

Appendix 09: Chronology and Transcripts with Prescribed Bodies



Affinity Water

Email	Contents
08/10/2025 - Email from AECOM to Affinity Water	Introduction and Request for shapefiles
04/11/2025 - Email from Affinity Water to AECOM	response to questions asked in introduction email.
10/11/2025 - Email from AECOM to Affinity Water	Request for Shapefiles
18/11/2025 - Email from Affinity Water to AECOM	Shapefiles attached
26/11/2025 - Email from AECOM to Affinity Water	Confirming that Hertsmere's housing needs are up to date
28/11/2025 - Email from Affinity Water - To AECOM	Request for a meeting
28/11/2025 - Email from AECOM to Affinity Water	Availability for the meeting
02/12/2025 - Email from Affinity Water - ACEOM	Availability for the meeting
03/12/2025 - Email from AECOM to HBC	Availability for the meeting
03/12/2025 - Email from HBC to Affinity Water	Confirmation of Duty to Co-operate
03/12/2025 - Email from Affinity Water to HBC	Confirmation of duty to co-operate and meeting
18/12/2025 - Email from AECOM to HBC	Summary of meeting
29/12/2025 - Email from HBC to AECOM	Thanks and acknowledgment of summary
18/02/2025 - Email from AECOM to Affinity Water	Consultation on the IDP proforma

09/12/2025 - Notes from the meeting between Affinity Water, AECOM and Hertsmere Borough Council Meeting

AECOM

Hertsmere

Affinity Water

Water Cycle Study –

Why is there such a discrepancy between Hertsmere's Housing numbers and Affinity Waters numbers?

Mapping is needed for Affinity Water to see the spread of growth across the borough and potential starting points for development.

Want to work with infrastructure partners to ensure the existing and future residents to ensure everything is in place for a collaboration.

The new number of 1000+ has not come out of nowhere, it's been dictated from central government and their standard method calculation. The figure is available from the government and is something the borough needs to meet that requirement.

The 1112 units is a baseline figure. 16000 new homes over the plan period, spread out over the plan period. The focus for growth is in Borehamwood which will be delivered through a mix of site typologies such as large and medium urban regeneration sites and the potential structuring urban extensions to the north of Borehamwood and smaller ones around the edge of Borehamwood.

Potters Bar will also see similar growth typologies but on a small scale. Many of the sites being considered by the council are already in the system and may not come as a surprise to the development industry.

We will be asking those sites to be working a lot harder than they currently are, to ensure the development opportunities to ensure there is no sprawl over the greenbelt, we are actively seeking to prevent that by intensification of existing sites.

Bushey and Radlett have fewer urban regeneration opportunities but have some opportunities around their edges for medium scale urban intensification.

As National Policy guides us, as per the NPPF, we are considering a 30 year timeline as the government are pushing for new housing the borough is considering a new settlement and is promoted in the media – Bowmans Cross. It could be considered a large urban extension to London Colney.

The council is engaging with the mayor through the GLA and we understand that are looking to meet their housing need within their boundaries. However, we are mindful that employment and logistics might be situated outside of the capital, such as warehouses and Data centres, the latter which consume a lot of water. Which is a strategic issue and could be considered a national planning issue rather than one for just Hertsmere. Intensification around rail stations is something which the council is considering within Hertsmere, once HBC get around to sharing their site allocations, areas around stations are on the list.

How many houses will be released to market per year? 50-100 or more?

In order to have a sound plan we will need to demonstrate that we can meet our housing need in full and a 5 year housing land supply at the point of adoption. This will include how many houses will be released per annum – this will need to be an ongoing discussion with developers. The industry does need to step up and work with local planning authorities to meet the ambition.

When is the council looking at starting to build on Bowmans Cross?

Given the strategic nature of the site, it's unlikely that Bowmans Cross will not come forward until years 11-15 of the plan period.

The WMP works in 5 year cycles, every 5 years they have to put together long term water. They look ahead to 50 years, when the plan was put together is from 2022/23 which means numbers are so skewed. Any changes beyond that, will be looked at in the next 5 year update which is taking place now/net year. It's an adaptive plan which plans for medium growth however they take uncertainty into consideration. There are uncertainties as they are working across two large areas, NW London and up to Luton. When they look at the uncertainty globally, they have overheads to accommodate new growth.

For Hertsmere they had 278 homes, which came from the old Local Plan in 2016 and they were working with the best info they had at the time. Teddy works on Hydraulic modelling which takes into place where the infrastructure is needed in the system and then they consider how to upgrade.

The question for Affinity Water is timing and when we expect these houses to be occupied as that then the surge will start and does this align with their plan e.g. is it within the 5 year period or not. The overall strategic plan between now and 2033 which is when the grand union canal is unlocked bringing 100m litres down from Birmingham to this area. Along with network upgrades to move the water from the west to the east and south to north. Aiming between own and 25050 to allow for a new 'motorway' of pipes.

Demand reduction targets – 110 litres per person per day by 2050 – in this area there is a very high consumption which need to be reduced. People not on a meter have a high consumption and people who aren't have a low consumption. Incorporating in smart meters and other interventions.

Data centres – no water company has this forecast in the WMP's it came very late and after 2024 and there was no public information. Systems have only just started to pick up on that, in WMP 2029 these will be included in the plan, policies have been started to develop internally at Affinity Water. Affinity Water don't want to hinder development however it is an issue when data centres are concerned.

Affinity Water requests that an early insight is given when it comes to data centres so that they can think about it. Some water companies are now declining water requests to data centres. What is sustainable and what isn't sustainable is a big question. The EA has indicated that we will have to minimise ground water extraction.

Just to confirm that we won't be able to manipulate these numbers downwards, development is being forced on us, the ability to resist has gone. Data centres are a national infrastructure issue which is bigger than the Hertsmere Local Plan, however thoughts here today are how

can Hertsmere help affinity and vice versa to make this work. If you're looking for a possible date for development, its likely to be 2-4 years from this date.

Water demand calculations, recommending reducing the water demand as low as possible by adding in lots of forms of water recycling. At the moment Affinity is banking on demand reduction from smart water meters, tackling leakage etc which is all being factored in to the water cycle study.

Next Steps:

Scoping Study for the water cycle study. Helpful for affinity water to review and provide comments.

For the more detailed study they need further numbers, able to send the allocations to affinity water etc.

Cadent Gas

Email

03/12/2025 - Email from HBC to Cadent Gas
03/12/2025 - Email from Cadent Gas to HBC
18/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to Cadent Gas
10/03/2026 - Email from HBC to Cadent Gas

Contents

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
automatic email
Consultation on Hertsmere IDP proforma
Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

Civil Aviation Authority

Email

02/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere
21/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere
22/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Contents

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

Environment Agency

Email

04/11/2025 - Email from AECOM to EA
06/11/2025 - Email from AECOM to EA
07/11/2025 - Email from EA to AECOM
10/11/2025 - Email from EA to AECOM
11/11/2025 - Email from AECOM to EA
12/11/2025 - Email from EA to AECOM
28/11/2025 - Email from Hertsmere
15/12/2025 - Email from Environment Agency

Contents

Request for EA to review IDP proforma
Follow up to previous email
Clarification of the IDP proforma
Clarification of the IDP proforma
Clarification of the IDP proforma
Receipt of previous email
Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
Acknowledgement from the EA

19/12/2025 - Email from Environment Agency	Request for current and existing site allocations shape files
22/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere Borough Council	Update on the site sifting process and re-establishing contact in the New Year
24/12/2025 - Email from Environment Agency	agreed to re-establishing in the New year
19/01/26 - Email from the Environment Agency	Request for the shape files
20/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere	Approval of request
20/01/2026 - Email from the Environment Agency	Receipt of previous email.
26/01/2026 - Email from the Environment Agency	Request for shapefiles
26/01/2026 - Secure email from HBC to EA	Confidential Shapefiles sent
26/01/2026 - Email from HBC to EA	Confirmation of secure email sent
26/01/2026 - Email from EA to HBC	Acknowledgment of shapefiles

Historic England

Email

01/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere
27/01/2025 - Email from Hertsmere
28/01/2026 - Email from Historic England
03/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere
03/02/2026 - Email from Historic England
03/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere
12/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere
24/02/2026 - email from Hertsmere
24/02/2026 - Email from Historic England

Contents

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
Follow up to previous email
Acknowledgement and set up of meeting
proposal of meeting dates
confirmation of meeting dates
Circulation of meeting link
Reschedule of meeting and link
Agenda for the meeting on 24/02/2026
Link for heritage advice on sites.

24_02_2026 Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with Historic England

Executive Summary

A Duty-to-Co-operate meeting was held on 24 February 2026 between Hertsmere Borough Council and Historic England to discuss heritage-related considerations for the emerging Hertsmere Local Plan. The Council outlined its ambitious timetable to reach Regulation 18 consultation by mid-April 2026 and submit the new Local Plan before 31 December 2026 under transitional arrangements. The Plan is being prepared under the current planning system, with a strong commitment to achieving a sound and legally compliant submission.

Hertsmere explained the forthcoming spatial strategy, focusing primarily on urban regeneration and intensification within Borehamwood and Potters Bar, supplemented by urban extensions around Radlett and Bushey and a proposed new settlement at Bowman's Cross, which may affect Tyttenhanger Abbey (Grade I listed).

Historic England raised concerns about the potential impact of taller buildings on heritage assets, even where tall buildings already exist. They emphasised the importance of clear evidence showing how heritage constraints have been assessed, particularly regarding site allocations and building heights.

HBC confirmed that AECOM has been commissioned to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), including site-specific assessments and recommendations for mitigation and enhancement. HE agreed to provide their Advice Note 3 on site allocations to support this work.

Historic England encouraged early engagement where significant heritage sensitivities arise and agreed to review documents at Reg 18 and Reg 19, as well as provide high-level

feedback to AECOM if needed. Both parties agreed that ongoing dialogue and clear record-keeping will support Statements of Common Ground later in the process.

Attendees

Hertsmere Borough Council

- Planning Policy Team Leader
- Planning Policy Officer, Duty-to-Co-operate lead

Historic England

- Historic Environment Planning Advisor (Herts, Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk)

Actions

Actions for Hertsmere Borough Council

1. Share Historic England's Advice Note 3 with AECOM so that its methodology informs the Heritage Impact Assessment.
2. Provide Historic England with advance notice of Reg 18 (and Reg 19) consultation dates and documentation.
3. Ensure the Heritage Impact Assessment is site-specific, assessing impacts on significance, setting, and mitigation for all candidate sites.
4. Include clear heritage policies within the Local Plan (estimated 3–4 policies), reflecting NPPF consistency and local distinctiveness.

Actions for Historic England

1. Send Advice Note 3 (site allocations guidance) to HBC for circulation to AECOM.
2. Provide high-level feedback to AECOM on the overall approach to the HIA if requested, especially regarding methodology.
3. Review HEELAs and/or sample site assessments if HBC chooses to share drafts, focusing on heritage-related gaps.

Joint / Ongoing Actions

1. Maintain dialogue throughout the plan-making process, noting areas of agreement or disagreement for future Statements of Common Ground.
2. Monitor tall-building implications and ensure evidence sufficiently demonstrates consideration of impacts on heritage setting

24_02_2026 Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with Historic England Transcript

[0:02 - 0:22] Historic England:

I work for Historic England. I'm a historic environment planning advisor covering Hertfordshire, Essex, Suffolk and a bit of Norfolk. So basically, you know, we work on advising mainly on local plans and the new spatial development strategies, SPDs and that kind of thing. Everything planning policy comes to us.

[0:28 - 0:47] Hertsmere Borough Council 1 :

My name is X. I am a Planning Policy Officer at Hertsmere, currently overseeing the duty to cooperate project. So yeah, you've obviously been in contact with me setting up this meeting and going forward it will be me and Karol who are the points of contact.

[0:48 - 1:04] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Thank you, X. My name is X. I'm the Council's Planning Policy Team leader, leading on the on the preparation of the borough's new local plan. I think that's probably all you need to know about me, to be honest. I've done this once or twice before, so hopefully we have a reasonable idea of what we need to be doing in order to ensure a legally compliant and sound local plan, which is our key objective.

[1:30 - 1:47] Historic England:

I mean, actually, something you could potentially help me on, because you'll probably be more up to speed on this than me, but obviously the changes coming through the system in terms of plan-making process and the revised, the overhaul of the NPPF. Are you preparing your plan under the existing system, or are you kind of hedging your bets and trying to make a plan that's, I suppose, future-proof?

[2:00 - 2:47] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think that's a very interesting question and it's a really good hook to open the meeting upon. So I'll go straight into it and I suspect what I'll say in the next five minutes will answer your question completely. But the point you raise about a new planning system which we and the government that we still know very little about in terms of what it will contain is a good one. So just briefly, because I think your question raises one or two other issues, we are seeking to do the duty to cooperate correctly. It is a legal requirement that, as an observer, I've seen many local authorities around the country fall over with, and I can imagine there would be nothing worse than on day two of an examination in public hearing session find that the inspectors are unhappy with the activities that the council has undertaken to discharge the duty.

So we are seeking to do this properly. So I suspect you are, as a key partner, in this process. English heritage are key to that, but I suspect that you're not quite in the first tier of partners. What I mean by that is our immediate neighbours who we are speaking to much

more frequently and in a lot more detail. So I suspect where we go from this meeting forwards will be subtly different from where we are going with those immediate strategic partners that we physically have cross-boundary issues with. In terms of the new planning system, we've been told that the duty to cooperate will disappear.

I think regardless of that, I know from my own experiences, it's still going to be something in a matter that inspectors will in some way or another interrogate us and scrutinise through the examination process. So I don't think that in any potential cancellation of the duty does not invalidate what we are doing. There is no strategic planning tier that is on the horizon to replace the duty in Hertfordshire.

Obviously, we are an authority that will be affected by local government reorganisation. That in itself is still unknown in terms of how the pie will be sliced up. So I think the sensible approach is that we continue business as usual through this and we have a robust, sound and legally compliant set of evidence that demonstrates we've done what's necessary.

That's a long way around of getting to the point which is we are progressing our local plan under the current system. We are seeking to get to submission stage under the current transition arrangements, which means that we have a deadline of the 31st December this year to submit. That is prohibition because we've yet to go out to regulation 18 consultation but we think we can do it. Obviously there are some hurdles that we'll need to cross but I think if our members are serious about the objectives that they have set themselves we can get there.

[6:34 - 6:46] Historic England:

I was going to say, so you've not had any kind of formal stages yet, but presumably you've been working behind the scenes to kind of get something ready to go out with.

[6:48 - 7:00] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

And I think that's going to form the bulk of what we discuss over the next 20 minutes or so, just filling you in on what we have done and where we are going very shortly. So there was historically a Regulation 18 consultation published in April 2024. That document was, I would respectfully describe as a sort of an old-style issues and options consultation document.

So it sort of set some of the issues that face the borough, it identified as sort of a suite of possible candidate sites, but it didn't include an appropriate spatial strategy. It didn't set out a sort of housing requirement or housing target for the borough. It didn't naturally or iteratively or consequentially lead to a Reg 18 stage.

So there was always going to be the need for some sort of bridging Regulation 18 consultation. Obviously since April 2024 a lot has changed, not least a new NPPF and a new housing requirement based on a new standard method figure. That standard method figure is significantly higher than what the borough had in April 2024, so effectively what we are working on in terms of growth is an increase from, I believe it was around 260 new homes per annum to somewhere around 11 to 1200 new homes per annum.

[8:55 - 8:55] Historic England:

Okay. So what kind of percentage increase is that? That's enormous. Significant. I'm not even going to do the math. It's a big one.

[9:10 - 9:35] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think the key message that we've been giving to partners during the course of these duty to cooperate meetings is that we intend to meet our needs in full. My advice that I've been giving to members and senior officers is that we cannot submit a plan that we believe is sound without meeting needs in full plans that are coming forward that don't meet their needs in full are not being found sound and the whole process is abortive.

I would add that at that point in time where local authorities could possibly argue about their abilities or capacity to meet need - the time when such approaches could have been considered has now passed and I can foresee that inspectors would only consider exceptions to that approach if there were very special circumstances present.

[10:38 - 10:50] Historic England:

Yes, I have to say I find the whole housing need methodology, my personal view is I just find it very frustrating. I don't feel it's objectively an objective assessment of need anymore, but there we go. I think you've been given a number that delivers the 1.5 million across the country as a whole and you've put your demographics into it, they've turned the wheel and it out comes your number. and it just doesn't seem to be objectively assessed anymore. But there we go. And there are a lot of authorities across my patch who have seen their figures go up by 70 or 80 percent. It's just bonkers, really. So, yeah, you're not alone. You're not alone. But I think, as you say, I can only think of one authority which is planning for less than their new figure. And, yeah, I think it remains to be seen how that goes. I would be nervous about their chances of getting a sound plan through.

[11:34 - 12:11] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

We are where we are and I think the instruction to local planning authorities is clear. I think that there is a sort of slightly separate conversation around implementation and delivery, which is more complex and even more challenging because clearly, we have a target, we can plan for it, but local planning authorities in the main are not responsible for actually building those buildings – namely, their delivery. And that is going to be, I think, the next challenge for the plan-making system, which is how to get developers building when they don't want to.

[12:28 - 12:37] Historic England:

How do you maintain a five-year housing and supply? It doesn't always force you back to square one. It's just impossible for authorities. I really do feel for you.

[12:39 - 13:17] Hertsmere Borough Council 2 :

I think that this is providing good hooks for us to have a meaningful conversation for the next 20 minutes. But I think that there are mechanisms, but equally that you know, my view, and it's a slightly cynical view, is that some sections of the development industry, there are developers who do want to get out there and get on with things, but there are some sections of the development industry that are rooted in practices that are dishonest, that they're gaining consent and knowing that they're not going to build them out. I think that that's a much broader step change than just getting Britain building. It is a change in ideology from the development sector in terms of what they're there to do. Are they like car manufacturers there to build a product? and sell it? Because there are some developers who are not genuine developers, or are they, you know, are those developers that are there just to create value

[14:13 - 14:34] Historic England:

Yeah, I mean it reminds me of when I went on holiday to Lyme Regis once and there was an oil tanker sat out at sea and we said, well what are they doing? And they said, well they're waiting for the prices to go up. If they delivered it now it drives the prices down, it's not in their interest. They would trash their own market and I do feel that potentially that's the same issue in the housing market.

[14:37 - 14:57] Hertsmere Borough Council:

It's not in their interest to flood the market with new homes. There is certainly a degree of that and who knows, maybe this is one of the indicators of the last days of what we in the modern era could describe as capitalism, I don't know. That's not what we're here to sort of say today as interesting as it is. So we are seeking to meet our housing need in full. The appropriate strategy that we are sort of going with, I would say as a plan maker, appropriate strategies, they tend to just sort of evolve naturally and the appropriate strategy for Hertsmere I think is a logical one.

I can't see there being an obvious deliverable alternative to what I'm about to describe, but the appropriate strategy we're going to be running with is one that focuses upon the regeneration of our two main towns, Borehamwood and Potter's Bar and concentrate the bulk of future growth towards those two centres in the form of urban regeneration within their existing urban area and that urban regeneration being a vehicle for intensification within their existing urban areas. Obviously with the hand-in-hand objective of reducing the pressure of releasing precious green belts.

[16:31 - 16:35] Historic England:

So you are a green belt authority then?

[16:37 - 16:48] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think if you sort of imagine the borough's four settlements, Borehamwood Potters Bar, Radlett and Bushey, everything else is sort of washed over in green belt effectively.

[16:49 - 16:50] Historic England:

Will you still be conducting a green belt review?

[16:54 - 17:19] Hertsmere Borough Council:

So, just to expand on that appropriate strategy, obviously, strategic urban regeneration on large sites located within urban areas is a slow-burn, long-term process. I would not imagine the majority of those sites coming forward before, say, years 8 to 14 of the planned period. Some of them will come forward sooner. There is genuine interest in strategic urban regeneration, particularly in Borehamwood, and some of them could well come forward within the first five years of the planned period. But the big sites, and if you know Borehamwood, I'm specifically referring to Borehamwood Town Centre Retail Park and the large Tesco on Elstree Way, Shenley Road, are going to take longer.

But I think inevitably, because those are sites where you have effectively single uses, that they're sort of sub-optimal performing, particularly the Tesco. I think particularly with Tesco, you've got an occupier operator who who's keen and sees what's on the horizon and they're probably within that 15-year timeframe. I think there's a high likelihood that that site will come forward for comprehensive regeneration. So comprehensive regeneration is the good news story that we're hanging the growth on. I think in order to secure five-year housing land supply, we are also looking at strategic urban sites around Boreham Wood, Possess Bar. We're also looking at urban extensions around Radlett and Bushy.

[18:49 - 18:56] Historic England:

So what proportion of your needs do you think you can meet with regeneration versus the extensions?

[18:58 - 19:00] Hertsmere Borough Council:

It's probably not going to be more than 30%.

[19:02 - 19:06] Historic England:

Okay. Still a fairly large figure. Yes.

[19:09 - 19:45] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think the other sort of parallel approach to that is that we're within the existing urban areas, we're taking that sort of small sites intensification approach. So, opportunities that come forward in the future within those settlements, we're going to look to optimize those. I guess the message to historic England is, I think particularly for Borehamwood and Potter's Bar we are talking about vertical intensification. Taller buildings and within Potter's Bar there appears to be an appetite for developing up to, I'm going to say, around the 12 storey mark. We do actually have a pre-app on the table at the moment that goes further in Potter's Bar. So if you've ever travelled on the Thameslink line out of London towards St Albans and

Luton you do get that sense of almost every station on that line there's verticality taking place.

[20:30 - 20:43] Historic England:

There is. So, I suppose my question, I know you probably want to talk about the kind of strategy as a whole but has the council commissioned any taller buildings evidence? Will you be mapping areas that are appropriate?

[20:44 - 21:03] Hertsmere Borough Council:

So, I don't think, we're not doing that because I don't believe that we will get into that sort of territory within the plan period. To clarify, we're not going to get into those sorts of heights where the impact is likely to register within a wider landscape.

[21:19 - 21:34] Historic England:

I suppose I use the word taller buildings. I suppose it all depends on what is the baseline in those areas, doesn't it? And I suppose 12 stories in somewhere like Cambridge, where I am today, I think would be very tall in other locations. Obviously it wouldn't. I do think, you know, I'm not hugely familiar with your patch. I do think you'll need to do something considering, how much taller they are than existing and therefore what impact that might have on the historic environment. Like for example St Albans and okay I appreciate it's a very different beast because it is a kind of historic city but they undertook a tall buildings assessment and they kind of as part of that work they looked at some heritage viewpoints considering what might be the impacts on clusters of heritage assets.

[22:18 - 22:33] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Let me explain what we are doing in terms of evidence. So we've taken a slightly different approach to the commissioning of evidence and that is in part due to the sort of the compressed timeline that we have to work within.

We've commissioned two separate organisations to effectively do the bulk of our evidence-based building. So the Consultants AECOM are preparing about 25 separate studies that cover everything from... and these are sort of the general purpose evidence-based studies, I think I'd describe them as, that cover everything from Greenbelt study right the way through to a whole plan viability assessment.

There is a heritage impact assessment being done as part of that. We are initiating that work today. So that's very timely because this is the sort of thing that what we've just discussed is the sort of thing I can take to that meeting. Alongside the work that AECOM are doing, and this responds more directly to your question about tool building studies, we have an organisation called AR Urbanism who are preparing four separate settlement-focused visions for Boreham Wood, Potters Bar, Bushey and Radlett. And that's certainly that work which is very advanced that is looking at capacity within those settlements for growth, both in townscape and urban design terms, to a lesser extent in heritage asset terms, because neither of those three settlements are heritage assets in their own right.

I mean, that's not to say they don't have heritage assets, it's just they're not. You know, they're not covered by conservation areas or I hesitate to say they don't include any sort of Grade 2 star or Grade 1 listed buildings either, although I know we have some of those assets across the board.

That's where we are with that and that evidence base is progressing.

[25:02 - 25:15] Historic England:

So have you identified potential sites, have you got a list of potential sites and have you, what kind of evidence base is supported as we're informing those? I'll be blunt, have you looked at heritage in relation to those sites?

[25:17 - 25:49] Hertsmere Borough Council 2 :

So heritage is in terms of popping up as a sort of 'I'm not going to use the word constrained, No, but kind of on a sustainability appraisal-style issue. So, heritage assets do – we are going through an assessment exercise of all the sites that have been identified through this process, so that's inclusive of sites that are within the HEELA process, the call for sites process, and candidate sites process. And neighbouring heritage assets that are designated or non-designated that either fall within the site boundary or are adjacent to the site boundary are being considered through that assessment process.

[26:03 - 26:09] Historic England:

Do you have in-house conservation officers, archaeologists at the council or do you have access to those?

[26:33 - 27:05] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Yes, so when we get DM applications they use, Place Services.

[27:18 - 27:48] Historic England:

I guess the reason I flag it is because we often see, and in fact I used to work at Central Bedfordshire Council prior to Historic England, and I remember how we assessed sites, and we often see them where you can flag the presence or absence of an asset, and you make a bit of an educated guess about whether it's going to be affected. But often, it's unclear what impact development is going to have on those, so you award it a bit of a neutral effect and therefore it doesn't meaningfully feed into your site selection drawing up your policies, criteria process, because you just simply don't know enough about how that proposal could affect development and I do think you do need some expertise to look at those heritage assets and say, What impact will development here have on the significance of that asset?

Mainly we're talking probably in terms of impacts on setting and what contribution the site makes to the significance of whatever those assets are. And that's where I think I would

probably urge you to get that. If there are sites, appreciating what you say about not having those kind of in-house specialists, if there are sites where there are seemingly highly graded things affected, so schedule monuments or Grade 1 or 2 stars, or there are clusters of lots of Grade 2s or Grade 2**s.

I would advise having place services provide some kind of assessment. Across my patch, we see a lot of place services heritage impact assessments, and they needn't be onerous. Some of them are quite brief, they are literally, depending on the scale of the site and the potential impacts, and they can be just a table, a pro forma, and just literally sketching out an assessment. Others are a bit wordier, but I do think it just provides you that reassurance you're not going to hit any issues which could affect the capacity or deliverability of your sites coming forward.

So I'm kind of heartened that you do use place services. I know we're not supposed to recommend, but they are I've never had any issues with them.

[29:36 - 29:47] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

For clarification, AECOM, who are preparing our technical evidence base, will be undertaking a heritage impact assessment.

[29:55 - 30:01] Historic England:

When I refer to heritage impact assessments, I'm talking about site-specific.

[30:01 - 30:14] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

So that will be site-specific. So in terms of what we're doing in terms of the candidate sites, we are freely sharing the candidate sites with AECOM.

[30:16 - 30:24] Historic England:

Will that make recommendations for, I suppose, mitigation or opportunities, or enhance nearby heritage.

[30:24 - 30:28] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Yes, I think that is the objective.

[30:28 - 30:44] Historic England:

Okay, that's encouraging. Sorry, I'm going all over the place here, but going back to the taller buildings, are you saying you're not commissioning anything specific to consider where are and aren't the most appropriate locations for taller buildings?

[30:45 - 31:20] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think the locations, I mean, I'll be completely honest, I think the locations for the taller buildings are really obvious. So within, and I think if you were more familiar with, I mean, I'll mention these places, that they, you would say yes, they are the obvious locations. So within Borehamwood it will be along a sort of literally an east-west arc that flows along the town centre.

Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

It is the centre of the town. It is literally the centre of the town. There are already tall buildings present, so that verticality, it's logical. It's the most accessible location probably in the borough.

[31:37 - 31:46] Historic England:

Yeah, I mean, I do appreciate that. It sounds like it's an obvious place to kind of grow.

[31:50 - 31:58] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

There is a smattering of heritage assets that could be impacted, but those are being factored.

[31:58 - 32:28] Historic England:

I guess that's what I was saying. I still feel, even if you're not commissioning a specific tall building study, that you do need to consider and accepting that there are already tall buildings there. I still think that given that the NPPF tells us that the significance of assets can be harmed by development in their settings. Taller buildings, even some distance away, could have a big impact on their significance. I do think you'll need something that you can point to say, yes, we have considered what would be the impacts of this. We are confident that this is consistent with the NPPF in relation to the historic environment.

So, yeah, I'll just put that thought there. There's more than one way to skin a cat, but I do think it's important, even if it's drawing on the work that AECOM are doing, whether there's something that can be tacked on to that, looking at these areas for tall buildings what assets could be affected, is there anything we should be considering? Because I think ultimately if you don't do that now we'll probably only come back at Reg 18 or Reg 19 and say actually what have you done to consider this? And it just, I think it's neater if it can be tied up now really. I'm not saying that these aren't the sensible locations but I do, again, there are plans that come unstuck because they haven't considered this. But I do accept that Elstree and Borehamwood and the other one is very different to say somewhere like St Albans. I stress everything should be proportionate.

[33:28 - 33:46] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Absolutely. I think one of the sort of the subsets of this is that we are, I mean, in order to make all of this palatable, we are seeking that, you know, an approach to growth that is design and master plan led. I think in terms of making this all work, hopefully in terms of the

planning policy mechanics, there's plenty of scope through the process, the delivery and implementation process to make this work within that wider sense.

[35:52 - 36:00] Historic England:

No, and I think that's possibly why it's never been formally recognised. We definitely don't need to come in and list for example.

[38:19 - 38:51] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think the one thing we haven't spoken about in terms of the appropriate strategy, the Reg 18 consultation will speak to the potential for an entirely new settlement in the north of the borough. So this is at a location called Bowman's Cross, which is adjacent to an existing town which is actually in St. Albans called London Colney.

[39:02 - 39:03] Historic England:

Right, okay.

[39:04 - 39:35] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Bowman's Cross is currently a large waste facility but could become something else. As a new settlement, it's unlikely to come forward in terms of volume growth during the emerging plan period. So what it would serve as is a continuation of that step change in the delivery of growth. I would be hoodwinking you if I didn't say that we know, because they're the landowners, that it is adjacent to, I think it's called Tyttenhanger Abbey, which is I believe a Grade 1 listed building. So there are, of all our sites that we will be consulting on, I mean there are others, but of all our sites, that is the one that has the potential, the most potential to probably impact on a heritage asset in an obvious way.

[40:19 - 40:28] Historic England:

Yeah. I mean, again, though, it doesn't, it needn't to be a showstopper.

[40:28 - 40:59] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

So the additional thing to say about Bowman's Cross is that, and possibly the main reason why we are going to be consulting on it is that there is a development promoter on board who is expending, I would say, a reasonably significant amount of resource to promote the site. So I know from experiences elsewhere, local planning authorities ignore things like that at their peril. Rather than discount it, we're grasping the potential. And obviously, if we do, if it were allocated, there's more of an opportunity to manage how that comes forward.

[41:15 - 41:31] Historic England:

So, I suppose my question is, the Reg 18 that will be coming out, presumably fairly imminently, will have a kind of a long list of everything that is deemed as having potential, but it's not necessarily your short list of preferred sites. Is that correct?

[41:32 - 41:48] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

That is correct. So my advice to our members is that we, at this point, consult on everything so that we could discount the stuff that is assessed as being inappropriate to come forward. So when I say everything, everything that falls within the scope of our spatial strategy, anything that's so it's important to draw that distinction because anything that with the exception of Bowman's Cross anything that's outside of the four main settlements or not adjacent to the four main settlements we can pretty much discount now.

[42:12 - 42:14] Historic England:

Okay that's helpful that is helpful.

[42:15 - 42:52] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think the so again hopefully you'll find this useful because we will be moved, you know, with a fair wind, we will be moving from Reg 18 to Reg 19 in a hopefully seamless manner. With the exception of that long list of candidate sites, the Reg 18 document will be relatively fully formed. So whilst it will not contain precise policy wording At this point, the policy options are going to be fairly limited. So, as you will see in probably six to eight weeks' time when it's published, heads up, you're the second person I've given heads up on duty to cooperate on this matter. When it's published in mid-April, you will see that the document's divided up into three parts. Part one is the spatial strategy, part two is the planning policies, and four parts. Part three is essentially the settlement and place policies and site allocations. Sorry, it's candidate sites. and Part 4 is the delivery and monitoring chapter which I think critically includes that policy on master planning and monitoring. So

[43:54 - 44:10] Historic England:

Rewinding to a comment you made about the Heritage Impact Assessment and you were speaking with AECOM today to give it the green light. Have you shared with them a kind of brief yet or a scope?

[44:14 - 44:33] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Yes and yes, and it's the other way round. So if I can describe the tortuous tender process, tendering process, sorry, this work is all scoped out as part of that tender submission.

It's simply the timing of the documents of their production.

[44:43 - 45:16] Historic England:

So they have been formally commissioned already, but they are about to embark on preparing it now. Can I... I'm guessing they've probably read this, but we've produced them a couple of advice notes and guidance notes on one in particular, our advice note number three on site allocations and local plans. It's a really short document, but it just sets out our preferred approach to assessing sites, setting and significance. It's really short, it's really straightforward. I just feel that just to have, you know, they just have sight of it.

[45:21 - 45:34] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I will make sure that that, so, if you like, this is, and I'm making this note for X and the note-taking purposes, this is an action for the council today. If you send us the link, we will make sure that that's passed through to AECOM and that it's taken into full account. So you're not the first person to do this. This is an approach we've taken and I can assure you that AECOM takes this intelligence and use it accordingly.

[46:02 - 46:04] Historic England:

Yeah, absolutely. I've worked with AECOM before and I have no doubts that they know what they're doing. There are a number of consultants that often refer to some of our advice and they kind of, I don't know why, but they miss out on this particular advice though and it is really helpful and really easy to use. So yeah, I'll send you the link for that after this meeting.

[46:20 - 46:52] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Excellent, thank you. I think that's probably about it. So just taking a step back, and this is important, I'd be it would be very remiss of me to not say this. The planning policies chapter, in addition to a chapter on securing design quality, it is... So that is the first chapter in the planning policies section. The second chapter will be the heritage policies. Okay, great. At this moment, we envisage there will be about three or four heritage policies. Yes, I mean, we're following an approach that other local authorities can.

[47:13 - 47:45] Historic England:

Absolutely. And we're in that difficult situation, aren't we, where we don't know what the future holds in terms of the need for those policies, I suppose. But yeah, I mean, again, we often see authorities I'll be blunt, paraphrasing NPPF in a way that is consistent. It's difficult, isn't it? Because I think ideally, policies are only really needed if they kind of have that local flavour, something specific locally. You know, like your film industry could be a good example, but more often than not it is just, oh, there's a policy on listed buildings, there's a policy on archaeology, and then we end up just correcting them to make sure they're consistent with NPPF. I find it frustrating almost because I'm not really sure why... It doesn't add any value, but if they're not there, the inspectors get very cross.

[48:12 - 48:42] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Just to give you an understanding and hopefully some comfort As I mentioned, I arrived in Hertsmere from Lewisham. I came having gone through Reg 19 all the way through to

adoption of the local plan there and I think one of the memorable experiences of what was thankfully a relatively short examination process was the back and forth between the inspectors and our conservation officer in Lewisham around the wording and how the wording there fitted in with national planning policy. Having said all of that, I mean I'm just going to say it because I feel I can be candid with colleagues. We are looking at the wording that has been used in Lewisham because it was found sound because it's part of it. Absolutely. No, I don't blame you.

[49:16 - 49:25] Historic England:

It's like saying the cat sat on the mat, the feline lay on the rug. I'm not really sure it adds any value, but there we are. One of the few positive changes that is coming out of the proposed changes, I think. But yeah, if there is something locally specific that you feel would add value or benefit proposals going forward, then that's possibly somewhere to kind of flag those, to highlight those.

[49:43 - 49:56] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think that will be the trick and obviously introducing a sort of a heart smear, as you say, a Hertsmere flavour through the whole of the dish is what's needed. What I would say is that, and we've said similar things to colleagues from Natural England, utilities companies, the sort of Thames and Affinity Water. When you see the Reg 18 and you have some thoughts on wording, when you see the Reg 19 and you have some thoughts on wording, please do let us know. We will do our best to incorporate that. I think it's certainly from our perspective as officers, it's a no-brainer that we use your advice and intelligence to get sound planning policy.

[50:40 - 50:44] Historic England:

Brilliant.

[50:44 - 51:08] Hertsmere Borough Council:

Thank you. I think that that's all we've got to say. In terms of going forward, I think we've given you the heads up of when it is coming. X and I have already this morning, because this These dates are fairly new for us as officers. They only hit us at the end of last week with the dates. What we will be doing with Duty to Co-operate partners is sort of letting you have advance notice of the consultation. I think if after this meeting you feel that you would like advance notice of some of that content, please let us know.

[51:32 - 51:57] Historic England:

We're happy to see that. I think in an ideal world we would, but I think realistically with the volume of work coming in, we can only really kind of prioritise it when it's part of that formal consultation process. That said, if you did want us to look at drafts of the HEELAs or even just like a sample, just to see that they are doing what we need them to do or whether they need any fine-tuning, we'd be more than happy to provide

[51:58 - 52:24] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

We can certainly do that. I think, if you don't mind, Andrew, we can certainly pass on your contact details to our AECOM colleagues. as we have done in relation to similar projects that they're undertaking. So it may well be that one of the questions I'm asked this afternoon is who's your contact at Historic England? So if you're happy for me to do that.

[52:24 - 52:40] Historic England:

Definitely. I think that would be really helpful. And as I say, I'm not talking about necessarily reviewing the kind of site-specific details, but more the kind of the overall what is the document doing, are the outputs what we need. and so forth. So yeah, I'm more than happy for you to put my name forward for that. Great.

[52:41 - 52:46] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

That's marvellous. Thank you. Cool. I think we can all break for lunch there.

[52:47 - 53:30] Historic England:

Sounds good. Perfect timing. Oh, sorry, just one last question then before we do go. In terms of recording this process, I mean, my experience with other authorities is we tend to have regular meetings if and when there become areas disagreement, I guess that's when we can start to record those and how we are addressing them. But I think for now recording and just meeting minutes is sufficient and then hopefully at the end of the process we'll have a table which sets out any areas that we encountered along the way where there were areas of disagreement. Hopefully the majority of those will have reached consensus and there might be a couple where we're just setting out why we agree to disagree. But yeah, again it needn't be an onerous thing from our perspectives.

[53:36 - 53:37] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Great. I think that's clear to us. Brilliant. Perfect.

[53:42 - 53:44] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Brilliant. Thank you, X

[53:44 - 53:56] Historic England:

No, I'm grateful for you taking the time to meet me today. Enjoy the rest of your day, then. You too. Take care. We look forward to receiving that plan in due course. Okay. Cheers for now. Bye. See you later. Bye. Thank you, x

Highways England

Email

Contents

03/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

03/12/2025 - Email from National Highways

Agree to request and what advice is given by NH

22/12/25 - Email from Hertsmere

Explanation of housing need and what this means for NH systems

23/12/2025 - Email from National Highways

Agree to consultation and understanding of housing needs.

13/01/2025 - Email from Hertsmere

Request for meeting

28/01/2026 - Email from National Highways

Confirmation of response received from National Highways

04/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Confirmation of previous response and request for meeting.

06/02/2026 - Email from National Highways

Suggestion of dates

06/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Receipt of dates and need to liaise with team

11/02/2026 - Email from National Highways

Confirmation of dates

11/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Chase HCC for alternative dates

17/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

chasing HCC for alternative dates

18/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to National Highways

Consultation on the IDP proforma

27/02/2026 - Email from National Highways to AECOM

Response to IDP proforma

02/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to National Highways

Confirmation of comments

Homes England

Email

Contents

02/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

02/12/2025 - Email from Homes England

Receipt of Email

27/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere to
Homes England

Emailed contact at Homes England

24/02/2026 - Email from Homes England

Updated contact from Homes England

Mayor of London

Email

Contents

02/12/25 - Email from Hertsmere

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

21/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

10/03/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Governance

Email	Contents
03/02/2026 - Email from HBC to MHCLG	Initial Duty to Co-operate email
04/02/2026 - Email from MHCLG to HBC	Re - direct to the right team
04/02/2026 - Email from MHCLG to HBC	confirmation of engagement with HBC
04/02/2026 - Email from HBC to MHCLG	Confirmation on how to progress
04/02/2026 - Email from MHCLG to HBC	Agree to set up a meeting
12/02/2026 - Email from HBC to MHCLG	Request for meeting dates
13/02/2026 - Email from MHCLG to HBC	Confirmation of meeting dates
13/02/2026 - Email from MHCLG to HBC	Meeting link forwarded for 06/03/2026
06/03/2026 - Email from MHCLG to HBC	Meeting link forwarded for 10/04/2026

Both meetings consisted of Hertsmere Borough Council and MHCLG checking in on the status of the Hertsmere Borough Local Plan.

Action plans were put into place regarding the outcome of the Extraordinary Council Meeting held on April 15th 2026.

National Rail

Email

03/12/2025 - Email to Network rail

26/01/2026 - Email to Network Rail

27/01/2026 - Email from HBC to Rail
Delivery Group

27/01/2026 - Email from HBC to Rail
Delivery Group

27/01/2026 - Email from RDG to HBC

Contents

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

Confirmation that they are unable to engage with
us on a local level

National Grid

Email

04/12/2026 - Email from HBC to National Grid (NGET)

Contents

Initial Duty to Co-operate email

10/01/2025 - Email from NGET to HBC

Introducing Fisher German I behalf of National Grid and further duty to co-operate issues such as needing to contact other bodies.

03/02/2026 - Email from HBC to NGET

acknowledgement of email and meeting request

04/12/2026 - Email from NGET to HBC

possible alternative dates and other National Grid contacts

04/02/2026 - Email from HBC to NGET

list of alternative dates

04/02/2026 - Email from NGET to HBC

confirmation of alternative dates and times for meeting

04/02/2026 - Email from HBC to NGET

link sent for online meeting

18/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to NGET

Consultation on the IDP proforma

19/02/2026 - Email from HBC to NGET

Forwarding of IDP proforma to NGET

19/02/2026 - Email from NGET to HBC

Receipt of IDP proforma

26/02/2026 - Email from NGET to HBC/AECOM

response to IDP proforma

02/03/2026 - Email from AECOM to NGET

receipt of IDP comments

19_02_2026 – Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with National Grid Electricity Transmission and Fisher German

Executive Summary

A Duty to Co-operate meeting was held on 19 February 2026 between Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC), National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET), and Fisher German. The purpose was to discuss strategic electricity infrastructure considerations in relation to Hertsmere's emerging Local Plan.

Hertsmere outlined its intention to submit the Local Plan by the end of 2026 under transitional planning arrangements and confirmed that a detailed Regulation 18 consultation—operating as a prototype Reg 19—would be launched in April. The Local Plan seeks to deliver c.16,000 homes, following a regeneration-led spatial strategy focused on Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Bushey, and Radlett, supported by strategic green belt release and the potential long-term new settlement at Bowman's Cross.

National Grid set out its priorities, emphasising the need for early recognition of existing transmission assets (overhead lines, substations, and cables) within draft allocations to ensure appropriate policy wording. NGET confirmed no known conflicts with the prospective Bowman's Cross area based on current infrastructure mapping. They also stressed the importance of HBC engaging with the correct distribution network operators (DNOs) for capacity and local-level power supply considerations, as these fall outside NGET's remit.

All parties agreed on the value of proactive, early engagement to avoid issues arising at examination. HBC will continue liaising with AECOM on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and ensure direct consultation with relevant arms of the National Grid Group and relevant DNOs.

Attendees

Hertsmere Borough Council

- Planning Policy Team Leader
- Planning Policy Officer

National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)

- Development Liaison Support Officer

Fisher German (acting on behalf of NGET)

- Development Plan Monitoring Service Lead for NGET

Actions

1. **HBC to ensure National Grid receives IDP consultation materials**
 - AECOM's IDP email/letter to be checked and re-sent to correct NGET contacts if needed.
2. **HBC to engage the correct National Grid business entities and DNOs**
 - Identify and consult relevant distribution operators (likely UKPN or Scottish & Southern), as distribution capacity sits outside NGET's remit.
3. **National Grid/Fisher German to review site allocations at Reg 18**
 - Once HBC publishes indicative sites and growth areas, NGET will provide asset-specific input and highlight required policy wording.
4. **Include appropriate policy wording in the Local Plan**
 - Policies must recognise existing transmission assets, ensure access/operation is protected, and secure masterplanning requirements where needed.
5. **HBC to maintain ongoing direct engagement with NGET**
 - HBC may contact NGET on an ad-hoc basis as the plan evolves, ahead of the formal consultation stage.
6. **Consider Statement of Common Ground (SoCG)**
 - Parties may prepare a concise SoCG confirming shared understanding of asset interactions and required plan wording to support examination.

19_02_2026 – Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with National Grid Electricity Transmission and Fisher German

February 19, 2026, 2:01PM

42m 56s

Hertsmere Borough Council 1 0:06

Thank you for joining us. We are we are grateful to all colleagues across all partner organisations that join us in these duty to cooperate meetings. I think the emphasis is that here at Hertsmere, we are trying to do this in a comprehensive manner, primarily so that we have a record of what contacts we have made so that we can use those constructively during the future examination and hopefully demonstrate to the inspectors representing the Secretary of State that we've done the job that we're supposed to be doing under the duty to cooperate. I should very briefly add that whilst we anticipate that the duty may in the future disappear, given the impending local government reorganization,

I'm X

I am Hertsmere's planning policy team leader.

Hertsmere Borough Council 2 1:46

Hello, my name is X I am the contact for Hertsmere when it comes to the duty to cooperate. Andrew, do you want to go next?

Fisher German 2:09

I'm X Fisher German. I manage the development plan monitoring service that we provide to National Grid Electricity Transmission. The focus is we advocate for the existing infrastructure, the large scale big stuff that transmits electricity across the nation which NGET are responsible for. We also do also now engage on new infrastructure projects as well. So as you'll be aware with the great grid upgrade and various pressures for expansion of the network, we also have evolved the system now to represent NGET's interests with regards to new infrastructure projects as well.

So that would be, for example, engagement like this with local authorities as they're developing their local plans, submitting representations on behalf of NGET to various consultations, all sorts of DPD documents, but also supplementary planning documents, neighbourhood plans. It's about advocating for the existing Network that and gets responsible for, but also their on-stream projects that are coming online.

NGET 3:15

I'm X and I work for National Grid Electricity Transmission. I am the Development Liaison Support Officer within a team that we're responsible for managing all third party statutory orders on behalf of VenGet and we're ensuring that our assets and our interests are protected.

So in this role, we're putting protective provisions and other related agreements in place to achieve this. And part of our team's role as well, we've also got the development plan monitoring that Fisher German undertake for us. It's great to have these outreach meetings, promoting improvement of communication and collaboration, and ultimately that protects our assets. So this engagement is really good.

Hertsmere Borough Council 1 4:11

Brilliant. I think X very kindly sent round an agenda.

I think we can probably fly through a lot of this, but I am very conscious that there are probably some very specific things that you may have an interest in.

Fisher German 4:54

No problem.

Hertsmere Borough Council 1 4:56

I'll start by saying that Hertsmere has a very ambitious but achievable objective of getting its new Local Plan through the regulatory process to submission under regulation 22 before the end of this year. So that's necessary if you didn't know because of the transition arrangements in advance of what we've been told will be a new planning system.

I strongly believe it is possible and I think the first part of that is that we will be getting to regulation 18 in April. That regulation consultation document, sorry, Regulation 18 consultation document will not be like previous versions published by Hertsmere. It will in effect be a sort of prototype Reg 19 plan. There are going to be, where it's possible to have options, those options will appear. So those will primarily be around the sites. We are going to be relatively inclusive in terms of sites that we test through the Reg 18 process. But otherwise, it is essentially going to be a sort of a prototype Reg 19 plan, so, in effect, we can make that rapid and relatively hopefully seamless transition to Reg 19 quickly.

Reg 19 will follow probably before the end of summer this year, which would allow us enough time to progress to submission by the end of the year.

We are seeking to put together a plan that meets all of our growth needs in full. That equates to roughly about 1500 new homes delivered per annum in Hertsmere over the plan

period. That includes the 20% buffer that we that is brought forward into the first five years of the plan period.

Over the entire plan period, that's a housing target of around 16,000. In terms of how we deliver that, we have a commitment from our members for a spatial strategy that is regeneration focused, that looks at the four main settlements and distributes growth proportionately. based on those four main settlements. Borehamwood gets the lion's share, followed by Potter's Bar, and then lesser levels of growth directed towards Bushey and Radlett.

How that growth manifests itself, we are looking to allocate sites, strategic sites within the existing urban area for comprehensive redevelopment. The purpose of that is clearly to take the pressure off the green belt, take the pressure off the release of land from the green belt and essentially begin transforming those existing urban areas into better quality and higher intensity environments.

Redeveloping sites that are either reaching the end of their effective life or are currently inefficiently used for more, essentially, more housing, more commercial use. Obviously, those sites are the hardest sites to redevelop because there are things already on them. So in order to ensure that we have a housing land supply at the beginning of the plan period and up to the point when those sites are going to be coming forward, We are also going to be allocating sites that are currently in the green belt that surround those two principal settlements, Borehamwood and Potter's Bar, to come forward as either strategic urban extensions or urban extensions.

I think the larger of those two, the strategic urban extensions will predictably be mixed-use developments. They'll be creating new centres. They will probably have compatible employment uses. So for example, in Borehamwood, that means more film studios. But they will also be developed in a pattern that's higher intensity than is currently found across Boreham Wood and Potters Bar. Radlett and Bushey.

We'll also receive some urban extensions. There'll be a little bit of urban regeneration within those two settlements as well, but to a significantly lesser extent than in Borehamwood and Potter's Bar. The focus again is that the sites coming forward in Radlett and Bushey will be coming forward at higher densities and intensities than is currently found in either of those two settlements, albeit again, this emphasis on quality. So you're not going to get 16 storey buildings in Radlett or Bushey, but certainly mid-rise apartments, particularly as part of mixed-use developments, is likely to be the way forward.

We've done quite a bit of work around development densities, those sort of strategic urban extensions and urban extensions typically coming forward at around 23 units per hectare gross. Urban regeneration sites, particularly in Boreham Wood, but I think equally probably in Potters Bar, I would imagine that's where there may be interest for the National Grid.

I know that some of those sites include existing assets and that form part of your network. The council will obviously need to start what will probably be a long conversation to with you and other utility providers to understand how those assets can be accommodated, whether

it's built around or I suppose in the more extreme examples relocated if that's even possible, but built around to ensure that your operational needs are met and that you can continue to have access to them.

As part of that plan making process, we are also we're also undertaking quite a significant technical evidence-based commission. I suspect that most of that isn't going to be of interest to you. What is going to be of interest to you is our infrastructure delivery plan, which is being prepared as part of that commission. I'm looking to Z across the room now. I'm assuming that your contact details, if they haven't been shared, we can share them with that are external consultants who are preparing that infrastructure delivery plans to ensure that you can be engaged accordingly.

Hertsmere Borough Council 2 15:05

AECOM are the team that are doing it for us. I know that they sent out a letter yesterday. I think it was sent to the National Grid, but I can just double check and if needed, forward it on to make sure it's reaching the right people.

Fisher German 15:26

Yeah. Just, will they have had our latest contact because prior to Fisher German's involvement, Avis and Young were sort of managing a similar project. It's evolved quite a lot since, but there will be other contacts in the past, I think, that may have, we tend to get stuff through, even if it's via Avis and Young who then forward on to us.

The way we would treat it is whoever's carrying out the IDP, we would treat that as essentially a consultation and an agree a date for getting information back to them because the difference obviously between IDPs and formal public consultations is often there's more flexibility or there's a bit more of a conversation and a bit of back and forth and there may also be different arms within National Grid that need to be engaged.

Just to be absolutely clear, is where we see interactions of development sites with our existing assets. We really, all we want is recognition in policy wording of that and a requirement placed upon developers to ensure that they develop those sites. in recognition of the presence of assets, because the starting point is that 400 kilovolt, they can't be moved unless it's in a sort of a high sensitivity landscape area. And in which case they would have been underground in the first place, probably. The idea is that we're supportive of developing around them.

There's no reason why these strategic sites can't be developed alongside our infrastructure. It's just making sure the right policy requirements are in there at a local plan. But I know that councils are also interested in potentially capacity issues and actual distribution more locally and what might be required. So might there need to be an expansion of substations or what have you.

That's often dealt with by sort of different arms of National Grid. So you would have, well, the description Rachel often uses is that we're the motorways and but there's then the A roads

and the C roads, B roads below us who are then delivering onto individual sites. And they're also contacts that you'll want to. And I think we've already forwarded on some contacts to you in our initial response to you where we've sort of listed assets within Hertsmere, but we're happy to just have a conversation around that and guide.

The way I see it is that anything we get from you, we'll log it as a formal consultation that we then agree a date to and we'll provide whatever feedback we can at any point because we, like you, we want to be proactive from the outset and help local councils effectively to avoid it even being an issue at examination in public.

So if you already have policy wording in there that sweeps it up for us, we'll have no issue whatsoever. The issue we have is when there have been allocates and there's been no mention or recognition of a whopping great overhead lines going across the site. And there's obviously certain things that, apart from actually the amenity of future residents, there's, you know, which obviously I'm sure you would be aware of anyway, there's implications for us in, like you say, access and, you know, there's guidance that we have in terms of how we can design around and certain buffers.

All of that can be factored into the policy writing itself, I think, at the earliest opportunity. And considering you're wanting to go with a really quite detailed regulation 18, which, to be honest, I applaud because there's some who are just skipping to reg 19 and actually reg 19 really should be the final version that you feel can be submitted.

And I'm not sure how councils can expect people to productively engage with Reg 19s when that's the first time they're seeing them. So I'm pleased to see that you will be doing a Reg 18 because it's far better to sort of put your cards on the table as early as possible. And I like the fact you'll be putting sites forward because that's what we'll be looking at is interactions.

And otherwise, we'll be looking for policy wording around where we think it might be restrictive of the great grid upgrade, things that NGET are responsible for, but actually it's a national objective beyond NGET, as in we're the vehicle for delivering what is a national government policy direction, which is that we need to rapidly increase the capacity of our network in order to pull in renewables to connect to other areas, to all of these factors are sort of almost, I wouldn't say forced on us, but they are things that ENGER are needing to respond to. And we need plans to just recognise that basically, that's all, and understand what's coming. So that's what we tend to look out for when we're looking at draft plans that just holds developers to account at that point when a master plan exercise is undertaken for this site. We, you know, we don't think the policy or the allocation can be effective, which obviously will be a test, unless you recognise the assets are present within the site. So it's good for all sides to just recognise their assets there. Developers will need to respond to it and that's often all we're looking for.

Hertsmere Borough Council 1 21:28

I would add to everything I've said and that this is something that we're putting into the Reg 18 as a discussion point is the prospect of a new settlement in the borough. And that's

located in the north of the borough next to a place called London Colney.

And the place in question is called Bowman's Cross and there is a land promoter to that site who are seeking to bring it forward as a new settlement. Certainly in the counts from the council's perspective, that that could be advantageous going forward in terms of securing a long-term meaningful step change in supply and delivery. And then within that context, what we would be thinking of doing in the emerging Local Plan is identifying it as a sort of a long-term prospect coming forward beginning to come forward in years 11 to 15 of the plan period and really seriously delivering in the next plan period. There is an important consideration around beyond the plan period because Hertsmere will no longer exist beyond the plan period because of local government reorganization. And in that respect, the potential for a new town or a new settlement in that part of the borough becomes even more of a potential opportunity because it then seeks to deliver need for the new planning authority area beyond. However, there is an issue of quantum with that site and rather predictably, what the sort of the right scale of development for that new settlement, whether it's a new settlement, whether it's a new village or whether it's a new town and what sort of contribution to future infrastructure investment it makes.

I say that principally in relation to transport infrastructure networks, but it could equally be other infrastructure networks. I don't know if that if that sort of sparks any interest.

Fisher German 24:48

I think it would be probably primarily from a capacity perspective with the local distribution. It may be that other arms and X will help me out here would be probably better placed to give you a bit of info on that specifically and you want to make sure that they're consulted on at Reg 18. But I think it sounds to me local distribution would be something you'd want to ensure was on track in order if you're planting 10,000 new homes somewhere or 5,000 new homes, it's a significant, but it's obviously quite far in the future. I think our key focus would be the precise location in the vicinity of where I think you're describing. We've got a 400 kilovolt line that sort of passes through that area that we would obviously highlight. And I think that would be our key focus is to make sure that was protected. I haven't got on record currently any particular new infrastructure projects going through that area. or important standoffs that need to be taken into account at this point as part of the great grid upgrade. So I think that's positive in terms of, constraints on the ground.

So I think, you know, it would be about highlighting that, ensuring that there was something secured in the Local Plan that really ensure there was a base minimum of effort made, at least at the master planning stage for something so significant.

Unless, of course, you're planning on going into quite a lot of detail as part of this plan as to how the site would look or how it would know. So you'd want to have plenty of parameters there. If it did interact with this, we'd certainly want some wording in there that recognised the presence of the asset.

There's no intention to this asset to move or to change. It's performing an important role. It's a particularly high voltage line, we would obviously want it to be designed around appropriately if it did spread into that that the sphere. But as I say, there's no NI new infrastructure that I can see that would necessarily conflict with that at the moment. There's nothing on the radar at the moment. But otherwise, I think you'd also want to be engaging with some of our other arms around distribution at the local level. This is useful.

Hertsmere Borough Council 2 27:06

This was part of the IDP e-mail that AECOM sent out and they sent it out to asset protection. I can forward this on to you, but this is the infographic that they included. So this up here is Bowman's Cross and is the cable that you're thinking about to the east of Radlett?

Fisher German 27:30

Yeah, so when, yeah, so I think it's actually to the west of Radlett, so we'd probably be okay then.

Hertsmere Borough Council 2 27:36

Sorry, yes. X sent me a document, there was a substation and a cable that went north of Borehamwood and down through Bushey and Radlett, whereas Bowman's Cross is on the on the other side.

Fisher German 27:51

So is that where we're talking about for potential new settlements? Yeah, so it looks to me we've got nothing in that area that would concern us in terms of our infrastructure, no interactions or issues with that area.

There is an east-west route which sort of passes through quite close to, for instance, that second largest dot. There is a substation west of where your arrow just was. So a lot of it feeds in and then there's some north-west lines, north-south lines. Just to the southeast of Patchett's Green that comes from that substation and freehold land there. There's also a cable that goes out southwest from there. So that's your main sort of bits of infrastructure for as far as we're concerned is certainly over the western side of the borough.

And we're very happy when we see the actual sites is we can provide that detailed input at that point and say, OK, well, these, because I guess at Reg 18, whilst these are quite indicative in terms of growth expectations, we'll have some red lines or we'll have some extensive sites or at least growth areas where we're saying, right, it's going to directly come from the west or the east-end of this settlement or what have you. And we will feed back on that and we will say, right, we've got this asset here, therefore this needs to be taken into account and any policy wording needs to reflect its presence and we can work that out as part of a local plan response in terms of the IDP.

I think we provided some of this information, didn't we? Yeah, so exactly. So this is the distribution of our assets at the moment. And as I say, there's no NI through the area, new infrastructure that would cause an issue is from what I can see on our mapping.

So yeah, it's about interactions with the actual sites and policy wording in general that may be interpreted as impacting on and get been able to undertake its responsibilities. So for example, a policy that said we don't want any pylons in the borough or we're not going to allow, I mean, we have actually dealt with policies where they've said unless infrastructure is directly benefiting the local population, we don't want it. Things that I'm sure you probably don't need telling are obviously going to cause us issues because the infrastructure is what it is. It's there already, it needs to do a job. But otherwise, it's generally interactions with development sites we're intrigued by.

And I think for your IDP, you'll also be intrigued with engaging with the right people on actual capacity and distribution locally, because that's where they might need to feed into the IDP and say, there's going to be a few million pounds of upgrading required at this substation or there's a lot of infrastructure with your borough is my point that isn't end here.

And that's where I think personally, having done plan making in the past, that's been the most useful kind of information because for us, it's fairly black and white. If sites interact with our infrastructure, we'll let you know and we'll say how it can be resolved because there's no reason why you can't still build on those sites. We just need it to be managed correctly in policy.

But in terms of IDP, IDP is more about can we get enough power to the right locations for some of these developments and how much will it cost to do that if it's not already possible? And the IDP wants to take things like that into account, doesn't it? So we can make sure that you've got the right contacts around that as well. I think, as I say, X already passed some on. There's different roles, we can sort of elaborate on that. If you get in contact after this, we can look into more detail. They are very separate organisations to us who deal with the distribution. At one point we were one and we're definitely not now when it was separated out. So whilst we don't have direct contact, we can certainly point you in the right direction if we haven't already.

NGET 32:07

Yeah, this causes big confusion with the whole national grid umbrella. What Andrew is saying is right. We encourage that you reach out to these separate national grids, organisations, they're different business entities. So yeah, so talking about system operators, so it's the national energy system operator, so NESO, that is now a government run body and that ultimately does the capacity of the system for the demand of energy. And as we said, we're electricity transmission, the highways to take the electricity everywhere and then beneath us, on the little roads, on the distribution operators. And I'm thinking, I should have looked it up, if your DNO is probably going to be UKPN or you might just verge into NGED territory. I can double cheque after this call. So national grid electricity distribution, local distribution, they kind of cut across the country. But I think kind of that

south east around London, I think it's usually UKPN, but we can do a quick cheque to see.

Fisher German 34:37

There's a split between companies, which I think we've come across even within actual boroughs, where it's not one or the other. Essentially, it's almost like we need like a super IDP list of you need to just basically send out to all these people, because whilst we can deal with sort of the transmission nationally, when we deal with all of that across this country and that high level stuff,

NGET 34:43

That's interesting.

Fisher German 35:00

It's that local distribution that I think the IDP really wants to get into because that's where money will be asked for potentially, or we need to factor in, or whoever delivers it needs to factor in the time taken to upgrade a local substation or a, you know, because that's going to factor in, isn't it, to your time horizons as well on site delivery and things.

There are big sort of capacity issues. Oh, here we go. I think X just sent a link. Is that the, that would be helpful.

NGET 35:28

It's really good. You just need to scroll down a bit, put your postcode in and if you go down a bit further, it does show the overall split. So there's around, I don't know, kind of six main big ones where the UK has been split up. So you can see Ingle goes across and then yeah, that kind of Southeast corner, UKPN on the very eastern side, and then yeah, more west, you go become Scottish and southern. I feel this constant confusion of who does what, but this is a really good little website, so I thought I'd provide the link and then there's no confusion.

Fisher German 36:11

Yeah, and you'll see the two tabs above the map, electricity distribution is what we're talking about at the lower level. Those are the guys that aren't us. We are electricity transmission. And, you know, you look at that map and you'll see National Grid covers the whole of England and Wales, and that's us, because that's that sort of motorways level distribution, even though it's all distribution, it's just that it's at different levels. And so that link's really useful for sort of making sure those contacts need to be spoken to as well through your IDP. Where we can engage on is interactions directly with our assets and sort of help you with policy wording and things like that. Very happy to do that. In terms of capacity on the ground to help support sites that you're bringing forward, particularly a new settlement, that will be distribution operators that you'll want to talk to.

Hertsmere Borough Council 2 37:01

I will forward the IDP e-mail from AECOM to you so that you can look at that. And then we need to reach out to the, because I know Bradley sent me an e-mail with all the splits. We need to reach out to them because, yeah, as you've just explained, there's different tiers.

Fisher German 37:32

Yeah, and if you use that link as well, that I don't know if X provided you with the DNOs, you're probably going to fall in one, but London does have a split, that area in general has a split and it's either UK power networks or Scottish and Southern. I would expect. So you won't need to go with both. That's just one extra contact to think about. And I would be sending out a letter that directs them to the IDP. That's the perfect, that's saying we're consulting on this, leave it to them to work out. You know what I mean? It's kind of, it's getting that information to them to then internally to go, Ok, they're talking about potentially a new settlement here or there's big growth numbers here. OK, what's our capacity like? And they say, that's what you want them to engage on. We will engage, of course, on any sites we see or areas and we'll highlight to you our existing assets. And then I think where we'll be particularly useful is more at the local plan stage where you've got actual draft allocations and there might be interactions with the cables or the overhead lines or the substation freehold or anything like that and we can engage with that and basically guide you in how that can be accommodated no problem and development can still come forward. That's basically what we look to try and do.

Hertsmere Borough Council 2 38:53

Okay, that makes sense. So other than those actions for us that I've mentioned, is there anything else other than just keeping you in the loop that you particularly need from us at this stage?

Fisher German 39:09

No, I don't think so. I think everything you've planned out and there are consultation stages coming up and we will pick up on those consultations, but we're very happy to receive direct correspondence from you as well around as things are evolving. We're very happy to engage on an ad hoc basis as well as you're actually sort of working it up. If you want to reach out, if you have any questions, just reach out to us. As sort of proactive as we can be, the better. And then by the time it comes to Reg 18, you might already know everything that we might have raised and it's just a case of confirming and you'll have a representation that's supportive of the approach and that kind of deals with the DTC, doesn't it really?

And, you know, even if there were to be a statement of common ground, I don't know how you're going to approach it with all of these different people that you do in DTC. Some places will do a statement of common ground which just says we agree and everything's

fine. And that just it means the inspector then just goes, that's not even an issue then. It kind of they can move straight on to where there are disagreements.

Hertsmere Borough Council 1 40:10

Yeah, I would I would hope that between us that this this is that that will be a straight straightforward process. I can't envisage it being complicated. I really can't.

Fisher German 40:30

No, it's about interaction for us. And even if there is interaction, there is wording that can be accommodated inside of local plans that basically satisfies us. And I think that's the point. It isn't, even if there is interaction with sites, with our assets, that doesn't mean that site can't come forward. We have no issue with the site being developed. We just need to know that it's there and it is clearly an issue that a developer needs to accept. And they need to respond to agent of change and those principles. There needs to be an understanding that our infrastructure exists because as you can probably imagine, this doesn't always happen and then get often enough, end up having to sort of defend their infrastructure that's been there years because development, you know, the complaints on noise or, you know, anything, you know, there are all sorts of like onward issues that have arisen historically that if we just get into a local plan early enough and have wording included in a policy, it resolves all of this, it satisfies our concerns. So that would be the only way is that we agreed to some wording that needs to be included in appropriate locations in the plan. And that would be that could be the subject of a statement, a page long statement of common ground that says as long as wording is included here or here, then we're satisfied. We've already agreed statement of common ground across a number of authorities before they've got to Reg 19 is just we've signed off and said, look, we're happy with that approach, go for it. And yeah, I think inspectors like to see that, don't they?

Good luck with the plan. But as I say, we'll look out for anything that you need from us. We'll look out for any correspondence from you. But otherwise, we'll keep an eye on that consultation and we're happy to engage.

Hertsmere Borough Council 1 42:36

Thank you.

Natural England

Email

02/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere

10/12/2025 - Email from Natural England

27/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere to
Natural England

27/01/2026 - Email from Natural England

27/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere to
Natural England

28/01/2026 - Email from Natural England

05/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

18/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to
Natural England

Contents

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

Agree to Duty to Co-operate and reconvene in the
New Year

Request for meeting and proposed times.

Organising meeting

Organising meeting

Confirmation of meeting.

Agenda for the meeting

Consultation on the IDP proforma

Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with Natural England

February 5, 2026, 2:02 PM

Executive Summary

A Duty to Co-operate meeting between Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) and Natural England (NE) took place on 5 February 2026 to discuss biodiversity, green infrastructure, protected sites, and key environmental considerations in the preparation of Hertsmere's emerging Local Plan.

Hertsmere outlined its ambitious timetable to reach Regulation 18 consultation and submit the Local Plan by 31 December 2026, driven by national transitional arrangements. HBC explained the dual evidence base approach: AECOM leading the technical studies (including Green Belt, viability, air quality, flood risk, water cycle and ecology), and AR Urbanism preparing design-led regeneration visions for the four main settlements—Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Bushey and Radlett.

Natural England welcomed early engagement and emphasised the importance of proactively incorporating Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) requirements, particularly regarding Wormley Hoddesdon Park Woods SAC and potential recreational pressure from growth around Potters Bar and the northeast of the borough. [https://hertsmeregovuk-my.sharepoint.com/personal/ciara_clapp_hertsmere_gov_uk/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc={42B603AD-DB4B-4A87-8F40-990F94C2E681}&file=Natural England Transcript.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true](https://hertsmeregovuk-my.sharepoint.com/personal/ciara_clapp_hertsmere_gov_uk/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc={42B603AD-DB4B-4A87-8F40-990F94C2E681}&file=Natural%20England%20Transcript.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true)

NE strongly encouraged HBC to integrate the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS), noting that it offers key mapped layers on designated sites and habitat opportunity areas, which can inform site selection, BNG delivery, flood risk and wider environmental benefits. NE offered direct officer training/support on using the LNRS mapping tool.

The meeting also discussed opportunities for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)—including the potential for higher uplift than the statutory 10%, use of habitat banking, and aligning new allocations with LNRS opportunity areas to secure the 15% BNG uplift.

Natural England introduced the Nature Towns accreditation scheme, highlighting Hertsmere's regeneration ambitions and emerging Green & Blue Infrastructure work as strong foundations for a future application.

Actions related to ecological evidence, policy wording, water efficiency, BNG viability, and continued engagement toward a robust and environmentally sound local plan.

Attendees

Hertsmere Borough Council

- Planning Policy Team Leader
- Planning Policy Officer (Duty to Co-operate)

Natural England

- Hertfordshire Lead, Sustainable Development (Local Plan responder; GI and nature in towns/cities)
- Senior Manager, Bedfordshire & Hertfordshire Team (previously led Local Nature Recovery Strategy)

Actions

Hertsmere Borough Council Actions

1. **Provide Natural England with full list of evidence base studies** (including air quality, flood risk, water cycle and ecology).
2. **Ensure AECOM scopes Wormley Hoddesdon Park Woods SAC into the HRA** due to potential recreational pressure from planned growth.
3. **Assess impact risk zones** (SSSIs, ancient woodland, SAC) during site allocation work to demonstrate early recognition of constraints.
4. **Provide early sight of Green & Blue Infrastructure (GBI) study** to Natural England for feedback.
5. **Integrate the LNRS into the Local Plan**, including policy references and direction for development management teams.
6. **Investigate potential for habitat banking** and aligning allocation boundaries with LNRS habitat opportunity mapping.
7. **Arrange officer training session** with NE on using the LNRS mapping tool.

Natural England Actions

1. **Provide BNG viability studies** from other councils achieving ~20% BNG uplift for HBC to consider.
2. **Provide updated water efficiency standards** from 2025 guidance for use in HBC's water scarcity evidence and policy development.
3. **Share information on the Nature Towns accreditation scheme** and support HBC if it chooses to explore accreditation.

Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with Natural England

February 5, 2026, 2:02 PM

54m 52s

Hertsmere Borough Council 0:17

My name is X I'm the Borough Council's Planning Policy team leader.

My name is X I am a policy officer within X's team.

Natural England 1 0:57

Yeah, I'm X. I am the Hertfordshire lead in sustainable development, so I would be responding to the local plan that comes in. I also work on green infrastructure and nature, towns and cities work.

Natural England 2 1:13

Hi, my name is X I was the senior within Natural England working on the local nature recovery strategy for Hertfordshire, but I've since moved into a senior manager role in the Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire team. So I'm overseeing the team and coming along to meetings like this to support and be more involved in the different work areas.

Hertsmere Borough Council 1:35

Thank you and welcome.

We're very keen to ensure that the Council meets its legal obligations through the duty and that the duty is done properly. There won't be any strategic cross boundary issues between us, but there are inevitably going to be matters of policy and policy wording in the emerging local plan that we can positively discuss going forward. I will say if meetings are necessary, we're very welcome to have them, particularly if it's to sort of crunch through solutions, but equally if we don't need to meet beyond this and we can deal with this through email and agreements that ultimately brings an agreed position through a statement of common ground, then that equally is a good way forward.

Natural England 1 4:23

It's very good to hear that that is the approach that you're wanting to take. I enjoy meetings like this because it gives us an opportunity to proactively get through some potential issues before they're issues. And if you want to continue the conversation after this point, I would be up for that. I think it doesn't necessarily need to be within that sort of statutory timeframe. I think that the sort of route that we're taking in Natural England now is to obviously proactively get this work in. So if you want to have an open door conversation as you go through the local plan process, I think that's probably a good idea. It means we can highlight things as we go and we can all be on the same page by the time you get to the Reg 18. So I'm more than happy to keep a conversation going after this meeting.

Hertsmere Borough Council 5:09

We have a very clear understanding that these conversations, whether they're strictly under the duty or whether they are engaging with the national body like yourself in policy preparation, will be ongoing. This is not a tick box exercise where we say, right, we've talked to that, we don't need to say anymore. That's not how we're going to do this.

In that respect, I think it would be useful for us to outline to you our timetable for all of this. And I think from the outset, I will say it is rather ambitious. Because of the transition arrangements around the existing and the proposed new plan-making system, we have a very fixed deadline for submission, which is before the 31st of December of this year.

Natural England 1 7:00

Okay, is that for your Reg 18?

Hertsmere Borough Council 7:03

That is for submission of the documents.

Natural England 1 7:07

OK.

Fantastic.

Hertsmere Borough Council 7:11

Yes, so, working backwards, that gives us just a little less than 11 months to progress through Regulation 18 consultation in terms of the preparation of the local plan and then Regulation 19. In order to achieve that we are doing this in a different way to how we would normally undertake plan-making. We have commissioned AECOM and AR Urbanism, who are preparing the majority of our evidence base, which are well underway and some are now nearing completion. That is everything from Greenbelt all the way through to plan viability, including green and blue infrastructure. Many of those technical evidence-based studies will pick up on ecological issues.

:

Natural England 2 9:38

Can I just ask whether those studies include anything for air quality or flooding?

Hertsmere Borough Council 9:40

Yes, they do. If it's helpful, we can provide you with a full list of what's being prepared.

Natural England 2 9:56

Yeah, I think that would be really useful.

Hertsmere Borough Council 9:59

I think under this process, obviously we're very happy to share any outputs with you as they're made. I think the studies that have reported to or have begun to report to date probably are of lesser interest to you, but yes, flood risk and water cycle studies are underway.

Natural England 1 10:30

Fantastic. It's going to be one of my questions, so that's good to know.

Natural England 2 10:33

Oh, okay. I just had one other question around the sort of evidence studies. One thing that we're always kind of interested in from a protected sites point of view is recreational pressure, and I just wondered whether any of your studies touched on those sorts of issues.

Hertsmere Borough Council 10:50

Believe that they will, yes. From my own experiences elsewhere, I understand where you're coming from on that. I don't, at the top of my head—I'm looking to X and her better local knowledge of SSSI's in the borough

Natural England 1 11:19

You've got two in the borough and then Northaw Great Woods is just outside, and that is just before Wormley Hoddesdon SAC. Yeah.

Hertsmere Borough Council 11:25

That's ancient woodland. And then I know that there is another protected woodland but im not sure if its an SSSI, but it is protected. We also have chalk streams. The local nature recovery strategy has just been launched. So we also have that.

Hertsmere Borough Council 12:07

And—and I'm certainly, I would hope proximity to those sorts of protected assets will be picked up in our site assessment process as well. That's AECOM in their studies.

The work being undertaken by A&R Urbanism is more place-specific. They are preparing a series of visions for the four principal settlements: Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Bushey, and Radlett.

Alongside all of that, we're also preparing site allocations and that work's being undertaken in-house, but with support from both of those external technical experts.

In terms of our spatial strategy, so I think this is probably where you will begin to get more interested in terms of our spatial strategy, the appropriate spatial strategy we are going for is a regeneration-focused strategy that looks first to the capacity that's within the existing settlements. To accommodate growth that facilitates regeneration within those settlements. Inevitably, in order to meet our housing requirement, that sort of urban regeneration first approach is being supported by a series of strategic and non-strategic Greenbelt policies, again proportionate to the settlements, to deliver new housing. Within that hierarchy, Borehamwood will have the most, followed by Potters Bar, followed probably by Bushey, then Radlett.

Within our emerging local plan, we are also examining the potential for a new settlement in the north of the borough. That's at a location called Bowman's Cross, which—you may be aware of, but I think it's probably more accurately described as land east of London Colney, which is not in Hertsmere but I do know that there is a SSSI to the southeast of the site. Albeit, the proposals that the promoters are sharing with us at the moment don't go too close to that.

Natural England 1 16:05

Yeah, the sort of north-northeast of the settlement, yeah, you've got those SSSIs, yeah.

Hertsmere Borough Council 16:06

So I think if it wasn't clear, what the local plan and its spatial strategy, planning policies, and site allocations will seek to do is meet our identified housing need and housing requirements in full.

The advice that we have been giving Members is that if Members want a sound local plan that an inspector can recommend, subject to main modifications for adoption, then they will need to have at least a five-year housing land supply at the point of adoption and demonstrably be able to deliver housing need and the housing requirement in full during the planned period.

The reason I say all of that is that's quite a shift in terms of where the borough has been in terms of meeting housing needs. The housing requirement itself has risen significantly in recent years. And I think it's gone from being somewhere in the region of 260 to 300 units per annum to closer to 1,500 units per annum. So that is a difference. I suspect that is of interest to you.

Natural England 17:57

It hasn't really come as a shock, to be honest, with the publication of the other housing targets, like across the areas that we deal with. It's good to see that you're starting in terms of a sort of urban regeneration first, to meet those targets and then expanding out. I think the first sort of level for us in that, what we would want to see consideration of, is obviously to ensure that your local plan meets the habitats regulations. So particularly with any allocations that may come in around Potters Bar, anything that comes around that area

or any allocations to that sort of northeast of your borough, I would scope in Wormley Hoddesdon Park Woods SAC into an HRA. Obviously at the moment, yes, you're outside of the impact risk zone that we currently have. However, there's potential for an impact pathway if there is going to be a large sort of degree of housing coming in. So that would obviously be for rec pressure. I would scope that into your HRA.

Hertsmere Borough Council 19:12

OK. We will pass that on to AECOM.

Natural England 2 19:17

Okay.

Natural England 1 19:17

Fantastic. Thank you.

Hertsmere Borough Council 19:18

I think that can be the first action from this meeting.

Natural England 1 19:23

Yeah, brilliant. Thank you. And of course, any unprotected sites around there are going to have their own particular requirements, especially with the ancient woodlands. And again, most of those are going to be rec pressure related. From our standpoint, as a person who tends to look through the local plans, it would be helpful for me if, when you are putting in those allocations, those impact risk zones are assessed at that stage. You don't have to come up with any mitigation yet. It's just a case of looking at magic maps and being like, okay, yeah, we know that this particular location will have an impact. It means that I don't have to go back in a letter and say, have you considered this? Because I know that you've already done that. So that's quite good practice, just to make my life easier, quite frankly, and to know that you've done that. So yeah, that would be the first level. Obviously, if you want to follow the agenda we can do, but while it's at the top of my mind, I think coming in with a sort of urban regeneration and, I guess, the new town/new settlement potentially that you're suggesting—there is quite a lot of opportunity there, especially if you're focusing in on GI and the LNRS and BNG opportunities. So yes, it's a target to meet, but while we're having these early conversations, you can potentially, if you're working from the ground up, do some really good green place-based work. So, that's potentially promising.

Hertsmere Borough Council 20:51

I should say—just taking a step back and possibly giving you some reassurance and comfort. We're coming at this from a successful and sustainable placemaking perspective, so while you will hear the likes of X and myself talk about numbers and meeting those targets, it is—and I think it is essential, particularly in terms of getting optimal and efficient use of those sites—because that is key for us, particularly urban sites do heavy lifting and take some of the pressure off the scale of Greenbelt release that we have to consider. Successful and sustainable placemaking can only be achieved if it's quality development. So, the way we're working at the moment in pulling the Reg 18 consultation document together is that quality design, that integration of many of the things you've just mentioned from the outset, through a sort of master planning, design-led approach, is there from the start. That it's not an afterthought. As a point of clarity, the new settlement, we are considering its potential opportunities, and I'll be completely frank with you because there is a promoter there. I think if we weren't, we'd be faced with that sort of adversarial situation. In terms of where it sits within the local plan, because of what it is, potentially and because it could deliver at scale, we are looking at it very much as coming forward at the very end of the plan period, well into the next. So it's all of that. So paragraph 22 in the NPPF, looking forward to at least 30 years beyond.

In terms of a new settlement, rather than—we're not considering this as some sort of golden goose that delivers our housing target overnight, because we don't think that that's going to happen.

I'm really pleased to hear you say there's real opportunity to deliver quality, deliver something with those particular infrastructure networks embedded at the heart.

Natural England 1 23:58

That is good to hear from you as well. That is essentially something that we are really pushing. Particularly, I think you mentioned the green and blue infrastructure elements to the work that AECOM and AR Urbanism are doing.

It would be good, if possible, to get an early sight of that GBI study. We've commented on them before if they have not messed with the requirements as such, but if things are looking good, then again opportunities that we can highlight. I will use this as an opportunity. Simply because I'm sort of thinking, if it's something that you're interested in—so that's your ambition—are you aware of the Nature Towns accreditation scheme?

Hertsmere Borough Council 24:54

No, we have not heard of that scheme.

Natural England 2 24:56

Okay, time to pitch. So, essentially, this started in 2025 and it is an application that you can do. So that work that you're doing in urban centres and different, say, new settlements can be recognised as a nature town.

And the benefit of passing that application, getting yourself logged as a nature town in these different areas, is that you have increased access to funding and investment from, say, like private finance.

This is something—Luton has got an accreditation there, and they're working towards that. And it's something that myself and another colleague on the team are working very closely with local authorities to try and get them to that level when they can be considered a nature town.

So one of the first things that we look at is whether a local plan or authority has a green and blue infrastructure study. And that is then used as the basis to go forward, get some good green infrastructure in, see where the connections are, and then help you get that kind of accreditation. So if you're already putting that work in early days it makes sense if you want to be ambitious to sort of start heading towards that. And that could be existing towns, it doesn't have to be new settlements. So that's why I'm thinking it's very good to hear that you're focusing on that sort of urban regeneration, because if you can integrate GI into that, then we can start having a proper conversation about, okay, let's get you to that next level.

Hertsmere Borough Council 26:32

I'm glad you've brought that up. That is something that's potentially popping out of the AR Urbanism work specifically here in Borehamwood.

Natural England 1 27:17

One of the criteria is accessibility to nature. So if you're showing that you're making strides in trying to increase that, sort of increase that equity across town spaces for people of special deprivation, then that would be—again, it's heading in the right direction. So I just wanted to make you aware of that. That is something that you would be able to apply for. And if you

want to explore that further, you just get in touch with me and I can help you through that process.

Hertsmere Borough Council 27:55

It's the sort of thing that we could conceivably flag up in our Reg 18 consultation document, that this could be an aspiration for the Council in terms of urban regeneration and the new settlement.

Natural England 1 28:20

Yeah, no, that's fantastic. And I think if you're doing it at that stage, having then those strong policies in, say, biodiversity net gain, in like a chalk streams policy, good water, sort of—part of your water scarcity project, seeing that you've got some more stringent sort of litres per day kind of levels based on the new water scarcity study, as well as an NLRS policy, having all of those then embedded in the local plan is just going to give us more confidence and evidence that you are going to commit to this, which I'm sure you are, but just for, you know, the sake of making it very clear to any developers coming through that this is the route that Hertsmere is taking. So you mentioned BNG. Obviously, the minimum 10% requirement is in there.

What is the sort of thinking in terms of going a bit higher than that? I know there are viability studies that showed that 20% is achievable. I just want to know if that was something that you were exploring.

Hertsmere Borough Council 29:59

Development viability – the industry's ability to deliver investment and enhancement on the ground is currently challenging. Many developers claim that they cannot afford to deliver schemes that make that on-site investment.

I think if other people from the Council were here today, from other services, they would reflect your ambition and your eagerness to push forward.

I would be nervous about pushing it too far. There are a lot of investment requirements being put on the industry.

Natural England 1 32:34

Absolutely. No, you need to make sure that they're evidenced. But what I can do, actually, if you'd like, I can make that an action for me—to send over some viability studies from other councils who have reached that 20%. So obviously, I know you're undertaking your own one, but just to have that as a bit of background. Yeah, I think there's a couple that have done that, but obviously, fully understand that the 10% is the minimum. You know, if you go beyond that, we'd be incredibly happy. But I know there are different things that you need to balance, but I'll send you over those studies. And if you can factor that into your current studies that you're doing with AECOM, then that would be fantastic just to explore that as a possibility.

Hertsmere Borough Council 33:12

Brilliant. I think if you could share that, that would be helpful. Thank you.

Natural England 1 33:30

That's no problem, OK?

Hertsmere Borough Council 33:47

For your information, Hertsmere and its Hertfordshire neighbours are going through local government reorganisation, and certainly at the moment we don't fully understand what that sort of landscape post-2028 will look like.

This goes back to the need to meet the timetable we're working for. Among the team, our biggest concern is (and this is a shortcoming of the transition arrangements) if we don't meet that deadline of the 31st of December 2026, there is a real risk that there will be a policy vacuum.

Natural England 2 35:54

And is that risk then that without that policy in place, it's a bit of a free for all in terms of development?

Hertsmere Borough council 36:01

Yes, yes. I mean, the situation we're experiencing now would perpetuate, which effectively is, the developers come in with (I would say) half-cooked schemes that don't really optimise the potential of sites, particularly sites in the Greenbelt. And that just perpetuates sprawl. But it does perpetuate that, and the consequence is that you're just continuously reviewing and potentially releasing Greenbelt to deliver penny packets of housing rather than considering the situation strategically. And, of course, I'll defend inspectors to a degree here—that in the absence of any sort of strategy or spatial strategy for the borough, they just have to make decisions on what they have before them, and obviously what they have before them is an ad hoc, piecemeal approach.

Natural England 1 37:21

Yeah, I'm just wondering whether that's a good segue, sort of thinking about spatial strategies, to ask you about the local nature recovery strategy and how that's being considered by AECOM and AR Urbanism

I've worked on the Herts Local Nature Recovery Strategy for a couple of years. I know it very well, and I just wondered sort of how you're getting on with it in terms of usability and whether you've had a chance to have a look around it and whether the consultants also are comfortable with it and factoring it into their studies and their proposals that they're going to put forward.

Hertsmere Borough Council 38:05

I think, in terms of working backwards, in terms of AECOM and the evidence base, I think 100%—it's been considered.

In terms of the work that we are doing in terms of site allocation, we can make sure that that site consideration is also factored in.

I think the issue with the local nature recovery strategy and BNG is that there's just simply not enough policy officers to dedicate time to it, so I'm doing BNG alongside the local plan. The time constraint there is obviously massive. I know that the local nature recovery strategy is being considered in determining planning applications, but it's been quite difficult. Like I would say that some people have approached me with "Well, I don't really know how to use this," I'm also not the most well-versed in that and they should probably talk to HCC, and I do advise them to do that.

I guess if we spin this around in terms of the Reg 18 and the Reg 19 draft, which is being prepared in parallel, it's really for confirming where we think—perhaps this is an action for both of us—that we confirm where the reference to the local nature recovery strategy is as required reading and what the scale of weight that's given to it through the DM process is—where it's located within those documents, so that it's clear to officers what it is they need to do.

Natural England 1 40:42

Yeah, I think having a specific policy around the LNRS would be good, as in sort of directing people to have notes of, or include that in any plans and make sure that that's the first thing that's looked at.

Have you looked into a potential to have habitat banking in terms of BNG in line with the LNRS along with your allocations, such as strategic allocations? I know that other councils have done this, almost allocating habitat sites at the local plan stage so that you know you're meeting those BNG requirements and it's being uplifted by the LNRS because there is an uplift.

If you do that habitat correctly in line with the Herts LNRS. Is that something that you're considering or have you looked into?

Hertsmere Borough Council 41:37

It's something that we can look into. Hertsmere has a habitat bank in the borough and we're also in the process of sorting out another one at Aldenham, so there is a lot of opportunity for that to happen.

Natural England 1 41:54

Yeah, just something to consider simply because, obviously, going by the mitigation hierarchy, we obviously want any kind of BNG on site first. But if you know that an allocation is going in there and you can factor in that habitat into the red line boundary, doing that in line with the LNRS, you do get that uplift and it will then embed the LNRS into any allocations you have, rather than it being sort of double checking afterwards.

That can certainly be quite a neat approach because it means that you get your BNG requirements in at the offset and you don't have to be, you know, having that discussion with developers about where they need to put what—it's already something that is attached to the allocations.

Hertsmere Borough Council 42:44

So just to confirm, using the local nature recovery strategy, which will show what's on that site—whether it be flora or fauna—and then saying as part of the allocation, we need to deliver X number of homes and also take into account these specifics.

Natural England 1 43:01

Yeah, I mean, ideally avoid high quality habitat, you know, that would be the first call to avoid that. But if, say, there's some Greenbelt site or some sort of brownfield site and adjacent to that is a high quality LNRS-mapped site, then the focus would be to uplift that to carry out the LNRS. If that's fair, Janie. I'm on the right track?

Natural England 2 43:26

Yeah, I don't know whether it's worth me just quickly sharing my screen just to show you a couple of things on the LNRS.

And I'd be happy to come in, actually, and walk your officers around it if that would be of any use.

So this is the map, which will be the main thing that they'll be looking at. There is the strategy document as well, but I've taken us straight into the map. One of the layers on there is called areas of particular importance for biodiversity, and that's your existing designated sites. So that includes SSSIs special areas of conservation, local wildlife sites, local nature reserves, and irreplaceable habitat as defined in the NPPF. So that gives the areas nice and bold where development can't occur. So it's quite an easy layer to use. Then there's a suite of other layers.

And these are all opportunities for either creation or improvement of habitat. And they could be quite good for AECOM to use in their evidence building because they are built on evidence and have built in wider environmental benefits.

So when you're thinking about problems like flooding, it can be quite useful to have a look at what is in the rivers actions, for example. So if you open them up, it sort of gives you a bit more detail and you'll see that there are some in there where it suggests, for example, locations for attenuation features to store surface water.

There's a whole range of habitat actions that would help you meet broader objectives in terms of flooding, air quality, carbon sequestration and those sorts of things. By clicking into the map, it can bring you a pop-up box that tells you exactly what the actions are that are being proposed in a location.

And it gives you a brief descriptor in the pop-up box, but then you can also click into the full strategy document for further information. So it's quite useful just to go through and click on and off the different habitat layers, see what is proposed in a location. So if we were to look at the potential sites up here, you could click them all on and see, okay, is there any habitat being recommended in that location?

If there was something quite prominent, it might be a location to avoid. So there doesn't seem to be anything coming up there, which is quite beneficial in a way in that there's not the potential to develop in a place that's been identified as a strategic location for habitat creation or improvement. But there's lots of opportunity in Hertsmere, mainly for grassland improvement and creation.

And yeah, you can just click on and off these different layers basically and see what's proposed in a specific area. It gets a bit busy if you've got too many layers on, so sometimes it's better to just do one at a time and see exactly what's being proposed.

I say, I can come in and have a chat through with your officers if they need any help learning how to sort of navigate it. Your planners will be used to using GIS tools, but they will have their own kind of idiosyncrasies and it can be helpful just to have someone to show you how to use it.

Hertsmere Borough Council 46:58

I think that would be really helpful. That first layer that was just the orange ones, did you say that's where development couldn't occur?

Natural England 2 47:18

Those are the current designated sites. They will be either a statutory designated site, such as an SSSI or an SAC or an SPA or a Ramsar site, or they'll be a county-designated site, like a local wildlife site, or they'll be irreplaceable habitat, which in Hertfordshire's context is either an ancient woodland or a lowland fen.

So one of the nuances of the Hertfordshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy is that this orange layer, this area of particular importance for biodiversity, which are these designated sites, it doesn't break them down into what designation they are. So it doesn't tell you, okay, this is a local wildlife site, this is a SSSI, and that was to protect the environmental record centres' data.

Hertsmere Borough Council :

Thank you. Well, I think as Ciara said, she'll liaise with you, Janie, and we'll take it from there. But that's a very kind offer. I think it will be helpful for colleagues to understand this.

And obviously unleash the potential of this very valuable tool.

Natural England 2 49:30

So if your plan is to deliver BNG in one of these sites where habitat has been recommended, and you align with that habitat recommendation—so for example, if it says grassland and you plan to deliver grassland in that location—then you get the 15% uplift in BNG, which ultimately means you have to deliver less in terms of area.

Natural England 1 50:28

The water scarcity study that you'll be doing. We do have updated water efficiency standards from the 2025 guidance that I, again, I'll be happy to share with you. Basically, everything else that I've shared I have an action down to send across.

It's similar to BNG, it's a viability study that shows the sort of work that can go on, having those standards be a bit more stringent than other people are looking at, simply because we all know we're in a water scarcity issue, multiple counties. So I can share that with you.

Hertsmere Borough Council 50:52

Yeah, that would be great. Thank you.

Natural England 1 51:11

The only other thing I would say in terms of any green infrastructure policies, it would be fantastic to see reference to the Natural England green infrastructure framework and standards. Yeah, no.

Hertsmere Borough Council 51:24

Yes. So as part of our framework for AECOM, I instructed them to use the Natural England green infrastructure practice because it was pretty much written out for us, so they should be taking that into account when they are doing the study.

Natural England 1 51:34

That's great. Yeah, seeing that named in there just gives a really nice hook for you to be able to direct any developers into better practice. I would say as well, if you're—again, if we're looking at the urbanisation, I would really encourage looking into the urban greening factor as an option there. Brilliant. OK.

Hertsmere Borough Council 52:00

We are doing that. Yeah, that's a big, big hook in all of our settlement master plans—grading and, yeah, just upgrading high-quality Greenbelt if possible, especially if there's a huge amount of Greenbelt, then those areas of Greenbelt, if there's opportunity for them to be enhanced, then that's being explored through the master planning as well.

Natural England 1 52:30

OK, fantastic. Yeah, this is all very much leading into, again, sort of reiterating—if you want to have a conversation about around the nature town accreditation, it sounds like you're very much heading in the right direction to get that. So yeah, if you want to pick that up offline, I have a conversation with X about the LNRS and myself and Anna about NTC, if that's something that you are interested in. Again, very much open for a continuous discussion, especially seeing as you said, you're trying to work to that tight deadline. I think the more proactive we are, the more conversations we have before that happens, the tighter this local plan is going to be and the more likely you are to meet that deadline.

Network Rail

Email

23/01/2026 - Email from HBC to Network Rail

Contents

Initial Duty to Co-operate email

26/01/2026 - Email from HBC to Network Rail

Initial Duty to Co-operate email

03/02/2026 - Email From HBC to Network Rail

Initial Duty to Co-operate email

03/02/2026 - Email from Network Rail to HBC

Direct to the relevant team

12/02/2026 - Email from HBC to Network

Request confirmation of email read receipt

13/02/2026 - Email from Network Rail to HBC

Confirmation of email

16/02/2026 - Email from Network Rail to HBC

Happy to engage over email.

18/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to Network Rail

Consultation on the IDP proforma

NHS Hertfordshire

Email

03/12/2025 - Email from HBC to NHS

Initial Duty to Co-operate

21/01/26 - Email from HBC to NHS

Follow up

21/01/2026 - Email from NHS to HBC

Acknowledgement of email

22/01/26 - Email from NHS to HBC

confirmation of duty to co-operate

26/01/2026 - Email form HBC to NHS

acknowledgement of previous email

18/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to NHS

Consultation on the IDP proforma

25/02/2026 - Email from NHS to AECOM

Request for extension on IDP proforma

02/03/2026 - Email from AECOM to NHS Extension confirmed

Office Of the Rail and Road

Email

Contents

03/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

03/12/2025 - Office of the Rail and Road

Receipt of Email

27/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate

12/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere

Request for receipt of email from previous attempts

Thames Water

Email	Contents
03/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere	Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
16/12/2025 - Email from Thames Water	Receipt of email and agree to meeting
22/12/2025 - Email from Hertsmere	Date for meeting set
22/01/2026 - Email from Thames Water	Agree to meeting
13/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere	Agenda
18/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to Thames Water	Consultation on the IDP proforma

14_01_2026 Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with Thames Water

Executive Summary

A Duty-to-Co-operate meeting was held on 14 January 2026 between Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC), Thames Water, AECOM, and other partners to discuss water infrastructure needs associated with Hertsmere's emerging Local Plan.

Hertsmere outlined its ambitious programme: Regulation 18 consultation and a near-complete draft Regulation 19 to be delivered during 2026, with plan submission required before the 31 December 2026 transitional deadline. The Council is planning for a significant housing increase—from 300 homes/year to 1,200 homes/year—under a regeneration-led spatial strategy directing most growth to Borehamwood, followed by Potters Bar, Bushey, and Radlett. The Council is also consulting on a potential new settlement at Bowman's Cross, though delivery is expected mainly beyond the plan period.

Thames Water outlined current and planned upgrades to key sewage treatment works (baple Lodge and Blackbirds) and highlighted the need to understand site-specific phasing, flows, and employment-related water demand. They emphasised the importance of continued engagement as growth trajectories become clearer.

AECOM's Water Cycle Study team requested further data from Thames Water, including wastewater catchment boundaries, permit information, and guidance on calculating employment-related flows—particularly in light of high-water-use employment such as data centres. HBC also agreed to share its candidate sites, early capacity estimates, and employment land data to support the study.

Both parties confirmed willingness to work collaboratively toward Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) as the Local Plan progresses, with Thames Water expected to provide policy wording and red-amber-green risk assessments at Reg 18 and Reg 19.

Attendees

Hertsmere Borough Council

- Planning Policy Team Leader
- Planning Policy Officer (Duty to Co-operate)
- Senior Planning Policy Officer

AECOM

- Senior Engineer (Water Cycle Study)

Thames Water

- Town Planner, Thames Water Property
- Development Planning Manager (Local Plans & planning applications)

Actions

For Hertsmere Borough Council

1. Share candidate site list and early capacity estimates with Thames Water for internal modelling (for pre-Reg 18 review).
2. Provide employment site GIS data and job number forecasts once the relevant officer returns.
3. Forward AECOM's email requests (including permit access issues) to Thames Water. Share information on data centre proposals and consents with Thames Water.

For Thames Water

1. Provide missing wastewater catchment boundaries (Maple Lodge, Blackbirds, etc.) and associated GIS layers.
2. Send PDFs of permits (instead of inaccessible links) to support AECOM's Water Cycle Study.
3. Advise on appropriate employment water-use assumptions, including specific figures for high-intensity uses (e.g., data centres).

4. Continue to engage with developers on network capacity, connection points, and potential phasing requirements.
5. Prepare policy wording for Reg 18/Reg 19 and maintain red-amber-green assessments of sites.

Joint / Ongoing

1. Work toward Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) ahead of plan submission.
2. Maintain ongoing liaison as modelling, site trajectories, and infrastructure studies evolve.

14_01_2026 Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate with Thames Water Transcript

[1:02 - 1:38] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Good afternoon colleagues from Thames. May I ask, are you all here as you anticipate? Shall we kick off then without further ado? So firstly thank you for everybody's attendance this afternoon. I'm hoping that this meeting and any future meetings that we need to have, or indeed any future contact that we need to have, will be mutually beneficial, certainly from our perspective as the plan-making authority, this contact in terms of plan-making and parallel infrastructure planning is proving very beneficial and hopefully will see us continue that positive track through the process.

We can do some brief introductions if that's okay. I think some people will know who I am. We have, I believe, met Nikki virtually via email. My name's X I'm Hertsmere's Planning Policy Team Lead.

[2:27 - 2:42] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Hello, I'm X. I am a Planning Policy Officer in X's team. At the moment, I am kind of overseeing the duty to cooperate, which is obviously a big part of the local plan process.

[2:48 - 3:01] Hertsmere Borough Council 3:

Hi, my name is X. I've newly joined X's team as a senior planning policy officer.

[3:02 - 3:16] AECOM:

My name is X. I'm senior engineer for AECOM and I'm one of the few people, I think we're about five people working on the water cycle study as part of a bigger contract with Hertsmere.

[3:19 - 3:41] Thames Water 1:

If I go first, I'm X I'm a town planner in Thames Water Property, so I'll kind of have a broad overview of all things planning for Thames, whether it's working on oversight of capital delivery projects where we need planning permission, or arguing we don't need planning permission, but also inputting into local plan representations where I'm assisted by X. I've got a figure I've worked on before on something, X. I don't know, have you always been at Hertsmere or...?

[3:48 - 4:08] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

No, no, so my time at Hertsmere has been fairly brief in comparison to X and X but just like the Beach Boys, I do get around, so you may have come across me driving up and down a different strip.

[4:13 - 4:25] Thames Water 2:

I'm X, Development Planning Manager. So as X says, I work with him on responding to local plans and my team is also responsible for reviewing third-party planning applications.

[4:29 - 4:39] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Brilliant. Well, I think the first item on our agenda, the first substantive item on our agenda is a sort of an update on Hertsmere's local plan making process. If you had an opportunity to read our local development scheme you will see that the Council has quite an ambitious programme for its plan making. Effectively, 2026 is when we do it all so we are intending to go out to consult on Reg 18 and I suspect subject to that going well, Reg 19 fairly rapidly after that. I will prepare you in advance by saying our Reg 18 draft will be fairly close to what you will get at Reg 19, so that seamless step between the two stages will be that much closer. When I say they'll be alike, the content will be very clearly set out in Reg 18. I think as you may be aware, as part of that process, the Council has commissioned both AECOM and AR Urbanism to undertake two separate but two comprehensive sets of evidence-based building and that's the reason Tamara is here today as part of that. That evidence-based building process is well advanced and is already feeding into the preparation of the Reg 18. We fully envisage that many of the studies will be, if not fully published, at least at draft stage by the time we get to Reg 18, the remainder are likely to finish publishing before we get to Reg 19, so that work is ongoing. A little bit about the local plan, I would normally assume that because this is in the public realm it's common knowledge but isn't necessarily so for clarity. Hertsmere has a housing requirement that has substantially increased housing requirements, and the standard method, all the way back in December 2024. The real-world consequence of that is that Hertsmere's housing requirement effectively goes from the position it was a couple of years ago of delivery of about 300 homes per annum to a new position of about 1,200 homes per annum. That is the figure that we are working towards. The Council has made, and our members continue to make, a commitment that we will meet that need in full.

We are intending to submit a sound and legally compliant local plan. What I would say is that we will be unable to do so unless we do demonstrate that we are meeting that need in force. So the two go nicely together. We are preparing a spatial strategy of planning policies and site allocations that will secure that. The spatial strategy is very simple and straightforward. It follows the borough's settlement hierarchy, so the majority of future growth will be directed towards Borehamwood, followed by Potter's Bar, then Bushey and Radlett. We're currently working on what the proportions are, but I think if you go on the basis that literally the majority of the growth will go to Borehamwood and then Potter's Bar, a little bit to Bushey and considerably less to Radlett. That is roughly how it pans out.

Everywhere else gets nothing in terms of site allocations or growth being directed towards those smaller settlements. The slight twist on all of this, and you may be aware of this, is that certainly as part of the Reg 18 process and possibly as part of Reg 19, the Council is anticipating consulting on a possible new settlement to the north of the borough that settlement roughly equates to an area of land known as Bowman's Cross which is adjacent to the small town of London Colney which lies outside of Hertsmere but is part of St Albans.

That new settlement option is in our estimation unlikely to deliver housing in at scale during the planned period simply because of what it will involve in terms of infrastructure planning, possibly most significantly in terms of highways infrastructure and other transport infrastructure. So that new settlement is being considered within us in a wider strategic

context that would include issues such as maintaining the significant step change in delivery of growth beyond the planned period, so across the sort of the 30 years that the current NPPF envisages. And also, and I think this is important, also within the strategic in local government administration terms, strategic context of local government reorganisation. And within that context we are talking, or beginning to talk with our neighbours about how a new settlement in that part of the borough may evolve over time. It's likely to be bigger than a sort of than what could be accommodated within our current administrative boundary.

One of the driving forces behind that new settlement is that there is a developer promoting the site. The advice that officers are giving members is to see this as an opportunity and consider it in that context because they're not going to go away. They've invested in the site so let's see what's possible from it. I think there are a couple of other bullet points on our agenda but I think one of the things I would sort of emphasize on those remaining bullet points is that it's clear that in order to make that step change in delivery of growth we not only need a lot of sites we also need a diverse supply of sites and a spatial strategy that allows for a diverse supply of sites. So the sites that you are likely to see coming forward through this process are not exclusively large strategic urban extensions.

It is a full mix going from strategic urban extensions sites, so strategic regeneration sites within our existing urban areas and as part and parcel of that intensification of our existing urban areas. That's particularly going to be the case in respect of Borehamwood and Potter's Bar where there are opportunities for that to happen. I suspect that that sort of regeneration is going to result in an increase in vertical intensity, again particularly here in Borehamwood where there is the capacity and the market for taller buildings.

When I say taller buildings, I'm not talking sort of London scale, but certainly somewhere between 12 to 20 storeys within Borehamwood appears to be where the market is currently pushing for. So that spatial strategy will have that sort of regeneration and intensification element to it that's likely to have implications for your side of the infrastructure business. So it's really over to you in terms of what do you make of that one then?

[14:59 - 15:14] Thames Water 1

In terms of the overall numbers, I think it's useful to know that and obviously all that as we get the consultation can be fed through our asset planners and that can be used for helping to inform the future business plans and so on for necessary upgrades. By all means, correct me if I'm wrong anywhere where I'm talking on this, X, but I think the whole of Hertsmere from memory is probably shared by a couple of shows of stream works. I think we've got Maple Lodge and Blackbird shows of stream works.

There are current upgrades planned for those works and in the process of moving forwards, certainly for Maple Lodge. In terms of the scale of those upgrades, they are based on growth that we have known about when we got to the last business plan. So obviously this is additional on top. But having said that, I think the design horizon was around 2040. So again, it would be likely there would be capacity within the works to some degree, but it may be that when additional upgrades are needed moves forward potentially, but would need to be guided by the asset planners on that in terms of when and where further upgrades are necessary and I think that's where we'd need to be engaging, carry on engagement with yourselves and other authorities within the area I know we have been approached by Hertfordshire County Council who are looking at their spatial development strategy and again I think that is something which will be really useful for us in getting a better understanding of the more holistic approach to growth and where and when it's going to

come forward, which is something I think has been missing ever since the abolition of the regional development strategies, really.

So, yeah, at the moment it has been, I think, quite difficult for us from an asset management point of view in terms of knowing where and when growth is coming forward with constant changes to housing methodologies and, obviously, around London we've got a lot of greenbelt constraints. You might look at the housing requirements and it's sky-high but actually a lot of the boroughs are heavily constrained by Greenbelt floodplains so have historically not delivered anywhere near that which is also factored into our planning.

[17:24 - 17:43] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

I fear that the wind has changed on a lot of that and I mean certainly going into this process, going into examination, there will be no hope for us if we don't meet our need in full. So that's where we're starting from. Just very quickly and for clarity, I'm conscious that a lot of decisions have already been taken in Hertsmere ostensibly by the planning inspector in order to encourage that step change. A lot of those commitments are likely to feature in our five-year supply as we submit this plan. Again, plot spoiler, a lot of those sites are likely to feature as site allocations. A lot of those sites are underperforming in terms of what they can deliver in terms of their land take. Again, it is ramping up that intensity of development, whether it's within existing urban areas on previously developed sites or on the Virgin Greenfield sites.

[18:55 - 19:31] Thames Water 1:

I fully agree with that. I fully agree there's been a movement in government policy and so on to move forward with delivery of all this housing. I know previous governments went backwards and forwards a little bit multiple times, which has never been particularly useful. But I think there is a need for it, and I think that's where we need to be liaising closely with our asset plans based on the evidence we get from yourselves and other stakeholders over the certainty of what development is going to be coming forward and at what rates that can feed into the asset plans and our future business plans. Like I said, there are upgrades progressing, so short-term I don't think there'll be capacity constraints once those are being delivered, which I think are targeted for 2030 for Maple Lodge at least. But then it might be that it brings forward when additional upgrades are needed, so we'll have to feed that into future business plans, make sure we're keeping pace with growth that's coming forward.

[20:09 - 20:35] Thames Water 2:

Sorry, just to add on those, there's a couple of studies going on at the moment, aren't there, to understand what's happening at Maple at the moment. You may or may not be aware that applications we see and we are seeking conditions around the sewage treatment works because we've got concerns about accommodating growth. But yeah, those studies are working in tandem just to understand what we need to deliver and when we need to deliver it by. And as X says, yeah, the design horizon at the moment is 2030.

[20:43 - 21:04] Thames Water 1

Those plans are progressing, also, with a separate hat on within them, so involved with oversight of those projects. So I know they are getting well advanced with design of upgrades and so on. focusing on those delivery dates, but there's discussions with other third-party stakeholders as well on those.

On the network side, it's more about keeping the actual detail of specific development sites, so we would need to be engaging with ourselves and more importantly developers to understand what is the scale of their development, what's the breakdown of the size of units and so on, and where are they planning to connect to the existing network, because we can't prevent connection. They can effectively choose where to connect to our network.

Put in a Section 106 connection request, which is always confusing for me as a planner. Section 106 is the Water Industry Act, not the Planning and Planning Act. But we cannot legally withhold that. It's basically a technicality. So if they comply with the technical specifications, they can connect. That obviously has potential to result in off-site impacts if suddenly we've got a big flow going through a sewer which doesn't have capacity for that additional flow. So there may be occasions where we need to do upgrades to the network to support development sites and where that does occur we sometimes seek phasing conditions so that we can accommodate 200 home development we can accommodate 50 but before units 51 upwards are occupied we need to have those network upgrades completed so we would look to work with developers and yourselves to agree suitable strategies for managing and aligning those new assets where they are needed to make sure we don't have pollution incidents or anything like that.

[22:55 - 23:32] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

In terms of how that integrates into the local plan, I'm assuming, as I know you as Thames have done elsewhere, in my last authority you very helpfully did this, provided suitable words for plant planning policy and site allocations. We are hoping, I think as I implied, we are hoping to sort of allocate the HECC out of this plan to ensure that the actual supply has a sort of a degree of certainty. Yes, I mean there is that opportunity for some words in every site allocation to cover this.

[23:47 - 24:10] Thames Water 2:

X is the policy expert, so he would be the ones providing me the words around policy, but what we do at Reg 18 and Reg 19 is a high-level red-amber-green assessment essentially. So red; we're definitely going to need to do some modelling to understand the impact and what infrastructure needs to be delivered. amber; is we're likely to need to do some modelling and green; is good to go.

[24:18 - 24:37] Thames Water 1:

I know you mentioned about specific site allocations and obviously how about red-amber-green assessment. That is a point-in-time exercise and things can change over time. So I think it's more likely we'd just look to make sure there's a sort of policy hook to enable us to agree with yourselves for phasing conditions to be attached. We may have site-specific comments on that, but realistically I think we need it to be possible to apply to any development. You might have your trajectory of weather housing coming forward, but you

get delays in some sites, others will be accelerated. That then maybe changes which one we have concerns about because it might be that one's coming forward earlier taking the capacity and the other one that impacts on the others So it's again just managing that process

[25:11 - 25:51] Hertsmere Borough Council:

That trajectory work is still underway so but having said that what I think we could and we have shared this with others what we could other infrastructure partners I should say what we can share is our list of candidate sites and they're sort of, how can I put this, initial early anticipated capacities. So we have a list of candidate sites, they're not site allocations, but we can certainly share those with Thames on the basis that they're not, they're for your own internal use and nothing else. If that would be helpful and perhaps front load some of this work?

[26:00 – 26:24] Thames Water 2:

Be helpful from a treatment works perspective, from a network perspective, as X says, you know, that there is the possibility that sites might be delayed, we don't reserve capacity, so we probably wouldn't feed phasing of sites into that assessment quite as much as we would into a treatment works assessment.

[26:32 – 26:53] Thames Water 1:

One other aspect from our point of view is you mentioned a lot of this, you're focusing on the existing urban areas and that's an area where there's maybe opportunities for reducing the impacts on our infrastructure to some degree. If you're redeveloping areas that, I don't know if they're existing housing areas that will be redeveloped or if it's more commercial

[26:53 - 27:23] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Commercial areas, so for example two of the largest sites within Borehamwood's' existing urban area are the, I can sort of point to them, so in that direction the Town Centre Retail Park and the Tesco on Elstree Way, which is a particularly large Tesco. If you're possibly familiar with it, I wouldn't expect you to be.

[27:31 - 27:54] Thames Water 1:

I think where it's redeveloping existing sites, there is potential there to be existing flows from existing developments, and obviously that needs to be taken into account. So if you've got particularly water-intensive uses which are being removed and they sort of drain to our network, that maybe means it would have a lesser impact than if it was a brand new development on a greenfield site. So that kind of weighs into our assessment of effects. I'm no expert. I'm a jack of all trades. I would be assuming that what we're looking at with those two sites is intensification with quite a bit of verticality, so it might not work out that way.

[27:56 - 28:12] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Moving on to the water cycle study. Okay, X you can come in

[28:39 - 29:13] AECOM:

Sure. And thank you so much for sending the information across. We're still missing a few points. I just want to cover those. Can you see my email named the Hertsmere Local Plan? Yep. So, for the permits, you mentioned the EA website. I only have access to permit notice of variation or compliance assessment reports, and also when I click on these PDFs which you join, Nikki, I think I need the Thames Water account. Could it be possible to send these PDFs without... I'm not sure. Maybe just send the PDF, not the link, because I can't access that.

I've sent this email to X Could you send this email to X

[29:47 - 29:59] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

I certainly can, yes. Thank you. Thank you, X in advance. I'm very appreciative that you... we've asked a lot of you. Thank you.

[30:00 - 30:06] Thames Water 2:

I acknowledge it has been quite painful. So, yes, I'll try and make this one a bit smoother.

[30:09 - 30:30] AECOM:

Thank you very much. And you mentioned you have sent the GIS layers of the water recycling centers. However, we haven't received those. We have received the sewers and I copied my GIS. We received a lot of things. However, we're still missing the boundaries of water recycling centers. I've received all of this via secured link, but there is no boundary of water recycling center. I know here it's written boundary, but it's not that. But there is loads of really interesting information that we will use, like, for example, the location of the sewers.

[31:00 - 31:03] Thames Water 1:

Is that the boundary of the catchments that you're after, rather than the boundary of the recycling

[31:04 - 31:35] AECOM:

Yes, I want the boundary of the catchments and the water recycling centre, yeah. Because there's three of them that are in Hertsmere and I will use Hertsmere's settlements to try to see which fits in which catchment. But yeah, maybe it's my sentence wasn't right. You probably send the boundary of the water recycling center and not the...

[31:41 - 31:42] Thames Water 2,

Okay. So the areas that that Maple serves essentially is what you're looking for.

[31:47 - 31:50] AECOM:

Yes, not just Maple, but also Blackbird. I will resend this email and rephrase. because I think this was creating confusions of the catchments. Okay, I'll resend this email. And my second question, sorry, my third question is about employment. So we have a very simple XL2 with the dry weather flow and the permit just to see the capacity for our report. However, we haven't included employment yet. Maybe the first question would be for the Council. Do you think you will provide potential employment soon?

[32:43 - 33:05] Hertsmere Borough Council:

Yes. The person who will be able to help the site on that is back next week. So I'm assuming when you say potential employment, it's not just sort of a table of committed sites or anything like that. You want the GIS layer as well.

[33:05 - 33:06] AECOM:

If that's possible, yes.

[33:07 - 33:17] Hertsmere Borough Council:

And the numbers. So yes, it will be my colleague X when she returns from leave next week. But yes, we will 100% try and make you happy on that one.

[33:19 - 33:21] AECOM:

So you would like it to be included in the scoping report?

[33:21 - 33:32] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

I think so, given the nature of some of the employment uses that are coming forward and their impact on water demand.

[33:32 - 34:05] AECOM:

Yes, okay. So usually what we do, and that's a question for Thames Water, we use 16 litres per employee per day. Is that something you would validate? The other way of doing it, however, we can do it without receiving the employment data. We've had in the past added 10% to their residential number to account for the employment sites. But if you give us numbers, ideally we would use this number. Is that the number that Thames Water is happy with?

[34:10 - 34:27] Thames Water 2:

You reference broad scale of employment uses. I think it would be helpful to understand what they might be because some are more water intensive, so therefore discharge more water to the network than others.

[34:28 - 34:50] Thames Water 1:

I think the modern developments which are very high profile at the moment obviously got data centres which might employ five people and they are going to have far more than 80 litres per day. They are massive uses of water or can be unless they come up with more sustainable solutions and we're having issues with that elsewhere. So yeah, the landscape is changing with employment to some degree, but it all depends on the nature of the employment development that's coming forward.

[35:05 - 35:26] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

You've said almost everything I was going to say, X, and the reason for the Council wishing to factor this into the work is specifically because we have a data set to come in Multiple, sorry.

[35:27 - 35:36] Thames Water:

Have you got any more information on that we can share? We've got people in the business that are looking specifically at... They may already be engaged with them.

[35:38 - 35:45] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Maybe under item 5 we can list the actions and that can be an action that we share with you.

[35:48 - 35:58] Thames Water 2:

We've got new policy wording being worked through, haven't we, X?

[35:58 - 36:21] AECOM:

For the scoping report, we usually don't go into that much detail. However, what we can do is have like a general number for employments that are not data center and maybe if you could recommend a number for a data center and then I could have two different numbers that we could use. Could that be an okay approach?

[36:25 - 36:27] Thames Water 2:

I can ask the question.

[36:29 - 36:30] Thames Water 1:

Okay. I can't answer that but we can take it away.

[36:31 - 36:38] AECOM:

Yeah. I will rewrite my email that I sent you, X, and I will include that question as well.

[36:39 - 36:40] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Thank you. Thank you.

[36:42 - 37:00] AECOM:

Yeah, just to keep in mind, I'll put it in the email, but this is a scoping study. There will be a detailed study later on, but for the scoping study we usually have quite simple calculations just to give us an idea. So I would appreciate if there were not too many parameters without saying data centers,

[37:11 - 37:19] Thames Water 2:

You could caveat-intensive users, maybe. Yep. I'll ask the question and see what they come back with.

[37:19 - 37:23] AECOM:

Sounds good. Thank you. That's all my questions.

[37:25 - 37:42] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Smashing. I was going to suggest under next steps, we quickly run through some of the actions and the things that we've agreed to exchange with one another. So there's all the all the stuff around Tamara's data request. I'm going to work on the basis that we will share with you the candidate site information for your internal purposes ahead of Reg 18. And we can also share as part of that process, the information that's out there on the data centre proposals and consents.

[38:21 - 38:34] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Okay. In terms of duty to cooperate, is there anything Thames Water needs from the council to kind of tick any boxes? Or if we kind of covered it in this meeting? Just think off the top of my head if there was something else.

[38:38 - 39:04] Thames Water 1:

I think it's probably been largely covered by the meeting and it'll be following on as we move through the consultation process, we'll be able to respond. When we respond on policy and so on, I try not to come in suggesting wholesale new policies just for us and just try to look at what you've got and if there's minor tweaks that can be proposed just to make sure we've got hooks that we need without causing too many problems.

[39:08 - 39:31] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

I think that's understood and we're very accepting of that approach. We can definitely work with that. Moving forward, as we outlined at the very beginning, this is an ambitious timetable. We need to get to submission before the end of this year. At that point of submission, certainly close to as we can be with you guys to signing SOCGs, I'm sort of mindful that it's not as simple a matter as signing SOCGs with you. It's also ensuring that any Consequential SOCGs we may wish to sign with the development industry, recognise your requirements for specific sites that are being promoted. But I think that's certainly how I would envisage the next whatever it is 12 to 18, 24 months panning out.

[40:30 - 40:41] Thames Water 1:

I mean it's only a sort of SHPs we've entered into those on numerous local plans in the past so we're happy to work with you on submitting them. Yeah,

[40:42 - 41:06] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

I mean I guess in the best case scenario it's a couple of sides of A4 and both organisations are happy and I think it is given the scale of growth that's coming Hertsmere's way, it may not be as simple as that, but I guess we'll see.

[41:09 - 41:34] Thames Water 1:

Yeah, I think we'll have to obviously review it. Like I said, there are upgrades coming for maple and blackbirds which will hopefully address issues in the short term at least for the first 5-10 years of the local plan, then it will be agreeing to monitor and manage as we go forward and putting forward the proposals for future business plans for further upgrades. But again, we'd need to liaise our asset planners on all of that.

[43:24 - 43:52] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Well I think that leaves us all with a bit of work to do, so thank you X, thank you. It's lovely to meet you. I hope you don't mind me saying, I hope we don't meet too frequently and we continue to move forward on this particular issue in a positive way. Thank you again it's good to see you as always.

Transport for London

Email	Contents
03/12/2025 -Email from Hertsmere	Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
21/01/26 - Email from Hertsmere	Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
23/01/2026 - Email from Hertsmere	Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
12/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere	Initial Email Request for Duty to Co-operate
13/02/2026 - Email from TFL	Agree to meeting
17/02/2026 - Email from Hertsmere	Proposed dates for meeting
02/03/2026 - Email from TFL	Agree to meeting
04/03/2026 - Email from Hertsmere	Link for the meeting and agenda

04_03_2026 Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate Meeting with Transport for London

Executive Summary

A Duty to Co-operate meeting took place between Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) and Transport for London (TfL) on 4 March 2026 to discuss strategic transport considerations relating to the emerging Hertsmere Local Plan. HBC provided an update on plan progress, including its intention to submit the Local Plan by 31 December 2026 under transitional NPPF arrangements, with Regulation 18 consultation planned for mid-April.

HBC outlined its spatial strategy, which aims to deliver approximately 16,500 homes over the plan period through a regeneration-first approach focused on Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Bushey, and Radlett, supplemented by strategic Green Belt release and potential new settlement at Bowman's Cross. TfL provided early reflections on rail, bus service capacity, bus garage safeguarding, and challenges associated with electrification of the bus fleet.

Both parties recognised the need for ongoing collaboration, particularly once site allocations and housing distribution become available at Reg 18. Key themes included bus service viability, safeguarding of existing transport infrastructure, opportunities and limitations for mixed-use redevelopment of bus garages, and the need to understand potential demand arising from growth.

Given the proximity to London and cross-boundary travel patterns, both organisations emphasised working jointly toward sustainable transport outcomes. TfL also noted constraints linked to funding, bus standing space, depot capacity, and wider London Plan policy considerations.

The meeting concluded with agreed actions on sharing information, further analysis, and scheduling follow-up engagement after the pre-election period.

Attendees

Hertsmere Borough Council

- Planning and Policy Officer
- Principal Planning Policy Officer

Transport for London

- Principal City Planner, London Plan Team
- Principal City Planner, Spatial Planning & Local Plan Programme (GLA liaison)

Agreed Actions

- 1. Hertsmere to assess bus capacity and sustainable transport impacts**
 - Review bus capacity requirements and other sustainable transport modes in the context of proposed growth and intensification, and consider implications for TfL.
- 2. Review existing TfL assets within Hertsmere**
 - Consider implications for the **Potters Bar bus garage**, railway stations, and other TfL-related infrastructure.
 - Keep TfL informed about any emerging land-use proposals that may impact these assets.
- 3. Share detailed information with TfL at Regulation 18**
 - Provide TfL with site allocations, proposed housing distribution, and relevant transport evidence once available (expected mid-April after Cabinet sign-off).
- 4. Arrange a follow-up meeting**
 - Schedule a meeting **after the pre-election period** and once Hertsmere has published Reg 18 material.
- 5. Maintain open communication**
 - TfL and HBC to contact one another by email for any urgent issues or if a further meeting is required sooner.

04_03_2026 Hertsmere Duty to Co-operate Meeting with Transport for London

[0:08 - 0:17] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Shall we do a quick round of introductions? So, X, do you want to go first?

[0:18 - 0:31] TFL 1:

Yeah, I'm X I'm a principal city planner at TFL in London plan team, and I lead on our responses to planning policy consultations from outside Greater London.

[0:33 - 1:04] TFL 2:

Hi, I'm X Principal City Planner and the same team in spatial planning. I lead on the local plan program for London as well as on the wider southeast planning liaison and we both actually are feeding into our next London plan so that's one of the main work It's been keeping us very busy. And just as a background, I was also working with GLA for part of my time in London and in the local plans team.

[1:18 - 1:30] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I'm X. I'm a planner at Hertsmere. I'm working mostly on the planning policy documents that are looking at density around the four main settlements in Hertsmere.

[1:32 - 1:52] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

And I'm X. I am a Planning and Policy Officer in the same team as X. Unfortunately, X couldn't be here today. He is our team leader who usually sits in on these. But I am overseeing the duty to cooperate as part of the local plan and then also just generally helping Anthony out on whatever else that needs doing.

[1:54 - 2:13] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

So moving on to the second item on the agenda, which is an update on the Hertsmere Local Plan. We're reviewing our local plan. We're hoping to submit it by December 31st this year. So we're going for the previous transitional arrangements in advance of the new NPPF. We will be going out to Reg 18 in mid-April. What the plan is seeking to do is meet our full housing need across the plan period, which is approximately 16,500 new homes, It's roughly 1100 homes per annum. And the spatial strategy is looking to focus on regeneration of existing towns in the four main settlements, which are Borehamwood, Potter's Bar, Bushey and Radlett. We're taking a regeneration approach first. So we've been looking at existing urban sites. However, to meet our full housing needs, we will also be looking at the strategic release of some green belts, which will be informed by our evidence base studies. We've commissioned AECOM to produce about 25 pieces of evidence for us. So that ranges from everything you see in a normal local plan, such as Greenbelt, all the way through to economic study and housing requirements. And we are also looking at masterplans, which

we have commissioned a London-based consultancy called AR Urbanism. They're looking at the comprehensive regeneration of those four settlements and the sites within them, which will be coming forward. Ideally, it's mixed use sites. We don't have a confirmed list of sites yet. Our Reg 18 will seek to be test some of those sites. So unfortunately, we're not able to share them with you at the moment.

[4:10 - 4:41] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I think that's good. I guess the bit about the sites is the bit that we're all interested in and I think maybe would be within your sphere of interest as well. When we go to Reg 18, we'll have a very long list of sites of which we have already done evaluations. We have excluded some sites, and we anticipate there'll be more that will fall out during Reg 18 and into Reg 19. And I guess that the approach that we're taking is to throw more into the mix at this stage and then strip back the ones that don't work rather than doing a tighter assessment now.

[4:56 – 7:39] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

We are also going to be testing the possibility of a new settlement, which I'm sure you've already come across, which is Bowman's Cross in the north east of the borough. It sits south of St Albans and pretty much adjacent to London Colney. That will hopefully be coming forward towards the end of the plan period, but will be taking on quite a sizable number of units. Borehamwood will be seeing the most regeneration, followed by Potters Bar, and then Bushey and Radlett mopping up the rest. All of the regeneration will be in line with the existing urban fabric of those settlements. So Radlett is quite a small town, so it wouldn't make sense to see a massive, huge extension to the end of that. But we wouldn't be looking to change existing settlements in a particularly major way.

How TfL comes into this is there's going to be a lot of intensification of use. There is existing TfL routes through Potter's Bar and Borehamwood. Given our proximity to areas such as Enfield and Barnet, we will be looking to basically ensure that those positive links remain. But also just understanding what TfL's approach is to non-London but somewhat London-based boroughs such as ourselves, especially when there's already assets and links within our borough. This meeting is to understand what your position is and then how we can move forward with the intensification of the use of public transport. We're looking to move to more sustainable models as part of the local plan and working in conjunction with Hertfordshire County Council ahead of local government reform.

[7:45 - 7:46] TFL 1:

I mean, I guess one question first. Do you have a sense yet of sort of what the distribution of the sort of 16,000 homes across the planned period would be between the towns, like sort of the census scale, and then how much you would be thinking about in terms of the new settlements?

[8:05 - 8:19] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I can field that one. So in terms of the mix across the settlements, we don't have that nailed down at the moment, but we are likely to have a better idea in Reg 18. So in six weeks' time, we'll be able to share that with you.

In terms of Bowman's Cross, that's an interesting one where we have a pre-application process that's currently underway with the proposal. And I think the council has a different... It's a slightly different vision for the site than what the promoters currently do in terms of probably wanting greater numbers in a new settlement. We don't have any kind of policy on it. We don't have an SPD or anything in the existing local plan that we can point to other than a, you know, hazy allocation, you know, recent draft. So, yeah, so we would be looking, I think we'll be testing in the Reg 18 process. Is this a 4,000 or 7,000 dwelling settlement? Realistically, There might be potential for more, we don't know. But in terms of what will come forward during the planned period on that site, I think the numbers would be pretty low. I think it would potentially be, you know, maybe not more than 2,000, potentially less than one, just because of the very slow build-out rate of new settlements. There's a lot of groundwork to be done before construction can commence and then they can only build a certain number a year.

[10:12 - 10:24] TFL 1

We've certainly seen or had similar themes with Greenbelt locations in London where they're sort of prospectively being promoted ahead of us having a policy position beyond what's in the current London plan, which is no release of greenbelt over very special circumstances. So it's interesting to hear that. It looks like it may not be the closest to any rail stations, which can present a challenge from a transport perspective, and it's by the M25 as well. So, yeah, just anticipating what could end up happening there. In terms of, I guess, sort of the links to London. So one thing that is worth mentioning is that we are exploring the devolution of the Great Northern Inner Services with DfT. We don't know where that's going to go yet, but we are exploring that and that would affect Potter's Bar in particular. So those are the services into Moorgate, so Moorgate to Welling Garden City.

And also, as part of that, looking at if there would be opportunities to increase the frequency along that line if it were devolved. So that's one thing to be aware of. I mean, we'll know more over the coming months. I don't think there's too much more to say on that. And then I guess on the bus side, I did have a quick look. You know, we do operate a number of bus services into Hertsmere. We also have a couple bus garages. It's really going to, for bus provision generally, so we're required to provide bus services to places that have clear cross-boundary link in the GLA Act. And as we've interpreted that, where there are sort of significant settlements or places that are around the up to five kilometre mark from Greater London. So that is definitely where we already operate the bus services to Bushey Heath, Borehamwood and Potter's Bar. So those certainly, depending on what is proposed in the plan and site allocations, we could look at what the options would be for improving those things. It does come down to, are we able to have the infrastructure to support those bus services? One of the most important things and most challenging things for us at the moment is having sufficient bus standing spaces. It's not a particularly, interesting topic perhaps, but it's really important that we have the bus standing space at the end of routes so that we have somewhere to keep the buses as they're between runs.

If we wanted to increase bus provision, that would be essential. Bus depot capacity is also a bit of a crunch point for us at the moment.

So that's one thing to be aware of as well. So I think losing any bus garages in site allocations would be a problem. And it would make it much harder to deliver sort of a robust bus network. And it might well be the case that we need additional capacity for bus garages as well. I mean, we'll be able to work through this once we have more detail in the consultation, I suppose, but I think those are the first things that come to mind.

[14:16 - 14:38] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Sorry, can I just pick up on the bus garage one? So do you have, well, both the bus garage and the sort of layover places, do you have specifications on those in terms of the land take and how far they have to be to the start of the route and those types of things.

[14:38 - 15:03] TFL 2:

Actually, even before you answer that, I also wanted to mention we've been having conversations with our bus colleagues for the Enfield local plan, and I suppose you might be aware of the crucial being kind of put forth for the new town, and we'll know the... final results after it's submitted, maybe towards spring. So one of the things that I remember from those conversations with the bus colleagues is that the finances are quite tight. The TFL bus services are already highly subsidized and the gap between fare and operating costs has been increasing. So, when the questions around improving or enhancing bus services outside London has been put forth, they've been quite, hesitant in promoting that dialogue. So I would caution when you're sort of thinking about depending on TFL enhancing or improving bus services. Again, more conversation with the bus colleagues after we have some more details from the consultation would be helpful, but I just wanted to put it out there before we get into the details of the capacity and the bus garages. Yeah. Sorry, Ethan, go ahead.

[16:22 - 17:13] TFL 1:

In terms of things like standing spaces, we have bus service planning guidelines, which I can share. I need to double check if that includes specifications for bus standing spaces, but that should be in there. In terms of bus garages, typically they're owned by the franchise holders, to my knowledge. So it's more for them to determine what they need depending on the capacity. The bus garage would be of a different capacity, but I think, off the top of my head, around 60,000 square feet is sort of an average-sized bus garage in terms of floor space, but I can double-check that as well.

Those are some pinch points just to be aware of as well. We can look at sort of the capacity implications once we have more information on site allocations.

[17:37 - 18:08] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

I think what X said is quite a major point for us, given that our plan kind of rests on intensification both... expanding towns and vertical intensification. Yeah. So if we could just

kind of reverse back to that point a little bit just so I understand, what TFL are saying is due bus services being subsidised, there's not a huge amount of money there,

[18:20 - 18:53] TFL 2:

I think it's more like we should have that conversation once we have the details and even if the plan is not out if you wanted to sort of share something in confidence and we can share with our bus colleagues because this is more of an overarching kind of position but not based on the details. It's trying to understand what's the value and what's the business case as there's a lot of other factors that might play out so I didn't want to like fully discourage.

[19:09 - 19:39] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

What you've said is very important, but also you're not the first person to have said that it's a bigger issue. We can definitely talk to X our team leader, about sharing things because obviously there are bus links within Borehamwood and Potters Bar, including that bus garage. And that's quite a major transport issue that we will need to definitely talk about in further detail. So I think it's worth us possibly going back and seeing what we can share just so that when it comes to Reg 18 so that we are all on the same page.

When it comes to the bus garage in Potters Bar, I think we're somewhat testing the waters. We don't necessarily want to see it removed because we understand the importance of it. But I think what we were possibly, slightly optimistically thinking is, would there be scope for that to maybe be a mixed use development. And are there any other cases of that where TFL have been kind of on board of a bus garage being continued in use and serving the community.

It's a really good location in Potter's Bar. It could unlock a lot of development, especially in that area, but we definitely wouldn't want to see a loss of a bus garage

[21:10 - 21:30] TFL 1:

Yeah, I think that is a tricky one. And it's another one that is coming up in London as well, because there's a recent example in Edgware and I'm not so close to it exactly but that's been actually Places for London, our development arm, have led on that particular site. The particular challenge is that with decarbonisation of the bus fleet there are fire safety related concerns. Effectively what you'd be doing is putting a bunch of large batteries underneath residential. It's something that I don't know the exact answer off the top of my head and we can certainly explore it, and it's something that is being looked at.

[22:14 - 22:41] TFL 2:

Just to also add, I think we have similar challenges in London in terms of the land supply being limited and how we can use some of those land assets for mixed use while ensuring that it's not affecting the bus operations and services and land available for those operations. So there are opportunities, but also challenges that, as X mentioned, if we are trying to electrify all our bus fleet. So these are conversations that are happening in London as well. It comes with design challenges. As long as it can be ensured that it will basically improve bus

operations and not affect the existing. And that's the London plan policy as well, to safeguard all of that, all the place.

[23:25 - 24:11] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

So we're definitely in agreement in that aspect and completely understand the design complications of it. I suppose then with... with Crews Hill potentially coming forward and the pinch point of potential capacity on buses, I think there's probably also a conversation around that. Do you think that you would be looking to implement new services running horizontally, or would you be reliant on the existing fleet to kind of cover that ground as well?

[24:12 - 24:30] TFL 2:

That's also a live conversation. I think, I mean, with the local plan or the new town, whichever way things go, you would need services to be enhanced if it has to be a sustainable development. What does that mean in terms of whether it's horizontal services or increasing services? frequencies on existing routes or sort of modifying these existing routes. We haven't come to that point because it needs much more details of what would be the trip generation and the demand. But those are live conversations and there will need to be some kind of changes and enhancement to make those plans work.

[25:04 - 25:17] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

From our point of view, we were probably a little bit concerned if there wasn't any horizontal linkages to purely because obviously Potter's Bar and Borehamwood are quite big employers in the film industry as well as in Hertfordshire itself. I appreciate that that's a live conversation. Depending on obviously what comes forward first, we would quite like to be, to whatever extent we could be involved in those conversations simply because as well as we're looking to move to a more sustainable transport movement, that also includes outside of the borough and, you know, we are pretty much in the middle of London Boroughs. We want to keep that positive relationship going simply because a lot of people are kind of moving in and out across Barnet and Enfield.

[26:28 - 26:51] TFL 2:

I think sort of the wider Southeast sort of liaisoning is important because we also don't want a lot of traffic coming into London. So if we can all kind of work towards more sustainable modes while managing the capacity and crowding on those modes is something I think we are aligned in that objective.

[26:57 - 27:03] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

X is there anything else that we haven't covered that I've completely missed off the agenda?

[27:06 - 27:35] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

I don't think so. I think we've, I mean, we are very happy to put our cards on the table in terms of what our plans are. Even if we had our full list of sites, we couldn't share them anyway because we have to take them to Cabinet first. Obviously, that's happening on the 15th of April. We're happy to share that as soon as we can. And, yeah, happy to share the mix of... Obviously, those sites will ultimately determine... where we think the dwellings will go. I'm happy to share that, which I imagine are the things that are of key interest to you.

So do we need to meet again? I'm thinking that maybe sometime after we've been able to share sites and numbers would be useful. Yeah. I'm thinking that need not be during the consultation period because obviously we can take submissions from you at any time, but it could be if that's what you wanted.

[29:15 - 29:55] TFL 2:

One of the things that might be helpful when you provide that information, if you have done any kind of analysis on what kind of bus capacity or other public transport capacity that you, what are your expectations of TFL? And also trying to understand what are other sort of policy levers that you're pulling in terms of car use, active travels. That might help us sort of give a more comprehensive picture.

The other thing to mention is I don't know if these conversations will be affected by that, but the pre-election period I think starts 27th March. It starts up. Yeah, it's soon, 27th March or 30th March, one of those two dates.

Yeah, communications might be constrained during that time till after the election.

[31:17 - 31:31] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

So we can send you that information mid to late April. We don't need to speak to you until after the election.

[33:15 - 33:32] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

You've mentioned the expectations of TFL. Are there any expectations that you have of us, of events that kind of keep you informed? Is there anything that we've not really spoken about that you think we've missed? Or is it more just keep you up to date and share things when we can?

[33:37 - 34:03] TFL 1:

Typically, with each borough or council that's sort of outside London, I mean, it's different for, you know, what we do with local plans inside London where it's very hands-on, London plan general conformity. This is certainly far more of the infrastructure and service provider side of things. So, I mean, anything in terms, anything that would inform that is useful information for us. What you said absolutely sounds like a good way forward. There are a couple other things I did want to mention before they sort of go out of my mind.

I did just want to say I did have a look at sort of like the position, the likely position in terms of rail crowding. And honestly, I don't have any immediate concerns on that.

This is, of course, a starting position as well. So, you know, things can change, things will change, spatial strategies will develop and where holes go will change. That's the initial impression looking at a crowding plot. But, so that's the rail crowding side. Obviously, surfaces do get crowded in London, but it doesn't look insurmountable.

On the bus garages, one thing that has recently sort of started coming up is that with, on the decarbonization side, electrification of buses means that we are actually sort of needing more space as well just to maintain the same capacity. And we're finding that, depending on the site layout and the context, 10 to 30% more space required range. That's it's still early analysis, to be honest, but it's something to be aware of. And we're starting to grapple with that now ourselves.

But I guess sort of the more general point as well, really, really positive to hear that Hertsmere are looking a regeneration brownfield first approach. That's something that we absolutely support because ultimately, that spatial strategy is going to lead towards more sustainable travel, reducing impact on the existing road network.

Anything that's sort of moving in that direction, we support. There might be some challenges that we need to work through in terms of bus capacity or various details.

But ultimately, we support that move towards a more sustainable spatial distribution of homes and jobs.

[37:59 - 38:10] Hertsmere Borough Council 2:

Yeah, we're also really keen to get a local plan in place because we are likely to fall victim to speculative development if we don't have a housing supply. And that's really been key.

I Hertsmere is one of 75 boroughs across the country that are currently trying to get to submission by the end of the year.

[39:35 - 39:53] TFL 2:

Fully understand the time constraints and the speculative development, which I think is an issue in London as well. So we're trying to get to that point. And how do we address all of those pre-ops before the policy is in place? One other thing I wanted to mention, you might already be consulting with National Highways on the impacts on M25. Yeah. That's something that's come up in, Enfield Local Plan. National Highways have been employed in the local plan, trying to sort of understand what's the impact on the highways, it's something that maybe you want to address early on.

[41:31 - 41:57] Hertsmere Borough Council 1:

Actions are:

- Look at bus capacities and possibly other forms of sustainable transport and how that impacts TFL.
- Look at TFL assets within the borough. So we obviously have the bus garage and potter's bar and I guess, on train stations, but again, they're also the individual

operators, but we'll obviously keep you on-site about what happened to them, because I think there are a few sites close to Borehamwood train station.

- Once we're able to give you all the information, which is, again, probably going to be Reg 18, we can set up another meeting post-election period, and when we're sort of clear of Reg 18, and if anything else comes up,

We can email if we need to set up another emergency meeting or something. We will do our best to accommodate. But, yeah, if there's any issues, like, or have you any questions, feel free to email me and I will do my best to answer them for you.

Regional Energy Strategic Planning

Email	Contents
05/12/2025 - Email from HBC to Central England Energy	Initial Duty to Co-operate email
10/12/2025 - Email from CEE to HBC	Acknowledgement of previous email and further steps
03/02/2026 - Email from HBC to CEE	response to the previous email and meeting suggested
11/02/2026 - Email from HBC to RESP	Confirmation of meeting.
11/02/2026 - Email from RESP to HBC	Reschedule of meeting and new date proposed
11/02/2026 - Email from HBC to RESP	Confirmation of new meeting date.
19/02/2026 - Email from AECOM to RESP	Consultation on the IDP proforma
06/03/2026 - Email from RESP to HBC	confirmation of what was discussed in the meeting.

03_03_2026 Hertsmere Meeting with Regional Energy Strategic Planning (RESP) for National Grid

Attendees:

RESP Strategic Lead

RESP Officer

Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Policy Team Leader

Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Policy Officer

Brief Update on the Local Plan

- The Hertsmere Local Plan is going out to consultation under Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 Regulation 18 during April 2026.
- The council has undertaken the Duty to Co-operate to discuss relevant strategic cross boundary planning issues with its neighbouring authorities and to build early relationships with national organisation partners. The council is seeking to ensure that the duty is discharged properly and not seen as a box ticking exercise.
- The council's spatial strategy seeks to secure the regeneration of existing brownfield sites which are underdelivering. This would be coupled with the strategic release of some greenbelt to provide urban extensions.
- HBC is hoping to meet full housing need, which equates to around 16,000 new homes over the plan period, this is roughly 1,500 homes per annum. Development will be focused on existing settlements, with Borehamwood taking the majority of development, followed by Potters Bar, Bushey and Radlett. All development will be in

line with the existing urban fabrics of the settlements and will be proportional to the size of the town.

- To be found sound at examination the Council will need to meet all housing need and demonstrate at least a 5 year housing land supply.
- The council are testing a possible new settlement in the north west of the borough, adjacent to London Colney in St Albans. The site in question is called Bowman's Cross. This will hopefully be coming forward towards the end of the plan period and into the next.
- The council are progressing quickly to Regulation 18. To help achieve this objective the Council has commissioned AECOM to produce an evidence base with 25/26 pieces of work. The council have also commissioned AR Urbanism to prepare Visions for the 4 main settlements where development will be concentrated.
- It was noted that the Borough has become a location favoured, by the industry, for data centres. It has one data centre with consent, with 2 more in the pipeline.

RESP Response:

- At the moment they are currently not a statutory consultee as they sit at a strategic level above the network providers. However it is likely they will become a strategic consultee in the future.
- When it comes to consulting on the IDP they would be looking to do this further down the line at reg 18.
- Neso fit into the planning process in the infrastructure and energy planning but as of now there is no formal steer.