2	2		2			3	63		66
Policy SADM32	1						1						
Policy SADM33	1					1							
Total Chapter 5	123				11				34				77
Chapter 6 Transport & Parking													
Access and Movement	4					2	2						
Policy SADM34	2					2							
Policy SADM35	5					5							
Total Chapter 6	11								11				
Chapter 7 Town Centres & Shopping													
Town and District Centres	1						1						
Site TC1	2					1					1		1
Site TC2	5		1		1	1	3						
Table 3 Shopping Hierarchy	1					1							
Total Chapter 7	9				1				7				1
Chapter 8 Implementation & Monitoring													
Delivery	2					1	1						
Monitoring framework	2					1				1			1

Section	Total	Objection				Comment				Support			
		Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total	Organisation	Individual	Landowner/ Developer	Total
Total Chapter 8	4							3				1	
Appendices													
Policies Map	25	1		7	8	10	4	2	16	1		1	
Total Appendices	25				8				16			1	
Miscellaneous													
Elstree Way Corridor AAP	1		1		1								
Telecommunications	1					1			1				
Airport Safeguarding	1					1			1				
Core Strategy	1			1	1								
Report of Consultation	1							1	1				
Sustainability Appraisal	1					1			1				
Street lighting and drainage	1					1			1				
Total Miscellaneous	7				2				5				

*includes petition/collation of views

**includes one representation that identified the site but made no comment

A summary of each individual comment is available at Appendix K.

- 4.4. In July 2015, significantly after the end of the consultation period, and also after both the consideration of the SADM draft for submission by the Council's Executive in June 2015 and the circulation of reports for the Council meeting on 8 July at which the SADM draft for submission was approved, representations from 35 people objecting to the designation of The Paddock as a Local Green Space were received. Council members were advised of the receipt of these objections at their meeting on 8 July 2015. These figures are not included in the above table.

Consideration of representations

- 4.5. Several approaches to the analysis of representations were taken
- as indicated in 4.2 above, individual comments were grouped according to the issue raised. This enabled all the views in relation to a specific site or policy issue to be considered together when assessing whether any change to the Plan was required;
 - the overall direction of each complete representation was also considered in order that the context for each comment was understood;
 - meetings were held with several statutory consultees in order to discuss and fully understand their representations. These were Hertfordshire County Council Highways department (the Highway Authority), Welwyn Hatfield Council and the Environment Agency;
 - meetings were also held with representatives of Haberdashers' Aske's Boys' School and also with the Bushey Museum Property Trust who had not submitted representations during the consultation exercise in March/April 2014 but made late representations in relation to The Paddock.

- 4.6. In considering and responding to representations to the SADM consultation draft, the Council has taken account of its existing adopted Core Strategy, and the Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan (EWCAAP) which has been the subject of public consultation and Examination. It is anticipated that the EWCAAP will be adopted by Hertsmere Council on 8 July 2015. The Planning and Design Guide, Parking Standards, Biodiversity and Trees, Affordable Housing, and Radlett District Centre Key Locations Planning Brief SPDs, which have also been the subject of public consultation and been adopted by the Council have also formed the context for the Council's response to representations.
- 4.7. Each representation has been carefully considered by the Council. Changes to the Plan in response to representations submitted have been proposed where they are considered necessary to:
- Reflect changes in national or local planning policies
 - Meet current statutory requirements
 - Correct errors or omissions
 - Ensure consistency throughout the SADM document and with other Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents
 - Add clarity
- 4.8. The Council's response to each individual comment can be found at Appendix K.

Main Issues raised

- 4.9. The main issues raised and the way in which the Council proposes to respond to them are summarised below. As indicated in 4.4 above, a schedule of all comments received and the Council's response to them is at Appendix K.

Issue: Housing need

Main comments:

- 4.10. Representations were made mainly by/ on behalf of landowners promoting sites for development. The thrust of the argument was that SADM makes insufficient provision for housing - that the SADM Housing target (set in the Core Strategy) is based on out of date household projections and that the lack of an up to date assessment of Objectively Assessed Needs makes SADM unsound. Representations included bringing the Core Strategy Review forward and/or using more up to date figures for identifying housing need in SADM, and reviewing the Green Belt in order to identify Green Belt releases to meet long term needs.

Council Response:

- 4.11. The adopted Core Strategy is clear that a Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD (SADM) will be prepared. One of SADM's key purposes is to help implement the Core Strategy, including implementation of the stated housing target. The housing target and land supply assumptions behind the housing target were justified by the Council, and tested and accepted by a Planning Inspector through independent examination of the Core Strategy in the light of the NPPF. These have been brought forward into SADM.

- 4.12. The completion of SADM will reflect a review of all development management policies and boundaries of policy areas in the Local Plan (within the context provided by the Core Strategy). It will therefore modernise the planning policy base and, together with the existing Core Strategy, create a new Local Plan.
- 4.13. The current development strategy is contained in the adopted Core Strategy. The Core Strategy does not indicate any significant change to the Green Belt and the role of the Site Allocations DPD is to deliver the policies of the Core Strategy, rather than to pre-empt the content of any future Local Plan. This is supported by several recent High Court judgements.
- 4.14. The Council is committed to a review of key elements in the Core Strategy – specifically housing and employment needs - and has begun the review of strategic issues and commissioning of key evidence with neighbouring authorities. This process will continue beyond the planned adoption of SADM. If this evidence indicates that objectively assessed housing needs are very substantially higher than currently planned for within the housing market area, the issues arising will need to be debated sensitively and transparently with the public with the appropriate evidence available. It would be wrong to assume the Green Belt boundary should automatically be changed (ref NPPF para 14), but solutions accommodating major development could have major consequences for the Green Belt and a number of existing communities.
- 4.15. The Council therefore considers that its approach to the preparation and review of its planning policies is justifiable and reasonable; no change is proposed in response to these representations.

Issue: Housing supply

Main comments:

- 4.16. Representations queried whether the supply identified in Table 1 will be adequate to meet the housing target over the Plan period. The justification for the Windfall rate used in projecting supply, deliverability of a number of allocated sites and consistency of approach to assessing site capacities were also questioned. In addition over-reliance on Elstree Way Corridor housing sites and evidence of an inadequate 'buffer' were alleged. A need to review (consistently) SHLAA and Green Belt brownfield sites, check site capacities, allocate safeguarded sites, and include appropriate additional sites and safeguarded sites in SADM in order to increase supply and help keep pressure off the Green Belt elsewhere were put forward.

Council Response:

- 4.17. The supply identified in Table 1 has been thoroughly reviewed. The overall effect is to confirm that Table 1, albeit revised, remains sound and will deliver the housing target over the Plan period. The assumptions behind the housing land supply have been reported in the SHLAA (2010) and its Update (2011), and tested through examination. The SHLAA has been further updated (2015). A detailed analysis of Windfall rates has confirmed that the windfall assumptions are reasonable and consistent with Government advice. There has been some

adjustment to the sites and net housing capacity in Policy SADM1 and Policy SADM2 as a result of new information and updating; in particular these figures have been checked through the SHLAA methodology, and where appropriate reflect planning permissions granted. The Council has worked with the relevant landowners/developers and is confident the allocated sites now included can be delivered.

- 4.18. The Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan has been examined through EIP and (subject to modifications) been found sound. The contribution to housing supply from the Elstree Way Corridor is therefore justifiable.
- 4.19. The housing supply figures in Table 1 allow for some contingency or margin of error. The suggested need for an additional across the board buffer of 5% does not accord with Government advice (NPPF paragraph 47).
- 4.20. As indicated in 4.12 above, SADM is delivering the Core Strategy housing target: the Core Strategy does not signal the release of Green Belt land nor all of the hitherto safeguarded land in order to meet the target. Safeguarded land should only be released upon review of the plan according to Government advice in NPPG (paragraph 85). That review will be the review of the Core Strategy itself. The Council does not consider that any additional or alternative safeguarded land for housing should be identified now. The appropriate time to do this, if needed and agreed by this Council, is following a Green Belt review to reassess the contribution of land to the Green Belt. A Green Belt Study is expected to be commissioned in 2015 or 2016 as part of the Core Strategy Review. The Core Strategy Review is a fundamental review of the 'local plan' and is the appropriate vehicle to consider the identification of releases of land from the Green Belt, should the evidence indicate that further major development may be required.
- 4.21. No change is proposed in response to these representations, other than minor adjustments to Table 1 to reflect the outcome of work referred to in 4.17 above.

Issue: Specific Housing site considerations

Main comments:

- 4.22. Statutory consultees including Thames Water, the Environment Agency, CPRE, HMWT, HCC Highways and Historic Environment Unit and English Heritage requested the addition of specific considerations to Site Specific Requirements for a number of SADM1 and safeguarded sites in relation to their areas of responsibility. Most site owners/developers supported the allocation of their sites for development but generally sought higher capacities.
- 4.23. Several sites however generated a greater volume and/or variety of comments. These included:
- **Site H3 Land south of Elstree and Borehamwood Station:** 72 objections mainly from local residents on grounds including impact on the amenity of existing residents, poor access, traffic, impact on local services, wildlife concerns and unsuitability of the site (including ground conditions) for residential development.
 - **Site H9 former Sunny Bank School:** 16 objections, including a 54 signature petition (plus additional concerns voiced as 'Comments' rather than 'Objections'), mainly from

local residents, on grounds including impact on the amenity of existing residents, poor access and local traffic congestion, burden on health and school facilities and utilities, pollution from the M25, loss of the school and erosion of the Green Belt. Sport England also objected to the loss of playing field. HCC, who own the site, objected to the requirement for 1.4ha open space but supported the proposed housing allocation and change to the Green Belt boundary here. Several representations suggested the building of a new road to access the site from Baker Street or Barnet Road.

Council Response:

- 4.24. Where appropriate specific requirements have been added to Site Specific Requirements for proposed SADM1 development sites. The Plan must however be read as a whole so it is not necessary (nor good practice) to cross-reference every relevant Policy. Where appropriate site capacities have been adjusted to reflect either the SHLAA methodology used to assess sites, or where relevant, planning permissions granted.
- 4.25. As safeguarded sites are not currently proposed for development it is not appropriate to include development constraints in SADM. Development coming forward for any site, whether or not currently allocated, will be expected to accord with the Plan as a whole.
- 4.26. Planning permission has been granted for H3 Land south of Elstree and Borehamwood Station. The site is retained as an allocation within SADM1 (as is the case with other allocated sites for which planning permission has been granted since the Consultation Draft document was produced) in order to control its future development should the currently approved scheme not proceed.
- 4.27. The former Sunny Bank School (H9) site in Potters Bar is at the edge of the urban area but currently within the Green Belt. The proposal to allocate the 2.87ha site for residential (1.47ha) and open space (1.4ha) purposes was included in the SADM consultation draft in the context of:
- the site being surplus to education requirements (although HCC now intend retaining one of the 2 former primary school buildings on the site as an Education Support Centre),
 - HCC's original request (via the SHLAA) that 1.84 ha of housing be permitted,
 - the contribution that 1.4ha residential development can make to meeting Hertsmere's housing needs,
 - an assessment of the contribution that the site makes to the openness of the green belt and the purpose of including land in it,
 - the identified open space deficiency in this part of the Borough in general, Parkfield ward in particular,
 - the desirability of retaining a community use on the site.
- 4.28. In proposing the removal of the site from the Green Belt and allocating part for housing, it was not the intention to open the way to the whole of the site being developed/built on. Rather the suggested Green Belt boundary in SADM reflects what would be an appropriate boundary after the redevelopment of part of the site for housing. The retention of a significant area for public open space remains a priority wherever the Green Belt boundary is drawn and the introduction of built development to the whole or significantly increased area of the site than that specified in H9 would not be supported. It is therefore proposed that a specific proposal (C1) for the provision of 1.4ha of open space be included in Policy SADM33 Key Community

Facilities, and that the developer will be required to produce a master plan indicating how the whole site is proposed to be laid out.

Issue: Additional Housing Sites proposed

Main comments:

4.29. Landowners/developers put forward a total of 24 sites to be allocated and/or safeguarded for housing development (or mixed use including housing) either directly or via an objection to the site's proposed allocation for another purpose. These were:

- in Borehamwood - Croxdale Road sports pitches (current proposed allocation as Major Green Space), Elstree Distribution Park (current proposed allocation for employment), Borehamwood Mail Delivery Office, Land east of Cowley Hill (Green Belt), Land East of Well End Road (Green Belt); SHLAA site S52 (Green Belt, adjoining Hertswood Lower School site)
- in Bushey - Elton House, The Paddock (current proposed allocation as Local Green Space), land at County End (currently safeguarded, proposed to be returned to urban area), Hartsbourne Golf and Country Club (Green Belt), First Place Nursery Falconer Road (Key Green Belt Site Bushey Academy);
- in Potters Bar – r/o Stagg Ridge flats, land east of Baker Street, land west of Barnet Road, Potters Bar Golf course, LB Enfield land SE of Potters Bar, (all Green Belt);
- in Radlett – Starveacres (currently safeguarded), r/o The Warren (Green Belt);
- in Shenley – land adjoining Wilton End Cottage (Green Belt);
- in South Mimms – land adjacent St Albans Road and Blackhorse Lane – Plots A and B (Green Belt)
- in Elstree – land off Watford Road, Fortune Oaks (both Green Belt);
- in Aldenham – Patchetts Green Equestrian Centre (Green Belt), land south of Watford Road and Aldenham Reservoir (Green Belt – to enable retention/development of the Reservoir as a community facility).

4.30. Of these, support for not allocating Croxdale Road and The Paddock for housing and for the application of Green Belt policies in relation to Hartsbourne Golf Club were also received.

Council Response:

4.31. As indicated in 4.17 above, the Council is confident that the housing supply identified in the Plan is sufficient to deliver the adopted Core Strategy housing target. The supply identified in the Submission Draft SADM includes two new sites – Elton House (which is within the existing urban area and now has planning permission for 102 residential units) and the First Place Nursery site (Falconer Road) which lies within the Bushey Academy Key Green Belt site immediately adjoining the urban area. It is not proposed to remove the First Place Nursery site from the Green Belt as requested; Falconer Road provides a defensible boundary to the Green Belt in a location where the gap between Bushey Village and the built up area of Watford/North Bushey is at its narrowest. However, allowing residential development here would provide the opportunity to remove the disused swimming pool from the more open part

of this KGBS and consolidate development closer to Falconer Road. The existing nursery building would be relocated.

- 4.32. The majority of other sites put forward would entail significant Green Belt releases, which would currently be inappropriate. Additional site allocations or safeguarded sites are not required in order to deliver the Core Strategy housing target and further significant Green Belt releases are not signalled in the Core Strategy. Any future consideration of whether Green Belt releases are appropriate will accompany a reassessment of objectively assessed needs for housing and employment development and a comprehensive Green Belt Study as part of the Core Strategy Review.
- 4.33. With regard to the sites within the urban area, the Council has had regard to the detailed arguments in support of their allocation for development and concluded that no change to the Plan is required. The site at Croxdale Road, which is identified as Major Green Space in SADM, has been promoted for residential development in order to enable the provision of improved sports ground provision elsewhere for Old Haberdashers. Submissions in relation to The Paddock, have objected to the allocation of the site as Local Green Space, on grounds including that the sale of the site for residential development is needed to finance the repair, renovation and enhancement and secure the long-term future of Reveley Lodge house and garden. The proposed designation of the sites as Green Spaces under Policies SADM35 (Major Green Space) and SADM36 (Local Green Space) reflects the findings of the Council's Green Spaces and Amenity Land Study which took a rigorous criteria based approach to identifying open spaces which it is considered important to protect. The findings of the Study were subject to public consultation at the time. The sites are not needed to meet the Core Strategy housing target. On balance, for detailed reasons set out in Appendix K, the Council has concluded that allocation of these sites for housing in SADM is not appropriate.
- 4.34. Detailed responses to submissions made in respect of all individual sites are included in Appendix K.

Issue: Provision for the Accommodation Needs of Gypsies and Travellers

Main comments:

- 4.35. Representatives of the Gypsy and Traveller community and Welwyn Hatfield Council considered that the Plan fails to make sufficient provision for Gypsy and Travellers and is therefore unsound; it was criticised for being based on out of date needs assessments and the proposed supply figures and their deliverability were questioned. The absence of further transit provision was also criticised. The Gypsy and Traveller representative and local residents' associations expressed concern about any further concentration of pitches in current locations.

Council Response:

- 4.36. The SADM makes provision for the level of need identified in the adopted Core Strategy. The recent Gypsy and Traveller accommodation Needs Assessment has identified a need for a further 28 permanent pitches in the period to 2028, and found no evidence of need for additional transit provision. The Council's view is that the most appropriate means of providing for this need would be within future housing allocations as part of the Core Strategy review

which may themselves require Green Belt boundary adjustments to accommodate them. The adopted Core Strategy, within which context SADM has been prepared, makes only limited adjustments to the Green Belt and these do not provide an opportunity for the provision of additional pitches. The Council is, however, committed to an early partial review of the Core Strategy which will focus on housing need (including gypsy and traveller pitch requirements) and employment land needs. This commitment is set down in the SADM Plan for Submission and the Local Development Scheme 2015.

Issue: Specific Employment sites considerations

Main comments:

- 4.37. Statutory consultees including CPRE, HMWT, HCC Historic Environment Unit and Highways and English Heritage requested the addition of a number of site specific considerations in relation to their areas of concern.
- 4.38. With regard to Land on Rowley Lane (safeguarded employment site), additional representations on behalf of the owners sought clarification on the planning status of both the Holiday Inn and remaining land within the safeguarded area. Sport England objected to the potential loss of former playing fields.

Council Response:

- 4.39. Should any applications for development in Employment Areas come forward, relevant policies relating to biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage will apply, as will all other relevant policies. The Plan must be read as a whole so it is not necessary (nor is it good practice) to cross-reference every relevant Policy. An appendix listing currently known assets has however been added to SADM, and this is now referred to in the text.
- 4.40. As safeguarded sites are not currently proposed for B class development it is not appropriate to include development constraints in SADM. Development coming forward for any site, whether or not currently allocated, will be expected to accord with the Plan as a whole; reference to the undeveloped nature of safeguarded sites and the consequent need to control future development in order to protect the environment has however been added to the Submission draft.
- 4.41. Clarification on the planning status of the safeguarded land at Rowley Lane has been added.
-

Issue: Landscape Character

Main comments:

- 4.42. HCC (Landscape) and Natural England requested reference to Landscape Character Assessments and for proposals to be required to conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area.

Council Response:

- 4.43. A new Policy SADM12 Landscape Character has been added to address these issues.

Issue: Biodiversity and Habitats**Main comments:**

- 4.44. Comments primarily from Hertfordshire Ecology, Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, Natural England and HCC (Landscape) focussed on ensuring that SADM provides adequate protection for wildlife sites and species; in particular they requested some strengthening and broadening of the policies to ensure that the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity be minimised, that the sequential approach to sites and the mitigation hierarchy be more clearly embedded in policy, and that the Plan more clearly support the protection, restoration and enhancement of ecological/biodiversity networks. A broadening of the Plan's focus to include both green and blue infrastructure was suggested.

Council Response:

- 4.45. The Biodiversity section of the Plan has been re-drafted in response to these representations in order to more clearly focus on the principles raised. Changes to terminology have also been incorporated as requested.

Issue: The Water Environment**Main comments:**

- 4.46. Comments of principle and detail were made mainly by the Environment Agency, Thames Water, and the HCC Flood Management Team. Issues raised covered the central importance of the sequential approach to allocating sites for or controlling development, the need for development to reduce flood risk and improve the natural environment of watercourses where possible (also raised by Natural England and HMWT), the need to avoid the possibility of polluting the aquifer, detailed guidance on SuDS requirements (including that they should provide multifunctional benefits) and that new development should achieve a high standard of water efficiency. Thames Water were particularly concerned to ensure that the water and wastewater requirements of development proposals are understood and that any upgrade requirements are identified and in place prior to development being occupied.

Council Response:

- 4.47. Detailed correspondence and a meeting with the Environment Agency have guided how this section of the Plan has been re-drafted in order to respond to comments made. The policies have been re-structured in order to more clearly and holistically address the planning issues relating to the water environment. In particular an over-arching Policy SADM14 The Water Environment and the embedding of the sequential approach to development in this and other policies in the section have been introduced. More detailed policies in respect of Flood Risk, Sustainable Drainage, Watercourses (new policy), and Water Supply and Waste Water address the detailed issues raised by consultees.

Issue: Green Belt**Main Comments:**

- 4.48. Representations on behalf of three owners of Green Belt sites promoted for development argued that a review of housing needs and Green Belt boundary should be undertaken in order to ensure Green Belt boundaries endure beyond the plan period in accordance with the NPPF. There was also criticism of the allocation of two sites for housing because they are currently in the Green Belt, and of other proposed adjustments to the boundary on the grounds of lack of consistency in relation to the Core Strategy and NPPF. Welwyn Hatfield Council advised that in their view the proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites should be excluded from the Green Belt.
- 4.49. The Green Belt issue generating the most response was the proposal in SADM to adjust the boundary to the rear of 29-37 Heath Road. 27 residents and two organisations representing local residents objected due to concerns that removing land here from the Green Belt would enable further housing development to the detriment of residential amenity and road safety, erode the Green Belt in this location and create a precedent for further Green Belt change. Reference was also made to a previous Inspector's view that the boundary should remain as it currently is. The owner of part of the land affected objected on the grounds that the proposed change does not go far enough.

Council Response:

- 4.50. The Council's response to requests to allocate new Green Belt sites for development has been set out in 4.32 above. Where changes to the Green Belt boundary have been made in SADM these are small in number and each relate to specific circumstances including
- signalled in the adopted Core Strategy,
 - minor adjustments to take account of the existing situation on the ground,
 - small rounding off of the Green Belt boundary.
- 4.51. It is not proposed to make any further changes to the Green Belt boundary in the Submission draft; neither is it proposed, nor appropriate, to undertake a full review of the Green Belt boundary at this stage. This will be undertaken as part of the Core Strategy review, preparation for which has already begun.
- 4.52. With regard to the Green Belt boundary to the rear of 29-37 Heath Road Potters Bar, the line of the existing long-standing boundary is evident on site and well known locally. On balance and in the light both of the previous Inspector's report and the comments received, the Council has concluded that the Green Belt boundary in this location should not be altered at this time. The change to the Green Belt boundary to the rear of 29-37 Heath Road proposed in the SADM Consultation Draft is therefore deleted.
-

Issue: Village Envelopes and Key Green Belt Sites

Main Comments:

- 4.53. The vast majority of comments received were requests by consultees including English Heritage, CPRE, HMWT and Hertfordshire County Council to include the need to protect various heritage and wildlife/ecological assets should development come forward. Other representations argued that Key Green Belt Sites should not be designated in the Plan as redevelopment of PDL in the Green Belt is covered by the NPPF; the view that tight infill envelopes unnecessarily constrain future development was also raised. Adjustments to infill boundaries to reflect existing or known development proposals at Aldenham School, Bio Products Laboratory, Bushey Meads School, Willows Farm and Haberdashers' Aske's Boys' School were requested, together with the proposal mentioned in 4.17 above to remove First Place Nursery Falconer Road from the Bushey Academy site and include it in the urban area. Specific requests for 5 adjustments to Village Envelope boundaries were also received including an objection to the exclusion of part of an individual property in Shenley, Shenley Grange, from the village envelope.

Council Response:

- 4.54. Development coming forward for any site will be expected to accord with the Plan as a whole; this includes the relevant policies concerning heritage, biodiversity and landscape assets. Due to the importance of building in these considerations early in the development process however, criteria requiring proposals within Key Green Belt Sites to be assessed for their impact on playing fields, heritage assets and wildlife and ecological network have been added to Policy SADM25 Key Green Belt Sites. With regard to retaining the designation of Key Green Belt Sites themselves, and their infill boundaries, the Council's view is that this provides clarity in terms of both the type and location of development that is likely to be supported and should therefore be retained. A number of adjustments to infill boundaries have been made as a result of representations submitted; details are set out in Appendix K and shown on the Policies maps.
- 4.55. As previously indicated, the Council has concluded that no further adjustments to the Green Belt boundary in order to release land for development is needed or appropriate in the context of the adopted Core Strategy. The village envelope boundaries have been carefully assessed following receipt of consultation responses but no further changes are considered necessary to those boundaries which therefore remain unchanged in the Submission Plan.

Issue: Development Standards in the Green Belt

Main Comments:

- 4.56. Local and national amenity groups generally supported this policy or sought a strengthening or clarification of some aspects of it. Conversely, objections (from landowners) argued that the proposed controls on development are too restrictive.

Council Response:

- 4.57. The addition of volume as a criterion for assessing scale, clarification that basements should be included in calculations and the word 'character' replaced by 'purpose' in relation to

assessing the impact of infilling or redevelopment on the Green Belt are considered to be the only changes to Policy SADM27 needed. It is not considered that the Policy was too restrictive since the NPPF (paragraph 90) restricts certain development to that which preserves the openness of the Green Belt and the criteria in Policy SADM27 seek to reflect that.

Issue: Heritage

Main Comments:

- 4.58. English Heritage and HCC Historic Environment Unit comments on this section of the Plan were largely supportive, subject to some minor amendments including in relation to the need for survey and recording of archaeological remains on development sites and it being made clear that non-designated as well as designated assets fall within the definition of the historic environment. More detailed comments were made in relation to specific sites (see paras 1.22, 1.37 and 1.53 above)

Council Response:

- 4.59. Reference to locally valued heritage assets has been added to the supporting text and requirements for survey and recording of remains clarified as requested.
-

Issue: Design Principles

Main Comments:

- 4.60. The tone of comments received was generally supportive. Hertfordshire County Council and Natural England in particular have however suggested that this section of the Plan be expanded in terms of recognising the role of good design in many aspects of life including the fostering of wellbeing and addressing issues of climate change.

Council Response:

- 4.61. Many of the principles referred to in these representations are addressed by Core Strategy policies, which it is not appropriate for SADM to repeat. However reference to the use of the Building Futures Sustainable Design Toolkit has, as requested, been included in the text.
-

Issue: Community Facilities

Main Comments:

- 4.62. Provision in the Plan in relation to Community Facilities generated a range of comments. National organisations (Sport England, Theatres Trust) generally supported the policy; those making more detailed comments tended to be local organisations and individuals with an interest in a particular proposal or site e.g. Hertfordshire County Council (as landowners) objected to the allocation of part of H9 for open space and Hartsbourne Golf Club backed the Policy's support for provision and enhancement of community facilities. The two specific

proposals in SADM also resulted in a number of representations. With regard to C1 (Watford BC's cemetery proposal), supported by Watford BC, local residents generally expressed concern about access and parking and the lack of information about the proposal. Representations on C2 (Hertswood Lower School) raised concerns about the ability of the site to accommodate all the development, including replacement playing fields and community facilities required, and also how community facilities can remain available during the development period. The issue of whether a site for a new primary school should be identified in the Plan in preference to the reservation for this purpose in the Elstree Way Corridor Action Area Plan was raised; a request to designate Aldenham Reservoir as a Key Community Facility was also submitted.

Council Response:

- 4.63. Proposal C1 has been deleted as Watford BC's intentions with regard to the site are unclear, they are known to be seeking alternative sites for a cemetery, and no further information concerning the issues raised has been forthcoming.
- 4.64. The site specific requirements for C2, Hertswood Lower School site, have been clarified with particular reference to the need to minimise any reduction in the overall quantity of playing field provision and achieve improvements to the quality and accessibility of playing field and sports provision as part of any agreed mitigation strategy. The Council's expectation with regard to the availability of school facilities and provision for theatre related activities throughout the development period has been clarified.
- 4.65. A site for an additional primary school has not been allocated in SADM, although it is acknowledged in the text that if the case for a new two form entry school (as opposed to the expansion of any existing local schools and/or the provision of a Free School) is proven, an alternative location to that identified in the EWCAAP will be preferred. Discussions are on-going on this issue.
- 4.66. The request for Aldenham Reservoir to be designated as a Key Community Facility was consequent upon adjoining Green Belt land being safeguarded for housing (to enable funds to retain, repair and restore the reservoir to be raised). As indicated in 4.32 above, identification of further safeguarded housing sites is not required in order to deliver the adopted Core Strategy and is therefore inappropriate at this time.

Issue: Green Spaces

Main Comments:

- 4.67. Natural England supported this section of the Plan, and Sport England asked for reference to the provision of an up to date playing pitch strategy to be included. Apart from this the main comments were in relation to specific sites proposed to be designated as Green Spaces dealt with under 4.33 above. The proposal generating the most significant response was the designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space: there were 66 representations in support (including three organisations representing local residents' groups) and objections from the site owners Bushey Museum Property Trust (wanting to release the site for development to enable investment in Reveley Lodge house and garden), and from the prospective developers of the site (who also objected to the general principle of affording Green Spaces the level of

protection proposed). Subsequently, as mentioned in para 4.4 above, objections to the allocation of the site as Local Green Space in favour of allowing residential development were received from 35 people. Objection to the designation of Croxdale Road sports pitches as a Major Green Space also came from the potential developers wishing to build housing and enable the re-provision of sports pitches for Old Haberdashers elsewhere.

Council Response:

- 4.68. Sport England's request has been agreed and the requested reference added to the document text. As indicated in 4.33 above, the designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space and Croxdale Road as Major Green Space are retained in the Submission SADM, the sites having been assessed (in the Green Spaces Study) as having a level of social, amenity or environmental benefit worthy of protection.
-

Issue: Transport

Main Comments:

- 4.69. Concern that the Plan should give adequate priority to achieving a shift to more sustainable modes of transport, and questions over whether people will in any case change their travel behaviour underlay several comments. Hertfordshire Highways and Hertfordshire Environmental Resource Planning in particular suggested that adjustments to the policies and supporting text to clarify the focus and reinforce the objective of modal shift were required. A related issue was the request to require the creation and maintenance of green linkages to be given greater priority in the development process.

Council Response:

- 4.70. The Policy and supporting text have been re-drafted in consultation with HCC Highways to clarify the importance of provision for non-motorised users, routes and networks. Green linkages are explicitly referenced in the re-drafted text supporting Policy SADM41 Highway and Access Criteria for New Development, which itself requires development to provide links through and within the site for all users.
-

Issue: Town Centres and Shopping

Main Comments:

- 4.71. This section of the Plan generated limited response, the main issue being concern about the potential impact of development of Proposal TC2 (Radlett Service Station/Regency House, Former Fire Station and Burrell & Co) for traffic conditions in Watling Street raised by several residents. Suggestions for minor changes to the designated retail frontages have also been made.

Council Response:

- 4.72. The principle of development of TC2 together with appropriate uses was established in the Radlett District Centre Key Locations SPD (adopted March 2011). No change is considered necessary other than to emphasise the desirability of a comprehensive approach to

development of the individual sites within Proposal TC2. There is no evidence to support adjustments to designated retail frontages, which will remain as proposed in the SADM Consultation Draft.

Other Miscellaneous Issues:

Comment	Response
Request for policy concerning telecommunications equipment proposals	NPPF and Policy SADM31 Design Principles provide sufficient basis for determining applications
Heathrow Safeguarding - Advice concerning Wind turbine developments within safeguarding zone.	New Policy SADM42 Aviation Safeguarding added

5. Conclusions

- 5.1. The Consultation on the draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan undertaken in March/April 2014 resulted in representations being made on a range of issues of principle and detail. Each representation has been carefully considered and where appropriate changes made to the version of the Plan which has now been published. An opportunity now exists for further comments to be made prior to submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State for examination.

Appendix A: Statement of Community Involvement 2014

Table 2: Public consultation procedures and methods for Local Plan documents

As the timetable of our Local Development Scheme may change please visit the Council's website on www.hertsmere.gov.uk for the latest version of this scheme. The 'regulations' refers to the relevant stated regulation taken from the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

Activity	Consultation and notice	When will you be involved?	How will you be involved?
Key Issues stage (also known as preparation of a Local Plan) Regulation 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will notify people and invite them to make representations at an early stage of local plan preparations so that we can consider the main issues of what the Local Plan ought to contain from the outset. We will notify specific and general consultation organisations for a minimum of 6 weeks. We will consult LSP partners on an ongoing basis. We will issue a press release. We will hold workshops for key stakeholders, if necessary. We will notify councillors and parish councils. We will issue a local press release. Articles and questionnaires will be available on our website. We will use mailing lists to invite comments from appropriate individuals, local groups, amenity groups, landowners, developers and so on. 	<p>We will notify people at the very start of creating a Local Plan so that they can tell us what they think the Local Plan ought to contain.</p>	<p>Appropriate key stakeholders will be involved in technical work to support the options being developed.</p> <p>People can get involved through written consultation, involvement in local forums and meetings.</p> <p>We will publish documents on our website and put them in local libraries, information centres and parish offices.</p> <p>For Local Plan documents that identify specific sites, we will carry out targeted consultation. This will include neighbourhood forums, local residents and businesses in addressing the issues.</p>

Appendix B: Notification letter inviting representations

Dear

Hertsmere Local Plan Consultation

Site Allocations and Development Management Policies

I am writing to inform you of an important part of our Local Plan that we are issuing for public consultation.

The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADM for short) follows the adoption of the Council's Core Strategy in 2013 which set out how future housing and other development needs will be accommodated over the next 15 years.

The draft SADM proposes specific development sites and areas, along with detailed environmental criteria against which future planning applications across the borough will be considered. As well as contacting people who have requested to be notified on new planning documents, the Council is also consulting people who live or work near to some of the sites which are identified in the document and which may come forward for development in the future. The enclosed leaflet contains more information about the SADM which can be viewed on the Council's website at www.hertsmere.gov.uk/SADM as well as at local libraries, the Civic Offices in Borehamwood and local area offices in Potters Bar and Bushey.

The Council is consulting on the SADM so that the local community, land owners and other stakeholders have a further opportunity to influence the document before it is submitted for an independent examination. Responses to this consultation can be made at www.hertsmere.gov.uk/SADM using a downloadable response form, which can be emailed to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk. Alternatively, you can write in with your comments to:

Policy and Transport team, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way,
Borehamwood, Herts WD6 1WA

The consultation on the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies ends at **5pm on Monday 14th April 2014** and it is important that all submissions are received by this date.

If you do not wish to respond to this consultation but would still like to be kept informed of progress on the SADM or any other planning documents issued by the Council, please email local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or telephone the Council on 020 8207 2277.

Appendix C: Summary Leaflet

Hertsmere Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies

Consultation Draft



About the new Local Plan for Hertsmere

In 2013, the council approved its Core Strategy, setting out how we will accommodate future housing and economic development needs, community facilities and the protection of the environment. Government policy requires us to plan for a significant amount of new development in order to meet housing and other local needs. Almost 4,000 new homes need to be built over 15 years along with supporting jobs and infrastructure.

The Core Strategy provided the planning framework for this to happen and was the first of three documents which make up the new Local Plan for Hertsmere, following a public examination.

The document which we are consulting you on now is the second part – the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADM for short).

A third part of the Local Plan, an Area Action Plan for the Elstree Way Corridor in Borehamwood, was published in February. We are engaging the local community separately in Borehamwood on this Plan which is set to have its own public examination later in 2014.

The Council is also introducing a new Community Infrastructure Levy on new development, which will require developers to help fund the new infrastructure required to support growth in the borough. Hertsmere is set to be the first authority in Hertfordshire to introduce this levy.



About the SADM

The SADM has two main purposes:

- (1) to provide environmental criteria, against which proposals and planning applications can be judged; and
- (2) to define sites and areas, on a map, known as a Policies Map.

The detailed Policies Map includes the green belt, towns and villages, town centres, employment areas and housing sites and open spaces. For site-specific proposals, the draft plan includes some specific planning criteria or constraints which should be followed.

The draft SADM contains 15 new sites, many of which could accommodate new housing. There are a few extra pitches for Gypsies and travellers, but no new sites. Changes have also been made to some of our employment areas, the types of businesses which will be supported in different parts of our town centres and locations where limited development might be acceptable in some of our villages in the Green Belt. This consultation is also an opportunity for other sites for development to be promoted and the council will consider carefully all proposals which are put forward.

Housing	Directors Arms, Borehamwood
	Gas Holders site, Borehamwood
	Land to the south of Elstree & Borehamwood Station
	Hertswood Upper School, Borehamwood
	Land at Bushey Hall Golf Club
	Land at Rossway Drive, Bushey
	Unused land at Lincolnsfield, Bushey
	Birchville Court and adjoining haulage yard, Bushey Heath
	Europcar House, Aldenham Road, Bushey
	Former Sunny Bank School, Potters Bar
Potters Bar Bus Garage	
Mixed Use	29-71 Shenley Road, Borehamwood
	Burrell & Co, former fire station and Radlett Service Station/Regency House
Cemetery	Former Watford Council depot site, Paddock Road, Oxhey
School and community uses	Hertswood Lower School, Borehamwood

The document provides more detailed policies on the following areas:

Housing	New housing allocations and residential development
	Safeguarded land for housing
	Accommodation for Gypsies and travellers
Employment and the economy	Employment areas and sites
	Safeguarded land for employment use
Open land and the environment	Natural resources
	Pollution and Environmental Impacts
	The Green Belt, including minor adjustments to the boundary and standards for appropriate development
	Key Green Belt sites
	Protecting the natural environment
Building sustainable communities	Design
	Protection of community facilities
	Allocation and protection of green spaces
	Bushey Heath MoD Estate Special Character Area
Transport and parking	Detailed highway standards
	South Mimms Special Policy Area
Town centres and shopping	Town and district centre boundaries and frontages

Find out more

More detailed information, including the SADM and various technical reports, is available on our website: www.hertsmere.gov.uk/sadm

Copies are also available to read at local libraries across the borough and at the Civic Offices in Borehamwood and local area offices in Potters Bar and Bushey. We are also running a series of exhibitions where you can raise questions with Council officers.

Borehamwood	Monday 17 March (12pm - 8pm)	96 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, WD6 1EB
Radlett	Thursday 20 March (4pm - 8pm)	Radlett Centre, 1 Aldenham Avenue, Radlett WD 8HL
Bushey	Monday 24 March (12pm - 8pm)	Bushey Country Club, High St, Bushey, WD23 1TT
Shenley	Thursday 27 March 4pm - 8pm)	Shenley Village Hall, London Rd, Shenley, WD7 9BS
Potters Bar	Thursday 3 April (12pm - 8pm)	Wylllyotts Centre, Darkes Ln, Potters Bar, EN6 2HN

We want to hear your views

We would welcome your comments which should be with us no later than **Monday 14 April 2014**. Please use the response forms which can be downloaded from the Council website at www.hertsmere.gov.uk/sadm and send your completed form to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk. Alternatively, you can write in with your comments, preferably using one of the response forms, to:

**Planning Policy Team
Hertsmere Borough Council
Civic Offices
Elstree Way
Borehamwood
WD6 1WA**

When commenting, please remember that the Council has committed to the amount of development in the Core Strategy and the broad locations for this to take place. The SADM provides much of the detail for how and where this development will take place.

The Council will carefully consider all comments and decide what changes need to be made to the document before it is re-published and submitted to the Secretary of State for a public examination to be held by an independent Inspector.



Appendix D: List of Consultees

a) Specific consultation organisations

Natural England
The Environment Agency
Highways Agency
English Heritage*
Natural England (Essex and Herts team)
Network Rail
Homes and Communities Agency*
National Grid (Property, Planning)
National Grid Transco*
Transco Network Analysis Dept
EDF Energy*
UKPN*
Affinity Water*
Thames Water
British Telecom*
Canal and River Trust*
The Coal Authority
Hertfordshire Constabulary (Police and Crime Commissioner, Architectural Liaison, Planning Obligations Manager, Spatial Planning Manager, Crime Prevention Officer)
West Herts Hospitals NHS Trust
Hertfordshire Partnerships NHS Foundation Trust
Herts Valleys Clinical Commissioning Group*
National Health Service Commissioning Board (contacted 2/5/14)
Mobile Operators Association (contacted 2/5/14)
Energy UK (contacted 2/5/14)

Government departments

DEFRA
MOD (Defence Infrastructure Organisation, Defence Estates - Safeguarding)
Dept for Transport, Airports Policy Division

Neighbouring and other local authorities

Hertfordshire County Council (Spatial Planning; Corporate Services; Director of Environment; Passenger Transport Unit; County Development Unit; Highway Authority; Property; Development Control; HertsHelp; Public Health Hertfordshire; Health and Well Being Board*; HBRC Planning; Minerals and Waste; Gypsy Liaison*; Libraries Arts & Information; Local Studies Library)
St Albans City and District Council
Three Rivers District Council
Watford Borough Council
Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Enfield
London Borough of Harrow
Broxbourne Borough Council

*Organisations consulted 16/04/2014 – 29/05/2014

Dacorum Borough Council
East Hertfordshire District Council
Mayor of London
North Hertfordshire District Council
Stevenage Borough Council
Central Bedfordshire District Council *
Luton Borough Council*
London Colney Parish Council
North Mymms Parish Council
Colney Heath Parish Council
Watford Rural Parish Council

Hertsmere Parish and Town Councils

Elstree & Borehamwood Town Council
Aldenham Parish Council
Shenley Parish Council
South Mimms Parish Council

b) General/Other organisations consulted - in excess of 580

Hertfordshire LEP
Office of the Rail Regulator*
Transport for London*
BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding
Elstree Airfield
National Air Traffic Services – Air Traffic Control
National Trust
RSPB
National Gypsy and Traveller Federation
Friends Families and Travellers
Hertfordshire Building Preservation Trust
Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust
Sport England
The Forestry Commission
The Planning Inspectorate
Royal Town Planning Institute
Ancient Monuments Society
Barnet Meeting Room Trust
Open Spaces Society
Potters Bar In Focus
British Horse Society
Council for British Archaeology
Garden History Society
Haydon Hill House (Garden Association) Ltd
Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Hertsmere Council for Voluntary Service
Herts Education Service
Kinetic Business Centre

*Organisation consulted 16/04/2014 – 29/05/2014

Land Access & Recreation Association
Local Agenda 21 Transport & Pollution Group
London Travel Watch
Network Watford
Patchetts Green Bridleways Trust
Potters Bar Town Centre & Integrated Transport Group
Radlett Society and Green Belt Association
Shenley Village Society
Swanland Road Residents' Group
Tabard Rugby Football Club
The Bushey Forum
The Showmans Guild of Great Britain (Eastern)
The Victorian Society
Jewish Care
SPOKES
Allotments Association (Watford)
South Midlands and Greater London Housing Society
Community Development Agency for Hertfordshire
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
National Trust
The British Wind Energy Association
The Woodland Trust (Regional Policy; Regional Local Government)
Watford Mail Centre
The Theatres Trust
Bushey Hall School
Dame Alice Owen's School
Hertswood School / Hertfordshire Scouts / Hertsmere Flyers Swimming Club
Immanuel College
The Royal Veterinary College
BREEAM
CPRE Hertfordshire
St Michaels C of E Church
Holy Cross Church Borehamwood
Oxhey Village Environmental Group
Borehamwood Library
Bushey Museum
Agency for the Legal Deposit Libraries
Borehamwood Youth Football Club
Bushey Library - Community Information
Bushey Conservative Club
Bushey Meads School
Bushey Residents Action Group
The College Of Osteopaths
Campaign for Real Ale
Potters Bar Society - Town Group
Crown Estate Office (Archives)
Cherry Tree Lane Green Belt Protection Group
Church of Christ Evangelical Borehamwood
Groundwork Hertfordshire

Elstree and Borehamwood Green Belt Society
Watford and District Talking Newspaper for the Blind
Watford Chamber of Commerce and Industry
West Herts College
Wroxham Residents Action Group
Imperial Cancer Research Fund
The Ridgeway Road Association
Potters Bar Society Country Group
PBIF Open Spaces Group
The London Green Belt Council
Visit East Anglia Limited
The British Library Legal Deposit Office
Thameslink
St Peter's Church Bushey Heath
St Margaret's School
St Hilda's School
Friends of Fishers Field
Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings
School of Construction & Engineering, Oaklands College
Save the Green Belt Association
Railtrack plc
Radlett Library
RAID Residents Against Inappropriate Development
Queens' School
Potters Bar and District Society for Mencap
Potters Bar Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses
Phillimore Trust
Bushey Parish Church
Patchetts Green, Roundbush & Aldenham Conservation Society
Oakmere Library
North Mymms District Green Belt Society
North Bushey Residents Group
Newberries JMI School
National Farmers Union
Mount Grace School
Manor Court Residents Association
London Essex and Hertfordshire Amphibian & Reptile Trust
Longwood School and Nursery
HSE Health & Safety Executive
Letchmore Heath Village Trust
Jewish Care
Highwood JMI School
Hertswood Secondary School
Hertfordshire Friends Of The Earth
Hertfordshire Local Access Forum
Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust
Hertfordshire Association for the Disabled
National Institute for Biological Standards
Heath-ways Residents Association

Hartsbourne Manor Residents Association
Haydon Hill House Flat Association
Haberdashers Aske's Boys School
Haberdashers Aske's School for Girls
Golfwatch Residents' Association
National Golf Centre
Banner Homes Group plc
Bellway Homes Ltd.
Bellway Homes North London Division
Annington Property Limited
Bishopswood Estates Ltd
BNP Paribas Real Estate
Elliott Burkeman Minton Group
Fairview New Homes Ltd.
Fusion Online Ltd
Fusion Residential
GL Hearn Property Consultants
Lanesborough Estates
Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd.
Colliers CRE
Fisher German LLP
Gerald Eve
St Modwen PLC
AKT Planning and Architecture
John Anderson
Apcar Smith Planning
Development Planning Partnership Ltd
Barker Parry Town Planning
Barton Willmore LLP (Hitchin)
Barton Willmore (Cambridge)
Bidwells (Milton Keynes)
Bidwells on behalf of Barratt Strategic (Kings Langley)
Bidwells Property Consultants (Cambridge)
Blue Sky Planning
Boyer Planning (Colchester)
Boyer Planning (Wokingham)
CGMS Consulting
Carter Jonas
Cliff Walsingham & Company
Consensus Planning Ltd
Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd
David Ames Associates
DLA Town Planning Ltd
DPDS Consulting Group
DTZ Planning & Development
Drivas Jonas Deloitte
FFT Planning (Friends, Families & Travellers) (Brighton)
G R Planning Consultancy Ltd
Gary Thomas Planning Works Ltd

Gregory Gray Associates
Heaton Planning
Home Builders Federation
Iceni Projects Limited
Indigo Planning Ltd.
Jennifer Lampert Associates Ltd
Jeremy Peter Associates
January Consultant Surveyors
Jones Day
Jones Lang LaSalle
King and Graham Chartered Surveyors
Knight Frank (Manchester)
Knight Frank LLP (Hungerford)
Lambert Smith Hampton
Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G)
Leith Planning
Martin Robeson Planning Practice
Maze Planning Ltd (on behalf of Exchange Ltd)
Millard Architects
Mono Consultants Limited
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Peacock and Smith
Pegasus Planning Group
Phillips Planning Services
Planning Perspectives
Planning Works Ltd for Rachel Trust
PPML Consulting Ltd (on behalf of Annington Developments Ltd)
PGA Design Consulting
Preston Bennett Planning
Robson Planning Consultancy
Rolfe Judd Planning
RPS Planning
Savills
Shire Consulting
Silk Planning
Stewart Management and Planning Solutions
Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust
The Planning Bureau Limited
Turley Associates on behalf Potters Bar Golf Course
Vincent & Gorbing
Woolf Bond Planning on behalf of George Wimpey UK Ltd
WYG Planning & Design
RPS on behalf of Willows farm
Rosenfelder Associates
Persona Associates
Brown Associates
Chris Thomas Ltd
Kirkwells
KJD Solicitors

Martineau
Stewart Ross Associates
Sworders Agricultural
Terence O'Rourke
Edaw PLC
Edwards Covell
A.C.P. Askew
Architects Corporation Ltd
British Land Company PLC
Kravetz & Cann
Maze Planning Ltd (on behalf of Amesbury Developments)
Clivenden Homes
Countryside Properties (Southern) Ltd
David Russell Associates
E M Pick Planning
Frank Timothy Associated Ltd Architects
Freeth Melhuish
Widacre Homes Ltd
GHM Rock Townsend
Wakelin Associates
The Planning Bureau Limited for McCarthy and Stone
The Bell Cornwell Partnership
Tetlow King Planning
Barratt North London
Sheppard Robson
Slough Estates plc
Scott Land Properties
RPS Planning on behalf of Wood Hall Securities
Hard FM Land Management Services
Rumball Sedgwick
Robin Bretherick Associates
Rapleys LLP
Planning Issues
Planning Potential
Post Office Property Holdings
Persimmon Homes
Pearson Associates
Old Road Securities PLC
Mymmsmead Land Trust
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners Ltd (on Behalf of Linden Homes (Chiltern) Ltd
MVM Planning
Michael Shanly Homes
Mike Hastings Design
McCarthy & Stone Ltd
McGuire Architecture & Design
M J Mapp LLP
LEVVEL
Land Securities Trillium
Landmark Information Group

Leach Homes
Lennon Planning
John Martin & Associates
Kent Jones and Done
John Griggs and Son Ltd
Jarvis Homes
JCPC Ltd
George Wimpey South Midlands Ltd.
George Wimpey Strategic Land
URS
Darnhills Ltd
Origin Group , St Pancras Housing
Hightown Praetorian HA
Metropolitan Housing Partnership
Affinity Sutton HA
Aldwyck Housing Association Ltd
Sanctuary Housing Association
Ridgehill Housing Association
Paradigm Housing Group
Metropolitan Home Ownership
John Grooms Housing Association
Guinness Housing Trust
Metroline Bus Company
Welcome Break Group Ltd
Bio Products Laboratory
New Wave Mortgage Solutions
Baker Pearce
Entec UK
Great Bear Group Ltd
Ian Harding Ltd.
ADER c/o Oaklands College
Aldenham School Charity
C L A
Bushey Health Centre
Balfour Newsagents
Bellissima Shoes Ltd
Newland Brothers c/o Clivenden Homes
Tyttenhanger Estate and Bowmans Leisure Ltd c/o Fisher German LLP
Robert Deards Ltd
Cannon Morgan & Rheinberg
Deloitte Drivers Jonas (on behalf of Cemex)
Devplan UK
Elstree Light & Power plc
Fosters of Radlett
Generics (UK) Ltd
Village Homes
Trewins
The Woodman Inn
The Power Service

Ottaways Solicitors
Tesco Stores Ltd (Town Planning Executive)
Taylor Hobbs & Partners
Swift Dry Cleaners
S & M Building
Oaktree Landscape Garden Services
North Bushey Newsagents
Newlands Managements
Marks and Spencer (Watford)
Manor Pharmacy
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd
Kestrel Grove Nursing Home
Knight Strip Metals Limited
J S Hunter & Sons
GATE*
Showmen's Guild of Great Britain (National)*
Gypsy Council (National, East of England)*
Hadley Wood Association*
Letchmore Heath Village Trust*
Footpaths – Mr Jennings
Arts Council England (Eastern)*
Bushey History Research & Conservation Group*
Merryhill Residents Association*
Bushey Hall Park Residents Association*
Bushey & District Footpaths Association*
Warren Estate Residents Association*
Borehamwood Four Parks Friends Association*
Bushey Heath Residents Association*
The Barnet Society*
Community Learning Disabilities Service (ACS)*
Caldecote Neighbourhood Association*
Cranborne Road Residents Association*
Elstree & Borehamwood Green Belt Society*
Well End Residents Association*
Hertsmere Chamber of Trade*
Potters Bar Chamber of Commerce*
The Green Belt Council for Greater London*
BBC - Transmitter Department*
Herts & Middlesex Bat Group*
Hertsmere Leisure Trust*
The Society for The Protection Of Ancient Buildings*
The Georgian Group*
Royal Commission on The Monuments Of England*
Herts & Middlesex Badger Group*
Health & Safety Executive*
Newlands Avenue Road Committee*

*Organisations consulted 16/04/2014 – 29/05/2014

Oakridge Avenue Road Association*
Potters Bar Society*
Heathways Residents Association*
South Mimms & Ridge Protection Committee*
The Ramblers' Association*
Royds Conservation Residents Association*
Ridge Residents Association*
Shenley Park Trust*
Twentieth Century Society*
Wall Hall Management Company*

Plus an additional 205 general consultees – email address only.

c) Neighbours adjoining proposals sites – in excess of 2300 addresses notified

Owner/Occupiers of properties adjoining Proposal sites H1- H11, T1- T2 and C1 referred to in Policies SADM1 and SADM29 were invited to submit representations – in excess of 2300 invitations were sent out. Maps showing the areas covered are attached at Appendix D.

d) Other individual consultees – in excess of 1300 individuals notified


Individuals on the Planning Policy database for consultation.

*Organisations consulted 16/04/2014 – 29/05/2014

Appendix E: notification to properties adjoining proposals sites - maps

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations


Site H1 – Directors Arms Public House, Ripon Way, Borehamwood



© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Legend



Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H2 – Gas Holders site, Station Road, Borehamwood and



© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H3 – Land to the south of Elstree and Borehamwood Station




© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H4 – Land at Bushey Hall Golf Club



© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H5 – Land at Rossway Drive, Bushey




© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations and Policy SADM29 – Key Community Facilities

Site H6 – Hertswood Upper School Thrift Farm Lane, Borehamwood and

Site C2 – Hertswood Lower School, Cowley Hill, Borehamwood



© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H7 – Land at Lincolnsfield, Bushey




© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H8- Europcar House, Aldenham Road, Bushey




copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

© Crown

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H9 – Former Sunnybank School, Potters Bar




© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H10 – Birchville Court and adjoining haulage yard, Heathbourne Road, Bushey Heath




© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM1 – Housing Allocations

Site H11 – Potters Bar Bus Garage, High Street, Potters Bar




© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM29 – Key Community Facilities

Site C1 – Former Watford Depot site, Paddock Road, Oxhey, near Watford




© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Policy SADM36 – Town and District Centres

Site TC1. 29-59 Shenley Road, Borehamwood



© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 OS EUL 100017428. Use of this data is subject to [terms and conditions](#).
You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Hertsmere Borough Council. Licence No: 100017428

Appendix F: Notification to all residents - Hertsmeare News Spring 2014

Planning news
Follow us on Twitter @HertsmeareBC

Planning our future

Are you interested in where new homes could be built in your area? How local high streets could be improved and where Hertsmeare is planning to provide local retail and industry areas?

Locally and nationally our population is growing and therefore all councils are required, by government, to make plans for building new homes and work with other organisations to provide the necessary infrastructure and services for residents now and in the future.

Our Core Strategy, agreed last year by the council, already sets the overall strategy for the borough with 3,990 new homes to be built over 15 years focused primarily on existing urban areas in order to protect the green belt. The latest planning document out for consultation now is our draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies which sets out, in more detail, what development could take place across the borough up to 2027. This includes identifying specific sites for a range of land uses and detailed planning policies to

guide decisions on planning applications.

Cllr Harvey Cohen, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Localism, said: "These are critical plans which we want people to give us their views on as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"These are critical plans which we want people to give us their views on."

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that green spaces are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met."

All local authorities must have local plans

in place which set out how and where their area could be developed and following the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework in 2012, the government expects councils to support sustainable development in these plans. Quite simply, if we don't put forward plans to provide an adequate supply of housing, we run the risk of being forced to accept inappropriate developments.

The draft Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document was approved by the council's Executive on 15 January and a **six-week public consultation period ends on 14 April.**

As part of the consultation, letters have been sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers such as Hertfordshire County Council which is responsible for roads and schools, town and parish councils, and



Sign up for planning updates

To ensure you are consulted directly on future planning documents and proposals, please email local.plan@hertsmeare.gov.uk or call us to be added to our mailing list

Spring 2014 Hertsmeare News www.hertsmeare.gov.uk
www.hertsmeare.gov.uk Hertsmeare News Spring 2014 9

Join us on Facebook www.facebook.com/hertsmeare

Planning news

community organisations including the newly-formed Elstree and Borehamwood Residents' Association.

Please note: These are draft plans that we are legally required to propose. The landowners of the sites haven't necessarily been approached or planning applications submitted. This is just the first stage of proposing where new development could and could not take place. All development proposals must meet relevant planning policies and applicants are required to demonstrate that any necessary infrastructure will be delivered.

What does this mean for... Elstree and Borehamwood?

In the document a number of potential locations have been identified for housing development including an estimated 276 homes on the site of Hertsmeare Upper School, Thrift Farm Lane, Woodcock Hill has green belt status following designation as a village green.

... Bushey?

Sites identified for potential housing include land at Rosway Drive for an estimated 61 homes and Birchville Court and the adjoining haulage yard on Heathbourne Road for an estimated 39 homes. Sites to be removed from the

green belt include the print works at Bushy Hall Golf Course.

... Potters Bar?

Sites identified for potential housing include the bus depot in the high street for an estimated 70 homes (subject to a suitable alternative site being found for the depot) and the former Sunny Bank School for an estimated 43 homes. Land to the rear of 29-37 Heath Road is earmarked to be taken out of the green belt to address an existing anomaly with the green belt boundary.

... Radlett and Shenley?

Three sites – Burnell & Co, the former Radlett Fire Station (which has planning permission for housing) and the adjoining Radlett Service Station/Regency House – are allocated for housing. A small area of Colney Fields, London Colney, and the former Shenley Hospital housing estate are to be removed from the green belt.

Please read the document for further details on each area.

How can I have my say?

There is lots more information in the actual document that will explain what it is and why we have to produce it. We are also holding public drop-in sessions so you can learn more, speak direct with planning officers and give your comments, see dates below.

Borehamwood – Monday 17 March, 12pm-8pm at 96 Shenley Road, WD6 1EB

Drop in and have your say

Radlett – Thursday 20 March, 4pm-8pm at The Radlett Centre, Aldenham Avenue, WD7 8HL

Bushey – Tuesday 25 March, 12pm-8pm at Bushey Country Club, High Street, WD23 1TT

Shenley – Thursday 27 March, 4pm-8pm at Shenley Village Hall, 108 London Road, WD7 9BS

Potters Bar – Thursday 3 April, 12pm-8pm at Wyllyotts Centre, Darkes Lane, EN6 2HN

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmeare.gov.uk or in the post to Site allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmeare Borough Council (full address on page 3). **Comments must be received before 14 April.**

For more information visit www.hertsmeare.gov.uk/siteallocations or call 020 8207 7527.

Last say on Elstree Way

Residents of Borehamwood have until the end of March to have their last say on the council's Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan.

The document will act as a master plan to guide the future development of homes and other facilities in the area up to 2027. Changes have been made to the document following public consultation and a revised version is now available.

The next stage of the statutory process is a six-week "deposit" period whereby residents can submit final representations which will be considered by an independent inspector at a public examination, then the document will be submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination.

A helpful leaflet should have been delivered with this magazine to those who live in the area – if not please contact us. Copies of the document and leaflet are also available at the Civic Offices in Elstree Way, Borehamwood, and at Borehamwood Library at 96 Shenley Road.

To have your say please complete the online response form or write to us (address details are on page 3).

For more information visit www.hertsmeare.gov.uk/elstreewaycorridor or call 020 8207 2277.

The right infrastructure

Hertsmeare is set to get more freedom to spend money from developers on infrastructure that residents want, following a change in government policy to give communities more power in planning local development.

We expect to be the first authority in the county to take advantage of the new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which is replacing the current system of planning arrangements between councils and developers known as section 106 agreements.

CIL is basically a tax that councils can charge developers who are building new developments in their area so that local authorities – including borough, parish/town and county councils – can deliver new infrastructure projects such as road schemes, schools, park improvements or a new health centre for example.

Appendix G: Consultation Drop-In Sessions

Location	Date	Times
Borehamwood – 96 Shenley Road	Monday 17 March	12:00 - 20:00
Radlett – The Radlett Centre	Thursday 20 March	16:00 - 20:00
Bushey - Bushey Golf and Country Club	Monday 24 March Tuesday 25 March	12:00 - 20:00 12:00 - 20:00
Shenley – Shenley Village Hall	Thursday 27 March	16:00 - 20:00
Potters Bar – The Wyllyotts Centre	Thursday 3 April	12:00 - 20:00

Appendix H – Press releases and press articles

[Home](#) > [News](#) > [Articles](#) > [January](#)

Interested in where new homes go?



Last Modified January 27, 2014

[Share this page](#)



Draft plans which set out what development takes place in the borough, and where, have been agreed by the council's Executive and will be out for consultation soon.

If you are interested in issues such as where and how new homes could be built, what your local high street looks like and the boundary of green belt land then this is your chance to get involved.

All local authorities must have a local plan in place which sets out how and where their area could be developed, and with what. The council's plan – which will guide development in the area until 2027 – is made up of a series of documents, including an overarching Core Strategy (approved in January 2013) and our Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, which are due out for consultation for six weeks in February.

The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies identify development sites for a range of land uses and also includes detailed planning policies to guide decisions on individual planning applications.

Cllr Harvey Cohen, portfolio holder for planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans which we want people to give us their views on as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met. The government also introduced a National Planning Policy Framework in 2012 which includes a requirement for councils to have a clear presumption in favour of sustainable development in their plans.

"Sometimes that does mean that we have to make difficult local decisions and so we are inviting residents to get involved in the consultation so we can continue to make well-informed judgements about the area and its future."

How can you be involved?

The draft plan has just been approved by the Executive for it to go out for public consultation. The period of consultation will be six weeks and is expected to start at the end of February.

As part of the consultation, letters will be sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers such as Hertfordshire County Council, town and parish councils and community organisations.

As soon as the consultation starts, we will publish details on our website and through our social media channels @HertsmereBC on Twitter and on our [Facebook page](#). In the meantime, to find out more about our [site allocations](#) If you would like to be added to our mailing list to ensure that you are consulted directly on the proposals please email local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or call 020 8207 7527.

There will also be public drop-in sessions across the borough which will be advertised nearer the time.

Posted on Thursday 16th January 2014

Consultation starts on where new homes could go in Hertsmere



Last Modified March 20, 2014

[Share this page](#)



If you are interested in issues such as where and how new homes could be built, what your local high street looks like and the boundary of green belt land then you will soon have your chance to get involved as a six-week consultation period gets under way from Monday, 3 March, concluding on 14 April.

All local authorities must have a local plan in place which sets out how and where their area could be developed, and with what. The council's plan – which will guide development in the area until 2027 – is made up of a series of documents, including an overarching Core Strategy (approved in January

2013) and our Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.

The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies identify development sites for a range of land uses and also includes detailed planning policies to guide decisions on individual planning applications.

Cllr Harvey Cohen, portfolio holder for planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met."

For **Elstree and Borehamwood**, a number of potential locations have been identified for housing development including an estimated 278 homes on the site of Hertswood Upper School, Thrift Farm Lane. Woodcock Hill is delegated as green belt following designation as a village green. Please view the document for further details.

For **Bushey**, sites identified for potential housing include land at Rossway Drive for an estimated 61 homes and Birchville Court and the adjoining haulage yard on Heathbourne Road for an estimated 39 homes. Sites to be removed from the green belt include the print works at Bushey Hall Golf Course.

For **Potters Bar**, sites identified for potential housing include the bus depot in the High Street for an estimated 70 homes (subject to a suitable alternative site being found for the depot) and the former Sunny Bank School for an estimated 43 homes. Land to the rear of 29-37 Heath Road is earmarked to be taken out of the green belt to address an existing anomaly with the green belt boundary. Please view the document for further details.

For **Radlett and Shenley**, three sites – Burrell & Co, the former Radlett Fire Station (which has planning permission for housing) and the adjoining Radlett Service Station/Regency House - are allocated for housing. A small area of Colney Fields, London Colney, and the former Shenley Hospital housing estate are to be removed from the green belt.

Please read the document for [more information](#) on each area.

How can you be involved?

As part of the consultation, letters are being sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers, such as Hertfordshire County Council which is responsible for roads and schools, town and parish councils and community organisations.

Public drop-in sessions are being held to enable you to find out more, speak directly with planning officers and give your comments:

- **Elstree and Borehamwood** – Monday, 17 March between 12pm and 8pm at 96 Shenley Road, Borehamwood WD6 1EB
- **Radlett** – Thursday, 20 March between 4pm and 8pm at The Radlett Centre, Aldenham Avenue, Radlett WD7 8HL
- **Bushey** – Monday, 24 March between 12pm and 8pm at Bushey Country Club, High Street, Bushey, WD23 1TT
- **Bushey** – Tuesday, 25 March between 12pm and 8pm at Bushey Country Club, High Street, Bushey, WD23 1TT
- **Shenley** – Thursday, 27 March between 4pm and 8pm at Shenley Village Hall, 108 London Road, Shenley, WD7 9BS
- **Potters Bar** – Thursday, 3 April between 12pm and 8pm at the Wyllyotts Centre, Darkes lane, Potters Bar EN6 2HN

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA.

[More information](#)

Posted on Friday 28th February 2014

Public drop in session for Elstree and Borehamwood next Monday



Last Modified March 11, 2014

[Share this page](#)

If you are interested in issues such as where and how new homes could be built in Elstree and Borehamwood, what your local high street looks like and the boundary of green belt land then come along and find out more at a public drop-in session next Monday, 17 March.

The session is being held at 96 Shenley Road, Borehamwood between 12 midday and 8pm, where there will be a chance to find out more or speak directly with planning officers and give your comments.

It forms part of a six-week consultation period which got under way on 6 March, concluding on 14 April.

All local authorities must have a local plan in place which sets out how and where their area could be developed, and with what. The council's plan – which will guide development in the area until 2027 – is made up of a series of documents, including an overarching Core Strategy (approved in January 2013) and our Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.

The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies identify development sites for a range of land uses and also includes detailed planning policies to guide decisions on individual planning applications.

For Elstree and Borehamwood, a number of potential locations have been identified for housing development including an estimated 276 homes on the site of Hertswood Upper School, Thrift Farm Lane. Woodcock Hill is delegated as green belt following designation as a village green. More details can be found [here](#)

Cllr Harvey Cohen, portfolio holder for planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met."

As part of the consultation, letters have also been sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers, such as Hertfordshire County Council which is responsible for roads and schools, town and parish councils and community organisations.

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA.

For more information visit our [site allocations](#) pages.

Posted on Tuesday 11th March 2014

Public drop-in session for Radlett



Last Modified March 13, 2014

[Share this page](#)

If you are interested in how development plans for Radlett might take shape, then come along and find out more at a public drop-in session next Thursday (20 March).

The session is being held at The Radlett Centre in Aldenham Avenue between 4pm and 8pm, where there will be a chance to find out more or speak directly with planning officers and give your comments.

The drop-in session forms part of a six-week consultation period which got under way on 6 March, concluding on 14 April.

All local authorities must have a local plan in place which sets out how and where their area could be developed, and with what. The council's plan – which will guide development in the area until 2027 – is made up of a series of documents, including an overarching Core Strategy (approved in January 2013) and our Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.

The Site Allocations and Development Management Policies identify development sites for a range of land uses and also includes detailed planning policies to guide decisions on individual planning applications.

For Radlett, Burrell & Co, the former Radlett Fire Station (which has planning permission for housing) and the adjoining Radlett Service Station/Regency House - are allocated for housing. Please view [the document](#) for further details.

Cllr Harvey Cohen, portfolio holder for planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met."

As part of the consultation, letters have also been sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers, such as Hertfordshire County Council which is responsible for roads and schools, town and parish councils and community organisations.

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA.

For more information visit our [site allocations pages](#).

Posted on Thursday 13th March 2014

First Local Plan drop-in session a success




Last Modified March 20, 2014

[Share this page](#)

More than 100 people attended the first of a series of drop-in sessions organised by the council to explain more about detailed plans for the local area.

The session, held at 96 Shenley Road, the community facility in Borehamwood on Monday, 17 March, provided an overview of the council's plan – which will guide development in the area until 2027. The draft plan follows the adoption of the council's overarching 15-year planning strategy in January 2013 and contains detailed proposals for individual sites, as well as policies for determining individual planning applications.

Information was available to attendees regarding a number of potential locations which have been identified for housing development including an estimated 276 homes on the site of Hertswood Upper School, Thrift Farm Lane. Woodcock Hill is returned to the green belt following designation as a village green. Planning officers were also on hand to answer a range of questions about plans for the area and to listen to views.

 [Please view the document for further details.](#)

Cllr Harvey Cohen, portfolio holder for planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in, so it's really heartening that the first session was so well attended."

The six-week consultation period ends on 14 April.

There are four more sessions arranged for the borough:

- Radlett - Thursday, 20 March, 4pm to 8pm at The Radlett Centre, Aldenham Avenue, WD7 8HL
- Bushey - Monday, 24 March, 12pm to 8pm at Bushey Country Club, High Street, WD23 1TT
- Bushey - Tuesday, 25 March, 12pm to 8pm at Bushey Country Club, High Street, WD23 1TT
- Shenley - Thursday, 27 March, 4pm to 8pm at Shenley Village Hall, 108 London Road, WD7 9BS
- Potters Bar - Thursday, 3 April, 12pm to 8pm at Wyllyotts Centre, Darkes Lane, EN6 2HN

As part of the consultation, letters have also been sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers, such as Hertfordshire County Council which is responsible for roads and schools, town and parish councils and community organisations.

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA.

Posted on Wednesday 19th March 2014

Find out about development plans in Bushey



Last Modified March 20, 2014

[Share this page](#)



If you're interested in where new homes could be built in Bushey, what the local high street looks like and the boundary of green belt land then pop along to one of our public drop-in sessions on **Monday, 24 March**, or **Tuesday, 25 March**. Both sessions will be held between 12pm and 8pm at Bushey Country Club, High Street, Bushey, WD23 1TT.

Come along to speak to planning officers direct and give your comments about our development proposals for the area. The sessions form part of a six-week consultation period which ends on 14 April.

The plans are detailed in our Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document which identifies development sites for a range of land uses and also includes detailed planning policies to guide decisions on individual planning applications.

Cllr Harvey Cohen, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met."

In Bushey, sites identified for potential housing include land at Rossway Drive for an estimated 61 homes and Birchville Court and the adjoining haulage yard on Heathbourne Road for an estimated 39 homes. Sites to be removed from the green belt include the print works at Bushey Hall Golf Course. Please view the document for further details.

As part of the consultation, letters are being sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers, such as Hertfordshire County Council which is responsible for roads and schools, town and parish councils and community organisations.

Sessions have already taken place in [Borehamwood](#) and Radlett and other sessions are being held in [Shenley](#) – on Thursday, 27 March, between 4pm and 8pm at Shenley Village Hall – and in [Potters Bar](#) – on Thursday 3 April, between 12pm and 8pm at the Wyllyotts Centre.

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA.

[More information](#)

Find out about development plans in Shenley and Potters Bar



Last Modified March 20, 2014

[Share this page](#)



If you're interested in where new homes could be built in Shenley and/or Potters Bar, what the local high streets look like and the boundary of green belt land then pop along to one of our public drop-in sessions. A session will take place on **Thursday 27 March**, between 4pm and 8pm, at Shenley Village Hall, 108 London Road, Shenley. Another session will take place on **Thursday 3 April**, between 12pm and 8pm, at the Wyllyotts Centre, Darkes Lane, Potters Bar.

Come along to speak to planning officers direct and give your comments about our development proposals for the area. The sessions form part of a six-week consultation period which ends on 14

April.

The plans are detailed in our Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document which identifies development sites for a range of land uses and also includes detailed planning policies to guide decisions on individual planning applications.

Cllr Harvey Cohen, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met."

In Potters Bar, sites identified for potential housing include the bus depot in the High Street for an estimated 70 homes (subject to a suitable alternative site being found for the depot) and the former Sunny Bank School for an estimated 43 homes. Land to the rear of 29-37 Heath Road is earmarked to be taken out of the green belt to address an existing anomaly with the green belt boundary.

In Shenley, a small area of Colney Fields, London Colney, and the former Shenley Hospital housing estate are to be removed from the green belt.

Please view the document for further details.

As part of the consultation, letters are being sent to residents who will be directly affected by certain significant proposals as well as all key agencies and service providers, such as Hertfordshire County Council which is responsible for roads and schools, town and parish councils and community organisations.

Sessions have already taken place in [Borehamwood](#) and Radlett and other sessions are being held in [Bushey](#) on Monday and Tuesday next week (24 and 25 March).

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA.

[More information](#)

Posted on Thursday 20th March 2014

Borehamwood & Elstree Times

Friday 28 March 2014

5

pg 7

My Bushey News

April 2014

Several sites identified for new homes in Bushey

pg 32

People in Bushey are being asked where they want to see new houses built in the town.

The question is part of a wider survey about land use in the Bushey area and Hertsmere Borough Council want to know what people think about a range of issues. This includes where and how new homes will be built, what the local high street looks like and the boundary of green belt land.

Local authorities have to have development plans in place until 2027 which include identifying potential sites for a range of land uses.


Sites in Bushey identified for potential housing development include Rossway Drive, earmarked for 61 homes and Birchville Court and Heathborne Court, for an estimated 39 homes.

The print works at Bushey Hall Golf Course has also been earmarked as a potential site to be removed from green belt land.

In a statement, portfolio holder for planning and localism councillor Harvey Cohen said that public participation was vital for the plans to succeed.

He added: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in."

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new



Rossway Drive has been chosen for 61 new homes

homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our diverse communities are met."

As part of the consultation process, letters are being sent to those who will be directly affected by the proposals, as well as key agencies and service providers.

Any residents wishing to submit comments to the council over the plans should contact:

Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA, or email local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk.

The closing date is April 14.

by Olly Douglas

Hundreds attend drop-in session

Hundreds of people attended the first of a series of drop-in sessions for the council to explain more about detailed plans for the area.

The first session, held at 96 Shenley Road, the community centre in Borehamwood, was held to show people a detailed plan of development in the area until 2027.

The sessions follow the adoption of Hertsmere Borough Council's new 15-year planning strategy in January 2013, and contains detailed proposals for individual sites.

Information about a number of potential locations identified for housing development, including an estimated 276 homes on the site of Hertswood Upper School in Thrift Farm Lane.

Planning officers were also on hand to answer questions about plans for the area and to listen to residents' views.

Councillor Harvey Cohen, portfolio holder for planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in."

The six-week consultation period ends on April 14.

The next event will be held at the Wylotts Centre, Darkes Lane, Potters Bar, on Thursday, April 3 from 12pm to 8pm.

Borehamwood & Elstree Times

Friday 14 March 2014

10

Comment on future of the borough

People can have their say over how their town will change over the next 15 years.

Hertsmere Borough Council is holding a public drop-in session at 96 Shenley Road, Borehamwood, on Monday to discuss its local plan, which will guide development in the area until 2027.

The plans detail where and how new homes will be built in the borough, the future face of the high street and the green belt boundary.

The drop-in session, which will run from 12pm until 8pm, will give people the chance to discuss the plans with planning officers and make their views heard.

Councillor Harvey Cohen, who is in charge of planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans on

which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for development, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of our communities are met."

The public consultation ends on April 14.

People can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood WD6 1WA.

Watford Observer

Friday 14 March 2014

pg 14

Chance for say on blueprint

A COUNCIL is inviting residents to have their say on where and how new homes could be built, what the local high street looks like, and the boundary of Green Belt land.

Hertsmere Borough Council is running a six-week consultation on its local plan.

All local authorities must have a local plan which sets out how and where their area could be developed, and with what.

The council's plan will guide development in the area until 2027, and includes

identifying development sites and also Chndetailed planning policies to guide decisions on individual planning applications.

For Bushey, sites identified for potential housing include land at Rossway Drive for an estimated 61 homes and Birchville Court and the adjoining haulage yard in Heathbourne Road for an estimated 39 homes.

Sites to be removed from the Green Belt include the print works at Bushey Hall Golf Course.

Welwyn and Hatfield Times (Potters Bar Edition)

Wednesday 12 March 2014

Back page

■ The bus depot in High Street, Potters Bar



Have your say on Potters Bar bus depot site plans

By David Morris
news@whtimes.co.uk

Now is the time for residents of Potters Bar to have their say on plans to build new homes on Green Belt land to edge of town and on the High Street bus garage depot site.

Hertsmere Borough Council has earmarked Green Belt land to the rear of Heath Road as a potential site for new homes, as well as wanting to build more than 100 houses elsewhere in Potters Bar.

And a consultation into the proposals has begun, with residents getting the chance to have their say in a six-week period concluding on April 14.

All local authorities must have a local plan in place which sets out how and where their area could be developed until the year 2027.

For Potters Bar, sites identified for potential housing include the bus depot in the High Street for an estimated 70 homes, and the former Sunny Bank School for 43 homes.

Land to the rear of 29-37 Heath Road is earmarked, too.

Councillor Harvey Cohen, portfolio holder for planning and localism, said: "These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views as they will have an impact on people and the communities they live in.

"We have responsibilities to provide adequate land for develop-



■ Councillor Harvey Cohen, Hertsmere's portfolio holder for planning and localism

ment, whether that is for retail or for new homes, but we also want to ensure our high streets are supported, that our communities are safe and pleasant places in which to live and work, that areas are protected and that all the needs of

“ These are critical plans on which we want people to give us their views

Councillor Harvey Cohen

our diverse communities are met.”

A public drop-in session is being held to enable residents to find out more, speak directly with planning officers and give their comments.

For Potters Bar, this session is being held on Thursday, April 3 between noon and 8pm at the Wyllyotts Centre, off Darkes Lane.

You can also submit comments via email to local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk or by post to Site Allocations, Planning Policy, Hertsmere Borough Council, Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood, WD6 1WA.

→ For more information visit www.hertsmere.gov.uk/siteallocations

Appendix I: Twitter posts - examples

HertsmerCouncil @HertsmerBC [Follow](#)

Find out about development plans in #Bushey at drop-in sessions nx wk hertsmer.gov.uk/News/Articles/...

Reply Retweet Favourite More

FAVOURITES
2

11:12 am - 20 Mar 2014

Don't miss any updates from HertsmerCouncil
Join Twitter today and follow what interests you!

Text follow HertsmerBC to your carrier's shortcode [Sign up](#)

© 2014 Twitter About Help Ads info

HertsmerCouncil @HertsmerBC [Follow](#)

Last chance to have ur say on development plans this weekend b4 consultation ends on Monday hertsmer.gov.uk/News/Articles/...

Reply Retweet Favourite More

9:23 am - 11 Apr 2014 [Embed Tweet](#)

Don't miss any updates from HertsmerCouncil
Join Twitter today and follow what interests you!

Text follow HertsmerBC to your carrier's shortcode [Sign up](#)

© 2014 Twitter About Help Ads info

Appendix J: Facebook posts - examples

 **Hertsmere** shared a link.
30 January

Hot off the press our February eNews - no excuses not to know what's going on in Hertsmere!



February eNews
us5.campaign-archive2.com

Interested in where new homes could go in your local area? Have your say on our draft 'site allocations' planning document which sets out what development could take place in the borough up to 2027. A six-week period of public consultation will start soon. Read more about oursite...

Like · Comment · Share

123 people saw this post

 **Hertsmere** shared a link.
Posted by Hertsmere Borough Council [?] · 2 April

Find out about and comment on development plans in Potters Bar tomorrow between 12pm and 8pm at the Wyllyotts Centre, Darkes Lane.



Find out about development plans in Potters Bar
www.hertsmere.gov.uk

Like · Comment · Share



Hertsmere shared a link.

Posted by Hertsmere Borough Council [?] · 9 April

Five days left to have your say...



Consultation starts on where new homes could go in Hertsmere

www.hertsmere.gov.uk

Like · Comment · Share

46 people saw this post

Boost Post

Appendix K: Summaries of Representations and Council Response:

Chapters 1-2

Chapter 3

Chapter 4

Chapters 5-7

Chapter 8, appendices and miscellaneous

The Paddock – late objections to Local Green Space designation

Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD: Consultation March/April 2014

Summaries of Representations and Draft Council responses.

Late Representations in relation to
The Paddock, Bushey

July 2015

Late Objections to designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space.

	Date received	Comment	Response
01400-1-001 resident	06/07/2015	It's private land – legally you can't designate it.	The ownership of the land does not preclude it from being designated as Local Open Space. The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail) . No change.
01401-1-001 resident	06/07/2015	It's private land – legally you can't designate it.	The ownership of the land does not preclude it from being designated as Local Open Space. The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future

			development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01402-1-001 resident	05/07/2015	Needs funds for Reveley – unique community asset. No funds = risk Reveley being sold for development. Paddock = useless scrub. Trust can't afford to maintain it. No benefit to local community	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01403-1-001 resident	05/07/2015	Spending money on maintaining Paddock = waste of money. Trust can't afford it. If Paddock not sold there is high risk of losing Reveley Lodge and gardens – local history will disappear, site likely to be redeveloped. Reveley Lodge is asset – educational and social - run by dedicated volunteers. Funds from sale will allow	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of

		<p>maintenance and refurbishment and Lodge and cottages (in turn generating income).</p>	<p>support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
<p>01404-1-001 resident</p>	<p>05/07/2015</p>	<p>Classifying Paddock as LGS based on incorrect application of superseded Government criteria. Will result in Reveley closure. Losses will include Victorian education sessions and gardens. Paddock not used, no historical, ecological or recreational value.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the</p>

			<p>designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01405-1-001 resident	05/07/2015	<p>Housing need and lack of purpose of Paddock signal carefully considered development = best option. Doesn't meet NPPF criteria for LGS. Private, busy road, barely notice it. Reveley Lodge much greater priority. If only way of maintaining it is to sell the Paddock then should do so.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from</p>

			Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01251-1-001 resident	05/07/2015	Inadequate consultation. Should sacrifice poor scrubland in exchange for long term preservation of beautiful and established house and garden. Benefits to National Gardens charity and many other causes.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are ‘demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance’ and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens; it was however agreed that the proposed designation for Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01406-1-001 Bushey Museum Property Trustee	05/07/2015	The Paddock was bought by Chewetts to safeguard view from Reveley. It’s scrubland. TPO oak would be retained in Cala development. Doesn’t fulfil LGS criteria. Not beautiful or peaceful, no historical recreational value, and little wildlife. Reveley Lodge Garden – had fallen into decay but has slowly been turned around (Kew trained Head Gardener). Rare plants, wildlife, veg garden, bees. Open free of charge. Visited by hundreds of school children, garden groups and other visitors. Part of National Gardens scheme. Other charities also benefitted from events. Funding from Paddock	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are ‘demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance’ and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces

		<p>– enable improved accessibility (paths, toilets) small visitor centre, parking, machinery. If no funds from sale, gardens will return to derelict state and could be built on.</p>	<p>and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
<p>01407-1-001 Learning Officer, Bushey Museum and Art Gallery</p>	<p>04/07/2015</p>	<p>Paddock unattractive scrubby grass and trees on busy road. Neither functional nor beautiful. Designation LGS will deny opportunity to secure future of Reveley house and garden. Would severely compromise teaching programme. Teach history – Victorian, WWII life through diaries of residents. Art sessions use garden, science taught through plants and seeds. Schools from Borehamwood and Stanmore as well as Bushey come.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are ‘demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance’ and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The</p>

			Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01408-1-001 resident	04/07/2015	Save Reveley Lodge. Tireless and dedicated volunteers work to further the legacy of Art in Bushey.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01408-1-002 resident	04/07/2015	What would be the purpose of the open space if retained?	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local

			<p>community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01409-1-001 resident	04/07/2015	Paddock scruffy, not used by public. Paddock not noticed by public. No significant plants.	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected</p>

			<p>from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01410-1-001 resident	03/07/2015	<p>Government criteria for designating LGS not agreed by members of Hertsmere and therefore has no validity. Must allow sale of Paddock to bring funds for Reveley Lodge and Bushey Museum – the ‘here and now’ heritage of Bushey. Paddock is inaccessible scrubland has no historical environmental or recreational merit. Reveley - significant benefits to local community, especially schools. Victorian workshops, learning about nature through seasons in gardens. Beautiful mature gardens, wildlife, free of charge entry. Unusual Victorian/Edwardian building. Protect Reveley from future closure and resultant educational loss.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are ‘demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance’ and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was</p>

			agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01411-1-001 resident	03/07/2015	Misguided NIMBYish attempts to prevent sale of Paddock. No aesthetic or practical value. Sale will help preserve unique Reveley Lodge – ‘a wonderful Edwardian time capsule and a unique piece of the history of Bushey Heath’. Many volunteers. Memorabilia, concerts, fetes, wonderful gardens. If have to choose, choose Reveley Lodge to survive.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are ‘demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance’ and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01412-1-001 resident	03/07/2015	Reveley Lodge needs funds to maintain and secure future of Lodge and garden for ALL Bushey residents now and in future. Sale of Paddock needed. Reveley Lodge part of National Garden scheme. Local history days for school children. Open free of charge. Part of	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are ‘demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance’ and indicates that development here should be ruled out

		Bushey's heritage.	other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01413-1-001 user	03/07/2015	Sale of Paddock needed to fund urgent repairs to house out-buildings and garden walls and provide on-going maintenance programme for Lodge and Bushey Museum. Gardens have been upgraded (part of National Garden scheme). Range of activities at Lodge continually expanding. Medicinal plants walk. Events contribute to Bushey Festival. Encourage youngsters to consider careers in horticulture, botany etc. Bees, local produce. Without funds from Paddock won't be able to restore buildings and maintain garden. Will decline and become potential development site – would be tragedy.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015)

			<p>considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01414-1-001 teacher	03/07/2015	Use house as a learning resource. Sale of Paddock will allow excellent work of volunteers from Bushey Museum to continue.	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan</p>

			(see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01381-2-001 Chairman BMPT	03/07/2015	<p>Council has not applied NPPF criteria for designation of LGS. Paddock isn't demonstrably special to local community or hold particular local significance. Compelling evidence needed for designation – not demonstrated. Should lose unremarkable private green space in favour of housing and Bushey's heritage and publicly accessible garden. Without capital from the sale Reveley Lodge will have to close – loss of heritage, local history and education. BMPT strenuous objection to proposed designation. Designation doesn't take account of loss of social amenity and environmental benefit if Reveley Lodge and garden is closed. Paddock doesn't meet NPPF criteria of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. Inspector said must be compelling evidence, and be able to demonstrate that requirements for allocation of LGS are met in full. Impact on Bushey's heritage will be catastrophic.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01415-1-001 resident	03/07/2015	<p>Object to designation as it will mean the closure of Reveley Lodge – have enjoyed visiting during childhood</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green</p>

			<p>Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01416-1-001 resident	03/07/2015	<p>How is designation going to provide any public amenity? It's a green field in private ownership. No-one has ever been able to use it. Need to sell it to fund maintenance of house and garden. Garden is publicly accessible. Better to leave Reveley Lodge and garden in capable hands of BMPT than be forced to sell for development. If that happened who would look after the LGS?</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the</p>

			grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01417-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	Designation would make development unlikely. If no funds from sale of Paddock will have to consider selling Reveley Lodge (listed building with superb garden). Will go into private ownership and likely that permission to build will be sought. Unlikely public would have access to gardens. Residents would lose access to superb 2 acre garden in exchange for retaining derelict 2 acre field with no scientific or aesthetic value. Could get travellers on it.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No

			change.
01418-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	BMPT have sold land to Cala STPP (planning application to be considered 16 July). Appalled by lack of homes for local community and affordable homes for younger generation. Site should be used to provide for the housing needs of Bushey. See Say Yes to Homes campaign. Don't be fooled by local self-interest. This is sneaky attempt to block housing development.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01419-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	Hidden treasure. Can't allow Reveley Lodge to disappear or fall into disrepair. Hard working volunteers. Mrs Chewett would be in favour of selling Paddock to ensure house remained intact. New homes will enhance the area.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category.

			<p>HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01420-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	<p>Object to designation, lack of consultation. Paddock doesn't meet criteria for designation – not beautiful, historically significant or used for recreation. Reveley Lodge garden is far more important. Trust needs to sell the Paddock to fund improvements and ensure long term survival of house and gardens. Change status of Paddock is an attempt to deny the Trust the ability to properly manage their resources in the interests of the wider Bushey community. Without sale likely Reveley Lodge and garden will have to be sold for development – significant loss of local heritage site.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and</p>

			development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01421-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	Gardens open to public. Activities also open to public. Real amenity to people of area. How compare to tatty field which has never been available to public. Money from sale urgently needed for repairs etc – without this will fall into disrepair –leading to dereliction and closure.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are ‘demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance’ and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01422-1-001	02/07/2015	Paddock doesn’t meet criteria for designation – not beautiful,	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green

resident		historically significant or used for recreation. Little local wildlife. Reveley Lodge Garden much more important for wildlife, recreation, historical significance. Open to public. Interesting and varied spaces plants and animals. Sale of Paddock needed to fund improvements and ensure long term survival as amenity for Bushey residents. Allow Paddock to be sold so that infinitely richer space of Reveley lodge and garden can continue to enrich lives of local residents.	Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01423-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	Mrs Chewett wanted house and garden to be cared for by Bushey Museum for the benefit of the people of Bushey. BMPT decided only way to secure future of Reveley Lodge was to sell Paddock. Without it Lodge will have to close. Will be loss in terms of heritage, local history, education, beautiful and peaceful garden. Land sold to Cala STPP. Designation prevents any development and puts future of part Bushey's heritage at risk. BMPT strenuous objection to proposed designation. Designation doesn't take account of loss of social amenity and environmental benefit if Reveley Lodge and garden is closed. Paddock doesn't meet NPPF	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to

		<p>criteria of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. Inspector said must be compelling evidence, and be able to demonstrate that requirements for allocation of LGS are met in full. Impact on Bushey's heritage will be catastrophic.</p>	<p>determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01424-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	<p>Mrs Chewett wanted house and garden to be cared for by Bushey Museum for the benefit of the people of Bushey. BMPT decided only way to secure future of Reveley Lodge was to sell Paddock. Without it Lodge will have to close. Will be loss in terms of heritage, local history, education, beautiful and peaceful garden. Land sold to Cala STPP. Designation prevents any development and puts future of part Bushey's heritage at risk. BMPT strenuous objection to proposed designation. Designation doesn't take account of loss of social amenity and environmental benefit if Reveley Lodge and garden is closed. Paddock doesn't meet NPPF criteria of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. Inspector said must be compelling evidence, and be able to demonstrate that requirements for allocation of LGS are met in full. Impact on Bushey's heritage will be catastrophic.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley</p>

			Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01425-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	Mrs Chewett wanted house and garden to be cared for by Bushey Museum for the benefit of the people of Bushey. BMPT decided only way to secure future of Reveley Lodge was to sell Paddock. Without it Lodge will have to close. Will be loss in terms of heritage, local history, education, beautiful and peaceful garden. Land sold to Cala STPP. Designation prevents any development and puts future of part Bushey's heritage at risk. BMPT strenuous objection to proposed designation. Designation doesn't take account of loss of social amenity and environmental benefit if Reveley Lodge and garden is closed. Paddock doesn't meet NPPF criteria of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. Inspector said must be compelling evidence, and be able to demonstrate that requirements for allocation of LGS are met in full. Impact on Bushey's heritage will be catastrophic.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01426-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	Mrs Chewett wanted house and garden to be cared for by Bushey Museum for the benefit of the people of Bushey. BMPT decided only way to secure future of Reveley Lodge was to sell Paddock.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and

		<p>Without it Lodge will have to close. Will be loss in terms of heritage, local history, education, beautiful and peaceful garden. Land sold to Cala STPP. Designation prevents any development and puts future of part Bushey's heritage at risk. BMPT strenuous objection to proposed designation. Designation doesn't take account of loss of social amenity and environmental benefit if Reveley Lodge and garden is closed. Paddock doesn't meet NPPF criteria of beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. Inspector said must be compelling evidence, and be able to demonstrate that requirements for allocation of LGS are met in full. Impact on Bushey's heritage will be catastrophic.</p>	<p>indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
<p>01427-1-001 Resident. BMPT and BMT Trustee</p>	<p>02/07/2015</p>	<p>Reveley Lodge in desperate need of fundamental renovation-without it will further deteriorate. Trust has been maintaining Lodge as best it can but little funds. Also developed programme of educational and other visits. Hundreds of children visit. Garden maintained by professional gardener supported by volunteers. Open to public. Mrs Chewett didn't leave funds to pay for upkeep. Trustees relying on sale of Paddock for repairs and renovations and to provide income to appoint full time manager and develop programme of activities. If can't develop Paddock will lose potential source of substantial revenue. Bushey Museum doesn't have space or facilities to host visits by school children.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being</p>

			<p>one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01428-1-001 resident	02/07/2015	<p>Field was used for car parking for many years for visitors to Reveley Lodge. Only feasible source of capital for maintaining and repairing Reveley Lodge. Shouldn't preserve Paddock (owned by Charity) for benefit of neighbouring properties which would have been built on open space. Loss of Reveley Lodge and gardens would be far more serious loss to neighbourhood than building on part of the Paddock.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock</p>

			as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01429-1-001 resident	07/07/2015	Object to LGS allocation - looks like it's just been brought forward to stop the proposed development on the site. Need more affordable housing. Development of land crucial to financial support and survival of Reveley Lodge and garden. Garden - setting for public events and concerts, and house once restored has potential as an arts and educational resource.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
01397-1-001 Learning Officer, Bushey Museum and Art Gallery	14/07/2015 Received after Council meeting.	Reveley Lodge needs considerable money spent on it for its upkeep and the only source of that income is from money from the sale of the field. Without this, the house will quickly fall into disrepair and have to be knocked down. Reveley Lodge is an enormous asset, particularly as an educational resource for school children.	The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of

		<p>The garden maintained as originally planned, is also, not just an excellent source of learning , but delightful venue for picnics for local school children. Groups of adults from the community enjoy guided tours of the house and garden, which provide a limited source of income. The garden is open to the general public and the stable block is used for exhibitions.</p>	<p>support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01398-1-001 resident	03/07/2015	<p>Privately owned, Not local beauty spot, overgrown wasteland used occasionally for parking. Not demonstrably special to local community. Major road alongside. Not part of Heath. Bushey needs homes. If designated will lead to sale of Reveley Lodge and garden. Community will lose asset.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the</p>

			<p>designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.</p>
01399-1-001 resident	07/07/2015	<p>Designation would present any development now or in future. No historical nor ecological value. Privately owned, not used for recreation. Bushey residents should remember their houses are built on what used to be open land.</p>	<p>The NPPF makes specific reference to Local Green Spaces which are 'demonstrably special to a local community and hold a particular local significance' and indicates that development here should be ruled out other than in very special circumstances. As the level of support for designating The Paddock as a Local Green Space under Policy SADM36 Local Green Space demonstrates, the site clearly falls within this category. HBC undertook a rigorous criteria-based Green Spaces and Amenity Land Assessment (December 2012) to determine which green spaces should be protected from future development, Local Green Spaces being one of these categories. Council members (8 July 2015) considered the submissions objecting to the designation of this site as Local Green Space on the grounds that monies could potentially be raised from its development to fund the maintenance and development of Reveley House and gardens. The Council is supportive of Bushey Museum and Reveley Lodge and the facilities provided there but it was agreed that the proposed designation of The Paddock as Local Green Space be retained in the Submission Plan (see response to representation 01381/1/001 from</p>

			Bushey Museum Property Trust for further detail). No change.
--	--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------