


Local Plan Regulation 18

Sites for Potential Allocation

(June 2021)



INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Foreword by Councillor Sarah Nelmes, Leader, Three Rivers District Council

All Councils in England are required by the Government to plan for future population growth and the demand for homes and jobs. That's why we're preparing a new Local Plan for Three Rivers. It's a blueprint for how the District will develop until 2038, identifying possible sites for development to provide new local homes and jobs alongside the shops, community facilities, transport, open space, schools and doctors that will be needed. Just as importantly, we also want to set out the policies that planning applications will be assessed against.

We now want to hear your views and invite you to take part in this consultation.

Much has changed since we first started on the journey to create a new planning framework for Three Rivers, including the national planning system which is undergoing further reform. Amongst these changes was the introduction of a national 'standard methodology' for calculating the District's local housing need; local housing need is the number of new homes needed on a year-by-year basis; this requires Three Rivers to provide 630 dwellings per year, resulting in an overall target of 12,624 dwellings over the plan period to 2038. Another very significant factor has been the Covid pandemic and lockdowns which have dramatically changed leisure activity and increased the demand for outdoor recreation and open space easily accessible from people's homes.

The Minister for Housing, Christopher Pincher, has stated that *"it is important to stress the standard method is only the first step in the current local plan process – the numbers generated for an area's housing need will not necessarily be the same as their ultimate targets. That's because councils will take into account various constraints in their areas, including protecting their Green Belt and environmentally significant sites. Nor does it dictate where those homes should go. Both are important aspects of the system which rest with local councillors to determine."*

As a Council, we acknowledge that there is an acute housing crisis in much of the UK and in particular high-cost areas like Three Rivers, and a pressing need for more homes, especially more affordable homes, so young people are not forced to move away from the area, but that this cannot be addressed at the cost of harming existing communities and reducing the quality of life and wellbeing of our residents. After very careful consideration of all the sites put forward, it is not possible to provide the Government's target for additional homes without causing disproportionate harm to existing communities as a result of building on much-needed accessible open space.

This is a draft version of the Plan which means that elements of it can still change before it is published and submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination. Alterations can be made based on the feedback received from this consultations or the findings of any emerging evidence.

Many of the sites put forward in this consultation will be controversial to some, but the Council has to seek to allocate sufficient sites to meet our needs. This will involve difficult decisions but is necessary. The sites now put forward are not the Council's preferred sites but those that meet the criteria in terms of availability, deliverability and sustainability. Some may change as a result of the consultation but for each site ultimately taken out, another has to be put in or site densities increased at those to be included.

We would welcome your thoughts on our approach which provides a balanced approach for new homes and local facilities which should benefit new and existing residents alike, while at the same time doing what we can to preserve our most valuable open spaces for the benefit of all of us. Thank you for taking the time to complete the consultation and give us your views so we can make the best possible plan for our District.



Cllr Sarah Nelmes

How to Respond to this Consultation

We are interested to hear the views of everyone including residents, businesses, community groups and all other stakeholders. All comments received will contribute towards the new Local Plan that will be submitted to the Government next year.

This document and supporting documents can be viewed and downloaded from the Council's website at: www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/new-local-plan

Our preferred method for accepting your representations is through our website, using our consultation portal. The links to the consultation portal for the Part 1 and Part 2 documents are at: www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/new-local-plan.

You can also send representations in the following ways:

By email to: localplanconsult@threerivers.gov.uk

By post to: Economic & Sustainable Development, Three Rivers District Council, Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth, Herts, WD3 1RL

The consultation period starts on 11 June 2021 and runs for a period of six weeks, ending at 5pm on 23 July 2021.

Please note that Three Rivers will only consider comments by respondents who provide their name and address. Your name, organisation and response will be made publically available once we publish responses; any comments made in your response therefore cannot be treated as confidential (published comments will exclude your personal contact details). Inappropriate, offensive or racist comments will not be accepted.

We cannot consider matters that are outside the boundaries of the planning process and are likely to be civil matters between parties. These include representations in relation to loss of property value, loss of view from property, private access rights, moral issues and restrictive covenants.

Decisions on sites will not solely be based upon how many responses of support or objection are received but will primarily be based on the impact of the development assessed against local and national policy and the requirements that a Local Plan must meet.

A separate sustainability appraisal report has been prepared on an independent basis for the Council. This document appraises the environmental, social and economic implications of the policies and sites and can also be viewed on the Council's website.

Notification of Future Consultations

If you would like your email address to be added to the Local Plan consultation database so that you are notified of future Local Plan consultations, please request this by emailing localplanconsult@threerivers.gov.uk including your full name and email address.

If you need this information in large print,
braille or another format call 01923
776611 Minicom 01923 727303

If you would like this information translated into another language please contact Three Rivers District Council on 01923 776611

[illegible]

ہم مقامی طاقت اور اور سرکوسٹریل کی طرف سے صوبہ کی جاری حیران
کے بارے میں آپ کی رائے سے جاننا چاہتے ہیں۔ اگر آپ ان خطرات کا
تعمیل کار، گورنر، عدلیہ اور دیگر کنگڈم میں شامل ہیں تو ہمارے
مقامی پبلک کے لئے چاہئے کہ

સ્થાનથી ક્ષેત્ર ઝીર કારડિસલ દ્વારા વીંટી જાણે વાલી સેવાઓ કે ચારે ને હમ ડ્રાપકી રાવ જ્ઞાનના પાઠને હૈ. પહ જાનકારી યદિ ડ્રાપકો બંગાલી, નુરતીની, કિન્ની, ઝડું વા કિન્ની અન્ય ભાષા ને અનુવાદ કરાની હો તો કૃપયા સંપર્ક કરો:	સ્થાનિક વિસ્તાર અને કાર્ડિસલ દ્વારા પુરી પડતી સેવાઓ વિશે અમ્યારે તમારા અભિપ્રાય જાણવા છે. જો આ માહિતી તમારે મંગાળી, નુજ્વાલી, કિન્ની, ઝડું અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં મેળવવી હોય તો મતરંબાની કરી સંપર્ક કરો:
--	--

સ્થાનિક વિસ્તાર અને કાઉન્સિલ દ્વારા પુરી પડતી સેવાઓ વિશે અમારે તમારા અભિપ્રાય જાણવા છે. જો આ માહિતી તમારે બંગાળી, નુકરતી, સિન્ડી, ઉર્દૂ અથવા બીજી કોઈ ભાષામાં મેળવવી હોય તો મતદારાની કરી સંપર્ક કરો:

This information is also available on our website at www.threerivers.gov.uk

Contents

1	Introduction	7
2	Housing	9
	Abbots Langley & Leavesden	12
	Bedmond	20
	Garston	22
	Kings Langley	23
	Langleybury	25
	Croxley Green	26
	Rickmansworth	31
	Mill End	39
	Chorleywood	44
	Maple Cross & West Hyde	49
	Moor Park & Eastbury	53
	Oxhey Hall	54
	South Oxhey	57
	Carpenders Park	60
3	Gypsies and Travellers & Travelling Showpeople	64
4	Employment	70
5	Warner Bros. Studios at Leavesden	74
6	Town Centres & Retail	78
7	Open Space	86
8	Education	87
9	Green Belt	89
10	Langleybury & The Grove	93
11	Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works	95
	Appendices	
	Appendix 1 Indicative Housing Delivery Trajectory	
	Appendix 2 Sites not taken forward	
	Appendix 3 Existing Employment Allocations	
	Appendix 4 Schedule of Proposed & Retained Public Open Space Allocations	
	Appendix 5 Map of Proposed & Retained Public Open Space Allocations	
	Appendix 6 Maps of Existing and Potential Sites for Allocation	
	Appendix 6a Map of Existing & Potential Sites for Allocation – North West	
	Appendix 6b Map of Existing & Potential Sites for Allocation – North East	
	Appendix 6c Map of Existing & Potential Sites for Allocation – South West	
	Appendix 6d Map of Existing & Potential Sites for Allocation – South East	

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation is presented in two parts. Please refer to the introduction in Part 1 of the consultation for an overall explanation of the Local Plan, its purpose and requirements and how the Council has arrived at this Regulation 18 consultation.
- 1.2 This document forms Part 2 of the Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation and sets out the potential sites where development will take place, how much development will take place, and when.
- 1.3 The sites in this document are the sites identified as having potential for allocation for the following land uses: housing, gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople accommodation, employment (including Leavesden Studios), town centre and retail development, open space and education. Also included in this Part 2 document and to be consulted upon are the proposed sites for allocation at Langleybury and The Grove and Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works, both of which are existing allocations in the current Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). The proposed revision of the Green Belt boundary in relation to Bedmond is also being consulted on.
- 1.4 Individual site assessments for the potential site allocations for housing, employment (including Warner Bros. Studios) and education sites have been undertaken as part of the Strategic Housing & Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA)¹, which can be viewed at: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/new-local-plan-evidence-base>. These sites have been identified through various sources including several Call for Sites exercises², a review of refused and withdrawn application sites, the Urban Capacity Study (2020), the Edge of Settlement and New Settlement Scoping Report (2020) as well as from the Brownfield Land Register (2019) and from sites which were previously considered in the preparation of the Site Allocations LDD (2014).
- 1.5 The introduction to Part 1 of this consultation document sets out the considerations and evidence base studies taken into account in arriving at the Sites for Potential Allocation that are included in this document.
- 1.6 The sites identified as potential site allocations for housing have been arrived at following extensive technical work and evidence gathering. Subsequently, and in line with national planning policy, these sites are considered to be the most appropriate in having the potential for housing development³.

¹ Assessments of all sites which have *not* been included in this document are also included in Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) (2020).

² Call for Sites exercises were undertaken in July-September 2017, August 2018 and October-December 2018.

³ Appendix 2 provides a summary of the sites that were included in the SHELAA which are not being taken forward.

- 1.7 It should be noted from the outset that if any of the potential housing sites for allocation are later found to no longer be suitable for allocation following this consultation, then replacement housing sites will have to be identified in order to contribute towards meeting the housing needs as much as possible. The same applies to potential employment sites. This is due to the national planning policy requirement for Local Plans to set out the land to be provided in order to accommodate the need for new homes and jobs over the plan period.
- 1.8 As stated in the overall introduction to the Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation (in Part 1 of this consultation), this is not the final stage of the Plan as we are still awaiting some key pieces of evidence. Your views submitted as part of this consultation will help inform the next stage and ultimately the document to be submitted to the Secretary of State. Following submission to the Secretary of State, there will then be an examination by an independent Inspector before the Council can adopt the document⁴.
- 1.9 An indicative housing delivery trajectory based on information available at the time of publication of this Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation is shown in Appendix 1. It is requested that the landowners/promoters of sites included in this document respond detailing realistic anticipated trajectories for housing and employment sites, which will help to inform future stages of the Local Plan.
- 1.10 An online map has been produced showing all of the existing and potential sites for allocation included within this public consultation document. The online map is viewable at the following webpage: <http://www.planvu.co.uk/trdc/localplanconsultation2021>. Alternatively, a PDF version of the map can be found at Appendix 6.

⁴ Details of the timetable are set out in the Local Development Scheme at: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/local-development-scheme>

PART 2: SITES FOR POTENTIAL ALLOCATION

2 Housing

- 2.1 National planning policy requires that the District meets objectively assessed needs for housing (OAN), including any unmet needs from neighbouring authorities where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development. Councils should identify needs in their area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth.
- 2.2 With a growing population, an ageing population and future changes in household make-up, the need for housing within Three Rivers continues to be high and is increasing. New development is an important responsibility that we have in order to help ensure that future generations can find homes of their own.
- 2.3 The new Local Plan is anticipated to be adopted in May 2023 in accordance with the Local Development Scheme (December 2020); national policy requires that a Local Plan should plan for a 15 year period following adoption. The new Local Plan period will therefore be 2018 – 2038.
- 2.4 For the 15 year plan period following adoption of the Local Plan the Government's Standard Method for calculating housing needs has been used of 630 dwellings per year. The Housing Target for the Local Plan will therefore be 12,624 dwellings based on the standard method for calculating local housing need.
- 2.5 However, taking account of completions and commitments through planning permissions since 2018 together with a windfall allowance, the residual Housing Target as of 31 March 2020 is 10,678 dwellings. The Council seeks to meet as much of the identified need for housing as possible given the ecological, environmental and policy constraints.
- 2.6 The proposed policy on housing allocations is set out below.

Proposed Policy on Housing Allocations	
(1)	Allocated housing sites will be safeguarded for housing development.
(2)	Sites should be developed at an overall capacity which accords generally with the dwelling capacity given for that site.
(3)	Proposals for the development of sites should have regard to the phasing strategy for the site, the Housing Supply Policy and the latest monitoring information on housing supply which may result in alteration to the indicative phasing of sites through the Annual Monitoring Report.
(4)	The earlier release of identified housing sites will only be considered if:

- i. The Annual Monitoring Report projects that there will not be a five year supply of land for housing;
 - ii. The sites can realistically be delivered in the short-term;
 - iii. It can be clearly demonstrated that the early release of sites will achieve significant benefits in terms of sustainability and other objectives of the Core Strategy;
 - iv. It does not unduly impact on other sites coming forward in accordance with the Spatial Strategy.
- (5) In the case of sites not being required in the plan period sites will be safeguarded for future development beyond the plan period.

Question 1

Do you think the Proposed Policy for Housing Allocations is the right approach? If not please identify how the proposed policy could be changed.

2.7 The potential housing site allocations are shown in site tables below for each settlement area, as listed below:

Abbots Langley & Leavesden
 Bedmond
 Garston
 Kings Langley
 Langleybury
 Croxley Green
 Rickmansworth
 Mill End
 Chorleywood
 Maple Cross & West Hyde
 Moor Park & Eastbury
 Oxhey Hall
 South Oxhey
 Carpenders Park

2.8 The site tables for the potential housing allocations include the following information:

- Site reference, name and map
- Site size (ha)
- Current use
- Indicative dwelling capacity
- Information on whether or not the site is located in the Green Belt & whether its allocation would require removal of the site from the Green Belt


- Anticipated phasing for development (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16 years plus⁵); this indicative timescale is based on ownership, physical limitations or constraints and the amount of time likely to be taken to develop the site in full.
- Site specific requirements/measures

- 2.9 The comments section in the site tables set out site-specific requirements and/or measures that would need to be addressed in proposals for the sites. It should be noted that these are in addition to matters set out in the detailed preferred policy options set out in Part 1 of this consultation document, including requirements relating to affordable housing and sustainable transport provision and net gain in biodiversity value. The site specific requirements/measures are not exhaustive but seek to aid future considerations by identifying key constraints and considerations which are specific to sites. As stated, all future proposals would need to comply with the full suite of policies in the Local Plan.
- 2.10 The potential housing allocations included below provide for a total indicative capacity of 8,973 dwellings.
- 2.11 The site tables for the potential housing allocations are shown below.
- 2.12 Appendix 2 provides a summary of the sites that were included in the Strategic Housing & Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) which have not been taken forward.

⁵ This relates to the numbers of years following adoption of the Local Plan, which is anticipated for 2023 according to the Local Development Scheme: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/local-development-scheme>. Appendix 1 shows the indicative housing delivery trajectory which the indicative phasing for each site is based on; it is requested that in response to this consultation, landowners/promoters provide information on their anticipated delivery trajectories for sites.

ABBOTS LANGLEY & LEAVESDEN


CFS3:

Site Ref.	CFS3	Site	Land adjacent to Fraser Crescent and Woodside Road	Size (ha):	7.1
				Current Use	Open grazing land
				Dwelling Capacity	303
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments Any development would be required to take account of the presence of protected trees within the site and public rights of way adjacent to the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. There is a sewer to the west of the site which would need to be protected as part of any development. Upgrades to the wastewater network would likely be required if the site were to be developed. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 2

Do you agree that that Site CFS3 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS4:


Site Ref.	CFS4	Site	Land at Warren Court, Woodside Road	Size (ha):	0.54
				Current Use	Former private allotment land (used by Warren Court Mental Health Impatient Unit)
				Dwelling Capacity	26
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments Any development would be required to take account of the presence of protected trees within the site. An archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any					

potential adverse impacts to heritage assets of archaeological interest. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 3

Do you agree that that Site CFS4 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS6:

Site Ref.	CFS6	Site	Land at Mansion House Equestrian Centre, Abbots Langley	Size (ha):	2.8
				Current Use	Grazing land
				Dwelling Capacity	133
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-10 years

Comments


Any development of the site would need to take account the public right of way adjacent to the site boundary. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 4

Do you agree that that Site CFS6 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS26c:

This site (Site CFS26c) is also included in the Kings Langley section on page 24

Site Ref.	CFS26c	Site	West of the Kings Langley Estate	Size (ha):	25.5
				Current Use	Open land Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	893
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	6-15 years


Comments

Part of the site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site and measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided. Any development would also be required to take account of the presence of protected trees and public rights of way within the site as well as providing suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk in areas of the site. There are Locally Listed Buildings to the west and south-west of the site and any development would need to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to these heritage assets. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would also need to be addressed. Upgrades to the wastewater network would likely be required if the site were to be developed. The site would be required to provide a primary school, open space and play space.

Question 5

Do you agree that that Site CFS26c is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

PCS21:


Site Ref.	PCS21	Site	Land at Love Lane	Size (ha):	1.3
				Current Use	Open grassland
				Dwelling Capacity	62
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments					

Any development of the site would need to take account the public right of way adjacent to the site boundary. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Suitable access arrangements would need to be achieved at the planning application stage. Upgrades to the wastewater network would likely be required if the site were to be developed. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 6

Do you agree that that Site PCS21 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


EOS4.0:

Site Ref.	EOS4.0	Site	Land adjacent to Bedmond Road & South of M25, Abbots Langley	Size (ha):	10.18
				Current Use	Agricultural and equestrian uses
				Dwelling Capacity	319
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would also need to be addressed as part of any development. A buffer between the M25 and residential development would be required. Part of the site is permissioned for a change of use to equestrian use and the development of a stable building, ménage and associated parking, which has recently been completed and would need to be protected as part of any development. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 7

Do you agree that that Site EOS4.0 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


AB18:

Site Ref.	AB18	Site	Garage Courts, Parsonage Close	Size (ha):	0.09
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Any development of the site would need to take account of protected trees located along the northern boundary of the site as well as the public right of way which runs along the northern boundary.

Question 8

Do you agree that that Site AB18 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


AB26:

Site Ref.	AB26	Site	Garages, Tibbs Hill Road	Size (ha):	0.1
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	7
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Any development of the site would need to protect heritage assets in the vicinity of the site.

Question 9

Do you agree that that Site AB26 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


AB31:

Site Ref.	AB31	Site	Garages, Jacketts Field	Size (ha):	0.08
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Any development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site.

Question 10

Do you agree that that Site AB31 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


AB32:

Site Ref.	AB32	Site	Yard off Tibbs Hill Road, Abbots Langley	Size (ha):	0.16
				Current Use	Builder's yard
				Dwelling Capacity	10
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
				Comments	Any development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site.

Question 11

Do you agree that that Site AB32 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

AB39:


Site Ref.	AB39	Site	Garages, Rosehill Gardens, Abbots Langley	Size (ha):	0.08
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years
				Comments	Any development would need take account of protected trees in/adjacent to the site and provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site.

Question 12


Do you agree that that Site AB39 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

- 2.13 The sites below are existing housing allocations in the Abbots Langley & Leavesden Area. These sites were allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) but have not yet been built out. The sites will therefore be carried forward into the new Local Plan.


H3:

Site Ref.	H3	Site	Pin Wei, 35 High Street	Size (ha):	0.13
				Current Use	Restaurant
				Dwelling Capacity	11
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
				Comments	The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014).

H4:


Site Ref.	H4	Site	Furtherfield Depot, Furtherfield	Size (ha):	0.53
				Current Use	Depot/storage
				Dwelling Capacity	36
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
				Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). The area of public open space within the site boundary would require protection. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.	

H6:

Site Ref.	H6	Site	Hill Farm Industrial Estate, Leavesden	Size (ha):	0.57
				Current Use	Industrial
				Dwelling Capacity	38
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
				Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). The site would be required to provide open space and play space.	

BEDMOND


CFS10:

Site Ref.	CFS10	Site	Land between Millhouse Lane and Bell Lane, Bedmond	Size (ha):	1.2
				Current Use	Open grassland
				Dwelling Capacity	34
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments The site is proposed for specialised/supported housing for the elderly. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Any development would need take account of protected trees along the western boundary. Highway improvements to Bell Lane would also be required. The site would be required to provide open space (play-space not required as proposed for supported housing for the elderly).					

Question 13

Do you agree that that Site CFS10 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS56:


Site Ref.	CFS56	Site	Church Hill Road, Bedmond	Size (ha):	2.9
				Current Use	Grazing
				Dwelling Capacity	71
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Any development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site					

and would also need to take account of protected trees adjacent to and in the site and the public right of way which runs along the southern boundary. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 14

Do you agree that that Site CFS56 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

ACFS9e:


Site Ref.	ACFS9e	Site	Land west of Bedmond Road, Bedmond	Size (ha):	1
				Current Use	Grazing
				Dwelling Capacity	48
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
				Comments	Any development would need to take account of protected trees within the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 15

Do you agree that that Site ACFS9e is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

GARSTON

CFS65:


Site Ref.	CFS65	Site	Land north of Bucknalls Lane, Garston	Size (ha):	5.8 4.2 (accounting for 100m buffer)
				Current Use	Former golf course
				Dwelling Capacity	190
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments An archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets of archaeological interest. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the A405 and M1 would need to be addressed as part of any development. Any development would be required to take account of the presence of protected trees within the site. A minimum 100m buffer distance between the nearest dwellings and the boundary of the Waterdale Household Waste Recycling Centre (located to the north) would be required as part of any development, which would reduce the developable area to approximately 4.2ha. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 16

Do you agree that that Site CFS65 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

KINGS LANGLEY

ACFS8b:

Site Ref.	ACFS8b	Site	Flower house, 2-3 Station Road, Kings Langley	Size (ha):	0.4
				Current Use	Retail
				Dwelling Capacity	19
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. The western boundary of the site is in Flood Zone 3b due to the main river which along the western boundary of the site; no development would be permitted on this part of the site and an 8 metre buffer between Flood Zone 3b and any development would be required. Any development of the site would need to take account of the potential noise issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 and Kings Langley station as well as potential air quality issues due to proximity to the M25.					

Question 17

Do you agree that that Site ACFS8b is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

PSCFS23:

Site Ref.	PSCFS23	Site	Former Chicken Processing Plant, Woodlands Road	Size (ha):	1.3
				Current Use	Former poultry farm
				Dwelling Capacity	62
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years

Comments


A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Any development would need take account of protected trees adjacent to/within the site as well as potential noise issues arising from the site's proximity to the railway line. Proposals would also need to address the areas of the site at risk of surface water flooding and provide suitable mitigation as necessary. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 18

Do you agree that that Site PSCFS23 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS26c:

This site (Site CFS26c) is also included in the Abbots Langley & Leavesden section on page 14

Site Ref.	CFS26c	Site	West of the Kings Langley Estate	Size (ha):	25.5
				Current Use	Open land Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	893
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	6-15 years

Comments

Part of the site is designated as a Local Wildlife Site and measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided. Any development would also be required to take account of the presence of protected trees and public rights of way within the site as well as providing suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk in areas of the site. There are Locally Listed Buildings to the west and south-west of the site and any development would need to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to these heritage assets. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would also need to be addressed. Upgrades to the wastewater network would likely be required if the site were to be developed. The site would be required to provide a primary school, open space and play space.

Question 18a

Do you agree that that Site CFS26c is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

LANGLEYBURY


- 2.14 The site below is an existing housing allocation in the Langleybury area. This site was allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) and is subject to the Langleybury and Grove Development Brief (2012) but has not yet been built out. The site will therefore be carried forward into the new Local Plan.

H7:

Site Ref.	H7	Site	Langleybury House/School	Size (ha):	1.97
				Current Use	In use for filming, comprised of redundant school buildings
				Dwelling Capacity	25
				Green Belt	The site would remain in the Green Belt and the redundant school buildings are proposed for replacement with housing.
				Phasing	6-10 years
Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) and part of the Langleybury and Grove Development Brief (2012) area. As set out in the Langleybury and Grove Development Brief, it is intended that a change in the location of the existing built footprint of the former secondary school buildings would be replaced with new development. Any development will be delivered in line with the Langleybury and Grove Development Brief. The site would be required to provide open space and play space. The site is subject to a planning application which is pending consideration for the temporary change of use of the site to film studios for three years (20/1697/RSP).					

CROXLEY GREEN


CFS19:

Site Ref.	CFS19	Site	Land adjacent 62-84 & 99-121 Sycamore Road	Size (ha):	0.27
				Current Use	Amenity grassland
				Dwelling Capacity	17
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments Any development would also be required to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on areas of the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Any development would need to take account of the presence of the protected trees in/adjacent to the site. The site is subject to a planning application for nine dwellings which is pending consideration (20/2737/FUL).					

Question 19

Do you agree that that Site CFS19 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS20:

Site Ref.	CFS20	Site	Land at Croxley Station, Watford Road	Size (ha):	2.3
				Current Use	Station, station car park & timber yard
				Dwelling Capacity	163
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
Comments The southern area of the site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) (Site H13). Any development would be required to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk. The					


site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Potential noise and vibrations caused by the use of the station/railway line would need to be addressed through mitigation measures. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

The station use would remain as part of any development and proposals would need to safeguard parking provision for the station.

Question 20

Do you agree that that Site CFS20 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


CFS61:

Site Ref.	CFS61	Site	Cinnamond House, Cassiobridge	Size (ha):	1
				Current Use	Office, workshop and parking
				Dwelling Capacity	133
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments Any development would be required to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Potential noise and vibrations caused by the use of the railway line should be addressed through mitigation measures. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 21

Do you agree that that Site CFS61 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


CG16:

Site Ref.	CG16	Site	Garages, Owen's Way, Croxley Green	Size (ha):	0.09
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Any development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site and suitable access arrangements would need to be achieved.

Question 22

Do you agree that that Site CG16 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


CG47:

Site Ref.	CG47	Site	Garages off Grove Crescent	Size (ha):	0.26
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	19
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Any development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 23

Do you agree that that Site CG47 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CG65:

Site Ref.	CG65	Site	British Red Cross, Community Way	Size (ha):	0.06
				Current Use	British Red Cross building & ancillary car park
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Any development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment may be required prior to any development. The public right of way running along the northern boundary would need to be protected. Re-provision of the community facility would be required on-site.

Question 24

Do you agree that that Site CG65 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

- 2.15 The sites below are existing housing allocations in the Croxley Green area. These sites were allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) but have not yet been built out. The sites will therefore be carried forward into the new Local Plan.

H9:

Site Ref.	H9	Site	33 Baldwins Lane, Croxley Green	Size (ha):	0.9
				Current Use	Car sales centre
				Dwelling Capacity	59
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted in 2014). Any development would be required to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Potential noise and vibrations caused by the use of the railway line should be addressed through mitigation measures. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

H10:

Site Ref.	H10	Site	Killingdown Farm, Croxley Green	Size (ha):	7.6
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	267
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted in 2014). Any development would be required to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on the site and a detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. The site would be required to provide open space and play space. The site is subject to a planning application for 160 dwellings that is pending consideration (20/1881/FUL).					

OSPF22:

Question 25


Do you agree that that Site OSPF22 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

Indicative Masterplan (OSPF22):

- 2.16 The following masterplan provides an indication of the quantum of housing, layout and infrastructure provision that could be supported on the site however the final detailed masterplan will be decided at the planning application stage should the site be allocated for housing. We are not seeking comments on the indicative masterplan and it is for *illustrative purposes only*.



CFS40a

Site Ref.	CFS40a	Site	Land at Park Road, Rickmansworth	Size (ha):	1.8
				Current Use	Transport for London depot and car park, grassland/tree coverage
				Dwelling Capacity	112
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years


Comments

Any development would be required to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk in the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Potential noise and vibrations caused by the use of the railway line should be addressed through mitigation measures. Development would also need to account of protected trees in the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 26

Do you agree that that Site CFS40a is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS41:

Site Ref.	CFS41	Site	Rickmansworth Station, Station Approach	Size (ha):	0.9
				Current Use	Rickmansworth station, adjoining car park and vacant land
				Dwelling Capacity	70
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
Comments					


Any development would be required to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Potential noise and vibrations caused by the use of the station/railway line should be addressed through mitigation measures. Development would also need to account for protected trees on the site and a detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

The station use would remain as part of any development and proposals would need to safeguard parking provision for the station.

Question 27

Do you agree that that Site CFS41 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


CFS59:

Site Ref.	CFS59	Site	Land on London Road	Size (ha):	1.1
				Current Use	Open grassland
				Dwelling Capacity	75 C2 bedrooms (equivalent to 40 dwellings)
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments The site is proposed for the provision of a residential care home (C2 Use Class). The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. The site would be required to provide open space.					

Question 28

Do you agree that that Site CFS59 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


CFS60:

Site Ref.	CFS60	Site	Affinity Water Depot, Church Street	Size (ha):	1.5
				Current Use	Affinity Water offices (former), water abstraction & treatment facilities
				Dwelling Capacity	65
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments The majority of the site is in Flood Zone 3a and approximately half of the site is in Flood Zone 3b; no new residential development will be permitted on Flood Zone 3b within the site and it is proposed that across the whole site, residential development will be delivered through the conversion of existing buildings only. Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site would also be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment would also be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets and the Locally Listed Buildings in the site would require protection. Affinity Water have stated that water treatment uses would remain on the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 29

Do you agree that that Site CFS60 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons

CFS77:

Site Ref.	CFS77	Site	Rickmansworth Library	Size (ha):	0.1
				Current Use	Library
				Dwelling Capacity	7
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years

Comments


Redevelopment of the site would require the re-provision of the library facility in a suitable, accessible location. A modern, upgraded library with improved facilities and access is potentially proposed for provision in the adjacent Council Offices. There is potential for a commercial use on the ground-floor of the redeveloped site.

Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site would be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 so a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment and archaeological assessment would also be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets.

Question 30

Do you agree that that Site CFS77 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

RWA13:


Site Ref.	RWA13	Site	Banstead Down, Old Chorleywood Road	Size (ha):	0.3
			Current Use	Residential gardens and residential dwelling	
			Dwelling Capacity	12	
			Green Belt	No	
			Phasing	1-5 years	
Comments The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Development would need to account for protected trees on the site and it is proposed that the existing residential dwelling to the east would be retained.					

Question 31


Do you agree that that Site RWA13 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

- 2.17 The sites below are existing housing allocations in the Rickmansworth area. These sites were allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) but have not yet been built out. The sites will therefore be carried forward into the new Local Plan.

H17:


Site Ref.	H17	Site	Police Station, Rectory Road	Size (ha):	0.29
				Current Use	Former police station
				Dwelling Capacity	24
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site would be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment would also be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

H18:

Site Ref.	H18	Site	Royal British Legion, Ebury Road	Size (ha):	0.08
				Current Use	Royal British Legion hall
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). Suitable mitigation to address groundwater flood risk on the site would be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals					

on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment would also be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets.


H21:

Site Ref.	H21	Site	Bridge Motors, Church Street	Size (ha):	0.12
				Current Use	Garage & car sales centre
				Dwelling Capacity	39
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years

Comments

The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). Suitable mitigation to address groundwater flood risk on the site would be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment would also be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets.

H22:

Site Ref.	H22	Site	Depot, Stockers Farm Road	Size (ha):	0.8
				Current Use	Affinity Water depot
				Dwelling Capacity	60
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years

Comments


The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site would be required. A detailed heritage impact assessment would also be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. The public right of way running through the south-western part of the site would require protection. Part of the site, to the west, is located in a Local Wildlife Site, with the Local Wildlife Site also located adjacent to the north and east of the site; measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

MILL END

EOS7.0:

Site Ref.	EOS7.0	Site	Land to the south of Shepherds Lane and west of the M25	Size (ha):	20.8
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	760
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	6-15 years
Comments An archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets of archaeological interest. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would need to be addressed as part of any development. Development would need to take account of protected trees in the site and the public right of way adjacent to the site. Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site would also be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. The site would be required to provide a primary school, open space and play space. Strategic drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity prior to development of the site.					
Question 32 Do you agree that that Site EOS7.0 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.					


P4a:

Site Ref.	P4a	Site	Quickwood Close Garages, Mill End	Size (ha):	0.16
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	7
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on the site would be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site.

Question 33

Do you agree that that Site P4a is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


P7:

Site Ref.	P7	Site	Oakfield Garages, Oakfield, Mill End	Size (ha):	0.1
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site.

Question 34

Do you agree that that Site P7 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

P33:

Site Ref.	P33	Site	Chiltern Drive Garages	Size (ha):	0.07
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site.

Question 35

Do you agree that that Site P33 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

P38:

Site Ref.	P38	Site	Garages at Whitfield Way, Mill End	Size (ha):	0.09
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site.

Question 36

Do you agree that that Site P38 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

P39:

Site Ref.	P39	Site	The Queens Drive Garages, Mill End	Size (ha):	0.11
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	7
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years


Comments

The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would need to be addressed as part of any development.

Question 37

Do you agree that that Site P39 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

RW31:

Site Ref.	RW31	Site	Garden land off Uxbridge Road, Mill End	Size (ha):	0.17
				Current Use	Garden land
				Dwelling Capacity	12
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on the site would be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site.

Question 38

Do you agree that that Site RW31 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

- 2.18 The sites below are existing housing allocations in the Mill End area. These sites were allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) but have not yet been built out. The sites will therefore be carried forward into the new Local Plan.

H15:

Site Ref.	H15	Site	Garages rear of Drillyard, West Way	Size (ha):	0.22
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	13
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years
				Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). Any development would need to take account of protected trees within and adjacent to the site.	

CHORLEYWOOD

CFS16:

Site Ref.	CFS16	Site	Land at Chorleywood Station (station car park and adjoining land)	Size (ha):	2.3
				Current Use	Chorleywood station, car park and adjoining land
				Dwelling Capacity	190
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years

Comments


A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Any proposals would need to take account of protected trees within the site as well as providing suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk in areas of the site. Potential noise and vibrations caused by the use of the station/railway line should be addressed through mitigation measures. Upgrades to the wastewater network would likely be required if the site were to be developed. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

The station use would remain as part of any development and proposals would need to safeguard parking provision for the station.

Question 39

Do you agree that that Site CFS16 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS18b:

Site Ref.	CFS18b	Site	Hill Farm, Stag Lane	Size (ha):	7
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	228
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised
				Phasing	1-10 years


Comments

An archaeological assessment and detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Any proposals would need to take account of protected trees and public rights of way within the site as well as providing suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk in areas of the site. Upgrades to the wastewater network would likely be required if the site were to be developed. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 40

Do you agree that that Site CFS18b is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS57:

Site Ref.	CFS57	Site	Pheasants Ridge Gap, Berry Lane	Size (ha):	0.7
				Current Use	Paddock
				Dwelling Capacity	40
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	6-10 years


Comments

Part of the site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets and potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would also need to be addressed. Any proposals would need to take account of protected trees adjacent within the site and provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk in areas of the site. The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site and measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 41

Do you agree that that Site CFS57 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS72:

Site Ref.	CFS72	Site	Land off Solesbridge Lane, Chorleywood	Size (ha):	0.4
				Current Use	Open land & barn
				Dwelling Capacity	19
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years


Comments

Part of the site is in Flood Zone 3b and there is an ordinary watercourse adjacent to the east of the site; a minimum 5 metre buffer between the ordinary watercourse and residential development would be required and no development would be permitted on the area of the site that is in Flood Zone 3b. Suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk in areas of the site would also be required and any proposals would need to take account of the public right of way adjacent to the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment would also be required prior to any development in order to protect and to mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. The site is in close proximity to the Chorleywood NO2 AQMA; potential air quality issues and noise issues arising from the site's proximity to the AQMA and M25 would also need to be addressed.

Question 42

Do you agree that that Site CFS72 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

ACFS1:

Site Ref.	ACFS1	Site	Heath House, Chorleywood	Size (ha):	0.2
				Current Use	Residential dwelling and garden
				Dwelling Capacity	10
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
				Comments	A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Any proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site.

Question 43

Do you agree that that Site ACFS1 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

PSCFS19:

Site Ref.	PSCFS19	Site	Land south west of Berry Lane, Chorleywood	Size (ha):	0.35
				Current Use	Grazing
				Dwelling Capacity	15
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment and archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Any development would need mitigate potential noise issues arising from the site's proximity to the railway line and M25. The site is located in close proximity to the Chorleywood NO2 AQMA and potential air quality issues would also need to be addressed. Any proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site and take account of protected trees along the southern boundary.					

Question 44

Do you agree that that Site PSCFS19 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


CW9:

Site Ref.	CW9	Site	Garages, Copmans Wick, Chorleywood	Size (ha):	0.1
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
Comments Any proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site and ensure protection of the public right of way adjacent to the north of the site.					

Question 45

Do you agree that that Site CW9 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CW24:

Site Ref.	CW24	Site	Garages, Green Street, Chorleywood	Size (ha):	0.1
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	7
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years
				Comments Any proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site and mitigate potential noise issues arising from the site's proximity to the railway line.	

Question 46

Do you agree that that Site CW24 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CW25:


Site Ref.	CW25	Site	Ryman Court Garages, Chorleywood	Size (ha):	0.1
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	7
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment and archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets.	

Question 47

Do you agree that that Site CW25 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

MAPLE CROSS & WEST HYDE


CFS31:

Site Ref.	CFS31	Site	24 Denham Way and land to rear, Maple Cross	Size (ha):	1.1
				Current Use	Market gardening
				Dwelling Capacity	55
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. Any proposals would need to take account of the protected trees in the site and provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on areas of the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 48

Do you agree that that Site CFS31 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

MC11:

Site Ref.	MC11	Site	Garages to rear of Longcroft Road	Size (ha):	0.06
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	5
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
Comments The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site.					

Question 49

Do you agree that that Site MC11 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

EOS12.2:

Site Ref.	EOS12.2	Site	Land to the west and south of Maple Cross	Size (ha):	52.2
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	1,500 & a 90-bedroom care home (equivalent to 47 dwellings)
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-15 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would also need to be addressed. Any proposals would need to take account of the presence of public right of ways within the site and protected trees adjacent to the site as well as providing suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on areas of the site. The majority of the site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 and the remainder in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 2; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Upgrades to the wastewater network would likely be required if the site were to be developed. The site would be required to provide primary education facilities (proposed as an extension to the existing Maple Cross JMI and Nursery School), a local centre (including local shops, community facilities, a nursery and flexible commercial space), a GP surgery, open space, play space and improvements to bus stops and an extended bus route through the site.					

Question 50


Do you agree that that Site EOS12.2 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

Indicative Masterplan (EOS12.2):

- 2.19 The following masterplan provides an indication of the quantum of housing, layout and infrastructure provision that could be supported on the site however the final detailed masterplan will be decided at the planning application stage should the site be allocated for housing. We are not seeking comments on the indicative masterplan and it is for *illustrative purposes only*.



EOS12.3


Site Ref.	EOS12.3	Site	Land to the north of Chalfont Lane	Size (ha):	3.7
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	176
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Potential noise and air quality issues arising from the site's proximity to the M25 would also need to be addressed. Any proposals would need provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on areas of the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 51

Do you agree that that Site EOS12.3 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

MOOR PARK & EASTBURY

CFS22:


Site Ref.	CFS22	Site	Knoll Oak, Sandy Lane, Northwood	Size (ha):	0.5
				Current Use	Residential dwelling (vacant)
				Dwelling Capacity	35
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	1-5 years
				Comments	Proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site and development would need to take account of protected trees within the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 52

Do you agree that that Site CFS22 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

OXHEY HALL

ACFS13b:

Site Ref.	ACFS13b	Site	Land at Hampermill Lane (larger site)	Size (ha):	2.8
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	133
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
				Phasing	6-10 years


Comments

A detailed heritage impact assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. Any proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 53

Do you agree that that Site ACFS13b is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

RWA6:

Site Ref.	RWA6	Site	165-167 Hampermill Lane, Oxhey Hall	Size (ha):	0.14
				Current Use	Residential dwellings (vacant)
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years

Comments

The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-

application stage to support any proposals on the site. Proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address groundwater flood risk on areas of the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets.

Question 54

Do you agree that that Site RWA6 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

PCS16:


Site Ref.	PCS16	Site	Vivian Gardens, Oxhey Hall	Size (ha):	0.33
				Current Use	Residential gardens
				Dwelling Capacity	8
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years
				Comments The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Development would need also to take account of protected trees within the site.	

Question 55

Do you agree that that Site PCS16 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


- 2.20 The site below is an existing housing allocation in the Oxhey Hall area. The site was allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) but has not yet been built out. The site will therefore be carried forward into the new Local Plan.

H24:

Site Ref.	H24	Site	The Fairway, Green Lane, Oxhey Hall	Size (ha):	0.35
				Current Use	Residential care home
				Dwelling Capacity	32
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1--5 years
Comments The site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Development would need to take account of protected trees within the site and would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site. Delivery of the site depends on an alternative mode of provision being made for the care home. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

SOUTH OXHEY


CFS52a:

Site Ref.	CFS52a	Site	Former Sir James Altham School, Little Oxhey Lane, South Oxhey	Size (ha):	1.3
				Current Use	Former swimming pool & car park, grassland, vacant residential care home
				Dwelling Capacity	43
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	6-10 years
Comments The southern part of the site is an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) (Site H32). An archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets of archaeological interest and proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site. The former swimming pool has now been replaced by a newly constructed facility in the locality. As part of any development, the residential care home on the site would need to be re-provided on the site or on an alternative site in the local area. Development of the site would also be required to provide an additional 15 car parking spaces and a coach parking space to serve Oxhey Jets Football Club which is adjacent to the site. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 56

Do you agree that that Site CFS52a is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


AS13:

Site Ref.	AS13	Site	Garages at Blackford Road, South Oxhey	Size (ha):	0.1
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	7
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site.

Question 57

Do you agree that that Site AS13 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


AS31:

Site Ref.	AS31	Site	Garages at Woodhall Lane, South Oxhey	Size (ha):	0.09
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk on areas of the site.

Question 58

Do you agree that that Site AS31 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

NW34a:


Site Ref.	NW34a	Site	Garages rear of the Dick Whittington Pub, South Oxhey	Size (ha):	0.09
				Current Use	Garages
				Dwelling Capacity	6
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	11-15 years
				Comments	Development may need to provide mitigation to address surface water flood risk along the access road to the site.

Question 59

Do you agree that that Site NW34a is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


- 2.21 The site below is an existing housing allocation in the South Oxhey area. The site was allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) but has not yet been built out. The site will therefore be carried forward into the new Local Plan.

BR20:

Site Ref.	BR20	Site	Northwick Day Centre, Northwick Road, South Oxhey	Size (ha):	0.56
				Current Use	Day centre
				Dwelling Capacity	48
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-5 years
Comments The site is part of an existing housing allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) relating to the wider South Oxhey regeneration area (H29). Development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk impacting the site and proposals would need to take account of protected trees within the site. The Northwick Road Day Centre facility would need to be re-provided in the local area as part of any development. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

CARPENDERS PARK

CFS12:

Site Ref.	CFS12	Site	Keibell House and land to rear Delta Gain, Carpenders Park	Size (ha):	0.9
				Current Use	Offices
				Dwelling Capacity	68
				Green Belt	No
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments Part of the site, to the north, is located in Flood Zone 3b; no development would be permitted on the area of the site in Flood Zone 3b. An 8 metre buffer from residential development and the main river which flows through the site will also be required. Proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address groundwater flood risk, surface water flood risk and fluvial flood risk on areas of the site. Any development would need protect the public right of way adjacent to the north of the site and take account of potential noise issues arising from the site's proximity to the railway line. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.					

Question 60

Do you agree that that Site CFS12 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS13:


Site Ref.	CFS13	Site	Land at Oxhey Lane, Watford Heath	Size (ha):	2.8
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	119
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments Any development will need to take into consideration the medium pressure gas pipeline which runs along the northern and eastern boundaries and an appropriate buffer from the pipeline to development will be required. A					

detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address the surface water flood risk along the southern boundary and development would be required to take account of the presence of the protected trees. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 61

Do you agree that that Site CFS13 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

CFS14:

Site Ref.	CFS14	Site	Land north of Oxhey Lane	Size (ha):	3.4
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	149
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised
				Phasing	1-10 years


Comments

Any development will need to take into consideration the medium pressure gas pipeline which runs through the north of the site and an appropriate buffer from the pipeline to development will be required. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address the surface water flood risk along the southern boundary and development would be required to take account of the presence of the protected trees. Potential contamination of the site due to the area of historic landfill within the site would also need to be addressed. The site would be required to provide open space and play space.

Question 62

Do you agree that that Site CFS14 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.


CFS69a:

Site Ref.	CFS69a	Site	Land at Carpenders Park Farm – Northern Parcel	Size (ha):	12.7
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	485
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised
				Phasing	6-15 years
Comments The southern boundary of the site is a 10 metre distance from the Hartsbourne Flood Storage Area and development would need to ensure protection of this designated flood risk asset. Proposals would need to provide suitable mitigation to address the surface water flood risk on areas of the site and development would need protect the public right of way running through the site to the north. The site would be required to provide open space, play space and a primary school.					

Question 63

Do you agree that that Site CFS69a is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

PCS47:

Site Ref.	PCS47	Site	South of Little Oxhey Lane	Size (ha):	19.4
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Dwelling Capacity	678
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised
				Phasing	6-15 years
Comments Any development will need to take into consideration the medium pressure gas pipeline which runs along the southern boundary and an appropriate buffer from the pipeline to development will be required. A buffer would also be required between development and the overhead electricity cables which run through the site. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Proposals would					

need to provide suitable mitigation to address the surface water flood risk on areas of the site as well as providing appropriate buffer distances to the ordinary watercourses within the site. The site is adjacent to Harrow AQMA so potential air quality issues would also need to be addressed. The site would be required to provide open and play space and there may be a requirement for a primary school on site.

Question 64

Do you agree that that Site PCS47 is an appropriate development site? If not, please outline your reasons.

3 Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- 3.1 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople have particular accommodation needs that require additional consideration. To ensure that members of these communities are able to access decent and appropriate housing with access to services including health and education, the Council must make provision for accommodation to meet identified needs.
- 3.2 All the identified Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites within the District will be 'safeguarded' to ensure that the permitted use as a traveller site is not lost through the grant of any subsequent planning permission whilst there remains a need for sites. The Preferred Policy below seeks to safeguard existing Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites.

Preferred Policy on Sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Allocation and Safeguarding Existing Authorised⁶ Sites

- (1) Existing traveller sites are allocated and safeguarded for traveller use. These sites will continue to be safeguarded for as long as the need exists for traveller accommodation within the District:
- GT1 The Oaklands, Bedmond Road, Bedmond
 - GT2 Fir Trees, Dawes Lane, Sarratt
 - GT3 Rear of 59 Toms Lane, Kings Langley
 - GT4 Land between Langleybury Lane and Old House Lane, Langleybury
 - GT5 Land Adjacent to 321B Uxbridge Road, Mill End, Rickmansworth
 - GT6 Rear of 317-319 Uxbridge Road, Mill End, Rickmansworth
 - GT7 Rear of 321 Uxbridge Road, Mill End, Rickmansworth
 - GT8 Brickfield Farm, Carpenders Park
 - GT9 Deadmans Ash Lane, Sarratt
- (2) Any new traveller sites granted planning permission and implemented shall also be safeguarded under provisions of this policy as long as the need exists as identified in the Council's latest, agreed Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment.

Question 65

Do you think the Preferred Policy for Sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is the right approach? If not please identify how the preferred policy could be changed.

- 3.3 Preferred Policy Option 5 in Part 1 of this consultation document explains that the additional needs over the 2016-2031 period identified for Gypsy and Traveller households

⁶ 'Authorised' relates to sites that have planning permission and those that have been in existence for over 15 years with no explicit permissions where a certificate of lawful use would be granted if sought.

arose from sites which had temporary planning permission at the time of the assessment, both of which have since been granted permanent planning permission with the decisions confirming that the households meet the definition for Travellers. The identified needs of those households have therefore been met and will continue to be met through safeguarding the existing sites and/or future site intensification.

3.4 Preferred Policy Option 5 in Part 1 of this consultation document recognises that existing authorised sites and tolerated yards are able to meet future needs for Travelling Showpeople accommodation. Therefore, whilst there is no need to allocate further sites, there is a need to safeguard these existing authorised sites to ensure that their permitted use is not lost through the grant of any subsequent planning permission whilst there remains a need for them

3.5 The preferred sites for gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople are shown below.

Preferred Sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site Ref.	GT1	Site	The Oaklands, Bedmond Road, Bedmond	
			Current Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
			Proposed Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
			Type of Permission	Site is permanently permissioned


Site Ref.	GT2	Site	Fir Trees, Dawes Lane, Sarratt		
				Current Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
				Proposed Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
				Type of Permission	Site is permanently permissioned


Site Ref.	GT3	Site	Rear of 59 Toms Lane, Kings Langley		
				Current Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
				Proposed Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
				Type of Permission	Site is permanently permissioned


Site Ref.	GT4	Site	Land between Langleybury Lane and Old House Lane, Langleybury	
			Current Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
			Proposed Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
			Type of Permission	Site is permanently permissioned

Site Ref.	GT5	Site	Land Adjacent to 321B Uxbridge Road, Mill End, Rickmansworth	
			Current Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
			Proposed Use	Gypsy and Traveller Site
			Type of Permission	Site is permanently permissioned

Site Ref.	GT6	Site	Rear of 317-319 Uxbridge Road, Mill End, Rickmansworth	
			Current Use	Travelling Showpeople Site
			Proposed Use	Travelling Showpeople Site
			Type of Permission	Site is permanently permissioned

Site Ref.	GT7	Site	Rear of 321 Uxbridge Road, Mill End, Rickmansworth	
			Current Use	Travelling Showpeople Site
			Proposed Use	Travelling Showpeople Site
			Type of Permission	Site is permanently permissioned

Site Ref.	GT8	Site	Brickfield Farm, Carpenders Park	
				
Current Use	Travelling Showpeople Site			
Proposed Use	Travelling Showpeople Site			
Type of Permission	No explicit permissions but current use is tolerated and has been in existence for over 15 years. A certificate of lawfulness would be granted if sought.			

Site Ref.	GT9	Site	Deadmans Ash Lane, Sarratt	
			Current Use	Travelling Showpeople Site
			Proposed Use	Travelling Showpeople Site
			Type of Permission	No explicit permissions but current use is tolerated and has been in existence for over 15 years. A certificate of lawfulness would be granted if sought.


Question 66

Do you agree with the approach of allocating the existing Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites in order to safeguard their existing use? If not, please explain why.

4 Employment


- 4.1 In order to maintain and improve the economic performance of the District, it is important to make provision for future employment and economic development alongside housing growth and protection of the environment. Economic development includes development within the office uses, industry and warehousing uses, public and community uses, leisure and tourism uses and main town centre uses. It also includes any other development which provides employment opportunities, generates wealth or produces or generates an economic output or product.
- 4.2 The South West Herts Economic Study (2019) has been used to inform the requirements for land or floorspace for economic development over the plan period. The Study indicates that on the basis of projected growth needs in the area, Three Rivers cannot afford to lose any more employment floorspace. The demand for office space is expected to be met by existing commitments at Croxley Park, but there will be a requirement for further land to be allocated for warehousing and industrial uses. Therefore, there is a need to safeguard existing employment allocations and to allocate further land to meet future need for employment floorspace.
- 4.3 There is expected to be a demand of 30,100 sqm office space for the period to 2036, which is expected to be met by existing commitments at Croxley Park (Site E(a) in the Site Allocations LDD [adopted 2014]).
- 4.4 In terms of industrial and warehousing space there is a total requirement for 39,945 sqm which will need to be planned for across the period. However, the capacity of approximately 18,000sqm on the existing Maple Cross/Maple Lodge employment site allocation (Site E(d) in the Site Allocations LDD) reduces the total requirement for industrial and warehousing space to 21,945sqm. This equates to a requirement of 5.5ha employment land to be planned for over the period to 2036.
- 4.5 Preferred Policy Option 7 in Part 1 of this consultation document seeks to safeguard allocated employment sites for business, industrial and storage or distribution uses whilst also focusing new employment provision on allocated employment sites through intensification and expansion where appropriate.
- 4.6 The potential employment allocations which are shown below would meet the requirements for employment land over the plan period when combined with existing commitments at Croxley Park and existing spare capacity at Maple Cross/Maple Lodge.
- 4.7 The preferred site allocations for Warner Bros. Studios (also considered an employment use) are shown in Section 6 of this document.
- 4.8 Details of sites which have not been taken forward are set out in Appendix 2.

Potential Employment Allocations

Site Ref.	CFS70a	Site	Croxley Business Park, Hatters Lane, Croxley Green	Size (ha):	0.4
				Current Use	Overflow car park (serving employment area)
				Proposed Use	Storage and distribution uses and office uses
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
Comments The site is proposed as an extension to the existing employment site allocation (Croxley Business Park, Site E(a) in the Site Allocations LDD [adopted 2014]). The site has an existing outline permission for the construction of a storage and distribution building (18/0820/OUT). An 8 metre buffer distance between the main river (adjacent to the western boundary) and any development would be required and no development will be permitted on the area of the site in Flood Zone 3. Development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk on areas of the site as well as taking account of protected trees on/adjacent to the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site.					

Question 67

Do you agree that that Site CFS70a is an appropriate development site for employment uses? If not, please outline your reasons.

Site Ref.	CFS70b	Site	Croxley Business Park, Hatters Lane, Croxley Green	Size (ha):	0.4
				Current Use	Grassland, compost area, hardstanding
				Proposed Use	Ancillary space to Croxley Green Business Park
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.
Comments The site is proposed as an extension to the existing employment site allocation (Croxley Business Park, Site E(a) in the Site Allocations LDD [adopted 2014]). The site has an existing permission for leisure use to support					

Croxley Business Park (18/1415/FUL). An 8 metre buffer distance between the main river (adjacent to the eastern boundary) and any development would be required and no development will be permitted on the area of the site in Flood Zone 3b. Development would need to provide suitable mitigation to address surface water flood risk and groundwater flood risk impacting the site. The site is adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest and Local Nature Reserve (Croxley Common Moor) and measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided.

Question 68

Do you agree that that Site CFS70b is an appropriate development site for ancillary space to the existing employment allocation? If not, please outline your reasons.

Site Ref.	CFS32a	Site	Land at Lynsters Farm, East of Old Uxbridge Road, Maple Cross	Size (ha):	10.7
				Current Use	Residential dwelling, agricultural buildings, grassland
				Proposed Use	Industry and warehousing
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.

Comments

Development would need to satisfactorily address the varied levels of risk of fluvial, surface water and groundwater flooding present across the site and suitable mitigation would need to be provided. A buffer distance from Flood Zone 3b (located to the south of the site) and any development would also be required. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. Mitigation may also be required to ensure acceptability of the development in terms of odour exposure and amenity of future occupants due to the proximity of Maple Lodge Sewage Treatment Works to the north-east of the site. Development should not adversely impact on the continued operation of the operational waste site at Maple Lodge Sewage Treatment Works. A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Development would need to take account of protected trees within the site and due to the adjacent Local Wildlife(s) and Local Nature Reserve, measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided. It should be noted that the whole of the site is not proposed for development and retention of the Grade II Listed building on the site would be required.

Question 69

Do you agree that that Site CFS32a is an appropriate development site for employment uses? If not, please outline your reasons.

- 4.9 Question 70 is an overarching question relating to all of the potential employment allocations. Details of sites which have not been taken forward are set out in Appendix 2. If your answer to Question 70 refers to a site included in Appendix 2, please state the site reference and site address in your answer. It should be noted that if any of the potential employment sites for allocation are found to no longer be suitable for allocation following

this consultation, then replacement employment sites will have to be identified in order to meet the requirement for employment land over the plan period.

Question 70


Do you believe there are more suitable alternative sites to the potential employment sites shown above? If so please provide details.

Existing Employment Allocations

- 4.10 There are several existing employment allocations in the District which were allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) and have remaining capacity for employment use. These sites will be carried forward into the new Local Plan and are shown in Appendix 3.


5 Warner Bros. Studios at Leavesden

- 5.1 The South West Herts Economic Study Update (2019) notes that the Warner Bros Film Studios in Leavesden is one of only a few locations in the UK where large scale film productions can be made. The site has also become a major visitor destination since the opening of 'Warner Bros. Studio Tour – The Making of Harry Potter' which receives over 6,000 visitors a day at peak times.
- 5.2 There is likely to be significant growth in demand for studio space over the next 15 years and there is still significant growth potential at the site. This is therefore a key asset for South West Herts and key to the future growth of creative industries in the economic market area. Warner Bros. has already invested significantly in the Studios and has further plans to increase its size by around a quarter, including new sound stages workshops, post production facilities and an extension of the studios tour.
- 5.3 In order not to compromise the ability of Warner Bros. Studios at Leavesden to contribute to the local and national economy, both as a local employer and as a centre to contribute to the economic growth of the District over the Local Plan period, it is essential that Sites CFS28 and OSPF6 are allocated to allow the expansion of the studios and safeguarded for Warner Bros. Studio Use. Both of these sites are shown below and Preferred Policy Option 8 in Part 1 of this consultation document seeks to ensure that the land is safeguarded for Warner Bros. Studio use.
- 5.4 The map below shows the existing Warner Bros. Studio allocation together with the two preferred allocations proposed as an extension to the existing Warner Bros. Studios and backlot use. Land within both sites is also proposed for use as green infrastructure or as an ecological reserve, which will be allocated as public open space (see Section 8). An indicative masterplan showing the proposed uses on the sites is shown at paragraph 5.6.



5.5 Details of the individual parcels of land are provided below.

Preferred Warner Bros. Studios at Leavesden Allocations


Site Ref.	CFS28	Site	Land at Gypsy Lane, Hunton Bridge	Size (ha):	8
				Current Use	Open land
				Proposed Use	Warner Bros. Studios & tour use and green infrastructure (public open space)
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised.

Comments

A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Development would need to take account of protected trees within the site. Due to location the Local Wildlife which is adjacent to the site and partially within the site, measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided. Land to the north of the site is proposed as space for green infrastructure which is proposed to be allocated as public open space and land to the south of the site is proposed for Warner Bros. Studios and tour use (see indicative masterplan below).

Question 71

Do you agree that site CFS28 is suitable for the expansion of Warner Bros. Studios and the reasons why? If not, please explain why.

Site Ref.	OSPF6	Site	Land west of Leavesden Aerodrome	Size (ha):	20
				Current Use	Open land
				Proposed Use	Warner Bros. Studios & tour use, green infrastructure and ecological reserve (public open space)
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised

Comments

A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Development would need to take account of protected trees and the Veteran Tree within the site. Consideration will need to be given to the public right of ways running through the site. The site is in Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1; a preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site, and whether remediation works would be needed, would be required at the pre-application stage to support any proposals on the site. The southern part of the site recently received planning permission for the temporary change of use of land for the purposes of external film production for a period of two years (full details of the planning permission can be found on the Council's Planning Online facility by searching the permission reference 20/667/FUL).

Land to the south of Gypsy Lane and to the north-west of Gypsy Lane is proposed for Warner Bros. Studios and tour use whilst land to the north-east of Gypsy Lane is proposed as green infrastructure and an ecological reserve, which is proposed to be allocated as public open space (see indicative masterplan below).

Question 72

Do you agree that site OSPF6 is suitable for the expansion of Warner Bros. Studios and the reasons why? If not, please explain why.

Indicative Masterplan (Warner Bros. Studios):

- 5.6 The following masterplan provides an indication of the proposed uses and the location of these uses on the preferred allocations for Warner Bros. Studios. The indicative masterplan also shows the existing allocations for Warner Bros. Studios use. The detail surrounding the proposed uses on the two preferred allocations for the new Local Plan (Site CFS28 and Site OSPF6) will be decided at the planning application stage should the sites be allocated for Warner Bros. Studios use. We are not seeking comments on the indicative masterplan and it is for *illustrative purposes only*.




6 Town Centres and Retail


- 6.1 Preferred Policy Option 9 in Part 1 of this consultation document sets out the proposed Retail Hierarchy, reflecting the size and relative importance of retail centres in the District. The proposed Town Centre Boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas for the Town Centre (Rickmansworth) and District Centres (South Oxhey, Abbots Langley and Chorleywood) are set out below, in line with the recommendations of the South West Herts Retail and Leisure Study (2018). The proposed Local Centres at Croxley Green (Watford Road and New Road) and Mill End (Moneyhill Parade) are also set out below.
- 6.2 As stated in Preferred Policy Option 9 in Part 1 of this consultation document, the Town and District Centres will be the focus for new town centre development and retail development will specifically be directed to the Primary Shopping Area within these centres in the first instance.
- 6.3 In addition to these larger retail centres, there are a number of smaller local shopping parades and individual shops throughout the District. It is not proposed to designate these small parades and individual shops individually as site allocations, however, Preferred Policy Option 9 in Part 1 of this consultation document seeks to protect and enhance these shops where they cater for local day to day needs.
- 6.4 There may be opportunities for new provision as part of development proposals where this would help to meet the needs of the existing and new community and rectify local deficiencies in provision. The locations of any new provision of retail floorspace depends on a District Council decision on strategic housing site allocations and subsequent planning permissions that may be granted. As the designation of any new retail centres through future development proposals is uncertain, it is intended for any new centres to be included in the Retail Hierarchy at the nearest appropriate and possible time.

Question 73


Do you agree with the preferred Town Centre Boundaries and Primary Shopping Areas for the proposed Town and District Centres? If not please identify how the proposed approach could be changed.

Preferred Retail Allocations







In order to ensure that the Proposed Town Centre Boundary and Primary Shopping Area boundaries accurately reflect the retail and town centre, the proposed boundaries may be subject to amendments as the ongoing redevelopment of South Oxhey Town Centre progresses to completion.




Site Ref.	R(d)	Site	Chorleywood District Centre
-----------	------	------	-----------------------------







Site Ref.	R(g)	Site	New Road, Croxley Green (Local Centre)
-----------	------	------	--



7 Open Space

- 7.1 The Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) sets out the existing public open spaces allocated for this use in the District. These existing open space allocations are shown in Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 and it is intended that these areas will continue to be protected by retaining their allocation as public open space.
- 7.2 Preferred Option 22 in Part 1 of this consultation document seeks to safeguard open spaces for this use and sets out that future development proposals will be required to contribute to new provision of open space and children's play space where justified by the scale of development. Site-specific comments on the potential housing sites in Section 2 identifies where a potential housing site would be required to contribute to open space and play space provision.
- 7.3 The location of new future provision of open space and play space depends on a District Council decision on housing site allocations and on planning permissions that may be granted both for windfall sites and future allocation sites (where such provision is required). As the designation of any new open and play spaces through future development proposals is uncertain, it is intended for any new open spaces and play spaces to be allocated as public open space and be included in the Policies Map at the nearest appropriate and possible time.
- 7.4 However, two new public open spaces are proposed on the preferred allocations for Warner Bros. (Sites CFS28 and OSPF6), as set out at paragraph 5.4-5.5. The proposed public open spaces on these sites are shown in Appendix 5 (Map of Proposed & Retained Public Open Space Allocations).
- 7.5 National and local planning policy will guide planning decisions on sites which are not specifically allocated as open spaces.
- 7.6 A list and map of the proposed open space allocations to be retained is shown in Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 respectively.

Question 74

Do you think that retaining all of the existing open space allocations is the right approach? If not please identify how the proposed approach could be changed.

8 Education


- 8.1 It is vital that necessary infrastructure and services, including education, are integrated into new developments. Proposals must address such requirements for new and improvements infrastructure through direct, on-site provision or through the Community Infrastructure Levy which applies to certain forms of new development.
- 8.2 Where education provision is required on-site, this may be in the form of a new education facility or the expansion of an existing facility. Site-specific comments on the potential housing sites in Section 2 identify where a potential housing site would be required to contribute to meeting education needs through the provision of a new facility or the expansion of an existing facility.
- 8.3 In addition to the potential housing sites which would be required to provide education facilities, there is a site with potential to be allocated for a secondary school located to the north east of Carpenders Park (as shown below). Hertfordshire County Council is responsible for the provision of schools in the District and has identified a high level of need for a secondary school facility in this location in order to serve the future secondary education needs of the education catchment area (including Carpenders Park, South Oxhey and Eastbury in Three Rivers as well as areas in the Hertsmere and Watford Boroughs).
- 8.4 It should be noted that there is a reserve primary school site in Abbots Langley (Site S(c) Woodside Road) which was allocated in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) but has not yet been built out. A map of this existing allocation is provided below.

Proposed Policy on Education Allocations
Three Rivers District Council will continue to work with the County Council, adjoining authorities and other interested parties to identify the most appropriate sites to meet identified educational needs.
Identified education sites for new primary or secondary schools will be safeguarded for educational use.

Question 75

Do you think the Proposed Policy for Education Allocations is the right approach? If not please identify how the proposed policy could be changed.

Proposed Education Allocations


Site Ref.	CFS11	Site	Carpenders Park Farm, Oxhey Lane	Size (ha):	8.2
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Proposed Use	Secondary education
				Green Belt	Yes. If allocated, the Green Belt boundary would have to be revised to remove land for the construction of school buildings. Land developed for ancillary playing fields would remain in the Green Belt.
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments A detailed heritage impact assessment and an archaeological assessment would be required prior to any development in order to protect and mitigate any potential adverse impacts to heritage assets. Development would need to satisfactorily address surface water flood risk on the site by providing suitable mitigation. Measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity would need to be provided due to the location of a Local Wildlife Site which is adjacent to the site.					

Question 76

Do you agree that that Site CFS11 is an appropriate development site for a secondary school? If not, please outline your reasons.

Do you believe there are more suitable alternative sites? If so please provide details.

Existing Education Allocations

Site Ref.	S(c)	Site	Woodside Road	Size (ha):	2.5ha
				Current Use	Agricultural
				Proposed Use	Primary education
				Green Belt	Part of the site is in the Green Belt and is allocated for use as ancillary playing fields. The part of the site allocated as the build zone area is not in the Green Belt.
				Phasing	1-10 years
Comments The site is an existing education allocation in the Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014). The site is allocated for primary education use and has capacity for a 2 form entry primary school.					

9 Green Belt

- 9.1 There is a need to allocate land outside the existing built up areas through planned Green Belt release in order to meet identified needs for development in the District. Green Belt sites identified as having the potential for release are those at sustainable locations on the edge of existing settlements, with priority given to previously developed brownfield sites over greenfield sites in the Green Belt.
- 9.2 The majority of the sites with potential to be allocated for housing (Section 2), employment (Section 5), education (Section 9) and both of the preferred sites to be allocated for Warner Bros. Studios at Leavesden (Section 6) would require removal from the Green Belt if they were to be allocated. Whether or not a site would require removal from the Green Belt is stated on a site by site basis in the individual site tables.
- 9.3 Reviewing the Green Belt boundaries around sites should ensure that there are sensible and defensible Green Belt boundaries in the future. Further work will be undertaken to ensure that a defensible Green Belt boundary exists when revising the boundary to accommodate the future allocation of sites. The revised Green Belt boundary will need to account for the removal of future allocation sites from the Green Belt, the need to ensure a defensible boundary in the future and the proposed inseting of Bedmond in the Green Belt.
- 9.4 Following a District Council decision on the proposed sites for allocation at a later stage, the revised Green Belt boundary will be consulted on, anticipated to be at the time that the Draft Local Plan is published for consultation⁷.

Proposed Insetting of Bedmond

- 9.5 An analysis of settlements within the Green Belt is required by national policy to determine whether there remains a case for them to remain 'washed over' by the Green Belt, by virtue of their contribution to Green Belt purposes set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of helping to maintain openness.
- 9.6 National planning policy⁸ states if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, the village should be included in the Green Belt. If, however, the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation areas or normal development management policies, and the village should therefore be excluded from the Green Belt.

⁷ The Local Development Scheme which sets out the timetable for the new Local Plan can be viewed at: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/local-development-scheme>

⁸ Paragraph 140 of the National Planning Policy Framework



- 9.7 This means that villages should only be included in the Green Belt if the open character of the village makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt and those that do not should be 'inset' within the Green Belt⁹.
- 9.8 Therefore, an analysis of settlements within the Green Belt is required by the NPPF to determine whether there remains a case for keeping them 'washed over' by the Green Belt, by virtue of their contribution to Green Belt purposes in respect of helping to maintain openness.
- 9.9 The Stage 1 Green Belt Review (2017) carried out an analysis of three settlements within the Green Belt which are 'washed-over' by the Green Belt (Heronsgate, Sarratt and Bedmond) to determine whether there remains a case for keeping them 'washed-over' by virtue of their contribution to Green Belt purposes.
- 9.10 The Stage 1 Review considered that the village of Bedmond could be inset from the Green Belt by virtue of its size and density.
- 9.11 A Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment (2019) further assessed the washed-over settlement of Bedmond through an assessment of harm that considers the extent to which the release of different areas of land reduces the contribution to the Green Belt purposes. This finer grained review of parcels of land in Bedmond is taken into consideration when determining the area to be 'inset'.
- 9.12 The proposed revised Green Belt boundary which would inset Bedmond in the Green Belt takes into consideration the findings from both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Green Belt Reviews and the national planning policy requirement for a defensible boundary.
- 9.13 The current 'washed over' location of Bedmond in the Green Belt and the proposed inset location of Bedmond in the Green Belt are shown below.
- 9.14 It should be noted that if any of the potential sites for allocation which are adjacent to Bedmond are allocated and removed from the Green Belt, then the proposed Green Belt boundary would require amendment.

Question 77



Do you agree with the revised Green Belt boundary to inset Bedmond and the reasons why? If not, please explain why.

⁹ 'Insetting' a settlement in the Green Belt excludes the settlement from the Green Belt through a revision to the Green Belt boundary; this means that Green Belt policies do not apply to development in the 'inset' area.

Current Green Belt Boundary (Bedmond – ‘washed over’ village)



Proposed Green Belt Boundary (Bedmond – ‘inset’ village)




10 Langleybury and The Grove

- 10.1 Langleybury and The Grove is subject to the Langleybury and The Grove Development Brief which was adopted in 2012. The Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) allocated the Langleybury site for hotel/leisure development and residential uses, with The Grove site allocated for hotel/leisure use. It is intended that these allocations, in line with the Development Brief, are carried forward into the new Local Plan.
- 10.2 As stated in Section 2 of this document, it is intended that the existing housing allocation at Langleybury (Site H7) will be carried forward into the new Local Plan; the site has not yet been built out but any development will be in accordance with the Langleybury and Grove Development Brief (2012), which involves replacement of the existing built footprint of the former secondary school buildings with new housing development.
- 10.3 The proposed policy for Langleybury and The Grove and a map of the proposed site allocation is shown below.

Proposed Policy on Langleybury and The Grove
The Council acknowledges the need for change in these two areas. Appropriate uses on the Langleybury site are hotel/leisure development and residential, and the continuation of agricultural uses remains appropriate. Appropriate uses on The Grove site will be hotel/leisure use. Proposals for the development of the Langleybury and The Grove sites should be in accordance with the adopted Langleybury and The Grove Development Brief (2012) and any subsequent revisions.

Question 78 Do you think the Proposed Policy for Langleybury and The Grove is the right approach? If not please identify how the proposed policy could be changed.
--

Langleybury and The Grove



11 Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works

- 11.1 Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works is a substantial developed feature in the local landscape to the east of Maple Cross and has an industrial character. It is a key infrastructure asset serving Three Rivers and the wider area. The Site Allocations LDD (adopted 2014) identifies Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works as a significant infrastructure site in the Green Belt.
- 11.2 No change is proposed to the designation of the Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works as a significant infrastructure site in the Green Belt. The site is shown below.
- 11.3 It is recognised that change on the site may be required to meet future operational needs¹⁰. Whilst redevelopment or limited infilling of the site may not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, proposals should continue to take into account the provisions of the policy set out below and any redevelopment and limited infilling should safeguard the continued use of the site for wastewater treatment works.

Proposed Policy on Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works
Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works is a significant infrastructure site in the Green Belt.
The landscaped setting provided by mature vegetation on the site boundaries and area surrounding the site should be retained in any proposals for infilling or redevelopment.
Any further buildings should be of comparable height to other nearby structures on the site.

Question 79

Do you think the Proposed Policy for Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works is the right approach? If not please identify how the proposed policy could be changed.

¹⁰ Any such requirements will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for the new Local Plan

