Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment SHLAA 2016 Update (New sites, interim and 2016 call for sites)

Individual Assessment Forms

<u>Note</u>

Council Comments:

Yes – Shortlisted - states indicative development capacity

Yes – Potential * - denotes site included in the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment Report (2013). To be further assessed for potential residential development. Part site only.

Yes – **Scale**^{**} - denotes site to be further assessed for potential residential development. Part site only.

No – Rejected - states reasons

Shortlisted (Potentially Suitable) Sites



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	 Various planning applications on or close to the site, the most relevant of which are as follows: Two replacement dwellings have been built on the site (92/0122 and 97/1674) 00/1343 – Erection of 2 detached chalet bungalows, 51 & 53 Bucknalls Drive. Condition Permission 00/1878 – Erection of 1 detached chalet bungalow, 49 Bucknalls Drive. Condition Permission 01/2339 – Erection of detached bungalow, land r/o 47 Bucknalls Drive. Refused 02/0354 – Two detached chalet style bungalows, land r/o 69 & 75 Bucknalls Drive. Condition Permission. 05/2201 – Detached double garage, land r/o 55 Bucknalls Drive. Refused. 5/2014/1694 – Three x 4 bedroom detached houses, six x 4 bedroom detached houses with integral garage and three x 3 bedroom detached houses. Refused on 25/09/2014. Appeal dismissed on 11/08/2015. Local Plan Inquiry 1992 - The Council argued that the site made an important contribution to the adjacent Common and prevented coalescence with the BRE site. Highway safety was also thought likely to be compromised. The Inspector considered that the land made a very important contribution to the Green Belt in a sensitive location. He was of the view that the site as a whole had a predominantly open, rural character which contributed to the protection of the countryside and to the prevention of settlement coalescence. The Inspector therefore recommended no modification.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No

Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	No
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Yes
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	N/A	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spe	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No

Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Mostly

Council Comments	Yes Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site is the same as the SHLAA 2009 site SHLAA-GB-BW- 16 except the site boundary is changed. SHLAA 2009 Comments
	"Although there would be some visual impact from development and a reduction in the site's openness, these are not considered major constraints to development (indeed the site is already partly developed). The key consideration for any residential development on this site would be protection of nature conservation interests (i.e. within the County Wildlife Site and the adjoining SSSI). Some concern over the site's poor accessibility to services, facilities and community infrastructure.
	Assuming the existing dwellings on site are demolished and a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the area, (principally two and three storey family housing, including semi-detached and townhouses). Appropriate distances will have to be maintained to ensure no negative impact upon the very important SSSI woodland to the south and east, significantly reducing overall capacity.
	A small part of the site falls within County Wildlife Site – 76/022 Bricket Wood Building Research Establishment (also a Protected Species Site), which may slightly reduce overall density. The degree to which the site consists of previously developed land is uncertain, but it is clearly not the entire site and further investigations of the amount of PDL may affect the dwelling capacity significantly."
	It is considered that based on the current site area, the estimated development capacity is 17.
Council's Estimated Capacity	17



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	Ref. 5/2013/3481- erection of two semi - detached dwellings, new vehicle crossover, parking and landscaping. Approved with planning conditions.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	No
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Perhaps

Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Perhaps

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Perhaps	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site is adjacent to the Five Acres Country Club. Permanent and temporary structures have been introduced at the Five Acres Country Club which have changed the overall sense of rurality in this location.
	The adjoining area to this site is a TPO woodland.
	The existing residential development stretches right up to the site's southern boundary so that the site is no longer separate from the existing settlement.
	It is considered a small portion of the site may be suitable for additional housing and the dwelling types should be appropriate to the wooded and low-rise nature of the area.
Council's estimated capacity	2



Method of site identification (e.g proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	Local Plan Inquiry 1982
	The Council argued the site has a distinct rural atmosphere, is not well contained, and lies on a prominent ridge marked out by Chiswell Green Lane. Furthermore, the existing Green Belt boundary is well defined and defensible.
	The Inspector argued the issue was whether the site's contribution to the Green Belt outweighed the contribution the land could make to reducing the Council's dependence on unidentified sites. The Inspector argued that the site was well contained, although he accepted medium views to the southwest.
	Because of the Inspector's perceived need for additional housing land, he recommended the site be allocated for residential development. The Council did not accept this recommendation, largely because additional housing land had come forward elsewhere in the intervening time.

Physical Constraints				
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No	
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No	
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No	
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No	
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified	
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No	
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No	
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No	
Tree and hedgerows	Some	Other habitat/green space	Yes	
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No	
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines,	None identified	

		sewers etc	
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Perhaps	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	Yes
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	N/A	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	Yes	Site with social or community value (provide details)	Perhaps
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S8 - Enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S8 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB25.
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB25 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	The enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S8). In light of the function of the strategic parcel, the sub-area identified on pasture land at Chiswell Green Lane displays urban fringe characteristics due to its proximity to the settlement edge and Butterfly World along Miriam Road to the west.
	This development bounds the outer extent of the pasture land and creates a physical barrier to the open countryside. The pasture land also displays greater levels of landscape enclosure due to localised planting along field boundaries. This creates potential to integrate development into the landscape with lower impact on views from the wider countryside and surroundings.
	At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the land makes a limited or no contribution towards all Green Belt purposes."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
	SHLAA 2009 Comments
	"The site is rural in nature and lies on a prominent ridge with long views to the south-west. The existing Green Belt boundary is well defined. Whilst development could have a negative visual impact on the surrounding open countryside, it could be argued that the site would be suitable for residential development in principle and that any new housing could be suitably screened from the surrounding countryside.

Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the

Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the new link road to the Butterfly World site and the expansion of the Thistle Hotel.
Prospect of housing development would be considered through the LDF process, given the site's location in the Green Belt, on the edge of the specified settlement of Chiswell Green. Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the cumulative impacts on infrastructure in the area, in the light of current developments in the immediate area.
Assuming part of the existing farm was retained and part was redeveloped (which would cause a small reduction in overall density) and all of the overall site was developed for housing, with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the openness of the site (principally two and three storey family housing, including semi- detached and townhouses) and its local prominence.
Care housing, as suggested by the landowners agent, may also be an alternative, but would be unlikely to significantly alter achievable density. Approximately 30-35 dwellings per hectare is a reasonable estimate, on approximately 2.5 hectares of overall site."

	Council's own estimated capacity Part site or		essed for potential hou	sing development.
--	--	--	-------------------------	-------------------



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Some	Other habitat/green space	Yes
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Perhaps	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	Yes
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant

Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	Yes	Site with social or community value (provide details)	Perhaps
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	Yes	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S8 - Enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S8 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB25.
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB25 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	The enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S8). In light of the function of the strategic parcel, the sub-area identified on pasture land at Chiswell Green Lane displays urban fringe characteristics due to its proximity to the settlement edge and Butterfly World along Miriam Road to the west.
	This development bounds the outer extent of the pasture land and creates a physical barrier to the open countryside. The pasture land also displays greater levels of landscape enclosure due to localised planting along field boundaries. This creates potential to integrate development into the landscape with lower impact on views from the wider countryside and surroundings.
	At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the land makes a limited or no contribution towards all Green Belt purposes."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>

SHLAA 2009 Comments
"The site is rural in nature and lies on a prominent ridge with long views to the south-west. The existing Green Belt boundary is well defined. Whilst development could have a negative visual impact on the surrounding open countryside, it could be argued that the site would be suitable for residential development in principle and that any new housing could be suitably screened from the surrounding countryside.
Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the new link road to the Butterfly World site and the expansion of the Thistle Hotel
Prospect of housing development would be considered through the LDF process, given the site's location in the Green Belt, on the edge of the specified settlement of Chiswell Green. Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the cumulative impacts on infrastructure in the area, in the light of current developments in the immediate area.
Assuming the existing equestrian buildings were wholly redeveloped and all of the overall site was developed for housing, with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the openness of the site (principally two and three storey semi-detached and townhouses) and its local prominence.
Care housing, as suggested by the landowners agent, may also be an alternative, but would be unlikely to significantly alter achievable density.
The three TPO Groups just inside the edge of the site and the TPO Wood adjacent would cause a very small reduction in overall density. Approximately 35 dwellings per hectare is a reasonable estimate, on approximately 5.3 hectares of available site."

Council's own	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development.
estimated capacity	Part site only.



SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION



Current use(s)	Mixed – Agricultural field (possibly fallow), open green space, small wood. A small area has lawful use for builders' material and plant
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Agent/Landowner
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	Yes	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	Near	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	Near
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Near	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Adjacent
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	Yes
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in		Scale and nature of development	

unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			Partial

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	Yes	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	1 5 (
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review report states the overall contribution of GB25 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	"• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	• To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	The enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S8). In light of the function of the strategic parcel, the sub-area identified on pasture land at Chiswell Green Lane displays urban fringe characteristics due to its proximity to the settlement edge and Butterfly World along Miriam Road to the west.
	This development bounds the outer extent of the pasture land and creates a physical barrier to the open countryside. The pasture land also displays greater levels of landscape enclosure due to localised planting along field boundaries. This creates potential to integrate development into the landscape with lower impact on views from the wider countryside and surroundings.
	At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the land makes a limited or no contribution towards all Green Belt purposes."
	In view of the above circumstances, this site would be further assessed for potential housing development.
	It should be noted that the Council's SHLAA 2009 estimated capacity is 200 units.
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx
	SHLAA 2009 Comments:
	"The site is rural in nature and development would constitute significant encroachment and visual intrusion into open countryside. However, it could be argued that the site (and adjoining Sites 43a, 43b, 40 and 96) would be suitable for residential development in principle and that any new housing could be suitably screened from the surrounding countryside.

	Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the new link road to the Butterfly World site and the expansion of the Thistle Hotel Prospect of housing development would be considered through the LDF process, given the site's location in the Green Belt, on the edge of the specified settlement of Chiswell Green. Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the cumulative impacts on infrastructure in the area, in the light of current developments in the immediate area. Assuming the overall site was developed for housing, with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the area and the openness of the site (principally two and three storey family housing, including semi-detached and townhouses). The TPO Groups and TPO Points inside the edge of the site and the TPO Wood adjacent would cause a very small reduction in overall density, as they could be incorporated into the overall landscaping scheme for such a large site, which would also likely be built in conjunction with adjoining proposed sites, if developed at all. The irregular shape of the site would cause a very small reduction in overall density. At approximately 35 dwellings per hectare, the estimated development capacity is 200".
Council's own	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development.
estimated capacity	Part site only.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-CG-408
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Noke Side, Chiswell Green, St Albans



Key: Green Belt Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3	Local Wildlife Sites Conservation Area Listed Buildings Local Nature Reserves Landscape Conservation Area Locally Listed Buildings Ancient Woodland SSSI Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953
Area of site or broad location (hectares)	1.06 Ha
Ownership details:	Mr G Moore
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc)	DLA Town Planning Ltd
Category of site (e.g. agricultural)	Grassland.
Current use(s)	Grassland

Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Agent/Landowner
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant

			Mara
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	Yes	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*	
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S8 - Enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S8 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB25.	
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review report states,	
	"The overall contribution of GB25 towards Green Belt purposes is :	
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no 	
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial	
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant	
	To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial	
	To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant	
	The enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S8). In light of the function of the strategic parcel, the sub-area identified on pasture land at Chiswell Green Lane displays urban fringe characteristics due to its proximity to the settlement edge and Butterfly World along Miriam Road to the west.	
	This development bounds the outer extent of the pasture land and creates a physical barrier to the open countryside. The pasture land also displays greater levels of landscape enclosure due to localised planting along field boundaries. This creates potential to integrate development into the landscape with lower impact on views from the wider countryside and surroundings.	
	At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the land makes a limited or no contribution towards all Green Belt purposes."	
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>	
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.	

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION



SHLAA-GB-CG-410





Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent
Planning History	5/2013/2188 - refused: Fourteen, Two Storey Dwellings With Habitable Roof space, Garages, Associated Access, Car Parking And Landscaping Including Estate Gates And Fencing. 5/2012/2461 - refused: Fourteen, Two Storey Dwellings.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and	Significant

		character of the settlement.	
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spe	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes –Scale **		
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site is close to the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S8 - Enclosed land at Chiswell Green Lane at Chiswell Green), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S8 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB25.		
	SKM Green Belt Review Report states the overall contribution of GB25 towards Green Belt purposes is:		
	"• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no		
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial		
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant		
	To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial		
	To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant		
	This area may, subject to scale of development, offer opportunities to develop with limited impact on the Green Belt.		
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx		
	nttp://www.staibans.gov.uk/planning/Flanningpolicy/library/greenbeit.aspx		
	SHLAA 2009 Comments		
	The following comments relate to site SHLAA-GB-CG-96, of which this site, SHLAA-GB-CG-410, forms part.		
	"The site is in a prominent position on high ground, with neighbouring open fields with long views to the west. Development would result in encroachment into open countryside and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.		
	However, it could be argued that the site (and adjoining Sites 43a, 43b, 40 and 44) would be suitable for residential development in principle and that any new housing could be suitably screened from the surrounding countryside.		
	Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the new link road to the Butterfly World site and the expansion of the Thistle Hotel.		
	Prospect of housing development would be considered through the LDF process, given the site's location in the Green Belt, on the edge of the specified settlement of Chiswell Green. Any development potential needs to be considered in the context of the cumulative impacts on infrastructure in the area, in the light of current developments in the immediate area.		
	Assuming part of the site was developed for housing, with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the area and its local prominence.		

	The site would also likely be built in conjunction with adjoining proposed sites, if developed at all, marginally increasing achievable density. The narrowness of the site will reduce overall density. The road layout adjacent may marginally increase achievable density."
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development. Part site only.


Current use(s)	Arable land (may have fallen fallow) / two residential properties.
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	Land immediately adjacent to the west of the two residences adjacent to this site – 5/2008/0703 Land adj 110 Ragged Hall Lane, Chiswell Green, St Albans, Erection of barn. This application was given the decision - DC4 Refusal on 10/06/2008 The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt, wherein permission will only be given for erection of new buildings or the use of existing buildings or land for agricultural, other essential purposes appropriate to a rural area or small scale facilities for participatory sport or recreation. The site is of insufficient size to support formal agricultural activities and is not a registered smallholding. The proposed development for a building for storage of agricultural machinery is therefore an inappropriate use within the Green Belt which is unacceptable in terms of Policy 1 (Metropolitan Green Belt) of the St. Albans District Local Plan Review 1994 and contrary to Government guidance contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2. The proposed development cannot be justified in terms of the purposes specified and no exceptional circumstances are apparent in this case.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Yes	Historic Park or Garden	No

Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Some	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	Yes
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Perhaps	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	Yes
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	No
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Yes
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes
Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	i ial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	Yes	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Mostly

Council Comments	Yes - Scale **
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site is located in the Green Belt, on the edge of the settlement of Chiswell Green. The site represents a physical gap between the existing residential development on both the east and west along Ragged Hall Lane. It is also facing towards some existing buildings on the opposite side of Ragged Hall Lane.
	Residential development on part of the site may not cause any significant detrimental impact on the character of the Green Belt or the visual amenity of the local area. Proposal is subject to design and details being appropriate.

Council's capacity	estimated	This site developm		assessed	for	potential	housing



Planning History	Adjoining areas include Beaumont School below:
	Ref. 5/2014/0940 - outline application (means of access sought) for mixed use development (up to a maximum of 75 dwellings including 2 and 2.5 storey dwellings), sports pitches including a hard surfaced area and all weather pitch, woodland, new school parking. Approved on 26/01/2016.

Physical Constraints			
-	.		
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	Yes
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Yes
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into	No	Development would result in encroachment into open	Yes

one another.		countryside.	
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	Nearby	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Part of SLP Broad Location
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing	This site forms part of the strategic sub-area (SA-S3 – Land between St Albans and Hatfield), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S3 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB36.
development? If no, provide reasons)	The SKM report states, "The overall contribution of GB36 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – significant To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – limited or no
	To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant
	Area enclosed by residential development at east St Albans along Sandpit Lane is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S3). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the sub-area includes a number of built uses and urbanising influences. It is a relatively open landscape. On land to the east of St Albans which penetrates into the settlement, urban influences are particularly strong and there is significant built development within the Green Belt at Oaklands College, which has recently expanded.
	The land along Sandpit Lane is enclosed by three urban edges and this limits the contribution of this local area to the wider Green Belt and its important role in separating settlements. A reduction in the size of the strategic parcel at the sub-area location would have a limited impact on the overall role of the Green Belt and the physical separation of settlements. It would not reduce the existing minimum distance of the gap between St Albans and Hatfield which is 1.4km. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preserving setting or maintaining the existing settlement pattern."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u> .
Council's estimated capacity	This site forms Part of SLP Broad Location. SKM Green Belt Review SA-S3.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by land owner via agent
Planning History	5/1980/0728 – Permission granted for shelter for ponies.
	5/1998/1745 – Permission granted for stables.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	Equestrian fields
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Perhaps	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Significant	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and	Significant

		character of the settlement.	
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Limited or No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Partial
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS4 – Land at west of Harpenden), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS4 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB20.
development? If no, provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review Report states the overall contribution of GB20 towards Green Belt purposes is :
	• "To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - significant
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – limited or no
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - partial
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – significant
	To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	Land at west of Harpenden is recommended for further assessment as a small-scale sub area (SA-SS4). The sub-area is located south of Falconers Field and north of Roundwood Park School. Assessed in isolation this land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at:
	http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx
	2009 SHLAA comments:
	"Assuming the overall site was developed for housing, with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the area (principally two and three storey family housing, including semi-detached and townhouses).
	Appropriate distance and setback of the dwellings from the adjacent school playing fields may cause a very small reduction in overall density. Approximately 35 dwellings per hectare is a reasonable estimate, on approximately 1.2 hectares of available site."
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development. Part site only.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference

SHLAA-GB-H-103





Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Agent/Landowner
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Significant	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spe	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site forms part of the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S6 - Enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment report (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S6 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB40.
provide reasons)	The SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB40 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – significant
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – significant
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	A strategic sub-area is enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close (SA-S6). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the relatively small (in comparison to the strategic parcel as a whole) sub-area identified to the northeast of Harpenden follows the angular urban edge which increases localised levels of enclosure and urban influence.
	In addition, existing field patterns and boundary planting create a greater sense of local landscape enclosure. This creates a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides partially screened views from the wider countryside and surroundings. At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the sub-area makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting and maintaining local gaps."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Letter requesting release from Green Belt for residential development by owner, several years ago
Planning History	5/2006/1255 Greenacres Equestrian Centre, Bower Heath Lane, Harpenden, AL5 5EG Two barns, stables, manege and car parking This application was given the decision - DC3 Conditional Permission on 04/08/2006. Partially or completely built.

Physical Constraints				
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No	
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No	
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes	
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No	
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified	
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No	
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No	
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No	
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No	
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No	
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified	
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No	
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No	

Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Significant	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site forms part of the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S6 - Enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment report (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S6 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB40.
provide reasons)	The SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB40 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – significant
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – significant
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	A strategic sub-area is enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close (SA-S6). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the relatively small (in comparison to the strategic parcel as a whole) sub-area identified to the northeast of Harpenden follows the angular urban edge which increases localised levels of enclosure and urban influence.
	In addition, existing field patterns and boundary planting create a greater sense of local landscape enclosure. This creates a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides partially screened views from the wider countryside and surroundings. At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the sub-area makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting and maintaining local gaps."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	5/2016/0669: planning application for 37 residential units. This application was being considered at the time of assessment.
	5/2016/0817: application for listed building consent for refurbishment and conversion of existing buildings on site. This application was being considered at the time of assessment

Physical Constraints				
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No	
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No	
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No	
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No	
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None	
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	Yes	
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No*	Historic Park or Garden	No	
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Yes	
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No	
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	Yes	
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No	
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified	
		1		
Policy Constraints	Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No	

Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site is within Conservation Area and near to listed building(s). The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate. The design of any new housing would need to enhance and preserve the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building(s).
Council's Estimated Capacity	25 <u>Note</u> : a planning application and a listed building consent application were being considered at the time of assessment.



Physical Constraints				
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No	
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No	
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No	
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No	
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified	
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No	
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No	
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No	
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No	
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No	
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified	
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No	
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No	
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Significant	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant	
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant	

Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	No	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	No

Council Comments	Yes - Potential*	
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S6 - Enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment report (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S6 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB40.	
provide reasons)	The SKM report states,	
	" The overall contribution of GB40 towards Green Belt purposes is:-	
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – significant 	
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial 	
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant 	
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – significant 	
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant 	
	A strategic sub-area is enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close (SA-S6). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the relatively small (in comparison to the strategic parcel as a whole) sub-area identified to the northeast of Harpenden follows the angular urban edge which increases localised levels of enclosure and urban influence.	
	In addition, existing field patterns and boundary planting create a greater sense of local landscape enclosure. This creates a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides partially screened views from the wider countryside and surroundings. At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the sub-area makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting and maintaining local gaps."	
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>	
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.	

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – URBAN SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION				
Site Reference	SHLAA-U-H-429			
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Land at 8 Rothamstead Avenue and 2 Salisbury Avenue, Harpenden			



Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc.)	JB Planning Associates Ltd, Stevenage
Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Residential
Current use(s)	Residential
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Agent/Landowner

Planning History	Ref. 5/2015/3510: demolition of garage and erection of replacement to No 8 Rothamsted Avenue and erection of one detached house and garage. This application was being considered at the time of assessment
------------------	---

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	Yes
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Yes
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Policy Constraints			
-	I		
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline (see Policy 114).	No

Can any of the physical or policy constraints identified above, be overcome?	
Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site lies within a Conservation Area and adjoins No.8 Rothamstead Avenue which is a Locally Listed Building. The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate. The design of any new housing would need to enhance and preserve the character of the Conservation Area and setting of the Listed Building(s).
Council's estimated capacity	4 <u>Note</u> : A planning application for one detached house on part of the site was being considered at the time of assessment.



Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Significant	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant

Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	Yes	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Part of SLP Broad Location			
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site lies within Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S5 - Enclosed land at northwest Harpenden in the vicinity of Luton Road, Cooters End Lane and Ambrose Lane, taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment report (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S5 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB40.			
	The SKM report states,			
	"The overall contribution of GB40 towards Green Belt purposes is:			
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - significant			
	• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial			
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant			
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – significant			
	• To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant.			
	A strategic sub-area is enclosed land at north Harpenden in the vicinity of Luton Road, Couters End Lane and Ambrose Lane (SA-S5). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the sub-area identified to the north of Harpenden penetrates into the urban area and it displays urban influence. There is strong urban influence as substantial development has taken place along the Luton Road, with adjacent development forming an extended urban edge to Harpenden in the northwest.			
	Therefore, assessed in isolation, it makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging or maintaining local gaps. Existing field patterns and boundary planting produces sense of local landscape enclosure, which creates a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides partially screened from views from the wider countryside and surroundings. A reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements."			
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>			
Council's estimated capacity	This site forms part of SLP Broad Location. SKM Green Belt Review SA- S5.			



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints					
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No		
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No		
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes		
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No		
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified		
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No		
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No		
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No		
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No		
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No		
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified		
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No		
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No		
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Significant	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant		
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant		
---	---------	--	-------------		
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes		

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	L cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site forms part of the Strategic Sub-Area (SA-S6 - Enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment report (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S6 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB40.
provide reasons)	The SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB40 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – significant
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – significant
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	A strategic sub-area is enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close (SA-S6). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the relatively small (in comparison to the strategic parcel as a whole) sub-area identified to the northeast of Harpenden follows the angular urban edge which increases localised levels of enclosure and urban influence.
	In addition, existing field patterns and boundary planting create a greater sense of local landscape enclosure. This creates a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides partially screened views from the wider countryside and surroundings. At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the sub-area makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting and maintaining local gaps."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.



Planning History	Hertfordshire County Council possible school site proposal
	overlaps with SHLAA-GB-H-442 (see Detailed Local Plan
	Consultation November 2016)

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Significant	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open	Significant

one another.		countryside.	
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spe	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	Yes	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*	
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to vicinity of Whitings Close), taken from SKM's Green Belt Rev Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S	
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review report states,	
	"The overall contribution of GB40 towards Green Belt purposes is:	
	• "To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - significant	
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial	
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant	
	To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – significant	
	To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant	
	A strategic sub-area is enclosed land at northeast Harpenden along Lower Luton Road, and extending to the vicinity of Whitings Close (SA- S6). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the relatively small (in comparison to the strategic parcel as a whole) sub-area identified to the northeast of Harpenden follows the angular urban edge which increases localised levels of enclosure and urban influence. In addition, existing field patterns and boundary planting create a greater sense of local landscape enclosure. This creates a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides partially screened views from the wider countryside and surroundings. At the strategic level, a reduction in the size of the parcel would not significantly compromise the overall role of the Green Belt or compromise the separation of settlements. Assessed in isolation the sub- area makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting and maintaining local gaps.	
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>	
	Hertfordshire County Council possible school site proposal overlaps with SHLAA-GB-H-442 (see Detailed Local Plan Consultation November 2016)	
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.	

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site	Reference
OILE	I CEIEI EI ICE

Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-H-467
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Land south of Harpenden (overlaps with/supersedes SHLAA-GB- H61 and SHLAA-GB-H-291)



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS5 – Land at northeast edge of St Albans), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS5 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB22.
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review Report states the overall contribution of GB22 towards Green Belt purposes is :
	"To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	Small scale sub-area SA-SS5 is recommended for further assessment. Land south of Harpenden enclosed by Beesonend Lane to the south and settlement edge to the north and east (SA-SS5) when assessed in isolation the land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.



SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference Site address (or brief description of broad location)

SHLAA-U-H-473a and 473b Land and Garages at Longfield Road, Harpenden



Key: Green Belt Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3	Local Wildlife Sites Conservation Area Listed Buildings Local Nature Reserves Landscape Conservation Area Locally Listed Buildings Ancient Woodland SSSI Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953
Area of site or broad location (hectares)	473a = 0.10 ha; 473b = 0.02 ha
Ownership details:	St Albans District Council
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc.)	
Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Garage Court
Current use(s)	Garages

Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes – shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	 From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary:- "The site is on a fairly busy road and between 2 side streets which will make access for car parking difficult, though not impossible. This site is worth considering further, perhaps using the small adjacent piece of land for some parking, and perhaps a mews type development could work. Some of the garages were in use so it would be sensible to include a small garage court at the rear in any development. It would be helpful if St Albans could consider how many garages need to be provided for prior to undertaking a feasibility exercise. Suitable for 5 flats on the site – subject to more detailed feasibility Estimated capacity: 473a = 4 units; 473b = 1 unit Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities "
Capacity	



Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Garage Court
Current use(s)	Garages
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No

Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted	
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	 From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary:- "Large garage site, mostly dilapidated, with a narrow access which may restrict development numbers 	
	 Option of demolishing house within the marked boundaries to improve access and it is recommended further feasibilities with and without this access to ascertain best value 	
	 If access can be resolved than this could be a prime development site on what is at present an eyesore. 	
	Estimated capacity: 8 units	
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities"	
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.	
Council's Estimated Capacity	8	

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

SHLAA-GB-LC-239

Sile Relefence	SHLAA-GB-LC-239
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	All Saints Pastoral Centre, Shenley Lane, London Colney (see also SHLAA-GB-LC-423)



Current use(s)	Former convent, which the Diocese of Westminster vacated in 2011 and is currently vacant. Also includes St Raphael's House, St Michael's House and the Westminster Room, currently occupied by Bell Language School, providing a residential retreat centre for children and young people.
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent
Planning History	<u>General Planning History</u> 5/2001/0156 Internal alterations This application was given the decision - DC12LB Listed Building Refusal on 18/04/2001 5/2002/0023 Internal alterations (resubmission following refusal of 5/01/0156LB) This application was given the decision - DC12LB Listed Building Refusal on 02/10/2002 5/2003/0858 Internal alterations (resubmission following refusal of 5/01/0156LB and 5/02/0023LB) This application has been withdrawn

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Yes	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Partial
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			Partial

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Scale **
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site is close to the strategic sub-area (SA-S7 – Land at south of London Colney), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S7 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB31. The SKM report states, "The overall contribution of GB31 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - partial
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	• To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant"
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u> . Part of the site is previously developed land and some buildings are vacant. This is likely to give some potential for residential development.
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-LC-423
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	All Saints Pastoral Centre, Shenley Lane, London Colney (see also SHLAA-GB-LC-239)



Current use(s)	Former convent, which the Diocese of Westminster vacated in 2011 and is currently vacant. Also includes St Raphael's House, St Michael's House and the Westminster Room, currently occupied by Bell Language School, providing a residential retreat centre for children and young people.
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent
Planning History	General Planning History 5/2001/0156 Internal alterations This application was given the decision - DC12LB Listed Building Refusal on 18/04/2001 5/2002/0023 Internal alterations (resubmission following refusal of 5/01/0156LB) This application was given the decision - DC12LB Listed Building Refusal on 02/10/2002 5/2003/0858 Internal alterations (resubmission following refusal of 5/01/0156LB and 5/02/0023LB) This application has been withdrawn

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Yes	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No

		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Partial
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Scale **
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site is close to the strategic sub-area (SA-S7 – Land at south of London Colney), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S7 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB31.
provide reasons)	The SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB31 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - partial
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	• To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant"
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u> .
	Part of the site is previously developed land and some buildings are vacant. This is likely to give some potential for residential development.
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Yes	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	No

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Yes
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Potential*			
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing	This site includes the strategic sub-area (SA-S7 – Land at south of London Colney), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S7 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB31.			
development? If no, provide reasons)	The SKM report states,			
	" The overall contribution of GB31 towards Green Belt purposes is:			
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no			
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial			
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - partial			
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial			
	• To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant.			
	Enclosed land at south of London Colney is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S7).			
	In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the sub-area is subject to significant urbanising influence. Assessed in isolation, the sub-area to the south and south west of London Colney makes a limited or no contribution towards the primary role of the Green Belt to maintain the local gap between settlements. This is mainly because of the configuration of the urban edge in relation to adjoining Green Belt and the character of the landscape and relationship to the M25, which disrupts the countryside and acts as a major physical barrier. Given the scale and nature of the local gap, which contains the M25, a limited reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the physical separation of any settlements or primary role of the Green Belt.			
	Development at Napsbury Park to west of London Colney recommended for further assessment as a potential boundary adjustme (SA-BA2). Green Belt land has been subject to substantial developme and as a result this land no longer contributes towards the 5 Green Be purposes."			
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u> .			
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.			

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-R-18
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	East of Redbourn and West of A8183 (See also SHLAA-GB-R- 425)



e.g. Proposed by landowner via agent.
Local Plan Inquiry 1982
The Council's case and the Inspector's comments included the following summary:
The Bridge nursery site included a dairy, poultry farm, touring caravan storage and grazing land (mostly in active use). A number of glasshouses were unused but could easily be brough back into use or removed. The site was in an attractive predominantly open valley. Glasshouses were not out of keeping with the rural setting and the site was clearly beyond the suburban development on the edge of the village. Some screening exists along the southern boundary. It was considered that the line of the bypass would provide an effective eastern boundary but in itself this was not sufficient to justify movement of the Green Belt boundary, indeed it was an argument for keeping development back for noise and visual reasons.
The site was thought unsuitable for development on environmenta and land use grounds. If developed it would have been a string of housing along Harpenden Lane, which could not have been regarded as infilling or rounding off. A precedent would be set for the development of the whole of the land between the approved District Plan boundary of Redbourn and the line of the new bypass.
Nevertheless once the bypass was opened it was suggested that a review of the Green Belt boundary on the east side of Redbourn be undertaken.
Inspector's Comments The desirability of reconsidering the Green Belt boundary on the east side of Redbourn in relation to the line of the bypass was common ground between the objector and the Council. He saw no reason to question the appropriateness of such a review which would consider the land use pattern taking into account the contro level needs at that time and noted that the landowners would be involved in the study suggested on behalf of the Council. In the circumstances the Inspector considered that any ad hoc amendment of the Green Belt boundary in relation to the objection site would be premature. This would be better considered in the wider context of an overall study of Redbourn's eastern Green Belt boundary. He recommended that no modification be made in response to the objection.

 1982 Public Inquiry into the District Local Plan (Inspector's Report 1983) Response to the consultation document published in 1986 favoured retention of the objection land as it was or as Green Belt recreational land. The Council officers recommended a development option changing the Green Belt boundary to follow the bypass and a residential, industry and open space mix of land uses. The Council did not accept the officer recommendation and the land remained in the Green Belt. Further consideration of the land was undertaken in 1988, when it was decided to propose that the land should stay in the Green Belt in the deposit Local Plan. In 1992, the Council considered that the land fulfilled a Green Belt purpose in several ways. The land was considered rural in character, with part of the Ver Valley as an important feature. Although there was some dereliction in the locality this was no reason to amend the Green Belt boundary, which was already well defined by trees and hedges along the eastern edge of the settlement built-up area. Redbourn possessed an attractive and historic centre and if the objection land were developed, there was concern that this could lead to traffic generation which would adversely affect the centre. The release of land may also have contributed to resources which should be directed towards urban renewal. Inspector's Comments It was the Inspector's conclusion that in the case of East Redbourn the Green Belt boundary was not defined on a permanent basis in the 1985 Local Plan and that it fell to the current Local Plan to determine this. The potential for unrestricted expansion of Redbourn is limited on its southern and north eastern sides by the strong physical barriers of the Nicky Line, Dunstable Road and Harpenden Lane. South of Harpenden Lane the development edge was less strongly defined by rear gardens and an opt nick between part of Crown Street and the objeccion land. Further east the prominent barriers of the Nicky Li	Planning History (continued)	
 favoured retention of the objection land as it was or as Green Belt recreational land. The Council officers recommended a development option changing the Green Belt boundary to follow the bypass and a residential, industry and open space mix of land uses. The Council did not accept the officer recommendation and the land remained in the Green Belt. Further consideration of the land was undertaken in 1988, when it was decided to propose that the land should stay in the Green Belt in the deposit Local Plan. In 1992, the Council considered that the land fulfilled a Green Belt purpose in several ways. The land was considered rural in character, with part of the Ver Valley as an important feature. Atthough there was some derelicition in the locality this was no reason to amend the Green Belt boundary, which was already well defined by trees and hedges along the eastern edge of the settlement built-up area. Redbourn possessed an attractive and historic centre and if the objection land were developed, there was concern that this could lead to traffic generation which would adversely affect the centre. The release of land may also have contributed to resources which should be directed towards urban renewal. Inspector's Comments It was the Inspector's conclusion that in the case of East Redbourn the Green Belt boundary was not defined on a permanent basis in the 1985 Local Plan and that it fell to the current Local Plan to determine this. The potential for unrestricted expansion of Redbourn is limited on its southern and north eastern sides by the strong physical barriers of the Nicky Line, Dunstable Road and Harpenden Lane. South of Harpenden Lane the development edge was less strongly defined by rear gardens and an open link between part of Crown Street and the objection land wold not lead to unrestricted growth of Redbourn or to the coalescence of the strice growth of Redbourn or to the coalescence of the settement barriers of the Nicky Line and		<u>1982</u> Public Inquiry into the District Local Plan (Inspector's Report 1983)
 purpose in several ways. The land was considered rural in character, with part of the Ver Valley as an important feature. Although there was some dereliction in the locality this was no reason to amend the Green Belt boundary, which was already well defined by trees and hedges along the eastern edge of the settlement built-up area. Redbourn possessed an attractive and historic centre and if the objection land were developed, there was concern that this could lead to traffic generation which would adversely affect the centre. The release of land may also have contributed to resources which should be directed towards urban renewal. Inspector's Comments It was the Inspector's conclusion that in the case of East Redbourn the Green Belt boundary was not defined on a permanent basis in the 1985 Local Plan and that it fell to the current Local Plan to determine this. The potential for unrestricted expansion of Redbourn is limited on its southern and north eastern sides by the strong physical barriers of the Nicky Line, Dunstable Road and Harpenden Lane. South of Harpenden Lane the development edge was less strongly defined by rear gardens and an open link between part of Crown Street and the objection land. Further east the prominent barriers of the Nicky Line and the objection and the Inspector considered that development of the land would not lead to unrestricted growth of Redbourn or to the coalescence of 		favoured retention of the objection land as it was or as Green Belt recreational land. The Council officers recommended a development option changing the Green Belt boundary to follow the bypass and a residential, industry and open space mix of land uses. The Council did not accept the officer recommendation and the land remained in the Green Belt. Further consideration of the land was undertaken in 1988, when it was decided to propose that the land should stay in the Green Belt in the deposit
It was the Inspector's conclusion that in the case of East Redbourn the Green Belt boundary was not defined on a permanent basis in the 1985 Local Plan and that it fell to the current Local Plan to determine this. The potential for unrestricted expansion of Redbourn is limited on its southern and north eastern sides by the strong physical barriers of the Nicky Line, Dunstable Road and Harpenden Lane. South of Harpenden Lane the development edge was less strongly defined by rear gardens and an open link between part of Crown Street and the objection land. Further east the prominent barriers of the Nicky Line and the bypass presented an obvious restraint on sprawl in that direction and the Inspector considered that development of the land would not lead to unrestricted growth of Redbourn or to the coalescence of		purpose in several ways. The land was considered rural in character, with part of the Ver Valley as an important feature. Although there was some dereliction in the locality this was no reason to amend the Green Belt boundary, which was already well defined by trees and hedges along the eastern edge of the settlement built-up area. Redbourn possessed an attractive and historic centre and if the objection land were developed, there was concern that this could lead to traffic generation which would adversely affect the centre. The release of land may also have contributed to resources which should be directed towards urban
its southern and north eastern sides by the strong physical barriers of the Nicky Line, Dunstable Road and Harpenden Lane. South of Harpenden Lane the development edge was less strongly defined by rear gardens and an open link between part of Crown Street and the objection land. Further east the prominent barriers of the Nicky Line and the bypass presented an obvious restraint on sprawl in that direction and the Inspector considered that development of the land would not lead to unrestricted growth of Redbourn or to the coalescence of		It was the Inspector's conclusion that in the case of East Redbourn the Green Belt boundary was not defined on a permanent basis in the 1985 Local Plan and that it fell to the
		its southern and north eastern sides by the strong physical barriers of the Nicky Line, Dunstable Road and Harpenden Lane. South of Harpenden Lane the development edge was less strongly defined by rear gardens and an open link between part of Crown Street and the objection land. Further east the prominent barriers of the Nicky Line and the bypass presented an obvious restraint on sprawl in that direction and the Inspector considered that development of the land would not lead to unrestricted growth of Redbourn or to the coalescence of

Planning History (continued)	He accepted that the dominant character of the land appears to be rural, but also contained some commercial development south of Waterend Lane. In his opinion, the gypsy site with its prominent fencing and compound appearance was an eyesore which detracted significantly from the visual quality of the area. Also, parts of the land were overlooked by the housing to the west and enclosed by the walkway and noisy bypass to the east. The whole area was isolated by roads on three sides and housing on the other, and this together with its general appearance provided more cohesion with the Redbourn settlement than with the open agricultural landscape to the north and east. There was no question that if the land were developed then some countryside would be lost, but the visual impact and encroachment on the wider countryside surrounding Redbourn as a whole would be limited and the visual effect would be seen as rounding off the settlement within the strong physical boundaries.
	The Inspector considered the most important consideration to be whether the boundary paid due regard to the long term development needs of Redbourn. Concerns raised elsewhere at the inquiry strongly suggested that there was a need to find land for a certain amount of development outside the confines of the existing built-up area in the short term, let alone any longer term development needs. Although the evidence was not conclusive, it led the Inspector to believe that the Council had not taken proper account of the probable future development needs of Redbourn when setting the proposed boundary.
	He concluded that the exclusion of the objection land from the Green Belt would not have a serious effect on its main purposes or the character of Redbourn. He stated that a long term, defensible Green Belt boundary would be best provided by continuing the line already established along the southern edge of the settlement which follows the Nicky Line in a northerly direction around the objection land to Harpenden Lane.
	Notwithstanding, the Inspector also considered it vital to adopt a comprehensive land use scheme for the land, which should include measures to safeguard the section of the Ver Valley and any proven ecological interest of the former watercress beds.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	Yes	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	Yes
County Wildlife Site	Yes	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No

Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	Two minor incidents
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	Yes
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	Yes
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Perhaps	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	No

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	Perhaps
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	Yes	Site with social or community value (provide details)	Yes
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	Yes	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes- Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS3 – Land at southeast edge of Redbourn), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS3 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB22.
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review Report states the overall contribution of GB22 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	"•To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant
	Land at southeast edge of Redbourn enclosed by A5183 (SA-SS3) when assessed in isolation this land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, safeguarding the countryside, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps. "
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
	2009 SHLAA comments:
	"Approximately a third of the site, running north to south down the middle and west sides, is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain). A further proportion is Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) or Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability), covering just over half the total area; effectively all of the western half of the site. Site constraints (primarily due to flood risk) would significantly reduce the net developable area. Relocation of the gypsy/traveller caravan site would also need consideration.
	Site has a long planning history, particularly in relation to Green Belt boundary review. Local villagers have made representations about the site's community value in the past and major riverside improvement works have been carried out in recent years. A comprehensive scheme for the area would need to consider what community infrastructure would be needed to mitigate development impact on this small village. It is possible that the southern part of the site might be more suitable for employment uses.
	Any development potential needs to be considered through the LDF process, given the site's location in the Green Belt, on the edge of Redbourn. The location or relocation of the Gypsy site may constrain achievability. Mitigation of flood risk may constrain achievability
	Assuming the Gypsy site could be accommodated within the site, or alternatively re-located nearby in Redbourn and employment uses could be located elsewhere; and the overall site was developed for housing, with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the area (principally two and three storey family housing, including semi-detached and townhouses). Approximately a third of the site, running north to south down the middle and west sides, is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain). A further proportion is Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) or Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability), covering just over half the total area; effectively the entire western half of the site, causing a significant reduction in overall capacity. The shape of the site likely to be unaffected by flooding and its relationship to adjoining land uses will cause a reduction in overall capacity.
------------------------------	--
	The site contains a County Wildlife site 55/014 and Local wildlife site 55/014 former watercress beds, causing some reduction in overall capacity.
	Significant mature trees, including those in a large TPO Group, should be retained, reducing overall capacity. A comprehensive scheme for the area would need to consider what community infrastructure would be needed to mitigate development impact on this small village, possibly causing some reduction in overall capacity.
	It is possible that the southern part of the site might be more suitable for employment uses, causing some reduction in overall capacity. Given the flooding constraints in particular, it is very difficult to judge how much of the site would be available for housing, but approximately 3 hectares out of the 13.5 hectare overall site seems a reasonable estimate. Approximately 35 dwellings per hectare is a reasonable estimate, on approximately 3 hectares of available site, in Zone 6.
	Council's own estimated capacity: 100."
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development. Part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by the landowner
Planning History	For full history of the "East of Redbourn" area see wider site SHLAA18

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	Yes	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	Yes	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	Yes
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	Perhaps some from the A5183
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Perhaps	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	No

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	Perhaps
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS3 – Land at southeast edge of Redbourn), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS3 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB22.
development? If no, provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review Report states the overall contribution of GB22 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	"•To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant
	Land at southeast edge of Redbourn enclosed by A5183 (SA-SS3) when assessed in isolation this land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, safeguarding the countryside, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps. "
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
	2009 SHLAA comments:
	"None of the constraints identified (i.e. proximity to a Wildlife Site, trees and hedgerows, green space, possible noise from bypass) represent any serious obstacle to development. However, it is considered that the whole area to the east of Redbourn (and west of the bypass) should be looked at in its entirety, rather than just this pocket of land in isolation."
	Yes, after due consideration through the LDF process, given the site's location in the Green Belt, on the edge of Redbourn, only when considered as a small part of a comprehensive scheme for SHLAA site 18.
	This site would only be considered as a small part of a comprehensive scheme for SHLAA site 18 and is therefore included in the assessment for the overall SHLAA site 18."
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development. Part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	Yes	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	Near	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	Near
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Near	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Adjacent
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	Yes
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	Yes	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS3 – Land at southeast edge of Redbourn), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS3 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB22.
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review Report states,
	"The overall contribution of GB22 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant.
	Land at southeast edge of Redbourn enclosed by A5183 (SA-SS3) when assessed in isolation this land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, safeguarding the countryside, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps".
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	Yes
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Limited or No

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Limited or No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Partial
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*				
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS2 – Land at southwest edge of Redbourn), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS2 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB18B.				
······,	The SKM report states,				
	"The overall contribution of GB18B towards Green Belt purposes is:				
	To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no				
	• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – limited or no				
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - partial				
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial				
	To maintain existing settlement pattern – limited or no				
	Land at southwest edge of Redbourn is recommended for further assessment as a small scale sub-area (SA-SS2). The sub-area is enclosed by the M1 to the west in the vicinity of Gaddesden Lane. Assessed in isolation this land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, safeguarding the countryside, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps."				
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>				
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.				



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Limited or No

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Limited or No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Partial
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS2 – Land at southwest edge of Redbourn), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS2 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB18B. The SKM report states:
	"The overall contribution of GB18B towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – limited or no
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - partial
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial
	• To maintain existing settlement pattern – limited or no.
	Land at southwest edge of Redbourn is recommended for further assessment as a small scale sub-area (SA-SS2). The sub-area is enclosed by the M1 to the west in the vicinity of Gaddesden Lane. Assessed in isolation this land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, safeguarding the countryside, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – URBAN SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION		
Site Reference	SHLAA-U-R-474a/ 474b/ 474c/ 474d	
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Garages at Lybury Lane and Down Edge, Redbourn	



Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Garage Court
Current use(s)	Garages
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No

Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary:-
no, provide reasons)	 *474c - NW site in map: Small site of garages in fair condition adjacent to a green amenity space
	 Could possibly fit 2 residential units on the site, subject to a detailed feasibility
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities
	474d - NE site in map:Could possibly fit 1 small unit.
	 Conclusion: carry out detailed feasibilities for a small number of units
	474b - SW site in map:Small site of garages in poor state of repair
	Could possibly fit 2 houses if garages can be lost
	 Alternatively 1 flat over garages could be possible – subject to more detailed feasibility exercise
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities
	474a - SE site in map:Could possibly fit 1 unit
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities
	Estimated capacity for all sites: 5"
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate
Council's Estimated Capacity	474a = 1 474b = 1 474c = 2 474d = 1



Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Garage Court
Current use(s)	Garages
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No

Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	 From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary:- "This site is a very run down garage site with very few garages in use and is clearly a social problem at present – probably because it is not overlooked
	 The access should be just wide enough to allow a development to take place
	 The site could take a number of houses or flats and perhaps provide some garages if felt appropriate
	Estimated capacity: 7 units
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities"
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's Estimated Capacity	7

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – URBAN SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference

139

SHLAA-U-R-477

Site address (or brief description
of broad location)

Garages at Stephens Way, Redbourn





Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Garage Court
Current use(s)	Garages
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No

Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted	
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September	
	 "Small site with garages of good quality, though small in size, but well overlooked 	
	 Development opportunity slim as car parking likely to have to be offset as at present the adjoining flats have no other parking and parking appeared to be a problem in the area 	
	 If parking was set aside, there may be the possibility of 2 houses on the site but no more 	
	Estimated capacity: 2 units	
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities"	
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.	
Council's Estimated Capacity	2	



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Agent/Landowner
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	Part
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Significant	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	Part
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	Yes	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	
(i.e. should this site	Yes – Potential*
be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS1 – Land at northeast edge of St Albans), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS1 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB36.
provide reasons)	The SKM Report states,
	"The overall contribution of GB36 towards Green Belt purposes
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – significant
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – limited or no
	To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant
	SA-SS1 – Land at northeast edge of St Albans (GB36) bound by House Lane to the east, and settlement edge to the south and west. The northern extent of the area runs level with Pirton Close. Assessed in isolation this sub-area makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx
	nttp://www.staibans.gov.uk/planning/Flanningpolicy/library/greenbeit.aspx
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.
	This site is unlikely to be available for residential development as it is a well-used and managed public open space needed for the adjoining residential area.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-SA-77
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Land between Harpenden Road and Sandridgebury Lane, St Albans



Current use(s)	Vacant open field
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner / agent
Planning History	There have been a series of planning applications, appeals and legal cases on this site. In summary:
	Hunston Properties Limited ("Hunston") applied for outline planning permission for the construction of 116 dwellings, a care home and some associated facilities on five hectares of agricultural land within the district of St Albans (Ref: 5/2011/2857). Permission was refused by the District Council. Subsequently, Hunston appealed under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the appeal was dismissed on 12 March 2013 by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. Hunston then challenged that decision in the Administrative Court under Section 288 of the 1990 Act, and that decision was quashed by order of the Court dated 12 December 2013.
	Hunston also applied for outline planning permission for the construction of 85 dwellings and some associated facilities at the same site. (Ref: 5/2012/2713). Permission was refused by the District Council and Hunston appealed under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
	Both Section 78 appeals were considered and dismissed by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State on 11 August 2015. (Refs: 5/2011/2857 & 5/2012/2713). It was noted that the proposals would give rise to definitional harm to the Green Belt and there would also be significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The harm is serious enough to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of both appeal schemes.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	Flood Zone 1	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	Yes
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	limited or no
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	significant	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes
	1	1	1

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	Yes	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development?	This site forms part of the strategic sub-area (SA-S4 – Land at north of St. Albans), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S4 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB38.
If no, provide reasons)	The SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB38 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – significant
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - significant
	To maintain existing settlement pattern – limited or no"
	Enclosed land at north St Albans along Sandbridgebury Lane is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S4). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the sub-area identified has relatively strong countryside characteristics as the landscape is a mix of open arable and some more enclosed areas in particular locations.
	However land along and around Sandbridgebury Lane penetrates into the north of St Albans to border existing development and settlement boundaries which contain it on at least two edges. This sub-area displays urban fringe characteristics and greater levels of localised landscape enclosure as a result of existing planting and field patterns and activities within the Green Belt including outdoor recreation. The small scale enclosed character of the sub- area makes it a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides screened from views from the wider strategic parcel.
	However, given the scale of the gap at 2.5km between St Albans and Harpenden, a reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the physical separation of settlements. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl or preserving setting."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-SA-419
Site address (or brief description	Verulam Golf Club, London Road, St. Albans
of broad location)	



Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc)	Mrs Mandy Owen, Boyer Planning, Wokingham, Berkshire
Category of site (e.g. agricultural)	Grassland, lightly wooded in parts.
Current use(s)	Vacant land to the north of the Golf Club
Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent
--	---
Planning History	Local Plan Inquiry 1992
	This site was proposed in the 1991 Deposit Draft for a small hotel, leisure or community uses (Site 8E, Policy 122) – with access not to be taken from the golf club entrance on London Road.
	Verulam Golf Club objected arguing the club house and car park area should be included in a comprehensive scheme. The Council argued at the Public Inquiry that inclusion of the club house and car park area was inappropriate given their prominent location above site 8E (which lies below the skyline). The Inspector suggested that although a comprehensive scheme made sense (barring access constraints) there appeared to him no clear case to allocate site 8E for any use. He felt the site formed part of the wider Green Belt, and that the current boundary was well defined by the existing built form and topography of the area. In these circumstances he recommended deletion of the site, a view strengthened by the premature nature of the proposal given access constraints. The Council accepted this recommendation and Site 8E was deleted

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Adjacent
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	Yes
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity	None

		substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	No
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Yes
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Perhaps

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Perhaps	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	ial character of St Albans	Yes

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	Yes	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	Yes	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If	This site is similar to SHLAA 2009 SHLAA-GB-SA-127 but with boundary changes.
no, provide reasons)	2009 SHLAA Comments
	"This site has a significant slope and comprises vacant land to the north of the golf course, which currently has poor access. However, these constraints could be overcome (indeed there are potential access improvements to be gained for the immediate area).
	Development would also need to mitigate against any negative impact on the setting of the adjoining Conservation Area. Visual intrusion in the Green Belt could be mitigated by new planting/landscaping and protection of existing vegetation.
	The Green Spaces Strategy identifies a deficiency in natural/semi-natural green space in this part of St Albans. However, given that this site is privately owned, it is unlikely that it would be possible to secure the entire site as a publicly accessible green space. Nevertheless, it could be possible for the Council to negotiate with any developer, in order to seek financial contributions towards providing access to natural/semi-natural green space in the locality. Contributions would be justified as any new development would exacerbate existing shortfalls in local provision.
	Assuming the site is developed with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the area, steep slopes at the entrance to the site from London Road may limit site capacity.
	Site lies adjacent to St Albans Conservation Area, possibly limiting site capacity. Existing perimeter tree screening would need to be retained, potentially limiting site capacity. There are extensive areas of mature trees, particularly in the north east and south east sections of the site, which would need to be retained, limiting site capacity. Long views from the south into the site and its relative prominence my limit the reasonable height of apartment blocks, limiting capacity.
	Sloping nature of the site may afford relatively easy opportunities for underground/undercroft parking for small apartment blocks, potentially raising site capacity.
	Approximately 35 dwellings per hectare is a reasonable estimate, on approximately 1.7 hectares available out of the 2.2 hectares of overall site."
Council's Estimated Capacity	60

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION			
Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-SA-439		
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Land north of St Albans, Rear of St Albans Girls School.		
DI333RICT 77 710 710			
Key: Green Belt Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3	Local Wildlife Sites Conservation Area Listed Buildings Local Nature Reserves Landscape Conservation Area Locally Listed Buildings Ancient Woodland SSSI Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953		
Area of site or broad location (hectares)	39.39 Ha		
Ownership details:	St Albans School		
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc)	Mr Robin Shepherd, Barton Willmore LLP, Reading, Berkshire		
Category of site (e.g. agricultural)	Agriculture		
Current use(s)	Agricultural grazing fields / Rugby Pitches		

roposed by landowner etc)	
Planning History	There have been a series of planning applications, appeals and legal cases on this site. In summary:
	Hunston Properties Limited ("Hunston") applied for outline planning permission for the construction of 116 dwellings, a care home and some associated facilities on five hectares of agricultural land within the district of St Albans (Ref: 5/2011/2857). Permission was refused by the District Council. Subsequently, Hunston appealed under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the appeal was dismissed on 12 March 2013 by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. Hunston then challenged that decision in the Administrative Court under Section 288 of the 1990 Act, and that decision was quashed by order of the Court dated 12 December 2013.
	Hunston also applied for outline planning permission for the construction of 85 dwellings and some associated facilities at the same site. (Ref: 5/2012/2713). Permission was refused by the District Council and Hunston appealed under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
	Both Section 78 appeals were considered and dismissed by an inspector appointed by the Secretary of State on 11 August 2015. (Refs: 5/2011/2857 & 5/2012/2713). It was noted that the proposal would give rise to definitional harm to the Green Belt and there would also be significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The harm is serious enough to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of both appeal schemes.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	Flood Zone 1	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	Adjacent	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	Yes
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	limited or no
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	significant	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting	g and specia	I character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	Yes	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Potential*
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site forms part of the strategic sub-area (SA-S4 – Land at north of St. Albans), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S4 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB38.
	The SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB38 towards Green Belt purposes is:
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – significant
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - significant
	To maintain existing settlement pattern – limited or no
	Enclosed land at north St Albans along Sandbridgebury Lane is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S4). In light of the functions of the strategic parcel, the sub-area identified has relatively strong countryside characteristics as the landscape is a mix of open arable and some more enclosed areas in particular locations.
	Land along and around Sandbridgebury Lane penetrates into the north of St Albans to border existing development and settlement boundaries which contain it on at least two edges. This sub-area displays urban fringe characteristics and greater levels of localised landscape enclosure as a result of existing planting and field patterns and activities within the Green Belt including outdoor recreation. The small scale enclosed character of the sub- area makes it a valuable part of the countryside, but also provides screened from views from the wider strategic parcel.
	However, given the scale of the gap at 2.5km between St Albans and Harpenden, a reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the physical separation of settlements. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl or preserving setting."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development. Part site only.

HLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – URBAN SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION				
Site Reference SHLAA-U-SA-457				
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Alma Road Youth Centre St Albans			



Key: Green Belt Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3	Local Wildlife Sites Conservation Area Listed Buildings Local Nature Reserves Landscape Conservation Area Locally Listed Buildings Ancient Woodland SSSI Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953
Area of site or broad location (hectares)	0.17 Ha
Ownership details:	Hertfordshire County Council
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc.)	Hertfordshire County Council
Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Youth Centre
Current use(s)	Youth Centre

Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	Yes
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Yes
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Can any of the physical or policy constraints identified above, be overcome?	
Council Comments	Yes – Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's estimated capacity	6

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – URBAN SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION Site Reference SHLAA-U-SA-458 Site address (or brief description of broad location) Rear of 64 -70 Tavistock Avenue, St Albans



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Agent/Landowner
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Can any of the physical or policy constraints identified above, be overcome?	
Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site is previously developed land in the urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's estimated capacity	2



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner via agent
	Quality Hotel 232-236 & 230A London Road St Albans - Ref. 5/2015/0310 demolition of existing buildings and construction of assisted living accommodation consisting of twenty -one, 1 bedroom flats and twenty-six, two bedroom flats and communal facilities with associated landscaping and parking. Application refused. Subsequently appeal allowed on 18/11/2015.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints

Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Can any of the physical or policy constraints identified above, be overcome?	
Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site is previously developed land in the urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's estimated capacity	14. <u>Note</u> : A planning appeal (ref. 5/2015/0310) was allowed for residential development. See planning history.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM - URBAN SITES SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION Site Reference SHLAA-U-SA-460 Site address (or brief description Land Between Mitchell Close and Holyrood Crescent, St Albans of broad location) School ians Recreation Ground Nùřser 438 Key: Listed Buildings Green Belt Local Wildlife Sites Conservation Area Local Nature Reserves 📃 Landscape Conservation Area 📕 Locally Listed Buildings Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3 Ancient Woodland SSSI Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953 Area of site or broad location 0.11 Ha (hectares) Ownership details: Private Contact details - if different from Unknown above (agent, consultant etc.) Category of site (e.g. Residential - potential infill/additional development employment land, garage court, green space etc.) Current use(s) Residential

Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site is previously developed land in the urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's estimated capacity	3 – potential additional residential capacity.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – URBAN SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference	SHLAA-U-SA-461
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Electricity Works, St Albans



/:		Gre
	_	

Local Wildlife Sites

Listed Buildings Flood Zone 2 Local Nature Reserves Landscape Conservation Area Locally Listed Buildings Flood Zone 3 Ancient Woodland SSSI Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance S

	© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953
Area of site or broad location (hectares)	0.66 Ha
Ownership details:	Private
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc.)	Derek Bromley, Bidwells
Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Industrial
Current use(s)	Industrial

Method of site identification (e.g proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner via agent
Planning History	Nearby employment sites: 5/2006/0943 - Alterations to existing building to include a new floor and change of use to residential to form twenty seven, one-bedroom and fifteen, two-bedroom flats This application was refused on 18/07/2006. Refusal reasons were based on the change of use of the land from employment land to residential would result in a loss of designated employment land that would be contrary to Policy 20 (Development in Employment Areas) of the St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994. Nearby site – 5/2001/2197 Demolition of office block and erection of building containing 56 apartments and office space This application was granted permission 10/01/2003. Nearby site - 5/2003/0885 -Erection of fifty one and two bedroom flats (Resubmission following withdrawal of 5/02/2125) This application was granted planning permission.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No

demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land usessubstations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etcidentified
--

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted		
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site lies within designated employment area. Proposals will be subject to Council decisions regarding the need to retain certain employment areas across the District in employment use.		
Council's estimated capacity	25		

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – URBAN SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference

SHLAA-U-SA-462

Site address (or brief description of broad location)

Rear of 143 Victoria Street, St Albans



Key:

Area of site or broad location

Green Belt Local Wildlife Sites Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3

Local Nature Reserves Ancient Woodland

0.02 Ha

Conservation Area SSSI

Listed Buildings Landscape Conservation Area Locally Listed Buildings

Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953

(hectares)	
Ownership details:	Private
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc.)	Unknown
Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Residential
Current use(s)	Residential

Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints				
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No	
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No	
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No	
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No	
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified	
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No	
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No	
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No	
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No	
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	No	
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No	
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified	

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate
Council's estimated capacity	1

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference

SHLAA-GB-SA-469

	SHLAA-GE
Site address (or brief description of broad location)	Cottonmill

Cottonmill Lane, St Albans



Key: Green Belt Flood Zone 2 Flood Zone 3	Local Wildlife Sites Conservation Area Listed Buildings Local Nature Reserves Landscape Conservation Area Locally Listed Buildings Ancient Woodland SSSI Tree Preservation Orders © Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953
Area of site or broad location (hectares)	0.11 ha
Ownership details:	St Albans District Council
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc)	
Category of site (e.g. agricultural)	Garage Court
Current use(s)	Garages

Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
Ancient Woodiand	INO	Local Nature Reserve	INO
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	No	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	No
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	No

Development of the site would	No	Development would be visually	No
affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	NO	intrusive from the surrounding countryside	NO

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	No	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			Yes

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary: -
, p	"Great site in a good location.
	 Access needs to be retained to allotments at the rear and some adjacent properties have been accessing their rear gardens by car through the site. Rights of access would need to be established.
	• The site is ripe for development and consideration may be given to this site being of sufficient value to sell for private development and to fund other social housing sites
	 A feasibility should be carried out to establish numbers of houses possible on the site
	Estimated capacity: 5 units
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities"
	Part of the site is previously developed land. The proposed residential development would cause only limited detrimental impact on the character of the Green Belt and the visual amenity of the local area.
Council's Estimated Capacity	5



SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference

SHLAA-U-SA-470

Site address (or brief description of broad location)

Garages at Creighton Avenue, St Albans



	© Crown copyright and database rights 2015 Ordnance Survey 100018953
Area of site or broad location (hectares)	0.16 ha
Ownership details:	St Albans District Council
Contact details - if different from above (agent, consultant etc.)	
Category of site (e.g. employment land, garage court, green space etc.)	Garage Court
Current use(s)	Garages

Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary:-
	 "Large site with mostly dilapidated garages, though some still in use, but with good width access.
	 Site not overlooked and clearly run down and in need of redevelopment, with a mix of housing and flats.
	 Beneficial to consider the option of relocating the sub- station if it could allow more units to be incorporated – the cost may be worth it as at present it splits the site
	Estimated capacity: 6 units
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities"
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's Estimated Capacity	6



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary: -
	• "The site is located near the railway line (Abbey Flyer)
	Garages seem in good condition
	 Would probably be able to have some form of residential development
	Estimated capacity: 2 units
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities"
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's Estimated Capacity	2


Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	St Albans District Council
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans City skyline	No

Council Comments	Yes - Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	From Council appointed consultant, Kyle Smart Associates Limited's, St Albans Garage sites Phase 2 report (September 2015). Summary:-
	"Feasibility study required
	Estimated capacity: 1 unit
	Conclusion: worth looking at detailed feasibilities"
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's Estimated Capacity	1



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc.)	- Proposed by landowner via agent.
	Planning application ref. 5/2016/0705 for a renewal of temporary permission for continued use of the site for temporary portable dwellings, replacement of existing modular temporary mobile homes and conversion was granted planning permission in September 2016.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	No	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	N/A	Public Right of Way	No
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	No	Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified

Policy Constraints			
Greenfield site	No	Designated employment area	No
Site with social or community value (provide details)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No

Tree Preservation Orders	No	Development would have an adverse effect on the St Albans	No
		City skyline	

Can any of the physical or policy constraints identified above, be overcome?	
Council Comments	Yes –Shortlisted
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	The site has been granted temporary planning permission for continued used of the site for temporary portable dwellings, replacement of existing modular temporary mobile homes and conversion.
	The site is previously developed land within an urban area. Residential development is acceptable in principle subject to design and details being appropriate.
Council's Estimated	10
Capacity	<u>Note</u> : the site has been granted temporary permission and part of the development commitments has been included in the housing trajectory.

SHLAA ASSESSMENT FORM – GREEN BELT SITES

SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Site Reference	SHLAA-GB-OS-400
Site address (or brief description	Land East of Hemel bound B487, St Albans
of broad location)	



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	On periphery	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Partial

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	i cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Part of SLP Broad Location
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site includes strategic sub-areas SA-S1 & S2 Land east of Hemel Hempstead which is currently being considered by the Council taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S1 & S2 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB21A & GB24A.
	SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB21A towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – limited or no
	To maintain existing settlement pattern – partial
	Land enclosed by east Hemel Hempstead and M1 in GB21A & GB24A is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S1). In light of the functions of the strategic parcels the strategic sub-area identified are relatively free of built development and represent open landscapes, which are however interrupted by the M1.
	Urban influences are strong as the sub-areas are enclosed by clear and visually prominent physical settlement edges including commercial and industrial development at Hemel Hempstead, especially to the south, as well as the M1 which disrupts the character of the countryside. Therefore, a reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the primary functions of the Green Belt or the separation of existing settlements. This is particularly the case because the gap between Hemel Hempstead and St Albans is relatively wide at 3.8km and is generally not compromised by existing built development or other urbanising uses and features, apart from the M1. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl or preserving setting."

	(continued)
	SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB24A towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – partial
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – limited or no
	To maintain existing settlement pattern – limited or no
	Land enclosed by east Hemel Hempstead and M1 in GB24A & GB21A is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S2). In light of the functions of the strategic parcels the strategic sub-area identified are relatively free of built development and represent open landscapes, which are however interrupted by the M1.
	Urban influences are strong as the sub-areas are enclosed by clear and visually prominent physical settlement edges including commercial and industrial development at Hemel Hempstead, especially to the south, as well as the M1 which disrupts the character of the countryside. Therefore, a reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the primary functions of the Green Belt or the separation of existing settlements. This is particularly the case because the gap between Hemel Hempstead and St Albans is relatively wide at 3.8km and is generally not compromised by existing built development or other urbanising uses and features, apart from the M1. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl or preserving setting."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site forms part of SLP Broad Location. SKM Green Belt Review SA-S1 & S2.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Partial
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant

Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Part of SLP Broad Location
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site is part of strategic sub-areas SA-S1 Land east of Hemel Hempstead which is currently being considered by the Council taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S1 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB21A.
	SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB21A towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – limited or no
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern – partial
	Land enclosed by east Hemel Hempstead and M1 in GB21A & GB24A is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S1). In light of the functions of the strategic parcels the strategic sub-area identified are relatively free of built development and represent open landscapes, which are however interrupted by the M1.
	Urban influences are strong as the sub-areas are enclosed by clear and visually prominent physical settlement edges including commercial and industrial development at Hemel Hempstead, especially to the south, as well as the M1 which disrupts the character of the countryside. Therefore, a reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the primary functions of the Green Belt or the separation of existing settlements. This is particularly the case because the gap between Hemel Hempstead and St Albans is relatively wide at 3.8km and is generally not compromised by existing built development or other urbanising uses and features, apart from the M1. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl or preserving setting."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site forms part of SLP Broad Location. SKM Green Belt Review SA-S1 & S2.



SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND GENERAL INFORMATION



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	Yes
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Partial

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Part of SLP Broad Location	
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons)	This site is part of strategic sub-areas SA-S1 Land east of Heme Hempstead which is currently being considered by the Council taker from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Counci appointed consultants). SA-S1 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB21A.	
provide reasons)	SKM report states,	
	" The overall contribution of GB21A towards Green Belt purposes is:	
	• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no	
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial	
	• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant	
	• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – limited or no	
	To maintain existing settlement pattern – partial	
	Land enclosed by east Hemel Hempstead and M1 in GB21A & GB24A is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S1). In light of the functions of the strategic parcels the strategic sub-area identified are relatively free of built development and represent open landscapes, which are however interrupted by the M1.	
	Urban influences are strong as the sub-areas are enclosed by clear and visually prominent physical settlement edges including commercial and industrial development at Hemel Hempstead, especially to the south, as well as the M1 which disrupts the character of the countryside. Therefore, a reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the primary functions of the Green Belt or the separation of existing settlements. This is particularly the case because the gap between Hemel Hempstead and St Albans is relatively wide at 3.8km and is generally not compromised by existing built development or other urbanising uses and features, apart from the M1. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl or preserving setting."	
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>	
Council's estimated capacity	This site forms part of SLP Broad Location. SKM Green Belt Review SA-S1 & S2.	



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Yes	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Limited or no

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Partial
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the settin	g and spec	cial character of St Albans	No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Part of SLP Broad Location
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site is part of strategic sub-areas SA-S2 Land east of Hemel Hempstead which is currently being considered by the Council taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-S2 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB24A.
provide reasons)	SKM report states,
	" The overall contribution of GB24A towards Green Belt purposes is:
	 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – partial
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – limited or no
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern – limited or no
	Land enclosed by east Hemel Hempstead and M1 in GB24A & GB21A is recommended for further assessment as a strategic sub-area (SA-S2). In light of the functions of the strategic parcels the strategic sub-area identified are relatively free of built development and represent open landscapes, which are however interrupted by the M1.
	Urban influences are strong as the sub-areas are enclosed by clear and visually prominent physical settlement edges including commercial and industrial development at Hemel Hempstead, especially to the south, as well as the M1 which disrupts the character of the countryside. Therefore, a reduction in the size of the strategic parcel would not significantly compromise the primary functions of the Green Belt or the separation of existing settlements. This is particularly the case because the gap between Hemel Hempstead and St Albans is relatively wide at 3.8km and is generally not compromised by existing built development or other urbanising uses and features, apart from the M1. This land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl or preserving setting."
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at: <u>http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx</u>
Council's estimated capacity	This site forms part of SLP Broad Location. SKM Green Belt Review SA-S1 & S2.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	1982 Public Local Inquiry
	Beech Hyde Farm
	<u>Council's Case:</u> The site makes an extremely important contribution to the Green Belt. Further development would create a dominant line of roofs, which would be even more obvious than those of the existing estate. The tree belt proposed by the objector would not be effective for several years. It does not provide a justification for a new Green Belt boundary across an existing field.
	Inspector's Comments: Although there appears on plan to be some logic in regularising the boundary to the south of the Hilldyke estate, I consider that this provides insufficient justification for the loss from current use of good quality agricultural land. The proposed woodland belt would no doubt provide effective screening both to new development and the existing somewhat exposed estate. There is no physical reason, however, why suitable screening should not be achieved along the existing boundary, as an extension of the settlement edge planting already projected in the Plan.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	Yes	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	Near	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	Near
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Near	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Adjacent
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	Yes
		Utilities – e.g. electricity	None

		substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Limited or no	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Partial	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	Yes	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes - Potential*				
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS7 – Land south of Wheathampstead), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS7 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB43A.				
provide reasons)	SKM Green Belt Review Report states,				
	"The overall contribution of GB43A towards Green Belt purposes is:				
	"• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – limited or no				
	 To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – partial 				
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant 				
	 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns – partial 				
	 To maintain existing settlement pattern – significant 				
	Land south of Wheathampstead to south of Hill Dyke Road and enclosed by Dyke Lane to the east and settlement edge to the west, is recommended for further assessment as a small scale sub-area (SA- SS7).				
	The southern extent runs level to Beech Crescent. Assessed in isolation this very small area of land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps."				
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at:				
	http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx				
	SHLAA 2009 comments				
	"The existing Green Belt boundary is well defined, following the clear line of existing development. However, the site is bounded by housing along its western and northern edges. Development would be unlikely to place additional pressure on adjoining land, but there would be a significant visual impact on long distance views to the south which could be mitigated to some extent with new landscaping.				
	Some limited housing development on this site could secure community benefits in the form of playing pitches, of which there is a deficiency in Wheathampstead. Through the LDF process, as a site in the Green Belt on the edge of the specified settlement of Wheathampstead where community benefits may be forthcoming				
	Assuming some limited housing development on this site could secure community benefits in the form of playing pitches, of which there is a currently a deficiency in Wheathampstead.				
	The site is within AS.R.14 – Area around Belgic Oppidum and Cropmarks north of the River Lea, Wheathampstead (an archaeological site which may be subject to a recording), so therefore may produce archaeological finds which prove to be a constraint, which may cause some reduction in overall capacity.				

It is very difficult to judge how much of the site would be available for housing, because of the uncertain nature of any decisions regarding the degree of 'enabling development' that would be acceptable to secure community benefits in the form of playing pitches, but approximately 1 hectare out of the 3.5 hectare overall site seems a reasonable estimate.
Approximately 35 dwellings per hectare is a reasonable estimate, on approximately 1 hectare of available site, with a mix of dwelling types appropriate to the area, an estimated capacity is 35."

Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development. Part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Proposed by landowner via agent.
Planning History	Ref 5/16/1329 – planning application for a four-bedroom detached house and detached garage was refused on 27 June 2016. An appeal was dismissed on 11 October 2016. The Inspector stated that the proposal would result in inappropriate and harmful development in the Green Belt, contrary to the development plan and the Framework.

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	Yes
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	Yes	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	Yes
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Yes	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and	No

		character of the settlement.	
Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Yes
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments Ye	es – Scale**
given further consideration for housing development? If no, provide reasons) de of sh clo Th pro	he site forms part of an extensive, undeveloped gap which eparates the two houses at 17 and 18 Gustard Wood which so includes part of the spacious gardens of No 18. This gap as a substantial frontage, depth and area and no further evelopment to the front or rear. No 17 forms the end of a row buildings running south and No 18 is itself separated from a norter terrace of houses running north which are situated oser to the lane than the southern group of buildings. The design of any new housing would need to enhance and reserve the character of the Conservation Area and setting of e Listed Building(s).

Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development. Part site only.



Method of site identification (e.g. proposed by landowner etc)	Agent/Landowner
Planning History	None relevant

Physical Constraints			
Area of flood risk	No	SSSI	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Nature Reserve	No
County Wildlife Site	No	Poor access	No
Site of Geological Importance	No	Steep slopes/uneven terrain	No
Scheduled Ancient Monument	No	Ground contamination	None identified
Site for Local Preservation (archaeological)	No	Proximity of Locally Listed Building(s)	No
Proximity of Listed Building(s)	No	Historic Park or Garden	No
Air Quality Management Area	No	Conservation Area	No
Tree and hedgerows	Yes	Other habitat/green space	No
Proximity to Hazardous Installations (as per Policy 84b)	No	Public Right of Way	No
		Utilities – e.g. electricity substations, pylons, telecom masts, underground pipelines, sewers etc	None identified
Minerals and waste site (i.e. development would result in the sterilisation of mineral reserves)	No	Site is adversely affected by noise, air or other forms of pollution (e.g. major roads etc)	No
Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses	Yes	Development would involve land that could otherwise help to meet the objectives of Watling Chase Community Forest	No
Development would result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.	Partial	Scale and nature of development would be large enough to significantly change size and character of the settlement.	Significant

Development would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.	Limited or No	Development would result in encroachment into open countryside.	Significant
Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature	Yes	Development would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside	Yes

Development would assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	No	Existing Green Belt boundary is well defined	Yes
Removal of the site from the Green Belt would create additional development pressure on adjoining land	Yes	Release of the site from the Green Belt would create a more clearly defined, robust long term boundary	No
Development would affect the setting and special character of St Albans			No

Policy Constraints			
Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1,2 or 3a)	No	Green spaces identified for protection in the Green Spaces Strategy	No
Landscape Character Area - i.e. those areas where emphasis is on conservation	No	Site with social or community value (provide details)	No
NB: Local Plan still refers to Landscape Conservation Areas)			
Tree Preservation Orders	No	Greenfield site	Yes

Council Comments	Yes – Scale**		
(i.e. should this site be given further consideration for housing development? If no,	This site forms part of Small Scale Sub-Area (SA-SS8 – Land east of Wheathampstead), taken from SKM's Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) (Council appointed consultants). SA-SS8 is an area within an overall strategic land parcel GB41.		
provide reasons)	SKM report states,		
	"The overall contribution of GB41 towards Green Belt purposes is:		
	To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas – partial		
	To prevent neighbouring towns from merging – limited or no		
	 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - significant 		
	To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - significant		
	To maintain existing settlement pattern - significant		
	Land east of Wheathampstead (GB41) to east of Brocket View is recommended for further assessment as a small scale sub-area (SA- SS8). Assessed in isolation this very small sub-area land makes a limited or no contribution towards checking sprawl, preventing merging, preserving setting or maintaining local gaps. "		
	Details of the SKM Green Belt Review Purposes Assessment (2013) can be found at:		
	http://www.stalbans.gov.uk/planning/Planningpolicy/library/greenbelt.aspx		
Council's estimated capacity	This site would be further assessed for potential housing development for part site only.		
	<u>Note:</u> the site is unlikely to be available for residential development as it is part of a well-used and managed public open space needed for the village.		