

Hertsmere Borough Council's
Local Development Framework



Radlett District Centre – Key Locations:
Planning Brief
Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

March 2011

Introduction

The following statement sets out those persons and stakeholders who have been consulted in the preparation of the Hertsmere Borough Council Radlett District Centre – Key Locations: Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD). The statement establishes how those persons were consulted, a summary of the issues raised and how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.

This statement has been produced in accordance with Regulations 17(1)(b) and 18(4)(b) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended).

The individuals and organisations consulted during the preparation of the SPD are listed and a summary of the main issues raised and how these have been addressed in the SPD both prior to and following its publication for consultation on 11 October 2010 is given.

This statement also lists those consulted in relation to the SPD (Appendix A) and provides a schedule of responses (Appendix B). This schedule includes details of how the main issues raised in these representations have been addressed in the SPD.

All consultation has been carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, which was adopted in September 2006.

Informal consultation

Town Centres and Shopping Surveys

As part of work on the Council's Town Centres and Shopping study (July 2008) *retailer and business, and shopper surveys* were carried out in relation to Radlett District Centre. These helped to provide an understanding of the nature and needs of Radlett's centre, and their results were fed into the production of the SPD (see paragraph 3.4 of the SPD).

Member involvement

Local Ward Members, as community advocates, were involved in the preparation of the SPD from an early stage. Members helped to identify locations within and adjoining Radlett District Centre for consideration and were consulted on an initial scoping report for the SPD. These locations were included in the SPD where appropriate.

Members on the *Bushey & Aldenham Planning Committee* were asked for comments once a draft version of the SPD had been prepared for public consultation. Members requested that small changes were made to the section of this draft discussing the former Radlett Fire Station site (for full details, see the minutes of the Committee's 3 June 2010 meeting). These changes were made prior to a draft version of the SPD being finalised for public consultation.

Details of a draft version of the SPD were reported to Members on the *Executive Committee*. This draft was discussed and it was resolved that:

- The contents of the Radlett District Centre – Key Locations: Draft Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), as set out at Appendix A to the report, be agreed, subject to any minor amendments to be agreed by the Head of Planning and Building Control in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning;
 - The views expressed by the Bushey/Aldenham Planning Committee at its meeting on 3 June 2010 in relation to the Brief, as set out at Appendix B, be noted;
 - The alterations made by officers to Radlett District Centre – Key Locations: Draft Planning Brief SPD following the 3 June 2010 meeting of the Bushey/Aldenham Planning Committee be noted;
 - Officers be requested to carry out full public consultation on the Radlett District Centre – Key Locations: Draft Planning Brief SPD and to report back to the Executive on the outcome of that consultation prior to adoption of the Brief; and
 - The Radlett District Centre – Key Locations: Draft Planning Brief SPD be approved for interim development control purposes for all valid applications received and registered on or after 28 June 2010.
- (For full details, see the minutes of the Committee's 23 June 2010 meeting).

Other stakeholder involvement

The *freehold title owners of all sites* addressed in the SPD were invited to meet with Council officers to discuss its proposed contents. *Potential future*

developers who contacted the Council during the production of the SPD were also given the opportunity to talk with officers. These discussions helped to inform the SPD and ensure that the plans of site owners and potential developers could be taken into account where consistent with the Council's Development Plan policies.

Discussions were also held with *Environment Agency officers*, regarding flood risk. This was because the issue was considered to be of particular importance on account of several sites being within areas that were identified as at risk of flooding in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The advice received was fed into the SPD.

Regulation 17 consultation

A letter was sent to over 350 relevant statutory and local stakeholders and local residents (the addressees/details are set out in Appendix 1) as part of consultation on the SPD. Local Ward Members were also notified. The SPD documents, and all other documentation required by Regulation 17 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 (as amended), were made available at deposit points and local libraries, and on the Council's website. The consultation ran from 11 October to 22 November 2010.

A public notice, in accordance with Regulation 17, was posted in the 8 October 2010 edition of the Watford Observer. This advertised the details of the consultation.

Representations received under Regulation 18

A total of 19 representations were received under Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004 (as amended). These were from local residents, and statutory and local stakeholders, including Aldenham Parish Council, The Radlett Society & Green Belt Association, The Environment Agency and Hertfordshire County Council.

A range of different views were expressed and the Council has revised the SPD where appropriate (full details are set out in Appendix B). However, the idea of providing clarity in respect of any development at the locations addressed was generally supported.

Drop-in session

A drop-in session was also held on 2 November 2010 at Christchurch Vision Hall, Radlett, which approximately 30 local residents attended (a summary of the main issues discussed can be found in Appendix C).

Adoption

A summary of the results of the public consultation was reported to the Council's Executive on 9 March 2011.

The Executive resolved to adopt the SPD as part of the Hertsmere Local Development Framework from 16 March 2011. As such, all relevant planning applications registered on or after 16 March 2011 will be determined with regard to the adopted Radlett District Centre – Key Locations: Planning Brief SPD.

Appendix 1 – Schedule of Individuals / Organisations Consulted

Aldenham Parish Council
British Telecom (West London District)
Dandy Booksellers Ltd
EDF Networks
English Heritage
Environment Agency
Hertfordshire County Council (Hertfordshire Property)
Hertfordshire County Council (HCC Highways)
Hertsmere Borough Council (Parking Operations)
Hertsmere Together
Koopmans Property Asset Management
Land Securities Trillium (Nelson)
National Grid Transco
Network Rail
NHS East of England
NHS Hertfordshire
Radlett United Synagogue
Radlett Village Institute
Red House Surgery
Stimpsons
Thames Water
The R M Partnership
The Radlett Society & Green Belt Association
Veolia Water Company

A further 342 local (residential, commercial and other) addresses were consulted.

Appendix 2 – Schedule of representations made under Regulation 18

Name		Representation	Council response	Recommended change(s)
Aldenham Parish Council	1.1	The following sites are potential development sites in Radlett: -Newberries Car Park; -Radlett Village Institute; -Burrell's second yard (rear of Park Road); -Red House Surgery and Post Office; -Telephone Exchange (Park Road); -Youth Centre (Loom Lane); -Radlett United Synagogue; and -Land to rear of Oakway Parade.	A number of these sites are already dealt with in the draft SPD. Planning permission has recently been granted in relation to the Radlett United Synagogue site for a new building (TP/07/1592). As such, it is not thought appropriate for this site to be discussed in the SPD. With regard to the other sites suggested, these will be considered for inclusion in any updated version of the SPD.	None.
	1.2	The Radlett Village Institute (Location C) should not be preserved or extended.	As noted in paragraphs 8.3 of the draft SPD the Radlett Village Institute is entry number 113 on the List of Locally Important Buildings in Hertsmere (2008). Therefore it has already been established that it should be preserved on account of its local interest. In respect of any extension, it is considered that this would be acceptable if it were sensitive to the buildings Local Listing and the adjacent Radlett (South) Conservation Area. Indeed, an extension may allow the building to be better used.	None.
	1.3	The Radlett Village Institute (Location C) should not be used as a Men's Club as this concept is anachronistic.	The Council regards the current use of the site as constituting a community facility and, in line with Policy CS17 of the emerging Core Strategy, would support such a use in the future. However, the Council would most	None.

		likely not oppose the use of the site for a different type of social or community facility.	
1.4	The Newberries Parade and Newberies Car Park (Location B) should be completely redeveloped. The parade of shops is out of date and the risk of flooding on the car park is minimal.	<p>The purpose of the draft SPD is to clarify the Council's existing policies in relation to key locations in Radlett District Centre. Its purpose is not to set out a masterplan for areas of the District Centre.</p> <p>With regard to the car park and flooding, it is considered that evidence collected by the Environment Agency and the Council, in the form of its Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, does not support the assertion that the risk of the car park flooding is minimal. Moreover, as stated in paragraph 7.6 of the draft SPD, the use of the car park is important in terms of the role it plays supporting other appropriate town centre uses.</p>	None.
1.5	The Red House Surgery and Post Office (Location D) should be redeveloped as sheltered housing for the elderly.	Such a use may be acceptable in the light of the Council's existing policies. However, the purpose of the SPD is to make clear the types of development that would be most likely acceptable in light of the Council's existing policies; it is not intended to list or specify exactly what should or could be developed on any of the sites considered.	None.
1.6	The Radlett Village Institute (Location C) should be used by the Radlett United Synagogue.	Please see response to representation 1.5.	None.
1.7	A secondary school should be considered in Radlett.	Hertfordshire County Council is the Local Education Authority (LEA). The provision of	None.

			a secondary school is not within the scope of the SPD and it a matter for the LEA.	
	1.8	Play areas should be provided to the east of Watling Street.	The provision of play areas is not within the scope of the SPD. The Council is currently undertaking an open spaces study that looks at the need for and provision of such facilities.	None.
Private resident	2.1	How will the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) affect the SPD?	The SPD's production has already been budgeted for. It is not, therefore, anticipated that the CSR and related cuts to Council budgets will have any significant impact on it.	None.
Hertfordshire Constabulary	3.1	Secured by Design (SBD) Guides should be mentioned in the section 5 and appendix A of the SPD, as this would make developers aware of SBD principles.	Noted. Change recommended.	SBD guides should be mentioned in section 5 and Appendix A of the SPD.
Network Rail	4.1	No comments.	Noted.	None.
Radlett Village Institute	5.1	The Radlett Village Institute (Location C) is not operated by Aldenham Parish Council, as stated by paragraph 8.2 of the draft SPD. It is an independent charity.	Noted. Change recommended to paragraph 8.2 of the draft SPD.	Change text as follows: This building is currently operated by Aldenham Parish Council a registered charity and used as a community facility.
Private resident	6.1	The former Radlett Fire Station (Location A) should have not been closed and its previous use should be reinstated.	Hertsmere Borough Council is not the Fire and Rescue Authority. Hertfordshire County Council is the authority undertaking the disposal of the former Radlett Fire Station. The purpose of the SPD is to make clear the types of development that would be most likely acceptable in light of the Council's existing policies; it is not intended to list or	None.

			specify exactly what should or could be developed on any of the sites considered.	
	6.2	Burrell & Co. (Location A) should not be used for a commercial or a residential development as it is close to the junction of Watling Street with Park Road. The roundabout here is dangerous.	<p>Hertfordshire County Council, the Highway Authority, has advised the Council that only two traffic accidents took place within 50 metres of the junction of Watling Street with Park Road between 1 August 2005 and 31 July 2010. One of these accidents was serious and the other was slight.</p> <p>Over a period of five years this is not considered an excessively high number of accidents. It is also noted that the subject junction is within a District Centre and that busy roads with high levels of traffic are not uncommon in such locations.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, any proposals for the development of sites discussed within the SPD should be accompanied by evidence demonstrating that there would be an acceptable impact on the safety and operation of the road network. It should be noted that the historic use of the site would have created some traffic generation itself.</p>	None.
	6.3	The former Radlett Fire Station and Burrell & Co. (Location A) should be used as a station for police, ambulance and fire and rescue services.	Please see response to representation 1.5.	None.
	6.4	The Radlett Service Station (Location A) should remain as it is the only petrol	As stated in paragraph 6.10 of the draft SPD, the Council would support the	None.

	station in close proximity to Radlett.	retention of a petrol station in this location. However, it is not considered that the Council could object to any otherwise acceptable development of the Radlett Service Station on the basis that the petrol station would be lost, given the relative close proximity of other similar facilities.	
6.5	Location A should be included within the Radlett (North) Conservation Area.	The Radlett (North) Conservation Area has recently been appraised. It was concluded that the Radlett Service Station/Regency House and the former Radlett Fire Station do not merit inclusion within the Conservation Area. However, the Council's planning policies and the draft SPD itself require that any development will need to preserve the special character or appearance and the setting of the adjoining Conservation Area.	The Radlett (North) Conservation Area Appraisal 2010 should be mentioned in section 5 of the SPD.
6.6	Newberries Car Park (Location B) should not be developed.	The draft SPD recommends that the Car Park remain in its current use.	None.
6.7	The Radlett Village Institute (Location C) should not be physically altered, but it could be better used.	The draft SPD recommends that the Radlett Village Institute continue to be used as community facility. Although it is considered that it may be possible for an extension to the existing building to take place, it is recommended that this building be preserved on account of its local interest.	None.
6.8	Red House Surgery and Post Office (Location D) should swap sites so that the doctors surgery can have a bigger premises and the Post Office can downsize.	Such an arrangement may be acceptable in the light of the Council's existing policies. However, the purpose of the SPD is to make clear the types of development that would most likely be acceptable in light of the	None.

		Council's existing policies; it is not intended to list or specify exactly what should or could be developed on any of the sites considered.		
	6.9	The public drop in session for the consultation on the draft SPD should have been better advertised.	<p>The Council followed its statutory duties in respect of publicising the public consultation on the draft SPD. Additional measures were also undertaken to ensure that Radlett residents living closest to the sites considered were aware of this process. A public notice was placed in the local newspaper and a press release issued which also generated coverage in the local press. The consultation undertaken followed those measures set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement</p> <p>As key local bodies, Aldenham Parish Council and the Radlett Society and Green Belt Association were also made aware of the consultation. The public noticeboard outside the Radlett Centre contained details of the consultation and drop-in session.</p>	Not applicable.
Private resident	7.1	The consultation on the draft SPD should have been better advertised.	Please see response to representation 6.9.	None.
	7.2	The Radlett Service Station (Location A) should remain as it is the only petrol station in close proximity to Radlett. The flats in Regency House (Location A) should also remain.	Please see response to representation 6.4.	None.
	7.3	The former Radlett Fire Station's (Location A) previous use should be reinstated.	Please see response to representation 6.1.	None.

	7.4	Burrell & Co. (Location A) should be used as a station for police and ambulance services.	Please see response to representation 1.5.	None.
	7.5	The former Radlett Fire and Burrell & Co. (Location A) should not be used for a commercial or a residential development as they are close to the junction of Watling Street with Park Road. The roundabout here is dangerous.	Please see response to representation 6.2.	None.
	7.6	Newberries Car Park (Location B) should not be developed.	Please see response to representation 6.6.	None.
	7.7	The Radlett Village Institute (Location C) should be better used.	The Council may support proposals that would allow for the site to be used more intensively as a community facility, provided they are otherwise acceptable in planning terms.	None.
	7.8	Red House Surgery and Post Office (Location D) should swap sites so that the doctors surgery can have a bigger premises and the Post Office can downsize.	Please see response to representation 6.8.	None.
Private resident	8.1	The consultation on the draft SPD should have been better advertised.	Please see response to representation 6.9.	None.
	8.2	What is the purpose of having another guidance document?	As stated in paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 of the draft SPD, the draft SPD sets out the constraints and planning policy contexts for the four locations. It provides advice on how the Council's existing policies should be applied. Its aims are to ensure that key development opportunities in and	None.

		immediately adjoining Radlett District Centre are maximised and to guide any development in order that it enhances the existing character, appearance and function of this Centre.	
8.3	Why the four locations chosen? Why is there not a strategy for the whole of Radlett District Centre or a masterplan in relation to Location A?	<p>The four locations have been identified, at the request of local Councillors acting as community representatives, as important locations that are potentially subject to current development pressures.</p> <p>A strategy for Radlett, as part of Hertsmere, is set out in the draft Core Strategy DPD (December 2010). With regard to a possible masterplan for Location A, it is not considered that the Location is large enough to warrant the commissioning of a masterplan.</p>	None.
8.4	There should not be a comprehensive redevelopment of Location A, and each site should be developed separately.	It is not considered that Location A should necessarily be developed as a single building. However, the Council would welcome a comprehensive approach to the development of the three sites that make up this Location, in that it is thought that developments that compliment each other in terms of their appearance and use would be positive.	None.
8.5	In paragraph 6.11, the draft SPD mentions the potential for two or three storeys of accommodation at Location A. What is meant by this?	Two or three storeys is intended to mean a building of this height, which might include a ground-floor, a first-floor and second-floor level accommodation with its roof space, when viewed from the principal elevation(s).	References to potential buildings heights at Location A should be amended to make clear what is meant by two or three storey and from which elevation(s) this needs to be considered.

		The slope of the land on this side of Watling Street has also resulted in an additional floor of accommodation at the rear of many properties. Notwithstanding this, the most important consideration would be existing policy that requires any development in the Location to be appropriate in terms of its height, scale and bulk. The reference to two or three storeys of accommodation is intended as guidance in relation to what a developer may be able to achieve in this location. It is not policy, as it is not possible for SPDs to create new policy.	
8.6	Any mix of uses included in the development of Location A should include community or social uses due to the former use of the former Radlett Fire Station site. Small scale offices and flats would be acceptable. But any retail units should be subject to an assessment of the impact it would have on other nearby shops.	<p>Paragraph 6.37 of the draft SPD recommends that a mixed-use development, incorporating a community or social facility and small retail units may be appropriate at Location A.</p> <p>It is not thought reasonable for the Council to request an assessment of impact in respect of any retail units as such a requirement would not accord with PPS4. Indeed, Location A is within a designated District Centre and retail development of the scale likely to take place is planned for in the Council's Development Plan in District Centres.</p>	None.
8.7	The SPD should set building lines, plot ratios, etc. in relation to Location A.	The SPD is not a masterplan and is not intended to be overly prescriptive.	None.
8.8	It should be ensured that any development at Location A includes an	An adequate level of car parking should be provided in relation to any new development.	Update SPD to include information about the amendments to the Parking

	adequate level of car parking.	It is noted that amendments Council's Parking Standards SPD, which make a presumption in favour of the maximum level of car parking provision, have been approved for development control purposes since the publication of the draft SPD. These were highlighted in an update note issued at the time of public consultation and should be incorporated in the SPD.	Standards SPD.
	8.9 Newberries Car Park (Location B) should remain in its current use.	Please see response to representation 6.6.	None.
	8.10 In relation to the Radlett Village Institute (Location C), the SPD should use the same wording to state that the demolition of the existing building would not be acceptable as that used in relation to the Post Office (Location D).	Different wording is used in relation to the Council's likely resistance towards the demolition of Locally Listed buildings at Locations C and D on account of Location C having just one building and Location D having two buildings on site. One of the buildings at Location D is not Locally Listed and the Council would not, therefore, necessarily oppose the demolition of the Red House Surgery.	None.
	8.11 The two buildings at Location D are not single-storey.	Noted. Change recommended to paragraph 9.2 of the draft SPD.	Change text as follows: There are two buildings, both of which are single <u>two</u> -storey.
	8.12 The SPD should be clear as to what type of use would be acceptable at the Red House Surgery site (Location D). This site with the Post Office would be a good location for the Radlett United Synagogue.	With regard to the suggested use of the Post Office site for the Radlett United Synagogue, please see response to representation 1.5.	Paragraphs 9.10-11 of the draft SPD should be amended to state the Council's position in relation to a potential change of use of the Post Office site away from a social and community facility.
Private resident	9.1 There are parking problems in Radlett. Any development at Location A should	Please see response to representation 8.8.	See recommendations made in relation to representation 8.8.

		include an adequate level of car parking.		
	9.2	Paragraph 6.15 states that development at Location A could draw people towards Oakway Parade. Where would they park?	There are a number of on-street car parking spaces outside of the Oakway Parade. There are other on-street spaces within Radlett District Centre, and off-street spaces within Newberries Car Park. Moreover, paragraph 6.15 is referring to people travelling by foot, who may be drawn further north along Watling Street by the development of Location A.	None.
Private resident	10.1	The Red House Surgery (Location D) should remain on the same location as this is well placed in relation to local amenities. The same is true of the adjoining Post Office.	As stated in paragraph 9.10 of the draft SPD, the Council would support the retention of these uses within Radlett District Centre. It is considered that District Centre locations are general well placed in relation to local amenities.	None.
	10.2	Could anything be built on Newberries Car Park (Location B) if parking were retained on the ground floor.	As stated in paragraph 7.5 of the draft SPD, Newberries Car Park is thought to be at a high risk of flooding. It is, therefore, unlikely that the Council would support the development of this site for water sensitive uses, even if the existing level of car parking were retained on the site.	None.
	10.3	Parking would be a problem in relation to any development of Location A.	Please see response to representation 8.8.	See recommendation made in relation to representation 8.8.
	10.4	The following are potential development sites within Radlett: -Phillimore Recreation Ground; -Fair Field School Playing Field; and -Youth Centre (Loom Lane).	These sites will be considered for inclusion in any updated version of the SPD.	None.

	10.5	There is a need for a Sure Start Family Centre or similar in the local area.	Hertfordshire County Council is the Local Authority responsible for Sure Start Family Centres. The provision of such a centre is not within the scope of the SPD and it a matter for the relevant Local Authority.	None.
	10.6	Radlett Village Institute (Location C) is in use but has limited parking.	As stated in paragraph 8.8 of the draft SPD, any proposed development of Location C should include an adequate level of car parking provision.	None.
Private resident	11.1	Agree with the comments Set out in representation 8.	Noted. See Council response to representation 8.	See recommendations made in relation to representation 8.
English Heritage	12.1	Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment (PPS5) should be mentioned in the section 4 of the SPD, given the importance of historic conservation in Radlett.	Noted. Change recommended.	PPS5 should be mentioned in section 4.
	12.2	The approach of the draft SPD to the historic environment is welcomed.	Noted.	None.
Thames Water	13.1	A note should be added to the SPD informing developers of their responsibility in relation to sewerage and waste water and of Thames Water's contact details.	Noted. Change recommended	The suggested information should be added to the SPD.
The Radlett Society & Green Belt Association	14.1	The Brief fails to mention other main roads in Radlett aside from Watling Street.	Noted.	None.
	14.2	Any proposals should reflect the wider context and character of Radlett. Could a masterplan be produced?	Please see response to representation 8.3.	None.
	14.3	Radlett Service Station (Location A) should remain as the petrol station on	Please see response to representation 6.4.	Amend paragraph 6.10 to remove reference to the petrol station on Radlett

	Colney Street has closed.		Road.
14.4	The former Radlett Fire Station (Location A) should include a substantial public use such as a Sure Start Centre.	Please see response to representation 1.5.	None.
14.5	Location A links retail areas in the north and south of Radlett and there should be an active frontage, including a retail use or similar at ground-floor level.	As stated in paragraph 6.15 of the draft SPD, the Council would encourage ground-floor uses that would support the vitality of Radlett District Centre.	None.
14.6	The SPD should define what would be acceptable for Location A in terms of massing, scale etc. and detailed design in general.	Please see response to representation 8.7.	None
14.7	Location A should be included within the Radlett (North) Conservation Area.	Please see response to representation 6.5.	See recommendation made in relation to representation 6.5.
14.8	It may be possible for Burrell's second yard (rear of Park Road) to be used for car parking in relation to Location A.	Such an arrangement may be acceptable in the light of the Council's existing policies.	None.
14.9	The Radlett Society should be allowed to comment on any pre-application proposals that the Council receives in relation to Location A.	The Radlett Society will be consulted in relation to any proposal at the appropriate stage.	None.
14.10	The draft SPD is supported in relation to Location B.	Noted.	None.
14.11	The draft SPD is supported in relation to Location C.	Noted.	None.
14.12	Red House Surgery and the Post Office (Location D) should remain as they are well located in relation to local amenities. It may be possible for the	Please see response to representation 10.1.	None.

		Red House Surgery to extend onto land to the rear of the Post Office site.		
	14.13	The growth of internet shopping makes the Sorting Office to the rear of the Post Office (Location C) a valuable facility.	Noted. Notwithstanding that the sorting office is a useful facility, it is not considered to be a social or community facility and would not, therefore, receive the same level of protection as the Post Office.	None.
Private resident	15.1	The roundabout at the junction of Watling Street with Park Road is dangerous and the development of Location A should not create additional traffic	Please see response to representation 6.2.	None.
	15.2	Development at Location A should not be three-storeys high.	Please see response to representation 8.5.	See recommendation made in relation to representation 8.8.
	15.3	Location D could be used for the United Reformed Synagogue.	Please see response to representation 1.5.	None.
	15.4	Location A should not be used for anything that is not a community use as it should be used for the benefit of the community.	Location A is currently used for a number of different purposes. Whilst it is noted that the former Radlett Fire Station would be subject to existing policies that would promote the provision of a social or community facility, the future use of Radlett Service Station/Regency House and Burrell & Co. would not be restricted in this way. This is reflected in section 6 of the draft SPD.	None.
	15.5	The Red House Surgery (Location D) could extend onto the Post Office site.	Please see response to representation 6.8.	None.
	15.6	Newberries Car Park (Location B) should remain in its current use. It could be made two-storey. But a market on this site would not be good	Please see responses to representations 6.6 and 10.2. Comments in respect of a market are noted;	None.

		idea if it was held at the weekend.	however, the purpose of the SPD is to make clear the types of development that would be most likely acceptable in light of the Council's existing policies. It is not intended to list or specify exactly what should or could be developed on any of the sites considered.	
	15.7	The Radlett Village Institute building (Location C) should be preserved.	Please see response to representation 6.7.	None.
The Phillimore Trust	16.1	No comments.	Noted.	None.
Private resident	17.1	Agree with the comments set out in representation 8.	Noted. See Council response to representation 8.	See recommendations made in relation to representation 8.
	17.2	Parking meters should be put outside Oakway Parade.	Noted. This is not a matter that is relevant to the SPD; however, these comments have been passed on the relevant officer.	None.
Environment Agency	18.1	Any new development should accord with the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk. In particular, new developments along any river corridor should be set-back and the opportunity to provide open space in these locations should be taken.	The Council would require all new development to comply with national and local policy in relation to flooding. However, as stated within the draft SPD, a site specific Flood Risk Assessment should support any development proposal. The Council would make reference to such a document when determining any planning application.	The likely requirement for site specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) should be clarified and developers should also be advised to contact the Environment Agency direct for advice.
	18.2	Opportunities should be taken to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems into any development.	Noted.	None.
	18.3	Any new homes should be built to be water efficient.	Noted.	None.
	18.4	Any sites located with Flood Zones 2	See response to representation 18.1.	See recommendation made in relation

		and 3 should be accompanied by an FRA.		to representation 18.1.
	18.5	A Preliminary Risk Assessment should accompany development proposals made in relation to any sites with previous uses that may have given rise to contamination.	Noted. Change recommended.	The requirements for Preliminary Risk Assessments should be clarified.
Hertfordshire County Council	19.1	The draft SPD is generally welcomed in its approach, though there should be more detailed design guidance.	See Council response to representation 8.7.	None.
	19.2	The brief does not explain why it deals with the four locations.	See Council response to representation 8.3.	None.
	19.3	In paragraphs 4.1 and 4.6 of the draft SPD it is not clear to which of the locations the document is referring.	Noted. Changes recommended to paragraphs 4.1 and 4.6.	Change paragraph 4.1 text as follows: The locations addressed through this Brief are either within or, as in the case of one location C, immediately adjoin the area defined as Radlett District Centre within the Hertsmere Local Plan (2003). Change paragraph 4.6 text as follows: In respect of the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), the Parking Standards SPD (2008) is particularly relevant because two of the locations A and D discussed are within residential and non-residential accessibility zones 3, as defined in this document.
	19.4	The proposals maps within the Hertsmere Local Plan (2003) are	The draft SPD sets out all relevant planning restrictions for individual sites, including	None.

	unclear and make site level assessments difficult. The SPD should provide clarity to aid assessments.	those set out on the Local Plan proposals map. It is considered, therefore, that the SPD will provide clarity in this respect.	
19.5	The draft SPD states that the Radlett (North) Conservation Area is being reviewed, but there is nothing in relation to this on Hertsmere's website.	The Radlett (North) Conservation Area Appraisal has been finalised and agreed by the Council. Change recommended.	The SPD should be amended to reflect that the Radlett (North) Conservation Area Appraisal has been agreed and the relevant webpage should be signposted.
19.6	<p>The former Radlett Fire Station (Location A) is not considered to be community facility as it was not used as a centre where services or care were provided to members of the public nor was there any general public access (such as a fire station, council depot, waste transfer station or purely administrative offices). Furthermore the County Council is now operating the Fire and Rescue Service for the community using alternative sites.</p> <p>This stance is corroborated by looking at the use class it would reasonably be considered to fall within, which in this case is a sui generis use, compared to a use class for an asset owned and used by the community. The document does not make the appropriate distinction between the different types of asset.</p> <p>As such, Hertsmere should not require that a significant part of this site be</p>	<p>Hertsmere Borough Council considers the former Radlett Fire Station to be a community facility. Whilst it is noted that members of the public did not come onto the site to use the Fire and Rescue Service it is considered that such a facility is different from a depot or purely administrative offices. Community uses can cover a range of use classes operated by various organisations, alongside D1 and D2 uses operated by local authorities, including C2 (care homes), Sui Generis (community theatres) and A3 (rural pubs). Indeed, the Draft Revised Core Strategy (2010) lists accommodation for emergency services as a key community facility. Emergency services are vital to the community and the location of their accommodation is strategically important.</p> <p>Policy S1 in the Local Plan and draft revised Core Strategy Policy CS18 set the parameters for the use of redundant or displaced facilities and the basis upon which replacement or alternative community facilities will be sought, before any other</p>	The way in which Policy S1 of the Local Plan and Policy CS18 of the draft revised Core Strategy will be applied will be clarified in the wording of the document.

		retained for a community use.	development is considered. The way in which these policies will be applied does need to be set out clearly in the Brief.	
--	--	-------------------------------	--	--

Appendix C – Drop-in session comments summary

- The former Radlett Fire Station site should be used as a location for combined Fire, Police and Ambulance services
- The junction of Watling Street with Park Road is dangerous and new development would exacerbate this problem
- Adequate car parking should be provided in relation to any new development, especially at Location A, as car parking is a problem at this end of Radlett District Centre
- The Radlett Service Station should not be lost, as other nearby petrol stations are too far away
- The brief refers to an alternative petrol station (Colney Street), which has now closed
- Pay and display in the bay outside Oakway parade would help to increase turnover of shoppers
- If Regency House is lost there should be some affordable housing developed in its place
- General support was expressed for a farmers market or similar at Newberries Car Park, though one person thought this would have a negative affect on local shops
- The Radlett Village Institute is underused, however, it should be retained, as it is important to Radlett's character as a village, and it should be used more for community purposes
- There might be scope to have additional parking to the rear of the Village Institute but the gradients may make this difficult to achieve
- If the Radlett Village Institute site is used in a more intense way then this would add to traffic on the roundabout at the junction of Watling Street and Theobald Street and a new access may be required
- The Sure Start Children's Centre is looking for a site and could use the Radlett Village Institute
- If the Red House Surgery were to move sites this could cause car parking problems elsewhere in Radlett
- The Red House Surgery should not move from its current site, as it is well located at the moment being opposite the two pharmacies in Radlett
- If the Red House Surgery were to move, then Affordable housing should be provided on the existing site
- There would be an adverse impact on existing pharmacies on Watling Street if a new one were to open as part of a relocated Red House Surgery development
- Vehicular access to the Newberries car park could be improved
- The Newberries Car park is important in accessing shops, the Red House surgery and the post office, but the former Radlett Fire Station site is not well served by the car park due to its lack of proximity
- The post office should be retained
- The post office and Red House Surgery should swap sites
- Other sites should be included in the Brief: The Village Hall (22 Watling Street), Radlett Youth Centre (2 Loom Lane) and First Place Nurseries (Cobden Hill)

- The roundabout at the junction of Watling Street, Shenley Hill and Aldenham Road is problematic
- Not enough people were informed about the consultation: more letters should have been sent to local residents' houses and it should have been advertised in local papers other than the Watford Observer