



Mr John Slater BA (Hons), DMs, MRTPI  
John Slater Planning Ltd  
The Oaks  
Buckerell  
Honiton  
Devon EX14 3ER

Signed original sent by post.

25<sup>th</sup> March 2020

Dear Mr Slater,

## **Reply from Shenley Parish Council and Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**

Thank you for your Initial Comments which we will do our best to respond to.

As you requested your 'Initial Comments' letter dated 6 March 2020 has been put onto the Shenley Village website in the Neighbourhood Plan section. This response will also be published.

### **Response 1 : Regulation 16 Consultation Responses – Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Comments**

With reference to all the responses to the Regulation 16 Consultation held by Hertsmere between 28<sup>th</sup> October and 10<sup>th</sup> December 2019 we would like to make the following comments.

We are very encouraged by the positive responses. Of the 78 responses only 7 do not support the Shenley Plan. We feel it is unrealistic to expect to get total support from 4650+ residents, 1650+ households. Our neighbouring Parish Aldenham Parish Council only had 20 responses to their first Reg 16 Consultation and so repeated it getting 40 responses. We are very pleased that all our efforts to encourage people to respond resulted in 78 responses. It is fair to say that the majority of respondents support the Shenley Plan. We also had a very positive response to our Regulation 14 Consultation. We thank everyone for their feedback which relates to the enormous level of landowner/developers interests and therefore in turn the care and concern local people have expressed throughout the Shenley Neighbourhood Plan process.

With your advice we will be able to make some good changes to the Shenley Plan.

As the names of respondents are listed on the Hertsmere public Consultation portal, we list them below with the Hertsmere ID references when giving our responses

#### **Consultee: James Craig ID: 1194564**

With regard to Mr Craig's point on vision work on Shenley Grange we would point to the Site Assessment carried out by AECOM in 2018. Demonstrating the site capacity principally aligned with the design principles, codes and policy is considered key in supporting the vision for a

walkable village extension. It is worth noting that the Local Plan Allocation will also mean that the land will be taken out of the Green Belt and then NPPF supported maximising density considerations are activated. We hope the SPPA, Design Principles and Codes will help to achieve the best design and place-making outcomes possible for Shenley.

Mr Craig is not happy that the Charrington Close development is ‘not endorsed’. He was the developer of that site and currently lives there. We do not believe that the style of the development is in keeping with its rural location. It should be noted that Mr Craig is a local developer putting forward alternative locations in Shenley and the wider borough as HBC is working on a new local plan.

**Consultee: Graham Robinson BSC in relation to the site at Lyndhurst Farm, Green Street DLP Planning. ID: 155**

We agree in principle re the need for housing and more social interaction for people in later life households. We consider that Site 4 in the heart of Shenley is a very suitable location to meet this local need. Based on the housing needs study for Shenley (AECOM report), we need more ‘adaptable homes’ and rather than whole purpose build care homes. We already have two care homes in Shenley the largest being in London Road, Wilton Lodge & Wilton House. We would support the use of Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI). We would like those added to the Neighbourhood Plan if possible as we feel they align well with our policies, design principles and codes.

<https://www.housinglin.org.uk/Topics/browse/Design-building/HAPPI/> see example:

<https://www.proctorandmatthews.com/project/steepleton-tetbury>

a) Regarding Pond House and The Old School: Both are considered exemplar in their approach to proportions, fenestration, articulation breaking down the mass of a building, material choice and detail. And as illustrated Pond House is by no means a small alteration.

b) Careful reading of SC9 will show two distinct approaches to edges of the countryside which allow for much adaptation aligned with SC3.

c) Regarding Internet download, speeds of more than 30Mbps are regularly achieved. (<https://labs.thinkbroadband.com/local/E07000098>). This policy aims to support future proofing development for up-grades available and demonstrating this in a ‘Connectivity Statement’ as this is important in helping to reduce the need to travel as well as for modern life demands and joys. This is aligned with the NPPF.

Because of the rural nature of the parish there are limitations now and, in the future, as it would be impossible to achieve the level of infrastructure required for modern living because of the number of outlying properties in the parish.

**Mrs Maureen Keegan ID: 1235705 & Mr Peter Buttle ID: 1235697**

Support Plan. Good suggested changes and support for the Special Policy Area.

**Dr Ann Davies ID: 1144486**

Dr Davies supports the concept of the Plan. As we continually emphasis the Shenley Plan cannot allocate sites in the Green Belt. It has stated a preference though based on the AECOM Site Assessment and tested design codes and policy aspirations on the most sustainable area for growing the village. The new Local Plan has not decided where or how many homes the Parish of Shenley has to accommodate. Throughout the Neighbourhood Plan process Shenley Parish Council and the Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering group have requested indicative development figures for Shenley. The Shenley Plan Mock Examiner, Mr Tony Burton, commented that the question had been asked numerous times and not answered and said we should be given an indicative figure. We have still not been given a figure. The announcement last year that Sky TV will be building 14 sound studios in Borehamwood which will give employment in 2022 for around 2000 employees is likely to mean there will be a major impact on our allocation and the location of it. This good news is unlikely to help Shenley families and Shenley elderly to meet their housing needs and unlikely to help the pressing issue of affordability. In fact, it can be expected that Shenley Village will become

even more popular and the need for better bus services, cycling and walking connections - as proposed in the Shenley Plan - is even more important.

**Mr Martin Wells, Hertfordshire County Council ID: 1127093**

We welcome the County Council's detailed response and support for the Shenley Plan. Proposed additions in support of achieving environmental net gain and detail as outlined are supported and we hope they can be integrated into the final version of the Shenley Plan.

**Mr Martin Howlett ID: 1142726**

Starter home and homes for the elderly are very much supported and indeed if developers were to build to Passivhaus standard/certified that would be very much welcomed. We have little evidence that 1-bedroom homes are needed but would expect developers to contribute to local housing need by building small homes (achieving national space standard). Building many 1 bedroomed homes might be one way of building more affordable homes particularly if part of such a street or courtyard had shared facilities that can be used by all residents (bigger meeting room, guest rooms, co-working space etc.). Planning Policy is a rather blunt tool in determining/insisting on a mix of homes and tenure over a 15-year timescale. We expect developers to demonstrate how their proposed mix contributes to local housing supply shortages and contributes to SH4 Housing Mix & Choices. This could perhaps be made clearer in the final wording of Policy SH4. See SC8 abc re energy and resource efficiency of development.

**Mr Nigel Davies ID: 1194400**

**Re SH6.2 New Community infrastructure facilities.** We agree with Mr Davies' concerns re the phasing of needed improvements to health, education and public transport infrastructure and development in Shenley Parish. We share Mr Davies concerns and therefore would like to see Development Briefs clarifying this and see this set out in planning conditions and performance agreements. A number of small developments will in our view make the right phasing even more challenging. The financial contributions that could come from a single larger development is likely to result in a much more noticeable difference locally than contribution collected from smaller sites. Planning policy is overall only one way of shaping this. Officers and Planning Committees need to make provisions for Planning Conditions and Performance Agreement as mentioned above. If that could be added to this policy as recommendation we would welcome this greater degree of certainty.

We are aware that Herts as a whole does not feature in the Herts County Council, Transport and Infrastructure Improvement plan 2018 to 2036. As we are not in the corridors of existing transport links in the county, the A414 and the A1 corridors which is where the County Council is planning to improve infrastructure.

**Policy SH5 Connecting Shenley Village.** Policy SH5 contributes to Objective 13 aimed at improving walking and cycling environments. Detailed proposals need to be developed as and when there is more clarity on available funds from development, the County Council and other sources. The identified nodes are priorities for instance for better and safer crossings as these are used by many. There is not sufficient provision for pedestrians and cyclists (young and old) at these key places.

**DLA Town Planning (Mr Simon Andrews) Cala Homes working with Shenley Grange Landowner (part of Site 4) ID: 1127819**

**SC1 Local Patterns** – The farmstead typologies and terraces of cottages in Shenley are locally listed and of recognised merit as demonstrated in the precedent study and mapping. The supported typologies are capable of accommodating a range of needs, housing sizes, types, uses and tenures to a density that is not achievable in detached and semidetached suburban development forms. A courtyard or a series of courtyards as a typical feature can take a range of functions including a

social one. The latter is also an important part of combating loneliness in older age and safe play at a young age.

**Why Design Principles and Code for Shenley?** - Some of the newer parts of Shenley are not thought of/are not considered to be making much of a positive contribution to the rural character of Shenley. Hence not all surrounding patterns are of relevance in contributing to rural character and positive local patterns. Perhaps that needs to be made clearer in the final version of the Plan.

**Policy SH1 Rural Character** – The phrase ‘the applicant shall’ could be used more often. We feel that together with the precedent study we support design teams of developers in working harder on designing for more locally embedded and inspired development rather than using set company models and typologies as a blanket approach no matter in which context the homes are built. The Design principles, code and policies will allow officers and committee members and the public to ask more specific questions while allowing creative design responses appropriate for each site and context to be supported and not prohibited. The Parish is after all a large area. We would particularly like to see much innovation in terms of biodiversity gain, carbon reduction/neutral in use and build, energy efficiency, resources use overall and more sociable spaces in new development and by doing so we will be able to contribute significantly to sustainable development and the NPPF, National Design Guide and Hertsmere’s own a design quality ambitions. We feel there is a lack of policy and guidance for strategic site design quality. Our plan aims to help this in our parish context.

**Policy SH2 Shenley Village Special Policy Area (SSPA)** – We await the examiners view. We could consider phrasing ‘The requirement to use locally sourced expertise and labour for constructing and repairing buildings and structures where possible’ in a softer manner as part of a ‘Local social and economic value’ contribution to sustainable development and rural regeneration.

**Turley Associates (Steven Kosky), for client Tarmac ID: 1195843**

The Shenley Plan cannot allocate sites in the Green Belt and confirms that all of the Parish Council with the exception of Potters Bar is located in the Green Belt and is largely rural in character. This is supported by ‘Landscape Assessments’ and other Local Plan evidence. The design principles and code apply across the Parish. The M25 is a relative recent addition and it is unclear how a piece of major road infrastructure with so many negative impacts on noise and air quality can inspire high quality residential-led development. The Shenley Plan does not stipulate densities but it also does not support suburban development without a sense of place, a centre with a mix of uses to meet Shenley’s needs. There is much rural and biodiverse landscape and uses including Listed Buildings located along the M25 and in our view new development will benefit from learning from good local precedent. We feel strongly that if there is a release of Green Belt land along the M25 then the justification needs to consider the impacts on health and wellbeing of future residents as well as impacts on landscape character and flood risk. Air quality next to the M25 is poor as seen by the daily pollution reports. Hertsmere Environmental Health are responsible for the M25 pollution monitoring, see HBC Website

**Mrs Debra Drinan ID: 1194470**

Much effort was made to keep the residents of the village abreast of the progression of the plan including a regularly updated website, leaflets to all households, regular articles in the monthly Shenley Parish Magazine and in the Parish Council newsletter Shenley Village Matters, Facebook postings, stands at the annual village fetes and numerous public meetings. The consultation outlines the key events. A simple laymen’s summary will again be provided for the next stage. We must also comment that throughout the process we have tried to encourage more residents to consider joining the Steering Group. Mrs Drinan was invited but declined due to personal circumstances. A lot of effort via extensive mail outs and continual mentions in articles was made to recruit more members. The Steering group is made up of 4 Parish Councillors and 5 residents who reside in different parts of the Shenley. At one time we had 12 members but personal

circumstance changes meant that people have had to leave the group for various reasons over the last couple of years. Preparing a Neighbourhood Plan entails a huge amount of work. It has been particularly onerous for us due to resource shortages. We have not been able to pay for extra admin assistance.

**Mr Martin Finney ID: 1196308**

The closure of the King William Pub is a newish event. The premises are due to be redeveloped into flats. It will be taken off the list of Community Facilities in the final version.

**Mr Robert Smeethe ID: 1127783**

Regarding windows: Perhaps carbon-low or neutral building materials, then recycled UPVC could provide a good compromise here. Reducing Embodied carbon in building material can make a significant contribution to the national carbon neutrality target. This provision re UPVC is not a must.

**Hertsmere Borough Council (Planning Policy) ID: 1194905**

In general Hertsmere's feedback is very welcome. We wonder though as all Neighbourhood Plan Policies are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan and NPPF if suggested additional references at different locations in the suggested policies changes substantially add value. Specific comments **re Policies SH1.2** does stipulate that the Design Principles and Codes must/should have regard to the area in the current Green Belt. We could accept merging of SH1.1 and SH1.2 for clarity if Section 3 is always easily accessible. (Note Porters Park is not included here then)

**Policy SH2.3** – We are not convinced nor clear what exactly 'small-scale' development is. It is not defined as such. Perhaps Hertsmere would like to propose more detail on this? There are tests to consider as to what might constitute 'not inappropriate development in the Green Belt' which should be followed and shaped by SH Plan policies. In recent years, approval of overly large individual dwellings with surrounding spaces with urban character (Charrington Place is a good example) within the village and the demolition of two ancient barns have negatively impacted on the rural village character. Current policies simply do not seem to deliver wanted outcomes re the distinct rural character of the village (See Conservations Area Assessment. Shenley Green Belt and historic rural characteristics are widely recognised and cherished).

**Policy SH4** – Minor changes are supported.

**Policy SH5** – We note Hertsmere's comments. All Neighbourhood Plan Policies need to be in general conformity with strategic policies in the local plan. We are not sure if the additional reference adds value.

**Policy SH5.2** – We suggest better wording is found relating to special focus of development contributing to improved active travel choices via planning conditions.

**Policy SH6.1 – SH6.3** - Suggested changes are supported.

**Policy SH7.1 – Good Design.** We are rather keen to retain as much as possible of this policy and would like to ask the Examiner to help us go as far as possible aligned with para 128 NPPF and the recent National Design Guide.

**Policy SH7.3** – Community Consultations & Neighbour Involvement. This is a very important to us and the NPPF. The adopted Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (CC1 and CC2) has similar wording so why can we not adopt the same policy? Surely it is in general strategic conformity with the Local Plan and NPPF.

**Policy SH8.1** Encouraged by its content, the NPPF and other adopted Neighbourhood Plans, we feel strongly about this and would retain it as a policy. The wording 'is supported and looked at favourably' is appropriate as this is the exact wording in the NPPF. Developers can achieve this and provide the necessary documentation so the DC officer and Planning Committee is satisfied they have due regard to NPPF and National Design Guidance and follow HBC SCI 2017 direction re 'encouraging' engagement with communities prior to the planning application. It is also worth remembering the value of land and property in the Parish as well as the significant number of land put forward for development. Development briefs are not necessarily long or complex documents

and they are aimed at creating more certainty for all involved including the facilitation of Planning Performance Agreements.

**Comments re Design Principles & Codes** We appreciate Hertsmere's detailed comments but would like to highlight that demonstrating adherence with 'Design Principles and Codes' at planning submission stage for an area does ask for higher levels of analysis and documentation so proposals are better understood in terms of their impact when delivered. Achieving good design quality (NPPF) and the new National Design Guide as well as our Shenley Plan will require a change of practice and training in DC and of the planning committee. HBC growth agenda and the significant amount of sites with hundreds of homes and facilities does absolutely require training and a change of approach by all trusted with making decisions.

The purpose of the Design Code is to improve design quality and delivering this is difficult to achieve without additional work and means of scrutiny at various stages and the submission and delivery stage. The National Design Guidance document published in late 2019 will change practice in DC and planning committee meetings. Note the 30m re distance to the countryside is only one of two principle types and it can be less if the buildings are narrow or single story. There is much design flexibility in this code while supporting a rural sequence of stepped built form and typical productive landscapes within this type. The development of soft biodiverse edges allowing the transition from built-up area to countryside and – where not otherwise possible or beneficial – of front elevations framing the countryside edge, is typical for Shenley as can be seen when looking at the green edges around Porters Park and Nursery Close for instance. It will also allow the applicant to demonstrate how a net biodiversity gain can be achieved. This could be made clearer as part of this Shenley Code.

Please note that we do not share HBC concern about using general insights from an excellent study of rural Irish buildings as a source. It would be helpful to be more specific where this source used is considered to be incompatible with rural design principles and form. Principles of rural settlements, built form and working with the landscape have much in common across the British Isles. We would like it noted that we support and expect HBC to use the National Design Guide, published in September 2019, as it is a material consideration. We welcome officers' demanding training in using more design focused planning documents in the near future. We would like to add clear reference to the National Design Guide to our submission version.

**Mr John Smith, ID: 1235535**

Mr Smith does not support the Plan. He thinks we can allocate sites.

The Shenley Plan does not allocate sites but recognises the need to grow and accommodate for local need. The Site Assessment Report by consultancy firm AECOM (2018) identified all the land to the west of London Road (Site 4) as a suitable area for development as and when Green Belt land release is delivered through the Local Plan. The completion of the new Local Plan will bring clarity to strategic site allocations. Local housing supply is under pressure and there is a great need for a new Local Plan to reduce speculative applications which will gain more traction the longer the new local plan takes to be adopted.

**Miss Laura McCabe ID: 1193076**

We understand that 2 Site 4 landowners are currently talking to Hertsmere Planning but neither are suggesting an access road in Woodhall Lane. The Shenley Plan does not and cannot allocate sites but it recognises the need to grow accommodating local need, even if the new Local Plan is not in place for some time. The Site Assessment Report by consultancy firm AECOM 2018 identified all the land to the west of London Road (known as Site 4) as suitable as and when a Green Belt land release is delivered through the Local Plan. The completion of the new Local Plan will bring clarity to strategic site allocations. Local housing supply is under pressure and there is a great need for a new Local Plan to reduce speculative application which likely to gain more traction the longer the new plan takes to be adopted. The SSPA anticipates that much of new development wants to be

close to amenities and services and contributing to rural function of Shenley Village without the need to negotiate significant typography.

The SSPA Policy in combination with and in proximity to the Conservation Area designation will enable, in planning terms, a greater recognition of Shenley Village's distinct rural character. There is also the possibility of not having a new Local Plan for some time and falling foul of housing delivery targets which in turn will encourage developers to submit speculative proposals. This is of great concern to the community.

The location of a large development on this site would certainly disrupt the rural character of Shenley by building on its precious Green belt, heritage assets (such as the Pillbox in Woodhall Spinney) and architectural features that contribute to the local character, the 40 locally listed and Grade 2 listed historic buildings in this sensitive area not to mention the unique wildlife, will not be enhanced, quite the opposite. The site is currently not visible from London Road and the Parish Council believes that the site is an appropriate site to grow the village if it has to. A landscape-led approach with a retention of all healthy and significant trees is very much supported particularly considering that any land that Hertsmere Borough Council allocate to be taken out of Green Belt will then have little protection. The SSPA area and the Design Principles and Codes aim to support rural forms of development in all of Shenley with a net biodiversity gain.

**Mrs Sharon Madsen ID: 11235498**

Supports Plan. Regarding concerns of possible access to the new development from Woodhall Lane, a rural track through secluded fields and woodland entered past 200-year-old thatched cottages. As far as we know there is no proposal suggesting an access road from Woodhall Lane. The land is in private ownership and such proximity of a road to the Spinney would not be supported by the Parish Council.

**Mrs Julie Lloyd ID: 1235497**

Supports Plan. We share Julie Lloyds concerns re the need for infrastructure service provision first before any development in Shenley.

**Mr Hilton Ellis ID: 1235487**

Supports Plan. With regard to future development Mr Ellis is very concerned about infrastructure provision in light of broken promises relating to Porters Park. We share his concern as do many other residents.

**Mr Cliff Newman ID: 1235237**

Supports Plan. The Examiner will consider Mr Newman's comments in detail. The SSPA is promoting the best rural development possible if it has to take place in Shenley. *Re: Is nothing safe even the Spinney is up for development in special circumstances.* Yes, that is true. We cannot make this policy without allowing 'special circumstances'. Knowing how much the community value the Spinney is a key reason for policy SH3 Local Green Space. A planning tool gifted to neighbourhood plan making.

**Mr Brian Bloom ID: 1193921 & Mrs Simone Bloom ID: 1235462**

Mr Bloom does not support the Plan. Both are against future development of Site 4. They believe that development on Site 4 will mean that there will be an access road in Woodhall Lane. The Shenley Plan does not and cannot allocate sites. Hertsmere will decide which Shenley sites are developed not Shenley Parish Council or the Shenley Plan Steering Group. We agree that an access road in Woodhall Lane would not be acceptable. We do not think that the Site 4 landowners are proposing one. 2017 data told us that there were 10,000 traffic movements daily through Shenley. The numbers must be considerably higher now. Traffic along Woodhall Lane then Green Street is heavy particularly in the morning and late afternoon and this has been the case for many, many

years. Much of the traffic is due to ‘rat run’ traffic, M25 traffic coming off at Jct 22 trying to avoid Jct 23 at Mimms to get onto the A1 going into London.

**Mrs Helen Hussain ID: 1142538**

Mrs Hussain supports the Plan. The Shenley Plan does not allocate sites but recognises the need to grow to accommodate local need even if the Local Plan is not going to be in place for some time. The Site Assessment Report (AECOM 2018) identified all the land west of London Road as suitable for development as and when a Green belt land release is delivered through the Local Plan. We believe that having the Shenley Plan SSPA policy relevant for this central location to the village and Porters Park will strengthen the village function and connectivity and result in us seeing greatly reduced car usage from new residents. This will contribute to lower carbon use, better health, more social interaction and less loneliness.

**Indigo Planning, Mr Robeson on behalf of our client Huntstowe Land ID: 1235164**

Some very constructive suggestions regarding improvements. The Examiner will hopefully consider them in full.

**Elstree & Borehamwood Town Council – Mr Huw Jones ID1127090**

We thank the Councillors and Full Council for their support and consideration of our Plan. We note the infrastructure issues and will work where possible together with the Town Council to mitigate and reduce them when development is promoted by the new Local Plan.

**Mrs Sarah Sankey ID: 1167597 & Mr Graham Sankey ID: 1187087**

Support the Plan. The Examiner will consider Mr & Mrs Sankey’s points. We do not think we can include more land into the SSPA but Green Belt Policy is retained with the known safeguards if the Shenley Plan is adopted with the Design Principles and Codes supporting good rural design.

**Mr Mick Cryer ID: 1136091**

Supports Plan. We will explore how wildlife and habitat protection can be further protected. Re the SSPA: To check and include the latest area to be proposed for development that is behind Shenley Glass (from London Road parallel to Rectory Lane up to Elliot’s Farm). The land is within the Conservation Area and part of the land identified as employment use/brownfield.

**Aldenham Parish Council, Mrs Paula Paley ID: 1162269**

Aldenham PC support the Shenley Plan.

**Mr Tim Morris, ID: 1143169**

Overall support for Plan. We share Mr Morris’ concerns regarding infrastructure. We will correct the Green Street reference. We agree the shops at Andrew Close and WellPet Vets should be added to the list of Community Infrastructure & Facilities.

**Mr Jay Ramani ID: 1192678**

We do not support a single developer or landowner. We support the most sustainable and accessible location for growth in the village if and only if land is allocated by the Local Authority through the Local Plan as it is not in our gift to substantially change Green Belt Boundaries. This will mean in practice that when allocated land will no longer have Green Belt protection and we would hope that the SSPA will support exceptional rural design especially closer to the old village which is currently in the Green Belt. By adding the vision to the plan (not as a policy or site allocation as that is not in our gift) we as a Parish Council want to explain our shared vision to future developers and investors up-front. We believe that is at the heart of the Neighbourhood Plan legislation. And we reiterate it’s not a policy. It’s our vision, shared by many, in the light of potential and substantial growth stipulated by the emerging Local Plan or indeed by developers if the Local Authority fails to deliver needed housing. The what is called 5-year housing supply and annual performance tests are eagerly observed by the many parties with land interests.

## **Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust –Mr Matt Dodds ID: 866619**

Supports Plan. We would very much welcome the integration of their policy suggestions into our Plan and Design Codes. We will also correct the mentioned section.

### **Regulation 16 Responses - General Comments**

Our Design Principles and Code stipulates Passivhaus standard is ‘encouraged’. We would like to know if we should consider Zero Carbon in use and embodied carbon further and wonder if you can tell us how this could be integrated into the Plan in light of the Climate Emergency and National Net Zero Carbon target by 2050. See [://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-becomes-first-major-economy-to-pass-net-zero-emissions-law](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-becomes-first-major-economy-to-pass-net-zero-emissions-law).

We feel that the publication of the National Design Guide in 2019 needs to be referenced in the Shenley Plan where possible and relevant. Hertsmere commented that our Design Code needs to be more ‘precise’ and that it is ‘too onerous’. A 15-year plan for large area and a landscape-led design cannot be made precise without doing all the necessary studies and design work and as illustrated in the National Design Guide asking questions, providing information and ‘demonstrating how’ are appropriate means to shape design quality.

We do not agree with Hertsmere and would like to know how their officers are prepared and enabled to use the National Design Guide and our design polices and code once adopted. Design polices, Design guidance and Design Codes do need to allow for a degree of flexibility and creative and innovative response by an interdisciplinary and design and developer teams with support of local insight. This is what our Design Principles and Codes are asking for to be demonstrated. There is not just one solution nor are all the site conditions always the same. Energy and resource efficiency are likely to become a major driver for change in Regulations over the next few years and we feel our policies and design principles and code are supporting applicants in being innovative and supporting rural character and environment. We know that this is *extremely* important to our community.

Many promises were made in the Planning Policies for the Porters Park development (developing the old Shenley Hospital site) but Porters Park ended up being overdeveloped with many resultant issues including lack of promised infrastructure. Every Neighbourhood Plan survey and all working party and public meetings have highlighted the lack of infrastructure and missed opportunity for a well-functioning and well-designed place with regard to Porters Park and this is felt by many as a ‘betrayal’ which must not be repeated at all costs. The development of the Design Principles, Code and the Shenley Plan itself is a response to this lack of trust in Hertsmere’s ability to provide a planning system that delivers on well-meaning but ineffective design and infrastructure related policies, planning conditions and guidance.

We feel that it needs to be made clearer in the Shenley Plan that if any land gets allocated by the Local Plan then that the land will be taken out of the Green Belt and therefore it will lose all Green Belt land safeguards. This is specifically of concern where there is no Conservation Area cover. We would like to comment that approved development in the village over the last decade has not always reflected innovative and appropriate rural space and building design (Charrington Place is an example).

There are a good set of comments provided in the responses that can make some plan policies and Codes clearer without material change. We feel sure you will let us know which ones should be used.

We recommend SH7 using the National Design Guide and para 128 as well as adopted Neighbourhood Plans as a means to further provide evidence base for supporting the policy ‘Development Briefs with Local Knowledge’ <https://www.architecture.com/knowledge-and-resources/knowledge-landing-page/national-design-guide-suggests-10-ways-to-create-successful-places>.

We would like to point out that Para 28 NPPF does support early and meaningful engagement and Hertsmere’s Statement of Community Involvement also encourages it. Close neighbour St Albans City and District Council is doing this with regard to their strategic sites. Community Engagement and the master planning as part of Planning Performance Agreements is at centre stage and we welcome such a pro-active approach appropriate for large sites with significant impacts.

We feel that Hertsmere and developers in the borough perhaps need to be reminded that the NPPF is not only there to be referred to when it is commercially advantageous (e.g. a single NPPF paragraph ‘Para.122/para 123 Achieving appropriate densities’ is often quoted when Green Belt is lost and seems to be stipulated as a new singular reality of much higher out of context densities. We do not think that this is appropriate as individual paragraphs or sections in the NPPF cannot and should not be read in isolation.

“NPPF Para 2: Planning Law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework must be taken into account when preparing the development plan, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning policies and decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements. NPPF Para 3: The Framework should be read as a whole (including its footnotes and annexes)”

### **Response 2: Plan Area**

A copy of the letter from Aldenham Parish Council dated October 2016 giving their consent for us to include the Cricket pitch as part of the Shenley Neighbourhood Area has been sent by email (8 March 2020). It was Hertsmere who suggested we should do this

### **Response 3: Policy SH2**

We would highlight that as you state in your letter ‘any planning applications that came in within the SSPA prior to decisions on the Local Plan and possible green belt releases, will only be able to support the classes of acceptable forms of development, as set out in paragraph 6 above’ is the intended outcome of the SSPA. In addition, and once the Local Plan has allocated sites for development, potentially located in full or in parts of the SSPA development to adhere to the SSPA policy incl. SH1.1 and SH 1.2. The latter might need to be made clearer?

The current wording of the policy is the result of significant efforts by the Parish Council and Hertsmere Borough Council to find an acceptable set of wording. Perhaps you could kindly advise if SH2.3 [page 57] is actually necessary in the policy section? We feel it could sit in the supporting text as SH2.1 does cover the main aspects of the policy and with SH1.1 making reference to 1 Jan 2019 making it clear that the Shenley Design Principles and Codes apply as and when land is taken out of the Green Belt.

#### **Response 4 :Policy SH3**

The Local Green Space survey results are on the Village website in the Neighbourhood Plan section though the comments need to be added.

Map to be provided. We are looking to prepare a better ordnance-based map for the final version. We had a meeting with the landowner to discuss Policy SH3 and pointed out that comments could be made on the Hertsmere Reg 16 Consultation portal. We have since contacted another landowner who also has a possible interest (not known at the time) and his letter response has been forwarded to you. All households were informed about the Local Green Space survey and there was extensive publicity.

**Update:** Callum Coddington, HBC, recently sent us an ordnance based map which our consultant has now overlaid. Do you think the new map is better? If so it can replace the one currently in the Plan. Map attached.

#### **Response 4: Policy SH6**

With regard to the old King William IV pub the landowner has put in an application to turn the building into 4 flats which is currently being reviewed by HBC. The conservation officer is insisting the outside remains unchanged

Re Arsenal and Watford football clubs.

They are separate. Arsenal have built a purpose-built training Centre, planning permission circa 2000. Watford rent facilities next door from London University and have a temporary permission for the zeppelin style inflatable which is considered to be an eyesore by most residents. The Arsenal Centre cannot be viewed from the road, due to planning conditions relating to woodland planted around it.

Please note the list of Neighbourhood CIL priorities is stated on page 30 of the Plan under Part B: Community Priority Projects.

#### **Response 5: Policy SH7**

We are of the view Hertsmere's Validation List is a start but is designed for householder applications in the main and not for strategic sites of the scale anticipated nor does it provide enough/ sufficient information to scrutinize design quality at the planning application stage allowing in our view the meaningful assessment of the impacts major development/ whole settlement expansions might have. We question how the National Design Guide can be a materially considered without the necessary information provided in consultation with the public and planning committee stage.

This SH7 policy is a very important to our community. Design and Development Briefs (DDBs) are a good tool to help reduce risk in the planning process and clarify key parameters. Hertsmere has produced in the past for instance the 'Radlett District Centre Key Locations Planning Brief SPD'. We don't feel that a Design and Development Brief for major development needs to become an SPDs nor that they need to be produced by the Local Authority, but we, as a community, want to be involved and share our local knowledge early in the planning and design process.

The adopted Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (CC1 and CC2) as well as the Ascot and Sunningdale neighbourhood plan have similar provisions why can we not adopt a similar policy for

Shenley given the scale of development that can reasonably be expected in the future. We intend to up-date our Shenley Plan shortly after the adoption of the New Local Plan (hopefully now in 2022).

John, perhaps you could improve our wording in a way that helps us achieve our policy intention?

### **Response 6: Policy SH8**

There is currently no coordinated Design Review activity in Hertsmere but service providers such as Design South East can upon request provide services. More information here regarding accreditation of the NPPF recommended BfL: <http://builtforlifehomes.org/go/about>

It is absolutely right that the BfL assessment can be carried out meaningfully at a number of stages in the planning application production process and we agree we should therefore change the name of the policy to 'SH8 Building for Life'.

Thank you again for your comments. Please let us know if there is anything else you need; any further clarifications and we will endeavor to give you speedy answers. We will ensure this letter and any further correspondence is posted on the website.

Kind regards

*Nicky Beaton*

Mrs Nicky Beaton (Chair SNP Steering Group)

pp

Cllr. Rosemary Gilligan (Vice-Chair SNP Steering Group)

&

Cllr. William Susman (Chair of Shenley Parish Council & Steering Group member)

**Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group & Shenley Parish Council  
The Hub, London Road, Shenley, Radlett, Herts WD7 9BS**

**Nicky Beaton's home office: 90 London Road, Shenley, Radlett, Herts WD7 9DX  
Mobile no: 07976 872668**

**Cc: Hertsmere Borough Council**