



**Shenley Plan 2019 to 2036  
Neighbourhood Development Plan  
for the Parish of Shenley  
Consultation Statement**

**August 2019**





Contact:  
Amanda Leboff (Parish Clerk)  
Email: [clerk@shenleyvillage.org](mailto:clerk@shenleyvillage.org)

Shenley Neighbourhood Plan  
c/o Shenley Parish Council  
The Hub  
London Road  
Shenley, Radlett  
Herts WD7 9BS

[shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan](http://shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan)  
Facebook: [facebook.com/ShenleyPlan](https://facebook.com/ShenleyPlan)  
Twitter: #ShenleyPlan

The Shenley Neighbourhood Development Plan documents have been produced by the Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on behalf of Shenley Parish.

Disclaimer: This document is optimised for online viewing only. Please consider the environment before printing. Hard copies are available for viewing at Shenley Parish Council Offices, The Hub, London Road, Shenley, Radlett, Herts WD7 9BS. Telephone 01923 855865. The office is open each weekday between 8.30am and 12 noon, unless otherwise stated on the door.



| <b>CONTENTS</b>  | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| <b>01 Introduction</b>   | <b>4</b>    |
| <b>1.1 Background</b>  |             |
| <b>1.2 Consultation History</b>  |             |
| <b>02 Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)</b>                      | <b>9</b>    |
| <b>2.1 Consultation Approach</b>   | <b>9</b>    |
| <b>2.2 Regulation 14 Responses   Overview</b>                              | <b>15</b>   |
| <b>2.2.1 Regulation 14 Survey   Summary</b>                                | <b>16</b>   |
| <b>2.2.2 Representations from Statutory Consultees &amp; Organisations</b> | <b>29</b>   |
| <b>2.2.3 Mock Examination Day &amp; Report</b>                             | <b>39</b>   |
| <b>03 Key amendments to Draft Shenley Plan (Reg 14)</b>                    | <b>44</b>   |
| <b>04 Community Priority Projects</b>                                      | <b>46</b>   |
| <b>05 Appendix</b>   | <b>47</b>   |

## 01 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 The Shenley Neighbourhood Development Plan (The Plan) is produced by the Parish Council under the Localism Act 2011 and the associated Regulations. This legislation requires Shenley Parish Council to carry out a formal public consultation on The Plan for a minimum period of 6 weeks before submitting it to Hertsmere Borough Council for a further round of consultation, independent examination and referendum.
- 1.1.2 In preparing The Plan the Parish Council has tried to go beyond the minimum requirements for community consultation required by law. The Plan has been produced by a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group made up of volunteers from the community, drawing on professional support at key stages.

### 1.2 Consultation Statement Report

- 1.2.1 This report summarises the entire consultation history and describes the Regulation 14 (pre-submission) consultation process, responses and consequent changes to The Plan.
- 1.2.2 We would like to thank the residents of Shenley for completing the various questionnaires, attending the events and giving us feedback. This has genuinely helped us produce The Plan and shape the future of Shenley more effectively.

### 1.3 Consultation History

- 1.3.1 In Autumn 2015 Shenley Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Working Party started planning how to commence Shenley's Neighbourhood Plan. Cllrs. Rosemary Gilligan, Nicky Beaton and Gavin O'Sullivan attended an HAPTC Neighbourhood Planning Course in November 2015, which was followed by a community recruitment drive to form a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. Initially the group was small but the key foundation work was carried out and, in June 2016, Shenley Parish Council applied to Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) for permission to start a Shenley Neighbourhood Development Plan covering the whole of the Parish.
- 1.3.2 In February 2017 Hertsmere Borough Council notified the Steering Group that the application for the Shenley Neighbourhood Development Plan had been approved. The Steering Group sent out a comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire in October 2016. Numerous articles in Shenley Parish News, Shenley Village Matters, posts on Facebook and on the Village Website throughout 2016 sought to inform residents about Neighbourhood Planning, letting them know that we were producing one and encouraging people to join the Steering Group and take part. All this led to an official Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Launch which took place on 5th April 2017 and was attended by over 120 people. As a result, more people were recruited for the Steering Group and many people signed up for the four working parties: Housing & Development; Green Belt & Heritage; Roads, Transport and Parking; and Amenities & Local Services.
- 1.3.3 The Steering Group carried out extensive research, looking at as many other Neighbourhood Plans as possible. They consulted Aldenham Parish Council, who had started working on their plan in 2014 and were extremely helpful. They considered the 2001 and 2011 Census returns which showed Shenley's population growth and changing demographics. The results from the initial October 2016 Questionnaire were analysed in detail. They looked at the List of Locally Important Buildings in Hertsmere 2016, The Conservation Area Appraisal, 2011, the Parish Plan 2005, and many other reports. The launch on 5th April 2017 gave them good initial feedback. The Working Groups and enlarged Steering Group proceeded to hold regular meetings, with over 50 meetings having been held to date. Minutes of the Steering Group meetings have been posted on the Village website as have regular Neighbourhood Plan updates, Questionnaire/Survey results and other key information. Nicky Beaton and Rosemary Gilligan attended a second, more advanced, HAPTC Neighbourhood Plan Course on 24th May 2017.
- 1.3.4 At the Launch on 5th April 2017 over 60 people signed up to join the different Working Parties. They were:
- Housing & Development – chaired initially by Natalie Susman, and later by Nicky Beaton & Rosemary Gilligan
  - Green Belt & Heritage – chaired by Jan Quinton, and later by Josephine Lunt
  - Amenities & Local Services – chaired by Nicky Beaton, and later by Gemma Archer
  - Roads, Transport & Parking – chaired by James Hulme, and later by James Hulme & Gemma Archer
- 1.3.5 From April to October 2017 there were over 25 Working Party meetings and 19 Steering Group meetings, during which questionnaire results were analysed in detail, policies formulated, and many relevant reports and other Neighbourhood Plans discussed. Steering Group updates were also given. The second Questionnaire, the Housing & Development Survey, was formulated together with questionnaires for a Neighbourhood Plan Stall at Shenley Fête in June 2017. The Housing & Development Survey was delivered to all households in September 2017 and was also available to complete via Survey Monkey. We received 557 responses, 33.7% of the total households in Shenley. The initial 2016 Questionnaire and 2017 Housing & Development Survey confirmed that preserving the Green Belt, and the retention of the lovely green historic arable landscape and village character, are by far the most important aspects, both receiving support from 98% of respondees. The priorities that emerged from the survey work, and the many conversations with local residents and businesses, have provided guidance and direction for the development of priority planning policies and projects. This is in conjunction with working with landowners, local planning officers and the need to contribute to the numbers of homes in the borough as set by the current and indeed emerging Local Plan.
- 1.3.6 Survey findings are presented in part in The Plan, and can be reviewed in full on the Shenley Village website.
- 1.3.7 There was a Public Meeting in October 2017, and Local Estate Agents completed a survey. The surveys were all analysed in detail as were the two specialist reports prepared by Aecom (The Site Assessment and Housing Needs Assessment). In addition, a business survey was delivered to all local business, and was completed by Gristwood & Toms (Shenley's largest employer), Crown Pharmacy, DGS Financial Services and Gateways Doctors Surgery.

1.3.8 An early draft of The Plan was developed with the support of Angela Koch of ImaginePlaces. It was presented at a large Steering Group meeting on the 24th April 2018, and then at a major Public meeting on 7th June 2018. The Steering Group then asked Angela Koch of ImaginePlaces to work with them, landowners and residents on a draft of The Plan, and to make suggestions to progress the draft to the pre-submission stage. The Draft Shenley Plan (pre-submission version, Reg.14) – herein known as the Draft Shenley Plan - was then published for the purpose of the Regulation 14 Consultation. All key reports and analyses of the surveys are available on the Shenley Village website: [shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan](http://shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan)



Figure 1: Pop-up exhibition of pre-regulation 14 surveys

Figure 2: Schedule of Key Meetings between November 2015 and September 2018 (page 1 of 2)

| GROUP   | CHAIR, CO-ORDINATOR or PRESENTER                 | MEETING ROOM   | DAY   | DATE     | TIME        | NOS ATTENDED | BOOKED/H ELD |
|---|--|--|-------|----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| HAPTC NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TRAINING COURSE              | James Parker, CEO Bishops Stortford Town Council | KIMPTON - Attended by Rosemary Gilligan, Nicky Beaton & Gavin O'Sullivan | Wed   | 04/11/15 | 9am-12.30pm | 150+         | HELD         |
| NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY - Initial meeting    | Rosemary Gilligan                                | 90 London Road   | Fri   | 22/04/16 | 9.30am      |              | HELD         |
| NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY                      | Rosemary Gilligan                                | 90 London Road   | Fri   | 06/05/16 | 9.30am      |              | HELD         |
| NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING PARTY                      | Rosemary Gilligan/Nicky Beaton                   | 90 London Road   | Thurs | 29/09/16 | 5.45pm      |              | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP  | Nicky Beaton                                     | 90 London Road   | Fri   | 11/11/16 | 2pm         |              | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP  | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Tues  | 28/03/17 | 6pm         |              | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP  | Nicky Beaton                                     | Shenley Primary School Hall - LAUNCH                                     | Wed   | 05/04/17 | 5.30-9.30pm |              | HELD         |
| HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT                                 | Natalie Susman                                   | Village Hall Small room  | Thurs | 20/04/17 | 7pm         |              | HELD         |
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE                                 | Jan Quinton                                      | Methodist Church   | Mon   | 24/04/17 | 6.30pm      |              | HELD         |
| AMENITIES & LOCAL SERVICES                            | Nicky Beaton/Helen Hussain                       | Methodist Church   | Tues  | 25/04/17 | 6pm         |              | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP  | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Wed   | 26/04/17 | 6pm         |              | HELD         |
| ROAD, TRANSPORT & PARKING                             | James Hulme                                      | Methodist Church   | Wed   | 03/05/17 | 7pm         |              | HELD         |
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE                                 | Jan Quinton                                      | Methodist Church   | Mon   | 08/05/17 | pm          |              | HELD         |
| HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT                                 | Natalie Susman                                   | Village Hall Small room  | Tues  | 09/05/17 | 7pm         |              | HELD         |
| AMENITIES & LOCAL SERVICES                            | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Tues  | 16/05/17 | 6pm         |              | HELD         |
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE                                 | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Mon   | 22/05/17 | 6.30pm      |              | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP  | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Tues  | 23/05/17 | 6pm         |              | HELD         |
| HAPTC NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN TRAINING COURSE-POLICY FOCUS | James Parker, CEO Bishops Stortford Town Council | KIMPTON - Attended by Rosemary Gilligan & Nicky Beaton                   | Wed   | 24/05/17 | 9am-3.30pm  |              | HELD         |
| HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT                                 | Natalie Susman                                   | Village Hall Small room  | Thurs | 25/05/17 | 7pm         |              | HELD         |
| AMENITIES & LOCAL SERVICES                            | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Tues  | 30/05/17 | 6pm         |              | HELD         |
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE                                 | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Mon   | 05/06/17 | 6.30pm      |              | HELD         |
| ROAD, TRANSPORT & PARKING                             | James Hulme                                      | Methodist Church   | Wed   | 07/06/17 | 7pm         |              | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP  | Nicky Beaton                                     | Village Hall Small room  | Tues  | 13/06/17 | 6.15pm      |              | HELD         |
| AMENITIES & LOCAL SERVICES                            | Nicky Beaton                                     | Methodist Church   | Wed   | 14/06/17 | 6pm         |              | HELD         |
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE and HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT       | Josephine Lunt & Natalie Susman                  | Methodist Church   | Mon   | 26/06/17 | 6.30pm      |              | HELD         |
| ROAD, TRANSPORT & PARKING                             | James Hulme                                      | Methodist Church   | Wed   | 05/07/17 | 7pm         |              | HELD         |



| GROUP  | CHAIR, CO-ORDINATOR or PRESENTER           | MEETING ROOM  | DAY   | DATE             | TIME       | NOS ATTENDED                | BOOKED/H ELD |
|--|--|---|-------|------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE  | Josephine Lunt & Rosemary Gilligan         | Members went to Radlett N.Plan Launch at Radlett Centre | Mon   | 17/07/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| AMENITIES & LOCAL SERVICES   | Rosemary Gilligan                          | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 25/07/17         | 6pm        |                             | HELD*        |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 01/08/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE  | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Mon   | 07/08/17         | 6.30pm     |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 22/08/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| ROAD, TRANSPORT & PARKING  | James Hulme                                | Methodist Church  | Wed   | 06/09/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT  | Natalie Susman                             | Village Hall  | Thurs | 07/09/17         | 7.15pm     |                             | HELD         |
| GREEN BELT & HERITAGE  | Josephine Lunt                             | Methodist Church  | Mon   | 11/09/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 12/09/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| AMENITIES & LOCAL SERVICES   | Gemma Archer                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 19/09/17         | 6.30pm     |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 26/09/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| ROAD, TRANSPORT & PARKING & AMENITIES & LOCAL SERVICES   | Gemma Archer                               | Methodist Church  | Wed   | 04/10/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD**       |
| OCTOBER PUBLIC MEETING – SPC & NP  | Nicky/Rosemary                             | Village Hall - Main Hall or Chapel?                     | Tues  | 10/10/17         | 6.30pm     | 200+                        | HELD         |
| HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT  | Nicky Beaton/Rosemary Gilligan             | Village Hall  | Thurs | 12/10/17         | 7.15pm     |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 17/10/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Village Hall  | Thurs | 16/11/17         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 23/01/18         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 20/02/18         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP + PUBLIC to see Presentation of first Draft of Plan                             | Nicky Beaton                               | Village Hall – Main Hall                                | Tues  | 24/04/18         | 7pm        | 45+                         | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Mon   | 14/05/18         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 22/05/18         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| PUBLIC MEETING – SHENLEY PLAN 1 <sup>ST</sup> DRAFT – REG 14                                   | Nicky Beaton/Rosemary Gilligan             | Chapel, Shenley Park                                    | Thurs | 07/06/18         | 6.30pm     | 112                         | HELD         |
| SHENLEY FETE – SHENLEY PLAN 1 <sup>ST</sup> DRAFT REG 14 LAUNCH                                | Nicky Beaton                               | Harris Lane Playing Field                               | Sun   | 01/07/18         | 12noon     | 150+                        | HELD         |
| DESIGN DAY 1-PART SITE 4   | Angela Koch/Nicky Beaton/Rosemary Gilligan | Methodist Church  | SAT   | 14/07/18         | 11.45am    | 35                          | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Thurs | 02/08/18         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Mon   | 03/09/18         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| PUBLIC MEETING – SHENLEY PLAN 1 <sup>ST</sup> DRAFT – REG 14 & NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT ORDER | Nicky Beaton                               | Chapel, Shenley Park                                    | Thurs | 13/09/18         | 6.30pm     | 46                          | YES          |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Thurs | 11/10/19         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Mon   | 5/11/19          | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Thurs | 5/12/19          | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Mon   | 07/01/19         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Mon   | 18/02/19         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| MOCK EXAM/HEALTH CHECK   | Tony Burton, NP Examiner                   | Village Hall - small room                               | Thurs | 21/02/19         | 4pm to 9pm | HBC, AK, RS, RG, MF, NB, RA | HELD         |
| STEERING GROUP   | Nicky Beaton                               | Methodist Church  | Tues  | 26/03/19         | 7pm        |                             | HELD         |
| SHENLEY FETE – SHENLEY PLAN – REG 16 ( preview of document)                                    | Nicky Beaton                               | Harris Lane Playing Field                               | Sun   | 23/06/19         | 12 noon    |                             | Planned      |
| PUBLIC MEETING   | Nicky Beaton                               |   |       | TBA October 2019 | 6.30pm     |                             | Planned      |

\*No attendees, reminder not sent

\*\* Poorly attended

Figure 3: Key outputs from Shenley Surveys 2016  
 (Click here: [www.shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan/questionnaire-results/](http://www.shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan/questionnaire-results/))


We need more...





Figure 4: Key outputs from the Surveys 2017 | 557 responses  
 (Click here: [www.shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan/questionnaires/housing-and-development-2017/](http://www.shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan/questionnaires/housing-and-development-2017/))

**Q21) Do we need to retain the green nature of the village and the surrounding Green Belt area?**




| Do We Need to Retain the Green Nature of the Village? | No. of Responses | %              |
|---|------------------|----------------|
| Yes   | 533              | 98.16%         |
| No  | 10               | 1.84%          |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                    | <b>543</b>       | <b>100.00%</b> |

**Q20) If required, why type of development would be most acceptable?**

Average acceptability score (1 = most acceptable, 5 = least acceptable)

Answered: 318

Skipped: 239



| Types of Development  | Average Ranking |
|---|-----------------|
| Redevelopment of brownfield sites                           | 1.63            |
| Development of small green belt sites near existing housing | 3.40            |
| Infilling   | 3.24            |
| Redevelopment of larger properties into smaller ones        | 2.63            |
| Larger development in green belt                            | 4.07            |

## 02 Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

### 2.1 Consultation Approach

2.1.1 In May 2018, Shenley Parish Council accepted the Steering Group's recommendation and formally agreed to carry out Regulation 14 consultation on the Draft Shenley Plan. The consultation proceeded along two main lines:

- a. consulting those residing and working within the Parish, and
- b. consulting the bodies referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (the Statutory Consultees, and the adjoining parishes and town councils including Aldenham, Ridge, London Colney, Borehamwood and St Stephens, as well as St Albans City and District Council).

The pre-submission consultation began on the evening of 7th June 2018 with a public meeting (attended by 110+ people). This was the soft launch event for the Draft Shenley Plan, including an exhibition and Q&A. On 7th June 2018 The Plan documents and on-line questionnaire went 'live' on the Shenley Village website. The Plan was then presented at the well-attended Village Fete on 1st July 2018 with a staffed exhibition (visited by 150+ people). A second Public Meeting was held on 13th September 2018 and attended by 50+ people. The Regulation 14 consultation period was closed at noon on Friday 28th September 2018, giving people 16 weeks to respond. This included a two-week extension to also provide statutory consultees more time to respond.



Figure 5: Shenley Plan Regulation 14 Launch, June 7 2018

In addition, an open and first Design Day was held on 14th July 2018 to test out some of the Design Policies in the Draft Shenley Plan. Over 35 people took part in this facilitated design workshop, and a report was written up and published on the Shenley Village website in August 2018. On 18th July 2018 letters were sent out electronically to a comprehensive list of Statutory and Non-Statutory Consultees (Figure 8). The Draft Shenley Plan, and the launch events in June and July, included a draft policy and information on the possibility of a Neighbourhood Development Order on the land on the back of London Road (west side). At the point of publication of the Draft Shenley Plan, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2018) was out for consultation. The now-adopted NPPF considers development in the Green Belt under a Neighbourhood Development Order as not inappropriate development, subject to a range of Green Belt tests. Meetings between the Parish Council with respective landowners and the Local Planning Authority have commenced to further explore this opportunity. A vision statement and associated material has been added to the Plan and Design Principles and Codes Sections of the Shenley Plan to provide more guidance on expectations and supported principles irrespective of which delivery route will be taken during the Plan period.

## 2.1.2 Plan Publicity

On 7th June 2018 the Draft Shenley Plan was launched in the presence of 110+ local people. A letter inviting residents to take part in the consultation went to every household in Shenley Parish on 24th and 25th May 2018. No less than 1,800 copies of the consultation notification were distributed across the Parish, with about 1,650 of these going to individual households in the Parish. Three banners were put up in the village at the same time. A number of A4 posters were put up on 17th/18th May in The Hub, on the Parish Council notice board in Andrew Close, the Post Office, Village Hall & St Martin's Church notice boards. Shenley Estates and Barkers Estate Agents also displayed the posters in their windows, plus they and the Post Office had the spare Invitation letters. A4 posters were also put on The Orchard Tea Rooms notice board.

An invitation to provide feedback on the Draft Shenley Plan was also sent to the adjoining parish and town councils, including Aldenham, Ridge, London Colney, Borehamwood and St Stephens, as well as St Albans City and District Council. This was part of the Statutory Consultees list (see Figure 8).

Steering Group members ran a stall at the Shenley Village Fete on 1st July 2018, with copies of The Plan and with large scale panels at hand to explain the policies to interested passers-by. In addition, the following publicity activities were carried out to bring the consultation of the Draft Shenley Plan to the attention of as many people as possible:

- An email invite/notification was sent via the Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan Stakeholder List (as of September 2018) and Statutory Consultees (List provided in Figure 8).
- Flyers inviting people to take part in the Regulation 14 Consultation were also placed at The Orchard Tea Rooms in the Park, Shenley Store & Post Office, Gateways Surgery, Shenley Estates, Gingerbread Dental Centre and The Hub. The flyers for The Draft Shenley Plan Regulation 14 meeting on 7th June were distributed on 22nd May, and for 13th September event, the flyers went out on 24th/25th August.
- Flyers were also pinned throughout the consultation period on the Shenley Parish Facebook page.



Figure 6: Banner advertising the Shenley Plan and Neighbourhood Development Order

### 2.1.3 Plan Availability

Over the summer in 2018, Shenley Parish Council carried out a 16-week long consultation on the Draft Shenley Plan. The Steering Group felt it would be beneficial to extend the consultation period, from the statutory 6 weeks to nearly 12 weeks, to accommodate those that might be on holiday over the summer months. The Draft Shenley Plan was launched on 7th June 2018 at a Public Meeting and then on 1st July 2018 at the Shenley Village Fete. Over 110 people attended the launch event at the Chapel, Shenley Park.

Hard copies of the Draft Shenley Plan were also available during the consultation period (7th June 2018 until 28th September 2018) at the following locations:

- The Hub – Residents were able to borrow hard copies
- The Post Office/Shenley Stores – Residents were able to borrow hard copies (like a library book).
- The Orchard Tea Rooms
- Gateways Doctors Surgery
- Gingerbread Dental Centre

In addition, a stall was set up at the Village Fete on 1st July 2018 launch. It was visited by 150+ people. The Draft Shenley Plan, including all surveys and supporting documents, was made available on [shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan](http://shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan) from 7th June 2018 onwards.

A brief version of the Draft Shenley Plan was prepared and widely circulated, which was aimed at people who did not have time to read the full Plan or found it difficult to read. It contained the Vision, Objectives and all policies. Hard copies were put at all of the places listed above, plus handed out at all meetings and the Shenley Village Fete Stall. A soft copy was also made available on the Shenley Village website. Many physical copies of the Regulation 14 Survey were also handed out as well.

All articles offered people the opportunity to meet Steering Group members at the Hub – no one took up the option, but there were numerous long phone calls with people and Steering Group members spoke to local people whilst out walking the dog and as part of the on-going Village activities. This included speaking at a WI and giving a presentation on the Draft Shenley Plan on 5th July 2018.



Figure 7: Shenley Village Website | Shenley Plan Regulation 14 Version

## 2.1.4 Statutory Consultees

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 identifies the bodies that must be consulted. The following bodies were notified of the Draft Shenley Plan and asked to comment. A notification letter was issued on 18th July 2018.

Figure 8: List of Statutory Consultees notified electronically

| Organisation                               | Email ( corrected)                             | Organisation   | Email ( corrected)                        |
|--|--|--|---|
| Affinity Water                             | ds@affinitywater.co.uk                         | NHS  | diane.brent@hchs.nhs.uk                   |
| Air Traffic Control - Airport Safeguarding | Sarah.ALLEN@nats.co.uk                         | NHS  | Laura.Griggs@hertfordshire.nhs.uk         |
| Air Traffic Control - Airport Safeguarding | natssafeguarding@nats.co.uk                    | nPower   | general.enquiries@npower.com              |
| Airports Operators Association             | info@aoa.org.uk                                | Office or Rail Regulation                                  | dutytooperate@orr.gsi.gov.uk              |
| BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding                 | safeguarding@heathrow.com                      | Police and Crime Commissioner for Hertfordshire            | commissioner@herts.pnn.police.uk          |
| BAA Aerodrome Safeguarding                 | simon_vince@heathrow.com                       | Sport England  | roy.warren@sportengland.org               |
| British Gas                                | customerservice@britishgas.co.uk               | SSE Energy   | customerservice@sse.co.uk                 |
| BT Openreach                               |  | Thames Water   | thameswaterplanningpolicy@savills.com     |
| Canals and Rivers Trust                    | John.Spottiswood@canalrivertrust.org.uk        | The Coal Authority   | planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk          |
| Canals and Rivers Trust                    |  | Three (Telecoms)   | jane.evans@three.co.uk                    |
| Civil Aviation Authority                   | infoservices@caa.co.uk                         | Transport for London                                       | BoroughEngagement@tfl.gov.uk              |
| Civil Aviation Authority                   | aerodromes@caa.co.uk                           | Transport for London                                       | Hiley@tfl.gov.uk                          |
| Defence Estates                            | DIOODC-IPSPAH@mod.uk                           | UK Competitive Telecommunications Association (UKCTA)      |   |
| Defence Estates                            | DIOODC-LMSCenSAH@mod.uk                        | UK Power Networks  | asknetworks@ukpowernetworks.co.uk         |
| Defence Estates                            | DIOStratPol-Access@mod.uk                      | UK Power Networks  | connections.gateway@ukpowernetworks.co.uk |
| Defence Estates                            | DIOPPD-AcqDispOffice@mod.uk                    | Vodafone and O2  | EMF.Enquiries@ctil.co.uk                  |
| Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO)  | DIOODC-IPSPAH@mod.uk                           | Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council                       | admin@elstreeborehamwood-tc.gov.uk        |
| DEFRA                                      | water.resources@defra.gsi.gov.uk               | Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council                       | hjonas@elstreeborehamwood-tc.gov.uk       |
| Department for Transport                   |  | Shenley Parish Council                                     |   |
| EDF Energy Networks (Gas & Elec)           |  | St Stephen Parish Council                                  | clerk@ststephenparishcouncil.gov.uk       |
| EE (Telecoms)                              | public.affairs@ee.co.uk                        | Hertfordshire County Council                               | ecology@hertfordshire.gov.uk              |
| Energy UK                                  | enquiries@energy-uk.org.uk                     | Hertfordshire County Council                               | paul.donovan@hertfordshire.gov.uk         |
| Energy UK                                  | frontdesk@energy-uk.org.uk                     | Hertfordshire County Council                               | andrew.burt@hertfordshire.gov.uk          |
| Environment Agency                         | HNLSustainablePlaces@environment-agency.gov.uk | Hertfordshire County Council                               | Jennifer.Clarke@hertfordshire.gov.uk      |
| EON Energy                                 | HomeQueries@eonenergy.com                      | Hertfordshire County Council -                             | Environment & Infrastructure Department   |
| Forestry Commission                        | steve.scott@forestry.gsi.gov.uk                |  | ailsa.davis@hertfordshire.gov.uk          |
| Forestry Commission                        | fe.england@forestry.gsi.gov.uk                 | Hertfordshire County Council                               | hwb.herts@hertfordshire.gov.uk            |
| Forestry Commission (East of England)      | enquiries.eastfd@forestry.gsi.gov.uk           | Hertfordshire County Council - Development Services        | Development.Services@hertfordshire.gov.uk |
| Govia Thameslink Railway                   | andrew.sidgwick@gtrailway.com                  | Hertfordshire County Council - Strategic Planning          | lewis.claridge@hertfordshire.gov.uk       |
| Gypsy Association                          | info@gypsy-association.com                     |  |   |
| Gypsy Association                          | sec@gypsy-association.com                      | Hertfordshire County Council - Flood Team                  | john.rumble@hertfordshire.gov.uk          |
| Hertfordshire Community NHS Trust          | communications@hct.nhs.uk                      | Hertfordshire County Council - Gypsy Section               | gypsy.section@hertfordshire.gov.uk        |
| Hertfordshire Constabulary                 | sophie.groombridge@herts.pnn.police.uk         | Hertfordshire County Council - Minerals and Waste planning | david.hodbod@hertfordshire.gov.uk         |
| Hertfordshire Constabulary                 | laurence.jones@herts.pnn.police.uk             | St Albans City and District Council                        | planningpolicy@stalbans.gov.uk            |
| Herts Valleys CCG                          | planning.enquiries@hertsvalleysccg.nhs.uk      | St Albans City and District Council                        | chris.briggs@stalbans.gov.uk              |
| Hertfordshire LEP                          | info@hertfordshirelep.co.uk                    | Cadent Gas Limited   | steve.carter@cadentgas.com                |
| Highways England                           |  | Hertsmere Borough Council                                  | christine.lyons@hertsmere.gov.uk          |
| Highways England                           | Stephen.Hall@highwaysengland.co.uk             | Hertsmere Borough Council                                  | local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk               |
| Historic England                           | eastplanningpolicy@HistoricEngland.org.uk      | Ridge Parish Council                                       | clerk.ridgepc@gmail.com                   |
| Homes and Communities Agency (HCA)         |  | London Colney Parish Council                               | info@londoncolney-pc.gov.uk               |
| London Luton Airport Operations Ltd        | tessa.beadman@ltn.aero                         | Aldenham Parish Council                                    | admin@aldenham-pc.gov.uk                  |
| UK Mobile Operators Association            |  |  | peter.evans@aldenham-pc.gov.uk            |
| National Grid                              | plantprotection@nationalgrid.com               |  | admin@aldenham-pc.gov.uk                  |
| Natural England                            | consultations@naturalengland.org.uk            | CPRE   | office@cpreherts.org.uk                   |
|  | wildlife@naturalengland.org.uk                 |  | gary.beaumont@hertfordshire.gov.uk        |
|  |  |  | lindsey.lucas@hertfordshire.gov.uk        |
|  |  | Virginmedia.co.uk  | new.build@virginmedia.co.uk               |
|  |  | Drainage Engineer  | terry.batchelor@hertsmere.gov.uk          |
|  |  | Homes England  | enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk             |

Figure 9: Notification Letter Statutory Consultees



SHENLEY PARISH COUNCIL



18<sup>th</sup> July 2018

Dear Consultee

**Re: Shenley Neighbourhood Plan – The Shenley Plan 2019 -2036 –  
Pre-Submission Plan/Regulation 14**

I am writing to you as a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect the Borough of Hertsmere and in particular Shenley.

In 2016 Shenley Parish Council (SPC) decided that it would apply to Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) to have a Shenley Neighbourhood Plan. The 2018 ~~Aecom~~ Shenley Housing Needs Assessment tells us that we need 220 homes to meet our needs over the next 15 years. SPC feels that having a plan will give the Parish the chance to have a real influence in terms of look and feel of the homes, the siting of them and the balance of sizes, styles and types and how they fit with our beautiful rural landscape. We feel this will help to enhance and preserve the rural character of the village which is so important to our residents whilst at the same time it will give us the opportunity to improve amenities and village connectivity.

Neighbourhood Planning is a fairly new concept introduced by the 2011 Localism Act to allow communities, such as Shenley, to shape development in their areas through the production of Neighbourhood Development Plans, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders. This is our opportunity for self-determination.

This is a community initiative, which although sponsored by Shenley Parish Council (SPC), with the aid of funding made available by Government, involves members of Shenley Community. Over 60 local people have been part of various working groups that looked at areas such as Housing & Development, Green Belt & Heritage, Roads, Transport & Parking and Local Services & Amenities. These were all themes highlighted in the first questionnaire to all residents in Shenley sent out in October

2016. The 2017 Housing & Development survey has told us what type of housing the community needs and the ~~Aecom~~ Housing Needs Assessment has indicated the numbers we need.

You can view The Shenley Plan 1<sup>st</sup> Draft Neighbourhood Plan at [www.shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan](http://www.shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan), please read and either comment on on-line or by email to [clerk@shenleyvillage.org](mailto:clerk@shenleyvillage.org)

The whole plan is also available by visiting the Shenley Parish Council office, The Hub, London Road, Shenley WD7 9BS.

The Regulation 14 consultation will run until the 15<sup>th</sup> September 2018 after which the Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will analyse the results and comments and make any necessary adjustments before sending it as Regulation 16 (Submission Plan) to the Local Authority and an independent examiner.

The independent examiner will review the Shenley Plan and if all goes well they will recommend it for referendum. All residents in Shenley aged 18 and older will then be invited to vote on the Shenley Plan.

If more than 50% of those that voted say yes the Shenley Plan becomes Planning Policy which everyone has to adhere to.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me via Amanda Leboff on 01923 855 865.

Yours faithfully,

|  
Nicky Beaton  
Chair of Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group



## 2.2 Regulation 14 Consultation Responses | Overview

The consultation process of the Draft Shenley Plan under Regulation 14 Localism Act generated 182 separate written responses, containing thousands of individual comments and ideas. The separate responses are made up of the following representations:

- a) 170 local stakeholders used the survey (online and hard copy) to provide feedback
- b) Hertsmere Borough Council, Local Authority Planning Authority, received on 28 September 2018
- c) Hertfordshire County Council, Environment & Infrastructure Department, received on 14 September 2014
- d) Six Statutory Consultees (Historic England, Sport England, Transport for London, Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council and UK Power Networks )
- e) Three representations by planning agents/promoters acting on behalf of landowners and/or developers (Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes, Woolf Bond Planning on behalf of Heronslea Ltd, Sworders Planning for Mr & Mrs Monk) (Link)
- f) A submission by students from the University of Hertfordshire, MSc Sustainable Planning Focusing on draft policy S7 – Connecting Shenley. As part of their assignment they submitted sketches of their formulated outline ideas

In the following, we present the key findings from the Regulation 14 Survey on the Draft Shenley Plan, and how we amended The Plan in light of feedback provided. All comments from the survey reading specific policies are attached to the Appendix A of this Consultation Statement. Please note each submission that reached us from Statutory Consultees and land interests are made in full available on the [shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan](http://shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan).

Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) and the team at Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) have provided a comprehensive set of comments in their representations. Many of the provided comments have led to improvements and a more robust Submission Version of the Draft Shenley Plan (Section 2.2.2). In Section 2.2.3 the report and recommendations for policies provided by Tony Burton, produced in his leading role during the mock examination day, are presented as part of this Consultation Statement.

The Shenley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group would like to thank all respondees for taking the time to consider the Draft Shenley Plan in its entirety as well as in its detail. All written comments, ideas, concerns and recommendations have been reviewed. They have helped the Steering Group to significantly improve the draft plan. In this Consultation Statement, we provide a summary of key points raised and how we amended the Draft Shenley Plan where appropriate and substantively.


## 2.2.1 Regulation 14 Survey I Summary

We would like to encourage readers to study all the very useful comments provided with this survey. They are made available in Appendix B of this document. Following the age profile and geographical origin of those that have taken time to fill in the survey, headline findings and the ideas for Community Priority Projects (Question 3 of the survey) as well other comments are summarised.

### Demographic profile of received survey responses

Out of the 171 survey responses, 99% (170) of respondents confirmed that they live, work or volunteer in the Parish of Shenley.

Q17: What is your age?




Out of the 170 survey responses:

- 1% (1) of respondents were aged between 0 and 24 years.
- 35% (60) of respondents were aged between 25 and 54 years.
- 64% (109) of respondents were aged between 55 and 75+ years.

2011 census data of Shenley showing population age shows that out of a population of 5,506:

- 32% (1,726) were aged 0 and 24 years.
- 48% (2,661) were aged between 25 and 59 years.
- 20% (1,119) were aged between 60 and 90+ years.



(<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/localarea?compare=1237323769>)



**Address of Respondents**

Of the 157 respondents, 48% (76) were from the Old Village to the east and 52% (81) were from the Porters Park area of Shenley (shown in the diagram below).



The six most common street addresses for numbers of respondents are shown below:



The following statements describe to what extent people are in support of each draft policy in the Draft Shenley Plan.


Overall the Draft Shenley Plan Policies received high levels of support (between 68% and 81%) from those that reviewed it and submitted feedback using the survey. In addition, a great deal of thoughtful feedback has been volunteered which has shaped and improved the pre-submission version of The Plan significantly. **Chapter 3 of this Statement outlines key changes to the Pre-Submission Plan.**

### Q1 Draft Objectives and Vision in the Draft Shenley Plan

Out of the 170 survey responses received, 77% (131) stated that they can support the draft Objectives and Vision in the Draft Shenley Plan (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 12% (21) stated that they could support parts of the draft Objectives and Vision in the Draft Shenley Plan (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 23 positive feedback points and 23 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents could support the draft Objectives and Vision in the Draft Shenley Plan. There were also 5 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: retaining the feel of the village, requirements for new housing, questioning the location of the proposed site and additional pressure on transport and infrastructure.




### Q2 Draft Shenley Plan Policies

Out of the 169 respondents, 72% (122) are in support of the Draft Shenley Plan Policies (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 13% (22) stated that they can support parts of the Draft Shenley Plan Policies (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 15 positive feedback points and 16 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents could support the Draft Shenley Plan Policies. There were also 3 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: questioning the location of the proposed location for growth and additional pressure on transport and infrastructure.




### Q3 Community Priority Projects (See page 24 for more detail)

#### Q4 Draft POLICY S1 Rural Character

Out of the 168 respondents, 80% (135) are in support of the Draft POLICY S1 Rural Character (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 10% (16) stated that they could support parts of the Draft POLICY S1 Rural Character (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 11 positive feedback points and 8 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S1 Rural Character. There were also 15 recommendations to improve the draft report.




#### Q5 Draft POLICY S2 Village Envelope

Out of the 168 respondents, 68% (114) are in support of the Draft POLICY S2 Village Envelope (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 10% (17) stated that they could support parts of the Draft POLICY S2 Village Envelope (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 14 positive feedback points and 21 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S2 Village Envelope. There were also 14 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: questioning the location of the proposed site and protection of the green belt.




### Q6 Draft POLICY S3 Housing Mix & Choices

Out of the 166 respondents, 71% (118) are in support of the Draft POLICY S3 Housing Mix & Choices (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 16% (27) stated that they could support parts of the Draft POLICY S3 Housing Mix & Choices (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 19 positive feedback points and 11 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S3 Housing Mix & Choices. There were also 11 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: questioning the definition of affordable housing and requests for smaller homes for downsizers and first-time buyers.




### Q7 Draft POLICY S4 Community Infrastructure Facilities

Out of the 166 respondents, 78% (129) are in support of the Draft POLICY S4 Community Infrastructure Facilities (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 13% (22) stated that they could support parts of the Draft POLICY S4 Community Infrastructure Facilities (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 11 positive feedback points and 19 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S4 Community Infrastructure Facilities. There were also 14 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: volume of traffic development will create and improvements to existing infrastructure and assets.




**Q8 Draft POLICY S5 Local Knowledge for Good Design**

Out of the 165 respondents, 81% (134) are in support of the Draft POLICY S5 Local Knowledge for Good Design (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 10% (16) stated that they could support parts of the Draft POLICY S5 Local Knowledge for Good Design (indicated by voting 3 stars).

**Summary of additional comments**

There are 10 positive feedback points and 5 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S4 Community Infrastructure Facilities. There were also 12 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: more examples needed and scepticism that local people will be listened to.




**Q9 Draft POLICY S6 Building for Life 12 Quality Mark**

Out of the 167 respondents, 80% (133) are in support of the Draft POLICY S6 Building for Life 12 Quality Mark (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 8% (14) stated that they could support parts of the POLICY S6 Building for Life 12 Quality Mark (indicated by voting 3 stars).

**Summary of additional comments**

There are 17 positive feedback points and 11 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S7 Connecting Shenley. There were also 11 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: much support but also doubt that it will be used and have impact on development as it is voluntary.




### Q10 Draft POLICY S7 POLICY S7 Connecting Shenley

Out of the 163 respondents, 72% (118) are in support of the Draft POLICY S7 Connecting Shenley (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 9% (15) stated that they could support parts of the POLICY S7 Connecting Shenley (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 17 positive feedback points and 11 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S7 Connecting Shenley. There were also 11 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: support for more and better pedestrian routes while protecting the ones that exist, and doubts that a good connection can be achieved between Porters Park and the Old Village.




### Q11 Draft POLICY S8 New Rural Edges

Out of the 167 respondents, 74% (123) are in support of the Draft POLICY S8 New rural edges (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 11% (18) stated that they could support parts of the POLICY S8 New rural edges (indicated by voting 3 stars).

#### Summary of additional comments

There are 14 positive feedback points and 7 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S8 New rural edges. There were also 9 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: support for the approach of a cordon but doubts that it can be enforced and maintained. Porter's Park Planning documents had similar design intentions.




## Q12 Draft POLICY S9 Rural Buildings

Out of the 168 respondents, 77% (130) are in support of the Draft POLICY S9 Rural Buildings (indicated by voting 4 or 5 stars). An additional 11% (18) stated that they could support parts of the POLICY S9 Rural Buildings (indicated by voting 3 stars).

### Summary of additional comments

There are 9 positive feedback points and 3 critical observations showing the extent to which the respondents support draft POLICY S9 Rural Buildings. There were also 12 recommendations to improve the draft report. Common themes include: much support for the rural building design, with some questioning the current encouragement on not using UPVC windows, and how realistic some are / how they can be implemented/delivered.



### 'Other' comments provided

The following table show the additional comments, questions or concerns provided as part of the survey. They are split into 8 key areas;

- 01 Process (16 comments)
- 02 Site Location (22 comments)
- 03 Transport and Infrastructure (16 comments)
- 04 Housing (6 comments)
- 05 Development (10 comments)
- 06 Open Space and Natural Beauty (8 comments)
- 07 Village Character (6 comments)
- 08 Community (5 comments)

### Summary

- A number of comments thank the organisers who have put this report together, and there are some suggestions of how the process could be improved and made more accessible.
- The majority of the comments focus on the location of the supported site for housing to the south of the Old Village. People are suggesting alternative sites for development.
- Many comments focus on the strain the additional housing will put on transport and infrastructure.
- There is negative feeling around scale of development and developers making a lot of money.
- There are a number of comments on housing provision, open space, natural beauty, village character and community amenity and infrastructure, and questions where the community infrastructure might be invested in.

Full details are provided in Appendix A


## Community Priority Projects

Q3: Tell us about your ideas for important Community Priority Projects for Shenley. Please describe them briefly. Thank you.  
The word cloud below shows the most common words and phrases to appear in each section:

### Summary

There were a large number of suggestions for community priority projects, most of which focused around transport and infrastructure and community facilities and spaces. Other topics that featured include: housing, digital infrastructure, sustainable transport, sports and leisure, food and drink and maintaining the village feel.

Specific requests include: traffic calming measures, funding for schools and healthcare, facilities for young people and the older population, new opportunities for pubs, cafes and improved digital infrastructure. This diagram shows the key project themes in proportion to how many comments were received.



Q3 Tell us about your ideas for important Community Priority Projects for Shenley. Please describe them briefly. Thank you.





## Community Priority Projects as named in survey and clustered by theme

### 01 HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.01 | We should have more social and affordable housing.  |
| 1.02 | Obviously social housing requires serious consideration together with associated infrastructure shops, schools, roads.  |
| 1.03 | Prefer no new houses but fully support this survey.   |
| 1.04 | Suitable housing for the elderly and first time buyers.   |
| 1.05 | Develop the available site at Porters Park.   |
| 1.06 | Affordable housing.   |
| 1.07 | More mixed housing with emphasis on smaller houses.   |
| 1.08 | Smaller more organic gradual development at a slower pace to minimize the shock and allow proper infrastructure to be out in place.                                     |
| 1.09 | Affordable Housing & Social Housing for young and elderly residents.  |
| 1.10 | Homes for elderly.  |
| 1.11 | To build houses of character.   |
| 1.12 | Ensure the boundaries of Shenley are not stretched.   |
| 1.13 | Housing for first time buyers.  |
| 1.14 | Don't build so many houses in Shenley spread the burden across Hertsmere.   |
| 1.15 | Re-centre the village around The Gingerbread House.   |
| 1.16 | New buildings in keeping with existing ones.  |
| 1.17 | Can the derelict outbuildings in Shenley Park be developed further -- perhaps some additional housing or shops (not exactly like Battlers Green but in the same vein?). |
| 1.18 | Using the areas north of the village to create new small housing developments.  |
| 1.19 | To scare off "councils", with the threat of prosecution if they object.   |
| 1.20 | Affordable housing and retirement homes.  |
| 1.21 | Any new housing must be compatible with the rural nature of the village.  |

### 02 TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.01 | Frequent transport to trains most important for commuters.  |
| 2.02 | Lets deal with basics first - holes in roads filled in so cars are not damaged.   |
| 2.03 | Adequate infrastructure.  |
| 2.04 | Improved roads. Not enough in and out of the village.   |
| 2.05 | Shuttle bus throughout the day. Shenley Radlett Borehamwood.  |
| 2.06 | Traffic calming.  |
| 2.07 | Better transport links.   |
| 2.08 | Improved transport access - ie more regular buses.  |
| 2.09 | Infrastructure - roads/transport.   |
| 2.10 | Repair roads.   |
| 2.11 | Traffic management.   |
| 2.12 | Shuttle bus to local stations.  |
| 2.13 | Regular bus service.  |
| 2.14 | Better public transport.  |
| 2.15 | Public transport.   |
| 2.16 | Reduction of pollution along London road which school children are currently breathing in on a daily basis during rush hour.  |
| 2.17 | Not to add a further 1000 car movements and subsequent pollution to the village.  |
| 2.18 | Improved traffic control through the village (numbers and speed).   |
| 2.19 | Traffic Calming on Black Lion Hill.   |
| 2.20 | Speeding.   |
| 2.21 | Speed calming, speed cameras.   |
| 2.22 | Parking facilities especially for those unable to walk far ie the Village Hall, church, Shenley Stores. Drop off points ?   |
| 2.23 | Slower traffic along London Road and 20mph sufficient. Restriction on over large lorries and containers except for access. We have become a cut through from M25 to A1. |
| 2.24 | Improved bus timetables.  |
| 2.25 | Better transport.   |
| 2.26 | Bus shuttle. It is difficult for old people or disabled in the village to go to Andrews Close to get the 602 bus.   |
| 2.27 | Transport. The transport to the village is appalling. Needs improvement now.  |
| 2.28 | More frequent buses to Borehamwood.   |
| 2.29 | Traffic management (speed restrictions).  |

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.30 | Speed and vehicle awareness. Green cross code.  |
| 2.31 | Traffic.  |
| 2.32 | Provide a shuttle bus service to Elstree & Borehamwood station.   |
| 2.33 | Roads.  |
| 2.34 | Speed control on porters park drive and black lion hill.  |
| 2.35 | Better infrastructure, eg buses, schools and meeting places   |
| 2.36 | Transport.  |
| 2.37 | Trying to petition to eliminate potholes.   |
| 2.38 | Minibus every 10 -15 mins for commuters to Radlett at peak times.   |
| 2.39 | Introduction of traffic light crossings as drivers seem to see zebra crossings as optional. My children and I have nearly been hit on a number of occasions.      |
| 2.40 | A better public Transport service, to reduce commuter traffic.  |
| 2.41 | Enhanced public transport to neighbouring towns.  |
| 2.42 | No Through traffic signs on Porters Park Drive, top and bottom.   |
| 2.43 | Traffic management.   |
| 2.44 | Width barriers and restrictions on large vehicles coming through Porters Park and the village.  |
| 2.45 | Reducing traffic speed and more pedestrian crossings and speed humps on London Road and Woodhall Lane.  |
| 2.46 | More through-traffic deterrent on main roads such as one way routes and/or alternating priority sections.   |
| 2.47 | Public transport to stations.   |
| 2.48 | Provide a bypass at Harpers Lane to avoid the village before development.   |
| 2.49 | Introduce traffic calming and restrictions and parking restrictions along London Road.  |
| 2.50 | Improve infrastructure.   |
| 2.51 | Bus shuttle to local train stations and essential services.   |
| 2.52 | Sufficient infrastructure eg roads/parking/transport.   |
| 2.53 | Speed cameras etc to reduce speeding. There is a speed camera sign coming into Shenley from Clore Shalom school but there's not actual camera. Why have the sign? |
| 2.54 | Additional road access to the shopping area so there can be separate 'in and out' routes.   |
| 2.55 | Make the village a 'local access only' area.  |
| 2.56 | More zebra crossings in village, for school access.   |

### 03 DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.01 | Digital connectivity - internet and phone connection is very bad           |
| 3.02 | Digital connectivity - so important for people working from home           |
| 3.03 | Digital connectivity - how can internet speeds be improved in the village? |

### 04 SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 4.01 | Cycle track/path/bridleways from Shenley to Radlett and between Shenley and Borehamwood.  |
| 4.02 | Develop and expand network of footpaths, bridleways and restricted byeways.   |
| 4.03 | New footpath and cycle way along Radlett Hill, using scrubland (presumably owned by the Cricket Club and Porters Park Golf Club) to the side of the existing, narrow and very dangerous pavement. |
| 4.04 | Zebra crossing on London Road by Novita.  |
| 4.05 | Improve the "walkability" of London Road.   |
| 4.06 | Better access to The Spinney - the current footpath is a disgrace.  |
| 4.07 | Promote to local open land owners the responsible roaming of all open space field margins and established tracks and paths.   |
| 4.08 | Walkways and cycle paths.   |
| 4.09 | Schemes to encourage renewable energy /environmentally friendly activities.   |
| 4.10 | More areas to cycle, perhaps by connecting to Radlett, we need transport so ability to get to Radlett cleanly and safely would be useful.   |
| 4.11 | Exercise nature trail around the village.   |
| 4.12 | Pedestrian areas.   |
| 4.13 | Improving walking and cycling environment in the village.   |
| 4.14 | Better footpaths.   |
| 4.15 | Walking Trails info leaflets.   |
| 4.16 | Cycling around the village - also need to get cyclists off London Road, Black Lion Hill and Shenleybury.  |

## 05 COMMUNITY MEETINGS AND EVENTS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 5.01 | Places to socialise.  |
| 5.02 | More regular events which promotes a closer community.  |
| 5.03 | A flexible community facility for hire by local individuals, businesses or groups to complement the over-subscribed Village Hall. |
| 5.04 | A better community facility is needed .... multi purpose facility   |

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 5.08 | Bring the community together by planning Shenley days.  |
| 5.09 | A new Shenley Hub with co-working space as well as room hire and a kitchen for teaching kids skills and having classes for older residence. |
| 5.10 | Hardly any new jobs here.   |

## 06 COMMUNITY SPORTS AND LEISURE

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 6.01 | Pavilion at Harris Lane playing fields to promote sports e.g football.   |
| 6.02 | I agree with most of the projects currently listed. I don't think we need another orchard as we already have one. Regarding re-posing sunken tennis courts--are these the courts at Shenley Park? If so, I would prefer they were retained as tennis courts; they just need upgrading. |
| 6.03 | Communal facilities - Local gym or sports facility / meeting areas   |
| 6.04 | A replacement for our ailing field sports pavilion.  |
| 6.05 | Netball Courts, transforming Tennis Courts in the Park.  |
| 6.06 | Increased leisure facilities.  |
| 6.07 | More independent shops.  |
| 6.08 | Cycle paths, brilliant idea. Skate board area would be good.   |
| 6.09 | More "Parkland" and play areas/woodland "exploration" areas and an improved footpath through the Spinney.  |
| 6.10 | Further sports and recreational facilities.  |
| 6.11 | Gym/swimming facilities.   |
| 6.12 | Additional sport and social facilities.  |
| 6.13 | Better sports facilities.  |
| 6.14 | Better / more public seating in our playing fields and elsewhere.  |

## 07 FOOD AND DRINK

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 7.01 | Cafe/indoor activities meeting place for young people e.g in St Martin's Church extension or if school site moved, within existing school site, or near Andrew Close.  |
| 7.02 | We are concerned that the King William IV pub has been allowed to run down by the Green King, the brewery. The village is certainly large enough, even now, to support a second pub and this one does not make any effort to attract a varied clientele. However, we are worried that if this pub is closed by the brewery, it will be redeveloped as housing thereby losing a valuable community asset. There is a scheme whereby the Parish Council can apply to Hertsmere for an ACV (Asset of Community Value) should the pub close down. We would be very much in favour of this. |
| 7.03 | The 1268 permission to hold a Monday market is interesting - perhaps a Farmers Market possible?  |
| 7.04 | Redevelopment of site adjacent to St Martin's church to provide a new building for community activities, including a café.   |
| 7.05 | No to pop up cafe - not in character/sympathetic to village.   |
| 7.06 | Market day sounds like a fantastic idea but query how popular and where.   |
| 7.07 | Sunday Monday Market local produce and local business.   |
| 7.08 | Non alcoholic bar - like a temperance bar.   |

## 08 GENERAL COMMUNITY

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 8.01 | PG says only 25% of the community infrastructure levy will be allocated to Shenley. Where is the other 75% going ? |
| 8.02 | A Parish Council centre with a library/history centre.   |
| 8.03 | New Community Centre with Council Office.  |
| 8.04 | The creation of Parish council offices is ridiculous and no doubts will be an ongoing expense for rate payers.     |
| 8.05 | Larger GP surgery with extended hours for working people.  |
| 8.06 | Extended hours at GP surgery for people who work.  |
| 8.07 | Local community Hub.   |
| 8.08 | New Shenley Neighbourhood Hub.   |
| 8.09 | Community support.   |
| 8.10 | The Parish Council secretary needs a proper space at the heart of the village.                                     |
| 8.11 | To unite the 3 churches & the synagogue into one religious faith centre. That will put us on the map!              |
| 8.12 | To aim for a cohesive society in Shenley village whatever the size.  |
| 8.13 | Health.  |

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 5.05 | Adult social activities/social clubs (evening classes, quiz etc...)   |
| 5.06 | The idea of a Community Centre would seem to be a vanity project, and it's effect on the existing community halls we be detrimental with regard to their existing income flows. |
| 5.07 | More get together to get to know the community better.  |

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 8.14 | Community centre.   |
| 8.15 | Improve facilities.   |
| 8.16 | Additional healthcare facilities.   |
| 8.17 | Ensure sufficient medical facilities.   |
| 8.18 | Community infrastructure.   |
| 8.19 | Extra amenities.  |
| 8.20 | Safety around Andrews way shops.  |
| 8.21 | A larger Parish Council office with community facilities.                                       |
| 8.22 | New Pavilion in Harris Lane Playing Field Wit.  |
| 8.23 | Community service hub.  |
| 8.24 | Maintain or increase allotments.  |
| 8.25 | Allotments and community gardening projects.  |
| 8.26 | Facilities.   |
| 8.27 | Improve community facilities.   |
| 8.28 | More GP access.   |
| 8.29 | Give actual power to the residents. Allow us too say yes or no and have that voice listened to. |

## 09 AGING AND ACCESSIBILITY

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 9.01 | Pavement accessible for easier wheelchair use, thank you for some that have already been done. |
| 9.02 | More community facilities for the over 60's.   |
| 9.03 | Senior citizens meeting place - not the pub!   |

## 10 YOUNG PEOPLE

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| 10.01 | Focus on activities for the children and teenagers of the village.   |
| 10.02 | A central space auditable for activities for all age groups. The village hall is constantly overbooked and lacks modern toilet/catering facilities.  |
| 10.03 | Possible basketball nets, we must try to connect with the youngsters and teens.  |
| 10.04 | Social activities for youngster and the older generation.  |
| 10.05 | New primary school in the heart of the village.  |
| 10.06 | Schools, Primary & Secondary.  |
| 10.07 | Move the school to Porters' Park, where a large number of Shenley's young families live.   |
| 10.08 | Schools.   |
| 10.09 | Something to occupy the anti-social teenagers.   |
| 10.10 | Focus on youth provision in the evenings for early teens.  |
| 10.11 | Youth club.  |
| 10.12 | I believe it is important to see how existing facilities can be enhanced before considering brand new facilities. It is important to establish real need! For example facilities for teenagers to be assessed by survey. |
| 10.13 | School expansion/consolidation.  |
| 10.14 | Getting the hooligan teenagers off the street at night.  |
| 10.15 | Additional education services and facilities.  |
| 10.16 | Play and sports facilities for youth.  |
| 10.17 | Possibly a new school site with better access, facilities and options for growth.  |
| 10.18 | Move the school to Porters Park site.  |
| 10.19 | Play area for teenagers.   |
| 10.20 | More social/education for young adults.  |
| 10.21 | Area/activities for the areas teenagers.   |
| 10.22 | Facilities and opportunities for teenagers.  |
| 10.23 | A youth club or place for teenagers to be social in a safe environment.  |
| 10.24 | Adventure play area in Porters Park a good idea.   |
| 10.25 | Activities for teenagers.  |
| 10.26 | Schools.   |
| 10.27 | Facilities and teenagers for the 60+.  |

## 11 MAINTAIN VILLAGE AND OPEN SPACE

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| 11.17 | Keeping it a Village and not adding to the 10,000 vehicles that charge through it each day!  |
| 11.18 | Maintain the integrity of the village.   |
| 11.19 | Maintaining as much of character of village as possible.   |
| 11.20 | Retain village boundaries.   |
| 11.21 | Retaining village boundaries and green belt.   |
| 11.22 | More general rubbish bins around the village and particularly in porters park drive and in the area around the shops.  |
| 11.23 | The authors of this report do not seem to know what parts constitute Shenley village, they are totally engrossed in the problems of London Road, Black Lion Hill and Porters Park, could it be because there are more voters in those areas. |
| 11.24 | Keeping green spaces and green belt.   |
| 11.25 | Police presence  |
| 11.26 | Police.  |
| 11.27 | Maximise greenery: tree and hedgerow planting (hedges rather than fences).   |
| 11.28 | Keep Shenley the lovely village feel it has at all costs.  |
| 11.29 | Protecting the small amount of green belt that we have to keep the community as it is.   |
| 11.30 | Control green belt use.  |
| 11.31 | Implement the NDO.   |
| 11.01 | Shenley does not require any. Keep it as a village!  |
| 11.02 | To keep as a village.  |
| 11.03 | Small village.   |
| 11.04 | Maintaining the integrity of the centre of the village as it now is.   |
| 11.05 | Keeping the Village's Rural Landscape  |
| 11.06 | Improving the behaviour of dog owners (keeping dog under control, cleaning up mess).   |
| 11.07 | Keep village feel.   |
| 11.08 | Integrate the two parts of the village.  |
| 11.09 | Keep the character.  |
| 11.10 | Maintain quality of green belt and living standards.   |
| 11.11 | Ensure open spaces are protected from development.   |
| 11.12 | Maintaining the rural quality of Shenley.  |
| 11.13 | Retain all places highlighted in plan.   |
| 11.14 | Protect Green Belt.  |
| 11.15 | Looking at the projects specified in the plan, these should be the subject of a separate discussion as some just seem to be unnecessary.   |
| 11.16 | Maintaining the essence of a village if possible.  |

## 2.2.2 Representations from Statutory Consultees and Organisations

Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) and the team at Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) have provided a comprehensive set of comments in their representations. Many of the provided comments have led to improvements and a more robust Submission Version of the Draft Shenley Plan.

Submissions on behalf of landowners and/or developers have also significantly added to the review and robustness of next version of the plan.

Here the full list of representations.

- Hertsmere Borough Council, Local Authority Planning Authority, received on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2018
- Hertfordshire County Council, Environment & Infrastructure Department, received on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2014
- Six other Statutory Consultees (Historic England, Sport England, Transport for London, Elstree and Borehamwood Town Council and UK Power Networks)
- Three representations from planning agents/promoters acting on behalf of landowners and/or developers (Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes, Woolf Bond Planning on behalf of Heronslea Ltd, Sworders Planning for Mr & Mrs Monk)
- A submission by students from the University of Hertfordshire, MSc Sustainable Planning Focusing on draft policy S7 – Connecting Shenley. As part of their assignment they submitted sketches of their formulated outline ideas

Copies of representations are made available on the Shenley Village website in full.

The issues some of the agents, promoters and the local authority have raised regarding the Housing Need Assessment, produced by AECOM in 2018, and in parts regarding the Site Assessment Study, also produced by Aecom in 2018, are noted, but are not shared by the Parish Council and Steering Group. AECOM has stated repeatedly the soundness of their approach which has the full support of the Parish Council and can be accessed here:

[shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan/supporting-documentation/](http://shenleyvillage.org/neighbourhood-plan/supporting-documentation/)

In the following we present a summary on key points raised by policy and the steering groups response. Amendments taking into account all feedback from statutory, non-statutory consultees, landowners and importantly the local residents and businesses are listed in Section 3.

### Shenley Plan Vision & Objectives



1. Hertsmere Planning Authority (HBC) made a few suggestions re terminology and clarity which are noted.
2. Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) is in support of the Vision and Objectives and suggests to emphasis the protection and enhancement of local character, green infrastructure and the protection of more local views and views from the countryside.

### Shenley Policy S1 Rural Character (Now SH 1 + Design Principles and Code section)



#### **Key noted issues raised by HBC, HCC and organisations:**

- a. The provided policy text for S1 is too prescriptive / onerous in parts
- b. More clarity required on design rules
- c. Requirements for documents to be submitted with a planning application are set down nationally
- d. Construction and Management Plan not enforceable

> See the proposed amendments to above key issues in Section 3. Generally, we state that the decision taker is to review all evidence and attaches different weight to a range and often conflicting policies and considers local circumstances in most cases.





> In March 2010, the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) issued “Guidance on information requirements and validation” in relation to local authorities handling of planning applications. This guidance was subsequently replaced by the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) issued by DCLG in March 2014. The position of the previous guidance remains unchanged in that the NPPG states that local lists must be reviewed at least every two years. The Steering Group is of the view, and with the support from local people, that the Shenley Local List needs updating. They are also of the view that more clarity on what information is required by applicants demonstrating the extent of how good design has been achieved.

**Shenley Policy S2 Village Envelope  
(Changed Now SH 2 Special Policy Area)**

Key issues raised by Local Planning Authority and others:



**a. Non-compliance of the scale of and the principle of the proposed expansion of the existing Village Envelope (Draft Policy S2) with Basic Conditions (CS13)**



> Noted. The Shenley Plan designates a Special Policy Area now and has departed from changing the Village Envelope in advance of Local Plan site allocations. The Steering Group is still of the view that expanding the village sensitively to the west of London Road is the most sustainable location for growing the village. The fifth basic condition<sup>1</sup> considers whether a policy is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the adopted development plan for the area concerned. The adjective ‘general’ allows a degree of (but not unlimited) flexibility. If there are policies contained in a development plan document, and they are strategic policies, then the policy must be in general conformity with them. This is a matter of degree and of planning judgement. In considering basic condition (e) we note the following in Planning Practice Guidance:<sup>4</sup> *“When considering whether a policy is in general conformity a qualifying body, independent examiner, or local planning authority, should consider the following:*

*- whether the development proposal supports and upholds the general principle that the strategic policy is concerned with the degree, if any, of conflict between the draft ... development proposal and the strategic policy the degree, if any, of conflict between the draft... development proposal and the strategic policy*

*- whether the draft development proposal provides an additional level of detail and/or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy the rationale for the approach taken in the draft... Order and the evidence to justify that approach*

*- whether the draft development proposal provides an additional level of detail and/or a distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policy without undermining that policy*  
*- the rationale for the approach taken in the draft Order and the evidence to justify that approach.*



> The emphasis in the representation, prepared by the Pegasus Group on behalf of Bloor Homes, with references to the **National Planning Practice Guidance**, are also considered particularly helpful, explaining why changes to the Village Envelope were proposed to ensure that the Green Belt status is secured for future generations while minor development in that location could be supported through a Village Envelope expansion. A Neighbourhood Plan cannot allocate sites in the Green Belt, which means de facto that there cannot be **any significant site allocation policy** in the Shenley Plan ahead of the new Local Plan. The Shenley Plan still supports Neighbourhood Development Orders as part of its proposal for a Special Policy Area. This is to champion and lead on positively planning for evidenced housing and employment needs in the Village and Parish and strengthen the function of the village in its distinct rural character.

**National Planning Practice Guidance:**

*“Can a neighbourhood plan come forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place?”*

*Neighbourhood plans, when brought into force, become part of the development plan for the neighbourhood area. They can be developed before or at the same time as the local planning authority is producing its Local Plan.*

*A draft neighbourhood plan or Order must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic condition. Although a draft neighbourhood plan or Order is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic*

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix for full list. (Page 51)



conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. For example, up-to-date housing needs evidence is relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

Where a neighbourhood plan is brought forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place the qualifying body and the local planning authority should discuss and aim to agree the relationship between policies in:

- the emerging neighbourhood plan
- the emerging Local Plan
- the adopted development plan

with appropriate regard to national policy and guidance.

The local planning authority should take a proactive and positive approach, working collaboratively with a qualifying body particularly sharing evidence and seeking to resolve any issues to ensure the draft neighbourhood plan has the greatest chance of success at independent examination.

The local planning authority should work with the qualifying body to produce complementary neighbourhood and Local Plans. It is important to minimise any conflicts between policies in the neighbourhood plan and those in the emerging Local Plan, including housing supply policies. This is because section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the conflict must be resolved by the decision maker favouring the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan. Neighbourhood plans should consider providing indicative delivery timetables, and allocating reserve sites to ensure that emerging evidence of housing need is addressed. This can help minimise potential conflicts and ensure that policies in the neighbourhood plan are not overridden by a new Local Plan.

Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20160211 | Revision date: 11 02 2016



> The proposed change of Village Envelope has not been well enough justified and explained in the supporting text of Regulation 14 draft. The introduction of the idea of a possible Neighbourhood Development Order (NDO) has further confused matters, we suspect. In principle, all high-level strategic policies would still be applicable. However, the Regulation 16 version of the Plan now suggests a Special Policy Area Policy for the Village and its setting, in the spirit of supporting CS13 while not impeding on current or future strategic Local Plan policies nor the possible NDO route. Pegasus Group state that as soon as the land is released via the Local Plan production process from the Green Belt, the effective use of land and achieving appropriate densities needs to be demonstrated (NPPF 2019, §123). This highlights the significant change in scale of development, density and impacts from the loss of Green Belt status in developing land via the Local Plan route without any other weighty policy intervention.



> The introduction of a Special Policy Area may also be considered, in light of the time it can take to have a New Local Plan adopted and the possibility of an under provision in the 5-year housing supply, delivery and the latest housing need evidence base. (See PPPG 083 Reference ID: 41-083-20170810 Revision date: 10 08 2017 and §33 NPPF 2018 and Housing Delivery Test 2018). Emerging evidence for the borough suggests an annual need of about 500+ homes per year for the Local Plan period. This in a borough mostly made up of Green Belt. We expect the number to be confirmed by mid-2019. In a proactive and positive planning sense, the proposed change does signal the preferred location of growth without a made Local Plan or one that does not 'deliver' the required housing numbers. Delivery of homes under the new NPPF 2019 is a much-emphasised requirement, to be demonstrated via the Housing Delivery Test.

§33 NPPF : Policies in local plans and spatial development strategies should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years, and should then be updated as necessary<sup>18</sup>. Reviews should be completed no later than five years from the adoption date of a plan, and should take into account changing circumstances affecting the area, or any relevant changes in national policy. Relevant strategic policies will need updating at least once every five years if their applicable local housing need figure has changed significantly; and they are likely to require earlier review if local housing need is expected to change significantly in the near future.

## Extract from FAQ, HBC Call for Site, Potential Sites, October 2018

### Why are you considering building in the Green Belt?

Our approach over several decades has been to focus new development within built up areas through the re-use of brownfield or previously developed land. Figures recently published by the Office for National Statistics and our own technical studies show that we need to be building more than double the number of homes we are currently looking to have built. We also need some additional land for employment development as this will help ensure our areas do not become dormitory towns over time. There isn't room within our existing towns and villages to provide land for all this growth – and in fact 63 per cent of people responding to the first consultation said that new homes should not be built within the existing larger settlements. The only realistic option for meeting some of Hertsmere's need for new homes, jobs and infrastructure is to plan to build in areas of the borough which are currently undeveloped. This could be on the edge of the existing built up area or in a new settlement altogether. What is important is to ensure that this is achieved in the most sustainable and attractive way possible.

### What is the purpose of the Green Belt assessment which has been undertaken?

Government policy states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Part of this process involves an assessment of how different areas of Green Belt perform against national Green Belt purposes. We commissioned an independent assessment of all Green Belt land across Hertsmere which together with other technical work, such as highways and flood risk assessments, will inform our consideration of potential development sites. The findings of this Green Belt assessment are summarised in our Potential sites for housing and employment report but it is important to stress that these are the views of independent consultants. Local Councillors will ultimately be responsible for agreeing which sites should be included in the new Local Plan before it is taken forward for public examination.

### Didn't household projections recently indicate a reduced level of housing need in Hertsmere?

The government recently introduced a standard method for calculating local authorities' housing needs, based on national population and household forecasts. The latest forecasts, issued in September 2018, point to a need for 444 homes per year in Hertsmere. However, the government is now consulting on further changes to how all Councils' housing requirements are calculated which could potentially increase this figure further. The government also requires councils to include a buffer of up to 20% more homes on top of the level of housing need identified, to ensure there is sufficient choice in the housing market, to take account of fluctuations in the market and to address historic under-delivery of homes.

Although the basic figure for Hertsmere is currently 25% lower than we indicated in our consultation last year (because of recent changes in national population and household projections), the level of overall housing need across South West Hertfordshire has not changed much. We anticipate a need to plan for at least 500 homes per year, in Hertsmere.



> The fact that since the publication of the Pre-Submission Plan, the Local Authority has proposed a Strategic Site Allocation (S4), in the latest Local Plan Consultation (Planning for Growth, October 2018), on parts of Site 4, underpins in our view the sustainability merits of this stretch of land/this location for growing the village. This with support from the Green Belt Review I and II, the Sustainability appraisal, and other criteria such as distance to local facilities. The inclusion of that land into a Shenley Special Policy Area will enable more appropriate development for this rural village setting and in support of the rural function.



> The supported route of development to meet Shenley's future housing needs through a Neighbourhood Development Order, (a route which is only available to the Parish Council), is also preferable because it does not necessitate this loss of Green Belt status. It also gives the local community a decisive say in shaping the look and feel of the new homes, spaces and facilities while keeping the Green Belt status of the area and ensuring that appropriate attention is given to the Conservation Area, improvements to London Road, landscape setting and biodiversity. The NDO is potentially a much faster route to delivery too. It will not result in Section 106 monies being spend in other parts of the borough, which is considered a positive aspect as then monies can be used for community infrastructures and more affordable homes in the Parish.

>The Local Planning Authority's Call for Site Consultation and indeed the extension of the original Village Envelope change in the Pre-Submission Plan have both identified land along Radlett Lane. After consideration of the Green Belt Review 2 findings, carried out by HBC, and in light of the currently identified housing need, it is proposed to include this land into the Special Policy Area in support of potential site allocations and managing their impact on the rural setting.



### **b. Shenley Housing Needs Study 2018 & Site Assessment Study 2018 (Aecom Reports)**



> The Local Authority and parties representing land interests contest Aecom's Independent Housing Needs study, prepared for Shenley Parish in spring 2018, which concludes an unconstrained need of about 14.6 homes per year over the next 15 years (220 homes) or 250 over 17 years in Shenley Parish between 2019 and 2036. Aecom has confirmed to the Parish Council that their methodology is sound and considered all relevant recommendations by Government in assessing housing needs in 2018. They have also confirmed that the Site Assessment Study is sound, and allows for the comparison of sites known at the time (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-development-needs-assessments>). Importantly,

the Shenley Plan cannot allocate sites as most of the land is located in the Green Belt, and it is not in the gift of a Neighbourhood Plan to allocate larger sites. The Local Authority's work on the Call for Sites and Site Assessments is to be referred to now.



> We also challenge the evidence base currently being used by the Borough which suggests an annual need for new homes of about 500+ plus infrastructures and additional employment spaces. This housing needs study dates back to 2005 and refers to the East of England Regional Plan and is wholly out of sync with current local needs. "2.27 The Council considers that planning for at least 266 homes per annum over 15 years following adoption of the Core Strategy (2012 - 2027) is the most appropriate level of growth in the current circumstances, taking into account housing needs and what can be delivered in the Borough in a sustainable way. However, as set out in Chapter 9, the Council commits to undertaking an early partial review of the Core Strategy within three years, in order to take account of an updated assessment of housing need and demand within the South West Hertfordshire Housing Market Area." (Core Strategy, 2013, page. 24)



**c. The creation of a Neighbourhood Development Order on Site 4 is not in general conformity with the Local Plan and/ or the National Planning Policy Framework**



> The Development of a Neighbourhood Development Order is considered not inappropriate development under the revised NPPF 2019. It is in the remit of the Parish Council to pursue this route to development. An NDO, if adopted, will not change the Green Belt status of the land concerned but allow for:

- not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, retaining and supporting the purpose of the Green Belt
- paying due respect to the Conservation Area and many listed structures
- protects and enhances environmental qualities of the site
- respects the landowners wishes to leave a positive legacy
- important growth in the village with the support from the village.



> There is and will be no strategic site allocation, adopted through the New Local Plan, in place until at least 2021. The delivery of much needed homes, genuine affordable homes via a community land trust, a community centre, a village square and improved access to the countryside could be accelerated through the NDO route.



> The Steering Group feels that issues raised by the Local Authority and some of the other landowners re compliance of an NDO with the Basic Conditions are premature and not in the gift of the Local Authority to judge at this stage. CS13 is concerned with "There is a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt, as defined on the Policies Map and such development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist." Approved NDOs are not considered inappropriate development since the introduction of the NPPF 2018. There also seems to be a misunderstanding of the relationship between a Neighbourhood Plan and an NDO. The Government and the NPPF supports NDOs and a strong relationship between a Neighbourhood Plan and NDO. *Para 2.49 in the Core Strategy states; "Policies will need to address the immediate housing needs of the local community in order to reduce the number of younger families leaving the Borough and to maintain a balanced demographic profile within the population. At the same time, the needs of older and elderly people will need to be considered, with a particular focus on facilitating the provision of more sheltered or extra-care housing, as well as lifetime homes which can be easily adapted for those with mobility problems."*

> The NPPF 2019 is clear that there is an expectation to support local communities in their endeavour to develop NDOs and avoid conflicts in policy terms.



**d. Polices need to be more precise and set out clear requirements for DM officers**



> A design code is now specified highlighting the key aspects of achieving rural character in buildings, streets and landscapes of Shenley Parish. A balance between 'precision' and 'being overly prescriptive' has been carefully considered and the need to design for each plot and site specifically to achieve the overall vision of the plan and objectives for rural character and identity is in the Steering Groups' view achieved and objectified by the introduction of the Building for Life Policy SH8 and Special Policy Area.



## Shenley Policy S3 Housing Mix & Choices (Now SH 4)

### Key issues raised by Local Planning Authority and others:



- a. **The Local Authority states that they cannot refuse development proposals that do not support this policy e.g. deliver the much needed smaller homes and homes for elderly and less mobile people.**
- b. **The prescriptive approach to housing size and design does not accord with the Development Plan and will stifle housing opportunity and choice.** (Letter from Woolf Bond Planning)



> The support for proposals that result in the increase of the described kind of homes do reflect and respond positively to the evidence from the South West Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment, 2016, the Housing Needs Assessment for Shenley, 2018, the demographics of Shenley/Radlett/the borough as a whole, the current housing stock mix and the government's requirement for affordable homes and self-build plots.



> The criteria are set out in a manner that will help applicants to deliver towards identified housing needs in Shenley. They allow the planning committee and Development Control officers to identify development that meets one or more of the criteria. The Steering Group recognises that not all development can contribute to all criteria but feels strongly to highlight the evidenced need for development to meet local housing need.

>The Local Authority needs to demonstrate that they are willing to uphold not just the letter but the spirit of the 2011 Localism Act which calls for the devolution of planning decisions 'to individuals and communities'. Similarly if the Local Authority are confusing the idea of appropriate development for the Village with 'stifling housing choice', despite a strong evidence base to the contrary, it is perhaps not surprising that the NDO route is attractive to local people and the Parish Council in that it offers the local community a better chance of meeting the identified local needs and maintaining the village character and green belt status.



> The contradicting views from a Local Authority that feels it cannot deliver on identified and needed mix of housing sizes, and the development industry looking at the same draft policy and stating that it will stifle housing choice, is in light of the string of evidence base provided perhaps another insight why the NDO route is so attractive to local people and the Parish Council in meeting the identified local housing needs.



> The representation from Pegasus Group and Sworders Planning state support for this draft policy. Pegasus Group also state that as soon as the land is released via the Local Plan production process from the green belt the effective use of land and achieving appropriate densities needs to be demonstrated (NPPF 2019, §123). This highlights the significant change in scale of development, density and impacts from the loss of Green Belt status in developing land via the Local Plan route.



> We also challenge the evidence base currently being used by the Borough which suggests an annual need for new homes of about 500 plus infrastructures and additional employment spaces. This housing needs study dates back to 2005 and refers to the East of England Regional Plan and is wholly out of sync with current local needs. "2.27 The Council considers that planning for at least 266 homes per annum over 15 years following adoption of the Core Strategy (2012 - 2027) is the most appropriate level of growth in the current circumstances, taking into account housing needs and what can be delivered in the Borough in a sustainable way. However, as set out in Chapter 9, the Council commits to undertaking an early partial review of the Core Strategy within three years, in order to take account of an updated assessment of housing need and demand within the South West Hertfordshire Housing Market Area." (Core Strategy, 2013, page. 24)

## Shenley Policy S4 Community Infrastructure Facilities (Now SH 6)

### Key issues raised by Local Planning Authority and others:



**a. Permitted Development rights might lead to loss of facilities**

> Noted. Article 4 Directive is only available for the Local Authority to be used.

**b. Clarity in what loss of amenity value might mean**

> Noted.

**c. Questions on who would check business case for facility**

> Noted.

**d. Opportunities for new and improved community facilities through development**

> The representation from the Pegasus Group highlights the possible benefits from a major development at Harperbury and the related ability to then financially support community infrastructure facilities.  
> Sworders Planning state full support for this policy.

## Shenley Policy S5 Local Knowledge for Good Design (Now SH 7)

### Key issues raised by Local Planning Authority and others:



**a. Detail identified under the 'expectation' of producing a Development and Design Brief and Statement of Community and Neighbour Involvement**



> This Policy details 'Planning for Growth, Statement of Community Involvement, 2017, Section 8 and 'Achieving well-designed places', NPPF 2019 Paragraph 128, NPPF 2019, does state 'Applicants that can demonstrate early, pro-active and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot. This policy clarifies the criteria to assess what favourably might mean.



> HCC states support for Design and Development Briefs for major developments.



> HBC warns of resource implications and is unclear who would manage those processes. It is worth noting, it is the Local Authority's duty to manage the pre-application processes in all matters other than NDO development. A 'Statement of Community Consultation' is a report which is commonly produced for major applications, as are Development and Design Briefs. They can be produced by the promoter or developer to support the decision taker in determining the compliance and quality of proposal/application. Design quality and consensus on design quality at scale cannot be achieved without design scrutiny throughout the design process.



> Design and Development Briefs are expected for major development and not mandated. Policies in the Shenley Plan direct how this can be achieved in Shenley and by doing so the plan adds to strategic directions from the NPPF 2019. HBC's 'Planning for Growth, Statement of Community Involvement, 2017' is silent on detail and the Steering Group proposes an up-dating of the document to give guidance and more clarity to promoters, officers, councillors and communities. In the Steering Group's view, Design and Development Briefs are also a means of de-risking the application process by putting good design at the heart of the pre-application process and involving local people with local knowledge early in the process. Paragraph 39 to 41, 129 and 130 of the NPPF 2019 provides direction regarding tools, processes and decision taking which are very much supported by Policy SH7 and SH8 'Building for Life 12 Quality Mark'.



- > Given the scale of growth expected for Shenley, the Steering Group is of the view that:
  - the current Statement of Community Involvement and the emerging Local Plan ought to require developers to provide a Statement on how they have engaged as part of the design development stage and how this engagement has shaped the proposals, and
  - developers should take inspiration from Shenley’s SH7 and SH8 policies which are supporting §128, §129, §130 NPPF.
  - an urgent update of the Statement of Community Involvement 2017 is needed to include the new requirements set out in the 2017 Neighbourhood Planning Act.



As of the HBC’s own publication ‘Planning for Growth, Statement of Community Involvement, 2017, page 25’ states: **‘7.10 The Council have introduced a Local Validation List for all development types which sets the scope for the amount and type of information we require over and above what is compulsorily required by the national list. The Local Validation List sets out what will be required to be able to register, assess and determine planning applications within Hertsmere Borough Council’s jurisdiction. It is envisaged that the addition of the Local Validation List will speed up the registration and planning application determination process by getting the right amount of information at the validation stage. Where applicants consider that the information required by the List is not necessary, a short written statement highlighting the reasons why should be provided.’**



> The Steering Group supports this approach, but highlights that the NPPF focus on design quality of large development and the 25 Year Environment Plan ‘A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to improve the Environment’ marks a shift in strategic national policy direction that may require a review and amendment of the Local Validation List. An assessment of its soundness in providing required information at the right time to make meaningful contributions in consultation and decision processes is recommended.



> The Steering Group highlights the importance of fulfilling the requirements as set by the ‘Gunning Principles’: They consist of four rules, which if followed, are designed to make consultation fair and a worthwhile exercise:

1. that consultation must be at a time when proposals are still at a formative stage;
2. that the proposer must give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit intelligent consideration and response;
3. that adequate time is given for consideration and response; and
4. that the product of consultation is conscientiously taken into account when finalising the decision.

**Shenley Policy 6 Building for Life 12 Quality Mark (Now SH 8)**

**Key issues raised by Local Planning Authority and others:**



**a. Non-binding nature of S6 and difficulty for Development Control Officer to apply**



> The Steering Group emphasise §128 of the NPPF (2019) which states ‘Applicants that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourable than those that cannot.’



> This policy guides developers on how they can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement and as such with give the Development Control Officer a means to assess an application. This via the Design and Access Statement and Statement of Community Consultation.



> The NPPF highlights the role of the Local Authority in making sure that they have access to tools and processes for assessing and improving design of development.



> SH8 specifies this with a tool that is specifically mentioned in §129. The Steering Group would like to propose that the New Local Plan, and backed by the NPPF, introduces BfL12 as an ‘expected’ assessment standard for major development applications.



> The NPPF also requires plans to set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. BfL12 is a tool specifically designed to be used by everyone interested in design and design quality. The Steering Group is of the view that BfL12 provides a good structure for design professionals and non-professionals to engage in a meaningful discussion about the design merits of major proposals.



> HCC supports BfL12 policy.



> The policy in the Shenley Plan sets out an expectation that major development will use BfL 12 and achieve 'outstanding' in the Special Policy Area. It only requires minimum of 9 out of the 12 'greens'. This is assessed by an independent design review panel in the pre-application stage. Again, this should help the Local Authority and Planning Committee to assess the merits of an application and, together with other more detailed considerations, lead to well-designed places. Hertfordshire Design Review Panel is the local panel and could be considered in carrying out this assessment (<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/microsites/building-futures/design-review-panel/hertfordshire-design-review-service.aspx>)



**b. Local Validation List and Statement of Community Engagement**



> A review and changes to the Local Validation List and Statement of Community Engagement is only one means by which this can be achieved.



> The BfL assessment framework is considered the best 'tool' around to help deliver the Shenley Plans Policies and support developers in marketing excellence in design across spatial scales (neighbourhood, place, street and home).



> 'Applicants that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot.' Early use of the BfL assessment framework is expected to facilitate a much more positive assessment in the late stages of a pre-application process.

**Shenley Policy 7 Connecting Shenley (Now SH 5)**

**Key issues raised by Local Planning Authority and others:**



**a. Delivery of policy (viability) and clarity for Development Control Officers**



> The Connecting Shenley policy is aimed at directing financial contributions from development and other investors, such as the Highway Authority, into key infrastructures that support access to local services and more social cohesion in the village. Investing in better walking and cycling facilities between key destinations is important in this regard, as well as directing scarce investment into central locations benefiting the highest number of local users.



> The Highways Authority supports this policy and would like to discuss matters with the Steering Group.

## Shenley Policy 8 Rural Edge (Now SH 2)

### Key issues raised by the representation from Pegasus Group and Sworders Planning:



#### a. Clarity required where policy is to be applied and to what extent individual applications can contribute



> This policy will form part of the Shenley Design Code in addition to SH1, SH2 and SH3.

## Shenley Policy 9 Rural Buildings (Now SH1 and Design Principles and Code section)

### Key issues raised by Local Planning Authority and others:



#### a. The prescriptive nature of Policy on Rural Character



> NPPF requires plans to set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. *The NPPF states at paragraph 125 that; "Plans should, at the most appropriate level, set out a clear design vision and expectations, so that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. Design policies should be developed with local communities so they reflect local aspirations, and are grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area's defining characteristics. Neighbourhood plans can play an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development."*



> The Shenley Plan is doing this via providing local precedents/case studies considered helpful in working on a 21<sup>st</sup> century design response to rural character, connections to the countryside and living and working in rural communities. Building new parts of Shenley Parish that celebrate rural heritage, as well as addressing:

- the need for more affordable smaller homes,
- isolation in older age,
- support for young families, and
- the need for adaptable buildings for different uses over time,

have played an important role in promoting rural building typologies around shared courtyards through Design Principles and Codes set out in Section C of the Plan. .



> Hence, Shenley Plan's Policy for rural character is not considered prescriptive in architectural detail, density or housing numbers. Instead the plan policy, principles and codes offers/challenges the applicant to demonstrate and explain design decisions and involve stakeholders in the design evolution based on a documented and deeper understanding of local context. This in landscape and built environment terms and the need and expectations of how the Parish wishes to evolve sustainably.



> This - and importantly - in recognition that the typical restraint shown in Shenley's many listed rural buildings, public spaces and structures , might provide/allow for more funds to be invested in community facilities, affordable homes and service contributions while rural character is enhanced and interpreted for 21<sup>st</sup> century village life.



> Recommendation: HBC's New Local Plan should provide clear direction in terms of tools and processes on how well-designed places are achieved in Hertsmere. The scale of growth and subsequent individual applications suggests – following other Local Authority's examples - that important development proposals are to be seen by an independent Design Review Panel (ref. §129 NPPF).

## 2.2.3 Mock Examination Day & Report

### Shenley NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN, February 2019 Version

Report of a “mock Examination”

Tony Burton CBE, BA, MPhil (Town Planning), FRIBA, FRSA March 2019

1. This is a report of a “Mock Examination” undertaken of the Shenley Neighbourhood Plan ahead of its submission to Hertsmere Borough Council. This was focused on a five hour review of the Plan’s policies and accompanying evidence base and consultation feedback. It was conducted in Shenley village hall with the participation of the Parish Council, members of the Plan’s Steering Group and officers from Hertsmere Borough Council. The process was supported by Angela Koch (ImaginePlaces).

2. A revised drafting of some of the Plan’s policies accompanies this report and addresses the many issues that were raised. This seeks to ensure the Plan will meet the Basic Conditions and meet up to the expectation of Government Planning Practice Guidance that:

*“A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared.”*

3. On some issues the Parish Council faces choices over the best way forward and these are addressed in this note.

4. Overall, the Plan is well structured and clearly written albeit the detail and quantity of information can be overwhelming. It is based on an impressive programme of community engagement and the immense effort of a small number of volunteers. A huge amount has been achieved in two years to reach this advance stage. The Plan responds to the particular circumstances of Shenley and your desire for this to have more influence over development than is currently available under borough wide policies. It is a good example of the purpose and merit of neighbourhood planning.

5. The proposed changes and revised structure seek to strengthen the Plan’s approach so it shows positive intent, avoids over prescription and provides clarity for those who will be applying the policies once in force. This will need to be accompanied by changes to the supporting text, including separating some of it out into separate supporting documents or for inclusion in Annexes.

6. Subject to the comments and recommendations raised in this report there is no reason why the Plan should not proceed. It will need to be accompanied by:

- An updated Consultation Statement reflecting this process and anything else which occurs between now and submission of the Plan
- An amended Basic Conditions Statement which specifically addressed the required to have appropriate regard to national planning policy
- The SEA and HRA screening appraisal prepared by Hertsmere Borough Council, informed by the views of Natural England, Environment Agency and Historic England – these should be initiated as soon as possible to avoid unnecessary delay
- An online evidence base which brings all relevant documents together and has a prominent link in the Plan

7. The review also highlighted the need for further work in the following areas:

Maps – these need to be of higher quality and at a larger scale so the location of various proposed boundaries is clear. They should include a base map. Hertsmere Borough Council offered support for this. All Figures should be numbered and titled. Figure 1 should be simplified so it only shows the neighbourhood area

Local Green Space – further evidence is needed (as a separate document) on how the proposed Local Green Space meets the criteria in paragraph 100 of the NPPF

Objectives – there is scope for minor redrafting of some Objectives, such as where the impression might be given that the Parish Council will be providing services it cannot, albeit that they have considerable support from the consultation process

Indicative housing requirement – Hertsmere Borough Council committed to providing an indicative figure and the factors to be taken into account are provided in paragraph 66 of the NPPF. It is recognised this may provide a range and also that the purpose is not to inform site allocations in the Plan but to demonstrate the likely future requirement for housing development outside the existing settlement boundary

Neighbourhood Development Order – the challenge of using a NDO to deliver significant housing development in the Green Belt without conflicting with the NPPF’s requirement for any such development to “*preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it*” (paragraph 146) was made clear. If the Parish Council were to proceed down this route it is advised to find precedents where significant development met these tests as an early priority.

Evidence – there are specific policy requirements about building heights (SH2), separation distances (SH3), home size (SH4), views/vistas/panoramas (SH6), key locations/spatial focus (SH6) where the evidence needs to be presented more clearly in the accompanying reasoned justification or additional evidence needs to be provided

Affordable homes – Policy SH4b could be strengthened to emphasise particular types of affordable homes if there is evidence from the AECOM research on housing needs

Major development – a definition is required - see Section 2 for the national definition [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2015/595/pdfs/ukxi\\_20150595\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2015/595/pdfs/ukxi_20150595_en.pdf)

8. There were at least two areas where you will want to focus your influence on Hertsmere Borough Council:

Local Plan – especially in relation to the principle and location of any Green Belt boundary changes, recognising these should endure beyond the period of a single Local Plan review

Statement of Community Involvement – to reflect the early and participative approach you are seeking through the Plan and to build on the support for this in the NPPF

9. You are likely to be more successful with a freestanding Shenley Design Code which is referred to in a Plan policy. This will allow you to be more assertive and directional. It will be important for the Design Code itself to be clearly distinguishable from the supporting explanatory text

10. There will be benefit in preparing a statement describing the components of “rural character” that you wish to see addressed in new development that can be referred to wherever appropriate, including Policy SH2. This might be provided on a separate page and/or in a box with a clear heading so it stands out. It may be appropriate to include in full in Policy SH2 if it is neither overly prescriptive nor long.

11. The Special Policy Area is seeking to perform two roles – provide a steer as to the location of any future expansion with safeguards over the character of the development and also define a coherent area of rural character embracing both the village and its immediate surroundings. The first role is problematic given the area is currently Green Belt and no strategic decisions have yet been made over this. The second role is problematic as other areas, such as to the east of the village, are also of rural character. The approach needs to be resolved and to be tested against the safeguards that the Shenley Design Code will provide in relation to any development. The combination of a Shenley Design Code, clearly articulated expression of rural character and pro- active effort to influence the outcome of the Local Plan and any Green Belt boundary change is likely to be a good way forward. This would mean not including a Plan policy for a Special Policy Area.

12. It may be appropriate simply to reference Building for Life 12 in Policy SH7. I have proposed an alternative approach which lists its 12 criteria as this has been used successfully elsewhere (see p139 Alrewas Plan <https://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/Council/Planning/The-local-plan-and-planning-policy/Neighbourhood-plans/Downloads/Alrewas/Alrewas-neighbourhood-plan-made-version.pdf> and page 46 of accompanying Examiners Report <https://www.lichfielddc.gov.uk/Council/Planning/The-local-plan-and-planning-policy/Neighbourhood-plans/Downloads/Alrewas/Regulation-16-2018/Alrewas-Examiners-Report-2018.pdf> . You would want to reference Building for Life 12 in the supporting text and the reference in paragraph 129 of the NPPF.

13. Where text has been removed from policies then it may be included in the supporting text or as a statement of community expectations, such as the full detail of information accompanying planning applications or the expectation of early presentations.

TB

## ***Proposed/ recommended policy wording by Tony Burton for consideration of the Shenley Plan Steering Group***

### **POLICY SH1**

#### **SHENLEY DESIGN CODE**

All development proposals should have regard to the Shenley Design Code.

### **POLICY SH2**

#### **RURAL CHARACTER**

Development proposals which respect the neighbourhood area's rural character as described in [insert] shall be supported

### **POLICY SH3**

#### **LOCAL GREEN SPACE**

The Spinney and adjacent woodland and hedge system (Figure ?) is designated as Local Green Space where inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

### **POLICY SH4**

#### **HOUSING MIX & CHOICES**

Development proposals for new homes or alterations to existing buildings for residential use will be supported where they increase the supply in the neighbourhood area of:

- a. One to three bedroom homes;
- b. Financially more affordable homes including starter homes, shared ownership, and/or social rented family homes;
- c. Homes for people with local connections, when affordable housing is built, which meets the criteria set by Hertsmere Borough Council [reference] and which is provided in a tenure-blind mix;
- d. Homes and developments for more mature households (55+), elderly living alone and young families within walking distance of local amenities and community facilities;
- e. Self-build and custom-build homes; and/or
- f. Homes meeting Building Regulations Requirement Part M4 (Category 2)\* and Wheelchair user dwellings as defined by Building Regulations Requirement Part M4 (Category 3)\*.

### **POLICY SH5**

#### **CONNECTING SHENLEY VILLAGE**

- a. Development proposals should, where appropriate:
  - i. Support delivery of improved walking, cycling and public transport accessibility identified in Map (x), including walking and cycling routes through the land west of London Road and Porters Park, and between Radlett, Borehamwood, Shenleybury and Shenley.
  - ii. Support development and /or improvement of community facilities, shops, offices and employment uses at the Key Locations identified in Map ? and the associated provision of green/open space and a new village square with pond and play facilities
  - iii. Reinstate and contribute to the maintenance of water features such as ponds located within the application site area and make water features a fully accessible public amenity wherever possible.
  - iv. Avoid any significant impact on the Key Views identified in Map ? and described in [where described]
- b. The delivery of improved walking, cycling and public transport accessibility and the strengthening of the Key Locations should be a priority for Community Infrastructure Levy expenditure.



# POLICY SH6

## COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

- a. Development proposals which retain or improve existing local community infrastructure shall be supported.
- b. Development proposals which would have a significant impact or result in the loss of existing local community infrastructure should demonstrate that:
  - there is no longer any significant need or demand for the existing community facility; or
  - the existing community infrastructure is no longer economically viable; or
  - the proposal makes alternative provision for the relocation or reprovision of the community infrastructure to an equally or more appropriate and accessible location within the Parish which complies with the other development plan policies.
- c. The existing local community infrastructure addressed in this policy includes:
  - The White Horse, pub/restaurant
  - The King William IV, pub
  - Novita restaurant
  - Orchard Tea Rooms, Shenley Park
  - Shenley Park Facilities, the Walled Garden and Tennis Courts
  - The Post Office
  - [Pond area and Pound Green near the Pond] [is this community infrastructure?]
  - Shenley Primary School
  - Clore Shalom School
  - Gateway Doctors Surgery
  - Gingerbread Dental Practice
  - The Chapel, Shenley Park
  - The Village Hall
  - St Winifreds Hall
  - Shenley Cricket Club
  - London Colney Cricket Club
  - Well End Scout Activity Centre
  - Arsenal Football Club Training grounds
  - University College London Sports Ground and Soccer Fields
  - Pursley Fields
- d. Development proposals that improve the quality and range of community infrastructure, particularly for young people and/or located in any of the Key Locations identified in Map (x), shall be supported where the development:
  - has appropriate regard to the Shenley Design Code, and
  - will not result in unacceptable traffic movements or impact on residential amenity, and
  - will not generate a need for car parking that cannot be adequately catered for, and

- is of a scale appropriate to the needs of the locality and conveniently accessible for residents of the village wishing to walk or cycle.

## POLICY SH7

### BUILDING FOR LIFE

Major development proposals should, where appropriate, demonstrate how they have had regard to the following:

- i. Connections - Does the scheme integrate into surroundings?
- ii. Facilities & Services - Does the scheme provide (or is it close to) community facilities?
- iii. Public transport - Does the scheme have good accessibility to public transport?
- iv. Meeting local housing need - Does the development have a mix of housing types and tenures that suit local requirements?
- v. Character - Does the scheme create a place with locally inspired distinctive character?
- vi. Working with the site and its context - Does the scheme take advantage of site characteristics e.g. topography, habitats etc.?
- vii. Creating well defined streets and spaces - Do buildings enclose streets and spaces and turn corners well?
- viii. Easy to find your way around - Is the scheme designed to make it easy to find your way around?
- ix. Streets for all - Are streets designed to encourage low vehicle speeds?
- x. Car Parking - Is resident and visitor parking sufficient and well integrated?
- xi. Public and private spaces - Will public and private areas be clearly defined?
- xii. External storage and amenity - Is there adequate external storage for bins, recycling and cycles?

## POLICY SH8

### LOCAL KNOWLEDGE FOR GOOD DESIGN

- a. Planning applications for major development should demonstrate how they have addressed the quality of design by:
  - i. providing a statement of how they have had regard to the Shenley Design Code supported by an illustrative layout that shows how the proposed development could be accommodated on the site, details of the scale, footprint, bulk and height of buildings and landscaping; and
  - ii. making appropriate use of tools and processes for assessing and improving the design of development, including collaborative, independently facilitated, design workshops which engage a cross-section of the local community early in the design process.
- b. Planning applications for major development that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community by providing the following information will be looked on more favourably than those that cannot:
  - i. An explanation of how a broad cross-section of local people, both in the immediate and the wider neighbourhood are likely to be affected by the development proposals;
  - ii. A record of the views expressed by local people and Shenley Parish Council; and
  - iii. An explanation of how the proposals have addressed the views, ideas and any issues or concerns raised by local people and the Parish Council.

++++ End of recommended policy wording++++

## 03 Key amendments to Shenley Plan



### 3.1 Introduction

Since the publication of the Draft Shenley Plan, a new National Planning Policy Framework has been published and Hertsmere Borough Council carried out a consultation on the site allocation for their New Local Plan.

### 3.2 Amendments

#### General points for review and plan improvement

1. Reduce the amount of text where possible.
2. Review of the use of shall, must, should, require, 'is expected', 'is supported', 'encouraged' in all policies and amend appropriately.
3. Explain more clearly that the Shenley Plan does not and cannot contain a significant site allocation due to the Green Belt status of much of the land in the Parish.
4. Explain more clearly the independence of a Neighbourhood Development Order process from the Neighbourhood Development Plan process
5. Introduction of 'Recommendations' for those proposals and initiatives that are important to achieve the vision and objectives of the Shenley Plan but lie outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan Policy.
6. Provide an update on the Local Plan evidence base including Call for Sites by the Local Authority
7. Add corrections and reference details as provided by stakeholders where possible
8. Strengthening the evidence base by adding more mapped information on landscape character, listed buildings, views, green and blue infrastructure, land uses.
9. Review clarity of text in policy justification sections
10. Introduction of a 'Shenley Design Code' to strengthen and detail the design quality requirements incl. diagrams.
11. Bring the Plan in line with new legislation, policy and guidance, principally the revised NPPF (July 2018) and make provisions to give stronger recognition of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan as a key strategy for sustaining a prosperous future in rural communities. This was suggested by Hertfordshire County Council in order to strengthen the Shenley Plan Policies and evidence base. Specifically, regarding biodiversity, Sustainable Drainage Systems including Design Guidance, projecting arable land and landscape character as well as rural amenity.
12. Final edit of grammar and clarity to be carried out.

#### Shenley Plan Vision & Objectives

13. Introduction of new objective to specifically conserve, protect and enhance the landscape character, visual amenity and views from and into the countryside.
14. A separate objective for a Neighbourhood Development Order as main delivery vehicle for growth in the Parish.

#### Shenley Policy 1 Rural Character (SH1)

15. Cover Village Area via Shenley Village Special Policy Area (now SH2)
16. Shorten the policy text and move elements into the supporting text as recommended through mock examination day session.
17. Develop a set of Design Codes with diagrams to illustrate how rural character can be achieved including more clarity regarding what is not permissible where possible
18. Highlight the role of a well-researched precedent study in meeting the requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning Order 2015 (as stated in Pegasus Group Representation submission, section 4.2)
19. Consider adding the emerging Vision for the Land on the West of London Road. Be aware of the challenges for and NDO in the Green Belt.
20. Retain support for Construction and Management Plan given the need for water and mineral protection as well as biodiversity and habitat protection, as well the expected need to reduce negative impacts from construction of homes promoted through the emerging Local Plan (incl. noise, air pollution, traffic impact etc.).
21. Protecting and enhancing local rural character is at the heart of the Shenley Plan. The Submission Shenley Plan to provide more evidence base and policy support based on suggestions made by Hertfordshire District Council. This to include Wildlife Sites, Landscape Assessment, Greenbelt Review Report content, Water Protection Zones as well as a new objective to specifically conserve and protect the landscape character and views. HCC highlights the support of Shenley Plan Objectives for Local Transport Plan Policy 1: Transport User Hierarchy, which states support for the creation of built environments that encourage greater and safer use of sustainable transport modes, with first priorities given to opportunities to reduce travel

demand, the need to travel and to vulnerable road users' needs (such as pedestrians and cyclists). The list of Community Priority Projects proposed as well as S7: Connecting Shenley ( Now SH%) are considered a good basis to start working with the team at Highway Authority. This specifically with regards to rural character of adoptable new streets, lanes and bridleways.

22. Policy support for the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and landscape character, including trees and hedgerows and other green infrastructure.

#### **Shenley Policy 2 Village Envelope (evolved into Special Policy Area)**

23. Replace policy with Special Policy Area for Old Village + CA+ Village Envelope (now SH2)

#### **Shenley Policy 3 Housing Mix & Choices (now SH4)**

24. No key amendments to Housing Mix & Choices identified

25. New SH3 Local Green Space Designation for 'The Spinney Woodland and connected hedge system as recommended through mock examination day session.

#### **Shenley Policy 4 Community Infrastructure Facilities (now SH6)**

26. Identify/map priorities in light of Community Priority Project if possible

27. Explanation of what 'loss of amenity value' might mean in policy terms

28. Support for publication of business case for facility as part of the pre-app consultation (new transparency on viability assessment of major development, NPPF 2019)

29. Check and monitor primary school provision over the next 5 years if possible and in relation to New Local Plan as it emerges. Currently, the assessed Parish housing need over the plan period (as of Aecom report) does suggest no substantial increase of primary school capacity required.

30. Simpler policy wording taking recommendations from mock examination day on board.

#### **Shenley Policy 5 Local Knowledge for Good Design (now SH7)**

31. Clarification in supporting text: Design and Development Brief will speed up the process of delivering a planning application and helps in improving design quality

32. References to new NPPF and Environmental Impact Assessment Requirements

33. Recommendations re New Local Plan, Statement of Community Involved and Local Validations List.

34. Keeping Design and Development Brief Requirement for major development proposals as a means to support design quality and ability to scrutinise design proposals adequately.

#### **Shenley Policy 6 Building for Life 12 Quality Mark (now SH8)**

35. Changes as recommended through mock examination day session.

#### **Shenley Policy 7 Connection Shenley (now SH5)**

36. Check Watling Chase Greenways Strategy

37. Add policy on Digital Connectivity

38. Local Views are taken out since not enough resources to produce evidence base. However, a study of landscape qualities added to policy section SH1

39. Add Movement Framework from Design Day as diagram showing principle links ( SC 12 Shenley Grange, Design Code Section) and

40. Consider creating a more clear map as part of showing Community Priority Projects more clearly.

41. Highlight links with Radlett Plan

42. Changes as recommended through mock examination day session.

43. Consider Green Space designations of Spinney and land along Footpath No 10 (now SH3)

44. Action: Setting up a task group with the HCC Highways with regular meetings to progress and package projects. (Amend S7.e and develop priority packages)

45. Explore Right of Way from Shenley Grange to Gingerbread House Dental and Health Centre/Shenley Park as part of future masterplanning process. There is reason to believe that there is an old Right of Way.

#### **Shenley Policy 8 Rural Edge (now SH2)**

46. See SH1 ( Design Codes) and SH2 Shenley Village Special Policy Area

#### **Shenley Policy 9 Rural Buildings**

47. Redraw typologies on page 72 / add cottage flat and mansion house

48. Simplify policy text and add illustrations as part of Shenley Design Principles & Code.

## Shenley Policy 10 Neighbourhood Development Order

49. Forms part of SH 2 Shenley Village Special Policy Area

50. Include Design Day Principles & Vision statements

# 04 12 Community Priority Projects

Minor amendments as of mock examination day and Steering Group discussion.

## Community hub (Policy SH5)

**Project** | A new Parish Council Office with public computer and printers lab, flexible co-working space, meetings space, storage and a community cafe located along London Road.

**Project** | Replacement of the old sports pavilion in Harris Lane

## Improving the walking and cycling environment in and around the village (Policy SH5)

**Project** | A Speed Reduction Scheme on London Road, Black Lion Hill, Porters Park Drive and Radlett Lane incl.

safe pedestrian and cycle friendly junctions and crossings

**Project** | Making Andrew Close Parade/ Gingerbread House gyratory system more pedestrian and cycling friendly for all ages incl.

safe pedestrian and cycle friendly junctions and crossings

**Project** | Making London Road around the Primary School and the White Horse Pub pedestrian friendly for all ages incl. safe pedestrian and cycle friendly junctions and crossings

## Outdoor sports and leisure facilities

(Policy SH6, SH5)

**Project** | An exercise nature trail around Shenley with simple exercise stations made out of fallen tree trunks etc. for all ages and levels. New routes from London Road to the Spinney to encourage circular walks and runs.

**Project** | A pond dedicated for use by dogs (dog beach) in the village centre.

## Play and sports facilities for children and youth (Policy SH6)

**Project** | Re-use of sunken tennis court for 5-a-side and other games

**Project** | Play areas integrated in new/improved village greens

**Project** | Playground on Andrew Close Green for a wide range of ages

## Digital Connectivity (Policy SH5)

**Project** | A network of boosters for much improved mobile phone reception until fibreoptic becomes an option.

## Public Transport (Policy SH5)

**Project** | Feasibility study for a regular shuttle bus to local train stations and essential services

## **05 Appendix**

**A) Regulation 14 - Survey Response:  
All Comments on Draft Polices**

**B) Basic Conditions Criteria**

# Q1: On the whole and on a scale from 1 to 5 to what extent can you support the draft Objectives and Vision in the Shenley Plan?

## POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.01 | Support of all you do.  |
| 1.02 | I support the objectives end version but not in that location.  |
| 1.03 | Fantastic clever. Thank you for all your hard work. I think that the local residents might benefit from a really simplified synopsis because there is a lot to take in.   |
| 1.04 | Support all points, particularly pleased that along with 01,02,03 there is future development perceived in 06 and 07. Appropriate employment and business opportunities to be encouraged and creation of quality low cost housing and supported housing.  |
| 1.05 | Full support.   |
| 1.06 | The plan is built around the idea of future development being contained and not contributing towards further sprawl to the north east (which would be hard to contain thereafter) and also providing more facilities for the community at the heart of the village which I fully support.   |
| 1.07 | Fully support.  |
| 1.08 | In particular feel strongly about item 12 as heavy-laden lorries make my bedroom vibrate making the foundations a worry. Needs speed reduction coupled with cameras.  |
| 1.09 | A very thorough plan which if respected by developers, will result in high quality, restrained and sympathetic development.   |
| 1.10 | It aims to retain the feel and characteristics of the village and also takes in to account the future needs of the local population.  |
| 1.11 | I fully accept that the plan accepts we do need to develop but in a controlled manner. It retains the charm but provides housing and improves what we have already.   |
| 1.12 | I support all the objectives and the vision.  |
| 1.13 | Overall, a well thought-out and evidence supported plan.  |
| 1.14 | I agree with all the draft Objectives and Vision other than no. 08: the "new rural edge to the western part of the village."  |
| 1.15 | There needs to be more housing however it is the impact that needs to be managed which I believe the PC are trying to do.   |
| 1.16 | We fully support the plan in order to protect the village from unsympathetic over development and subsequent erosion of the greenbelt by Hertsmere Borough Council. We think it is vital to protect the rural character of the village.   |
| 1.17 | Very important to retain village feeling.   |
| 1.18 | I accept that some development is inevitable, but as I can't really support any significant development of our village. Some controlled development is better though, with consent of people who live in village.   |
| 1.19 | I will not live to see achievement of Objectives and Vision. Marvellous prospects. Excellent plan in hand.  |
| 1.20 | Glad that village life will look to be retained but still allows improvements.  |
| 1.21 | Very ambitious!   |
| 1.22 | I support the draft objectives & vision for Shenley, particularly the suggestions for architecture for any new housing. If there has to be development within the village, it must be in keeping with the rural nature of the old village. The houses within the Porters Park development was not in keeping with the old rural village.  |
| 1.23 | As I am staunchly against any development in or around the village, it is difficult for me to give a 5-star response, but I am conscious of the tremendous effort that the Steering Committee and others have put into investigating the best options for the village under the cloud of potential development. It is clear that the plan to extend the village envelope is a strategic move to have some level of control over any future development and this is to be applauded, but I would like to think that all efforts will be made into preventing ANY development on our doorsteps. |

## 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.01 | Not the what that's objectionable so much as the WHERE  |
| 2.02 | Wrong area being recommended for development, no discussion or vote on what is the right site.  |
| 2.03 | Shenley is too rural a village for any housing, school, doctors and roads.  |
| 2.04 | I am really worried our existing infrastructure of roads, schooling, health, Emergency services will not cope and there will not be sufficient increase for the expansion. Our roads are like a car park during rush hour.  |
| 2.05 | As a newcomer to Shenley, I fully support the survey to maintain Shenley as a village with all its present attractions.   |
| 2.06 | The proposal is ill-thought out and serves no practical use whatsoever. The main issue is traffic flow and access to Radlett and M25!   |
| 2.07 | Not clear how this would actually happen if at all.   |
| 2.08 | Already increase 180% last 20 years - no promised infrastructure, no real fresh intro 1.15 "Material considerations" Rev. so far not sympathetic to traditional village of Black Lion. Nursery Close - psychologically gated housing. Nightmare traffic London Road.  |
| 2.09 | I believe the draft will spoil the centre of the village and what has been the centre for a great many years.   |
| 2.10 | Site allocation is a problem for me. Only one option! Seems like someone (or persons) is benefiting from this.  |
| 2.11 | Without question the team are trying their best and have good intentions however the Objections and Visions don't seem as yet to have fully taken on board the real feeling of the village residents or assessing the various opportunities.  |
| 2.12 | Traffic will be a nightmare.  |
| 2.13 | I do not agree with proposed site. The village existing infrastructure cannot accommodate its building or future existence.   |
| 2.14 | The plan says "We want to achieve that by managing traffic speed, volume, noise and poor air quality generated by the large number of through traffic." I want to point out that speed bumps cause significant increases in noise and air quality by making vehicles slow down and then speed up again. Please do not encourage more of these to be built in Shenley, and preferably encourage the removal of the ones on London Road.  |
| 2.15 | Full of vague & admirable intentions. Reminds me of 'Securing a good future for Shenley', which never even started to completely fulfil its provisions & which were legally adopted by & after a public enquiry, yet many were not implemented.   |
| 2.16 | Recognise that Shenley needs more housing but want alternative locations.   |
| 2.17 | 4, 5 and 6 are lower priority.  |
| 2.18 | Main concern is road infrastructure.  |
| 2.19 | I have lived in Shenley for 36 plus years, I bought here for the peace and village life. Porters Park ruined that and now further development will ruin the village forever.  |
| 2.20 | Not as Nimbyism but why Shenley and not somewhere else in Herts? The village has grown massively - Porters Park, Old Garden Centre, Black Lion Development, Nursery Close and now the new development just beyond the White Lion roundabout with more being built. The train line is already at or above capacity the small country roads wont be able to take the extra traffic without widening them, which will destroy more of the rural feel, not to mention the extra pollution. Where will the kids go to Primary school how will they get to secondary school? Trying to get a doctors appointment at the moment can takes weeks. The one supermarket already has issues with stock. I can go on. It is not been made clear in any logical way why the burden falls on Shenley? Given the developments I have mentioned I think the area has done its fair share. |
| 2.21 | The provision of council offices for community/storage is a very low priority as there's plenty of provision for this at the village hall/the chapel/Methodist church and in the future St Martins. By proceeding with this you will reduce their income, which they rely on, so it is in my opinion short-sighted and clearly a vanity project.  |
| 2.22 | Given Britain's exit from Europe and likely tariffs on imports, it will be vital to retain the ability to farm land, and not just build houses on our land. Central Government is likely to change its view on arable and dairy farming once the effects of Brexit are felt.  |
| 2.23 | Will all depend on the detail!  |



### 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.01 | I suggest adding the word "Parish" to the plan title (replacing neighbourhood) so it is clear it covers the whole Parish and not just the village. Use of the word "neighbourhood" does not define what areas the plan covers and is currently comes across as excluding Porters Park and areas outside of the old village (like Shenleybury). |
| 3.02 | Objective S9 contains contradictory objectives.  |
| 3.03 | I think the emphasis regarding traffic is purely based on London Road and Porters Park Drive, little attention has been given to Woodhall Lane, especially as this one of the busiest entrance/exit points to the village and has been the scene for many accidents due to speeding and a dangerous long drawn out bend in the road.           |
| 3.04 | Strengthen Objective 2 by adding the following text after "biodiversity": "aligning decisions with the findings of HBC Green Belt Assessments."  |
| 3.05 | Many of the facts in the draft, are not accurate and are misleading for the village.   |

## Q2: On the whole and on a scale from 1 to 5 to what extent can you support the Draft Shenley Plan Policies?

### 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1.01 | Great.   |
| 1.02 | Very impressed !   |
| 1.03 | Full Agreement.  |
| 1.04 | Sound design and rural planning rationale.   |
| 1.05 | Fully support.   |
| 1.06 | I support the fact that we need to maintain some input into what happens and where in our village.   |
| 1.07 | Policies are clear, thought out and ambitious.   |
| 1.08 | All great but the Parish council (and the locality community) will have to spend a lot of time for examination compared to the cursory process of discussion at an average P.C. meeting. |
| 1.09 | They protect but look to the future too.   |
| 1.10 | Again, I can support all except S9, due to the contradictory policies.   |
| 1.11 | We do support these but the development of the west side of London Road needs very careful management particularly in relation to transport.   |
| 1.12 | If we have to build then I guess its the best out of a bad bunch.  |
| 1.13 | I do support the draft plan and the need for development but the draft plan has many inaccuracies.   |
| 1.14 | Easy to follow, the policies drafted so carefully, thoroughly deserve to succeed.  |
| 1.15 | Plans seem sensible even though further development is unfortunately going to end up occurring.  |

### 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.01 | Do not want business premises in Shenley. The housing will not be affordable. Traffic problems will get worse.   |
| 2.02 | Again not in that location where there are other locations nearby which will not affect the village so greatly.  |
| 2.03 | We are particularly anxious to ensure that present and future infrastructure minimises the traffic which is extremely noisy at present without the addition of more. |
| 2.04 | No infrastructure support.   |
| 2.05 | Feel builders/developers monetary interests override existing villagers views - Porters Park 1.62 "dense urban development with many inherent problems"              |
| 2.06 | I do not agree with the proposed site. More option should be given.  |
| 2.07 | Site allocation is a problem for me. Only one option! Seems like someone (or persons) is benefiting from this.   |

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.08 | I do not agree with a single choice of proposed site in this manner and especially the chosen location west of London Road.  |
| 2.09 | Don't feel that other smaller opportunities have been considered.  |
| 2.10 | There is a need but not on the proposed site due to the access to this site and the current state of the roads and pavements.  |
| 2.11 | The proposed sites would ruin the old part of the village.   |
| 2.12 | I can support only some of these Policies I cannot accept S2, I accept S3, but not S4 as the list has not included The Spinney and the Thatched Cottages in Woodhall Lane (where I live) and refers to Policy S7, which I do not accept because of the proposed location. .  |
| 2.13 | Once again the emphasis seems to be concentrated on "New Shenley" which was a disaster in itself. There is a danger that these new plans will continue that trend making Shenley even less like a village.   |
| 2.14 | Only as opposition to the development that could be imposed on us.   |
| 2.15 | I do not support the idea of development between Shenley Spinney and London Road as it will have a huge impact on the current residents on London Road and Woodhall Lane and bring more traffic through the centre of the village. Shenley does not have the infrastructure to support any more development as traffic is already an issue. Development below the footpath & in the fields opposite Porters Park on Radlett Lane would be a better option in my opinion as it would have less impact on the centre of the village. |
| 2.16 | Big concerns with even higher traffic levels on London Road plus access to the development area west of London Road.   |

### 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.01 | More could be said about provision of car parking and not paving over front gardens/requirement to use natural hedging or post and rail etc. |
| 3.02 | Some concerns/suggestions over policies S2, S3, S4 and S5.   |
| 3.03 | I would like to know how many dwellings and people expected in new development and therefore plan numbers for local facilities.              |

## Q4: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support draft POLICY S1 Rural Character?

### 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.01 | Keep Shenley green !  |
| 1.02 | Full support.   |
| 1.03 | Fully support.  |
| 1.04 | Rural character should be maintained.   |
| 1.05 | I support maintaining the rural character of Shenley village by extending what was the hospital site (including hospital housing northwards).       |
| 1.06 | Fully support - love the new buildings that have gone up which are in keep or add value to the local area.  |
| 1.07 | Very important.   |
| 1.08 | This is a rural area, it needs to remain so. We have farming here, keep it that way.  |
| 1.09 | I support the Draft Shenley Plan Policies except for e: "Major Development at the edge of the village", which will have a major impact on our home. |
| 1.10 | Yes - however cost will be an issue if it is all to be 'affordable' what can be done to ensure recycled, organic etc is cheaper.                    |
| 1.11 | I support the rural character draft policy.   |

### 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.01 | Policy wants to destroy rural character.   |
| 2.02 | I WILL NOT support this proposed envelope and new site for housing and think there are MUCH BETTER |

|      |   |
|------|---|
|      | options that should be proposed.  |
| 2.03 | Not on the proposed site. Also the Shenley Plan (Draft) S4a makes no mention of the existing of the existing Grade 2 and other listed buildings of historic importance.   |
| 2.04 | We had a rural character until the NHS destroyed the hospital allowing development of poorer homes (Admiral Homes),and endless 1800mm panel fences facing Porters Park Drive.   |
| 2.05 | There is a danger that this will just light the fuse, encouraging developers to pressurise the village to become even bigger.   |
| 2.06 | How can the rural character, be possible by having 220 houses on one site, the village were told we would have small sites.   |
| 2.07 | The draft shows understanding and healthy respect for Shenley's history.  |
| 2.08 | Its a sticking plaster intended to placate, hide and reassure. The issue is not how pretty the houses look or the type of housing/Street furniture it is this continuous march of expansion of building that is the issue. Shenley is being eroded and destroyed. |

### 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.01 | The buildings you show on p80/81 are not in keeping with the village and look like offices and light industrial.   |
| 3.02 | Adapted where necessary for 21st century. Some times principle of simplicity. Use of sun, wind, rain and adaptable for all age ranges and changes.   |
| 3.03 | Can there be stronger guidelines about not paving over front gardens (a'la garden city/Hampstead Garden Suburb)?   |
| 3.04 | Housing suggested 500 over next 15 years - need to know EXACTLY where proposed sites are.  |
| 3.05 | Needs to cover bigger area including the original nurses cottages in and around North Avenue rather than central village. Not representing the most populated areas.   |
| 3.06 | Hedge boundaries rather than walls or fences.  |
| 3.07 | This policy if taken to extreme, would only see timber framed, thatch cottages built in future. Allowance needs to be made for architectural elements after 1950.  |
| 3.08 | We think that this has been covered very well in the plan especially with regard to the types of buildings proposed. However, we are particularly concerned that any development, however sensitive, erodes wildlife and the natural environment. We would want to see very stringent rules applied to the felling of long established trees and that the finished result is landscaped sensitively and appropriately so as to encourage the return of wildlife. |
| 3.09 | Rural is the most important word with this new development plan and saving the green belt and nature   |
| 3.10 | Must maintain our distinct rural character   |
| 3.11 | Great ideas to protect the image of the village but I don't understand how this can realistically be done along London Road when the plan also proposes building hundreds of houses near to it.  |
| 3.12 | Once again there is a picture of the thatched cottage, apparently in "Green Street". This factually incorrect it's in Woodhall Lane, is this yet another instance of ignoring Woodhall Lane especially with all the maps that are available. Whilst the Nursery site is given as a good example the Charrington Close one that was allowed is the complete opposite it the proverb always "Blott on the landscape".  |
| 3.13 | When Porters Park was built it was done so on the edge of the original village, using PPD to link the new development with the old village. Further developments should take this into account which will have the effect of preserving the original village.  |
| 3.14 | Charrington Close as a new development in the heart of the Village doesn't look anything like the older properties this plan is keen to emulate.   |
| 3.15 | One of the biggest new developments is not mentioned - Charrington Close - most visible development in the village and not in keeping at all with an old rural village.  |

# Q5: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S2 Village Envelope?

## 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1.01 | Agree it must be retain Green Belt status.   |
| 1.02 | <b>Agree.</b>  |
| 1.03 | Fully support.   |
| 1.04 | If it proposes that future development should be west of London Road and not further 'sprawl' to the east then I am in support.  |
| 1.05 | As above I would support if area expanded and not so elitist.  |
| 1.06 | This is a great idea. I'd never really thought about this apart from always feeling how difficult it is to move around the village on foot. Let's make this a friendly useful village. |
| 1.07 | In an ideal world I would want this to happen but will short term outweigh longer term?  |
| 1.08 | We support this wholeheartedly as any development within it is controlled by the Parish Council and, by extension, the villagers.  |
| 1.09 | Yes it seems balanced.   |
| 1.10 | Yes I agree with policy, but I don't agree with retaining it in the green belt.  |
| 1.11 | Assuming no building between dotted blue line and line of blue dashes on the Envelope Plan.  |
| 1.12 | Change called for; proposal seems to me to be reasonable.  |
| 1.13 | Design work required to see how it works out. In principle a good approach.  |
| 1.14 | Extending envelope is a good way of minimising other developments.   |

## 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.01 | Access to London Road a concern- will be fine as long as access route done well.  |
| 2.02 | Wrong site being promoted. No proper road access for new development.   |
| 2.03 | This makes no sense at all. Any development should be at the Southern edge near Pursley Farm or on the London road adjacent to Clore shalom School to give access to M25, Radlett.  |
| 2.04 | Shocked at Porters Park being removed. I believe it needs to connect more with New village and have access to Radlett Lane. Not all traffic having to in and out of London Road, then halt !  |
| 2.05 | Where will the new houses have access to London Road ? If it is to be at the junction with Harris Lane - I object strongly. The traffic is excessive now, and will only get worse.  |
| 2.06 | Swallows up Green (not brown) space.  |
| 2.07 | It is a MASSIVE development - Not welcomed ! 1.92 Hertsmere Borough Council "will include the release of Greenbelt". 1.39"Heavy traffic.....detracts from environmental quality and attractiveness of area". 2.18 sites not identified formally until Sept'18 is hard to respond in detail. |
| 2.08 | Extending building westward will spoil the rural atmosphere of the village.   |
| 2.09 | I WILL NOT support this proposed envelope and new site for housing and think there are MUCH BETTER options that should be proposed.   |
| 2.10 | I do not like the location of the proposed village envelope - more option please?   |
| 2.11 | Do not agree with the change to extend the village envelope - mainly location.  |
| 2.12 | The area west to London road has outstanding natural beauty, which will be lost by this project and convert Shenley from a rural village to a built up small town feel.   |
| 2.13 | This is fundamentally flawed.   |
| 2.14 | Not on proposed site. The site is enclosed and will encourage more traffic and pollution into the heart of the village. Porters Park has the open space to facilitate development.  |
| 2.15 | To what extent does that reduce threat of development on proposed sites outside the extended village envelope. Key issue as the local infrastructure eg roads, schools make the scale of mooted housing development completely unsustainable and unacceptable.                              |
| 2.16 | Do not support building major development on greenbelt land especially that identified.   |

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.17 | I can't support this policy as I object to the proposed location of the development.   |
| 2.18 | No development is preferred, or as unobtrusive as possible to our village character.   |
| 2.19 | If there has to be new development within the village, then I feel that any new development should be an addition to Porters Park estate or in that area as this is the more urban part of the village. I do not support new development within the old village due to the impact this would have on residents who have lived in the village for many years. |
| 2.20 | Can't support because this is coming across as a toe in door process, which in the end the property vultures will use to their own end.  |
| 2.21 | The envelope is being extended too widely. IT should be 50% smaller so that it extends West of London Road by half of what is being proposed.  |

### 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 3.01 | Area to west of 'Old Shenley' has great natural beauty and visitors. Particularly from Shenley Park, Porters park, the Spinney and footpaths.   |
| 3.02 | It is still unclear to me if there are not too many risks with doing this. What if the site turns out to be not viable ?  |
| 3.03 | Would have liked a bigger map 52 with street names indicated as we are new to the area.   |
| 3.04 | Green belt should be kept.  |
| 3.05 | Land allocation for new houses development should be fairly spread between all relevant owners wishing to develop their sites.  |
| 3.06 | Be imaginative, allowing small-scale development, rather than allowing 1 or 2 developers benefitting from land sales which otherwise they wouldn't be able to due to Metropolitan Green Belt restrictions.  |
| 3.07 | Seems like a large extension but seems sensible to have boundaries.   |
| 3.08 | I understand the reasoning as to why the area west of London Road has been proposed, but it means building on an area that is not farmland and I imagine is a bit of a wildlife haven, which seems a shame. It is nice having a wider area centrally in the village and I would think this would help with reducing air pollution.  |
| 3.09 | The only problem I see is that will become a toe in the door for the developers and property speculators to continue to rape and pillage our village.   |
| 3.10 | We agree with the proposed extension to the Village Envelope but are concerned about the current wording in the last sentence of 2.8 which leaves us too vulnerable to further development in other areas. We suggest the following text: "However, the only sites for development should lie within the extended Village Envelope and these will meet the development needs of our village."   |
| 3.11 | Didn't really understand need detail of number of homes and numbers of people.  |
| 3.12 | Porters Park Estate should be protected too.  |
| 3.13 | The maps I have seen do not seem to have an accurate key? Or at least one I can understand. Just a series of 3 blue dots which each of the 3 looking identical yet meaning 3 different things. The language used is also worryingly and deceptively vague, pertaining to give guarantees whilst simultaneously giving the ability to circumvent the supposed protections. The more I read it the more it looks like a dishonest and misleading salve disguising large scale future development. |
| 3.14 | Cannot support this until we understand where access roads will go. Specifically, we do not support a new road between 43 London Road and Charrington Close.  |

## Q6: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S3 Housing Mix & Choices?

### 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.01 | Excellent.  |
| 1.02 | Agree.  |
| 1.03 | Fully support.  |
| 1.04 | More social housing for elderly/disables required. AFFORDABLE housing for youngsters so they don't move |

|      |  |
|------|--|
|      | out of the village.  |
| 1.05 | Over 55 + retirement properties integrated with family properties an essential element.  |
| 1.06 | Preferably new buildings will be of a reasonable size ie as per Gibbs buildings on the Bonzai site not Octagan buildings on the Garden Nursery site.   |
| 1.07 | There should be a greater mix .... there is demand for all types of housing in all size and price brackets ...   |
| 1.08 | It is imperative that any new homes are affordable.  |
| 1.09 | I support S3.  |
| 1.10 | Essential for affordable, smaller, accessible homes to be built instead of larger properties.  |
| 1.11 | The emphasis should be on affordable housing with some sort of caveat that they could only be sold once the owners had lived there for a prescribed amount of time.  |
| 1.12 | Support but not sure how this will continue as people will enjoy the first benefits and the sell on.   |
| 1.13 | Support the policy. However, Policy Intent should include the word "sufficient", i.e. "Ensuring that housing development includes sufficient smaller..." and S3.2 is unclear and needs to be reworded.   |
| 1.14 | We need more assurance that any development earmarked as "affordable" housing or social housing, will retain this status and cannot be sold on privately.  |
| 1.15 | I agree. But on the d/day one of the land owners said this sort of housing would degrade the village which is wrong.   |
| 1.16 | I agree with the suggested mix and do not support "social housing" for the sake of it - as an instrument of welfare it is unfair, unsustainable and unrealistic.   |
| 1.17 | Smaller more affordable houses & flats needed.   |
| 1.18 | Key concern is that "affordable housing" will be left to social housing and not smaller private dwellings for 1st time buyers or retired downsizing - as developers granted planning permission will always seek to build the biggest and most expensive properties they can for excess profits. |
| 1.19 | Totally agree that more downsizing properties are required for older members of the community.   |

## 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.01 | Ugly house design p80/81. Not affordable. Will be built for incomers. Social housing put into central pool.   |
| 2.02 | Don't want any, except small bungalows !  |
| 2.03 | More houses more crime more traffic more pot holes more road deaths.  |
| 2.04 | No "Self build homes" for Shenley please - v.strict controls over developments needed.  |
| 2.05 | I do agree with more self-build projects but also believe we need bigger homes.   |
| 2.06 | I don't think cheaper/social housing will mix with the current community at all, there is plenty social housing in Borehamwood. Cheaper housing will likely create more young anti-social behaviour   |
| 2.07 | Reduced housing development.  |
| 2.08 | No more huge houses - we are turning into Radlett!  |
| 2.09 | I do not believe that your definition of affordable will be anything of the sort. Why not build social or council housing to actually help the people in need rather than letting developers build more unaffordable houses for the rich.                                     |
| 2.10 | You have no hope of choosing the mix, a private developer will build what is most profitable. smaller more affordable houses & flats needed   |
| 2.11 | Overall the record is poor throughout the village at all levels, destroying the village's country feel, it's now become a money pot for property developers and people generally trying to make a fast buck, unfortunately some of our residents are included in that number. |

## 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 3.01 | I would add work shop/ small commercial/ business opportunities.  |
| 3.02 | More larger homes needed to allow 2nd time buyers to move - they are stuck in their first homes. Making supply for 1st time buyers a problem. As a result people are looking at extensions instead of moving. |
| 3.03 | Small scale housing may bring with it more social problems and may lower the existing balance of small and large houses.  |
| 3.04 | Is this a typo- 'to self build plots' - should be 'for'?  |
| 3.05 | These have to be useful, more affordable houses. There is enough expensive stuff already!!  |
| 3.06 | A better outline of how many of each type of housing would be appreciated.  |
| 3.07 | Do need to see breakdown.   |

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.08 | There should be more luxury housing to avoid having areas that are less pleasing aesthetically.  |
| 3.09 | I cannot make up my mind about this.   |
| 3.10 | This is a difficult one to get right. Real demand is a starter and further research I suggest is needed. Why people move into Shenley, why they move away and why they stay. |
| 3.11 | Intuitively, 3-4 bedrooms would better meet the demands of families in the area.   |

## Q7: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S4 Community Infrastructure Facilities?

### 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1.01 | Fine ideas in principle can they be delivered.   |
| 1.02 | Support.   |
| 1.03 | Fully support.   |
| 1.04 | Really support this to bring the village back to life.   |
| 1.05 | Supported in principle but the list is too long and too restrictive.   |
| 1.06 | I support S4b .The Shenley Plan (Draft) S4a makes no mention of the existing Grade 2 and other listed buildings of historic importance.  |
| 1.07 | While a "high frequency" bus service is a nice wish, the current bus services in Shenley are to a much higher availability than many areas.  |
| 1.08 | This is important.   |
| 1.09 | Fully support building a brand new Primary School if possible; improving and expanding current one if not. Also, would welcome development that enabled elderly - and perhaps disabled - to live independently in their own homes, while receiving assistance where necessary. |
| 1.10 | We need more facilities to maintain village life.  |
| 1.11 | I agree with the identified facilities - but all "community" facilities should be inclusive, especially if funded by tax.  |

### 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.01 | I wouldn't agree to the loss of any of the community infrastructures as detailed in the draft plan.   |
| 2.02 | Largely not met.  |
| 2.03 | 4.14 New Primary School ? Where? 4.17 rebuilding Shenley school - should NOT be on Green Belt. The site will then be filled with housing !! No to refreshment hatch in Harris Lane Pavilion- there is a covenant on it restricting use to a specific age group.   |
| 2.04 | Grave doubts that infrastructure will be provided to match housing expansion.   |
| 2.05 | We lost a very good centre (King GeorgeV hall), on the hospital site. So if the powers that be deem that we do not need this, how the heck can we remake/ rebuild one now?  |
| 2.06 | Infrastructure already stretched to max. If New housing to be added infrastructure has to be improved.  |
| 2.07 | Improvement in bus services is very much needed. This is more important than retention of for example, Arsenal football training field, in my opinion. Seems strange to have these in the same policy.  |
| 2.08 | We need to keep what we have, although not that bothered about an expensive private dental practice. Not sure that enhances the village. However, more community based stugg e.g. the community hub be developed.   |
| 2.09 | It is essential that before any new properties are built that a better public transport infrastructure is provided to reduce the impact of traffic on the village.  |
| 2.10 | I cannot accept S4 as the list in S4a does not include The Spinney and the Thatched Cottages in Woodhall Lane (where I live) and refers to Policy S7, which I do not accept because of the proposed location.   |
| 2.11 | There is a danger that the suggestion of a Community Centre would have a detrimental effect on the income flows of the existing community groups and could prove to be a negative.  |
| 2.12 | Have some concerns about policy S4a, specifically do not believe that the 2nd indent on economic viability is appropriate and it should be deleted. For example, a community amenity such as the village hall may not always be fully economically viable but we would not want the lack of economic viability to allow |

|      |  |
|------|--|
|      | developers to develop the site or avoid meeting the requirements of the 3rd indent, i.e. relocation. We also suggest that the Shenley Park facilities should be expanded to include "all of the Trust's land" as this is included in the infrastructure. The whole emphasis of para. 4.12 is wrong and the wording needs to be changed. It currently suggests that "further large scale developments and future significant growth" would be acceptable if basic community infrastructures are upgraded appropriately prior to major development commencing. This is clearly not the case! |
| 2.13 | We are concerned about the volume of traffic coming through the village. There is a serious issue with speeding at both the orth and south exits of the village. What safeguards are proposed to control this in view of even more traffic with the proposed new development? Also, the provision of public transport is poor. It's not the links - they are good; it is the frequency of services. As stated in the draft plan, provision is particulalry poor in the evenings and at weekends. This needs to be addressed as people should be encouraged out of their cars.              |
| 2.14 | It is no use building houses if there is a poor bus service and inadequate schooling available.  |
| 2.15 | Better bus service from St.Albans to Borehamwood Station.  |
| 2.16 | Again if I have read this right if those things you highlighted are not commercially successful you can, without recourse, do as you wish with them. Surely this gives you the power to do what you wish and if so desired rip the heart out of the village if the amenity is not commercially viable. This is perditious and makes me fear for the future of our village.   |
| 2.17 | We need to think how to reduce the traffic through Shenley and enforce the 7.5T + lorries that drive through illegally.  |
| 2.18 | S4 presumes that a development is proposed. All efforts should be made to prevent development.   |
| 2.19 | Significant improvements to existing community infrastructure will be required to accommodate significant additional housing. Today the basic infrastructure used by ALL residents falls far short of supporting the current community population (roads, buses, cycle paths, crossings). By increasing the population by 8% and 15% to an already failing infrastructure will be a disaster - look at the NHS.  |

### 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 3.01 | Also do not want to lose fields by Pursley Farm where many local people walk.   |
| 3.02 | Would add allotments, fete field and play areas in Shenley and Shenley Park areas to be kept.   |
| 3.03 | What about a village cafe with subsidised rent and controlled prices ?  |
| 3.04 | How?  |
| 3.05 | Infrastructure must support any new building.   |
| 3.06 | I don't see that new site/s for community use is a priority - the Chapel and the Village Hall sites could provide greater land needs use.   |
| 3.07 | Conflicting info- why build a bigger school if it is not needed by shenley residents? If new school in borehamwood is opening that will mean even less kids attending!  |
| 3.08 | It is imperative that the ethos of the village is maintained. We also end to ensure that the VILLAGE remains a village and doesn't become a town.   |
| 3.09 | Should Harris Lane Playing Fields and the Allotments also be listed as amenities to protect?  |
| 3.10 | Some facilities such as additional healthcare must be given priority over others such.  |
| 3.11 | Not enough detail.  |
| 3.12 | Suggest more work required with priorities.   |
| 3.13 | Once again another example of Woodhall Lane not being included or mentioned when creating a safer/healthier environment, I suggest the authors need to look at an Ordinance Survey map or station them selves at the junction of London Road/Woodhall Lane during the rush hours. |
| 3.14 | I think more mention should have been made in the plan of the village hall. It is listed as something that should not be lost, but there is no mention about how much goes on in the village hall that I could find   |



## Q8: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S5 Local Knowledge for Good Design?

### 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.01 | Support.  |
| 1.02 | Fully support.  |
| 1.03 | Yes - as long as it does not slow the process down and cost money.  |
| 1.04 | I support S5.   |
| 1.05 | Comprehensive and correct.  |
| 1.06 | Support but will it happen?   |
| 1.07 | Much thought has gone into this in the plan and we like the proposals.  |
| 1.08 | There should be no question.  |
| 1.09 | A thoughtful design and minimal impact.   |
| 1.10 | Good idea if it's adhered to strictly and enforced, and not subsequently abused by our so called representatives. |

### 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.01 | I am not consulted. It will be a decision higher up anyway.  |
| 2.02 | Local knowledge has been completely disregarded in the past. 'Development briefs' are a waste of time. I've been through this process, spending too much "free time" with our village society, providing alternative plans, petitions, etc. To no avail.   |
| 2.03 | I can only accept Policy S5 in part, as no ALTERNATIVE SITES are being suggested, so the residents of Shenley Village are not being given a choice.  |
| 2.04 | Same issues. The language used has no effect. Nothing is guaranteed, everything is preferable and toothless there is no power of veto and no indication of what effect the views of the village will have. If you tell you when, how and where you are going to punch me, the advanced knowledge doesn't mitigate the pain caused by the blow. |
| 2.05 | Presumes that a development is proposed. All efforts should be made to prevent development.  |

### 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 3.01 | Will consultation be listened to?   |
| 3.02 | It is imperative that any design solutions should harmonise with the rural setting of the village?  |
| 3.03 | Need examples !   |
| 3.04 | Smaller houses (starter type) or 2 bedroom houses/bungalows for downsizing.   |
| 3.05 | What is the definition of a Major development ... if this is say 200 houses plus then possibly subject to refinement .... if 10- 100 units this is over kill, restrictive and prohibitive ..... needs re drafting and more thought .. |
| 3.06 | Is this strong enough? - Possibly greater influence by local residents - can we block things we think are bad for the village?  |
| 3.07 | The DDB needs a quality assurance process, e.g.a British Standards Institute (BSI) or RIBA standard or Design Review Panel sign-off to avoid situations like at Rest Harrow where the new houses are completely out of                |

|      |   |
|------|---|
|      | keeping with adjacent Conservation Area buildings.  |
| 3.08 | Buildings should complement existing homes etc.   |
| 3.09 | Those that actually live in the village are going to be better place to give local knowledge.   |
| 3.10 | As long as the whole of Shenley is notified and not those who only have emails.   |
| 3.11 | I am very keen that new buildings fit into the existing character of the village but also make use of design and technology e.g. to reduce fuel use and make the buildings adaptable. |
| 3.12 | Employ architects with local knowledge. Also have scope for modern innovative design not just traditional design.   |

## Q9: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S6 Building for Life 12 Quality Mark?

### 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1.01 | Good intentions who will police it. What will happen if quality mark not followed?   |
| 1.02 | Such a good idea! Houses to accommodate openness for young children, have privacy for teens and preferably space to support elderly relations within the home. |
| 1.03 | Agree.   |
| 1.04 | Fully support.   |
| 1.05 | Support.   |
| 1.06 | I support S6.  |
| 1.07 | Very important.  |
| 1.08 | I would expect nothing less.   |
| 1.09 | Support however not confident in plans to get commitment.  |

### 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.01 | Key themes :- little true integration, no good public transport.   |
| 2.02 | Somewhat ambivalent on this - may be too restrictive and effect delivery.  |
| 2.03 | Is "Outstanding" really necessary? How much of the rest of the village is "Outstanding"? Is this just creating unnecessary expense to essential development?   |
| 2.04 | I do not wish to see this policy and the Quality Mark to which it refers used as a tool to railroad through the development proposals.   |
| 2.05 | Reduced housing development.   |
| 2.06 | Advisory, beyond the control of the applicant. Same rhetoric. No safeguards no guarantees and no protections.  |
| 2.07 | Creating retail and commercial properties is a danger, because they are easily converted into homes that give them greater value on the property market. There is huge history of such premises having done to them. So how are you going to control that. |
| 2.08 | Presumes that a development is proposed. All efforts should be made to prevent development   |

### 03 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 3.01 | Not explained nor developer proof.  |
| 3.02 | To remember promises are made to be broken. BUT if you can bite back then the Plan is not a load of useless words.  |
| 3.03 | We need more properties which can be bought by local youngsters who grew up in Shenley but can not afford to move out of parental homes and have move away for financial reasons. |

# Q10: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S7 Connecting Shenley?

## 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.01 | Definitely support walking/cycling routes connecting Shenley with Radlett and Borehamwood.  |
| 1.02 | Improvements will be needed just not sure its the ones you propose.   |
| 1.03 | Creating a healthier and safer London road is paramount.  |
| 1.04 | Agree.  |
| 1.05 | Fully support.  |
| 1.06 | Infrastructure needed now and in the future.  |
| 1.07 | Very important this one. Sad to see how the developer/owner of most of the land to the north west of the village has already blocked access to long-standing paths, as well as stopping agricultural use of most or all of this land.   |
| 1.08 | Fully support very important we keep existing walkways such as 'Woodhall Spinney' and not loose nice views and panoramas.   |
| 1.09 | Support the walkways and cycle routes connecting Porters Park to Old Shenley Village.   |
| 1.10 | I see no down side, this has to be good and will help me in my every day movement around the village.   |
| 1.11 | I feel it is essential that cycling paths be created and public transport linking Shenley with Radlett and Borehamwood so that residents can get to the train stations without having to drive. Regular shuttle buses should be available, particularly during peak time travel.  |
| 1.12 | We offer here. One of us is concerned at the proposed site and how it will connect with the old village. The implications are huge for Woodhall and Radlett Lanes. How can we protect the rural nature of this site? However, both of us would prefer a development to happen here under the protection of a Neighbourhood Plan than to have unrestrained development on another sensitive site in the Parish under Hertsmere. Therefore, we give it our support. |
| 1.13 | Good for residents of Shenley, but not so good bringing people in from outer areas, more people, more crime.  |
| 1.14 | What a good idea to use requirement for new homes in a way that causes minimum disadvantage while at the same time creating the bonus of connecting up the village and providing new central facilities.  |
| 1.15 | Shenley must have be better connected, especially through better public transport, but shouldn't have to be only due to large scale development.  |
| 1.16 | I hope better safer pedestrian & cycling facilities will encourage less people to drive to the school, shops etc & so reduce the traffic issues. This would also encourage a healthier lifestyle.   |
| 1.17 | So long as you're talking about running footpaths/cycleways along London Road rather than building new roads which we do NOT support.   |

## 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.01 | If Site 4 was deliverable in its entirety then this could possibly create a connectivity benefit ..... however you will can't get away from the fact that porters park and site 4 is separated by shenley park / an orchard ... no roads / paths, no street lights etc etc .. in practice won't be an inviting route. In addition one will have to take on the dangerous task of crossing shenley hill / radlett lane. We understand that site 4 is currently 100% NOT |
|------|--|

|      |   |
|------|---|
|      | bliverable and as such there will be no connectivity ... the suggestion of using the footpath / bridle way in the pinny is farcical ... It appears that the plan is seeking to fix a problem that is not really a problem... people can walk and drive safely along Porters Park Drive and London Road to and from either the older or newer parts of the village ..  |
| 2.02 | The connectivity idea is flawed without correct infrastructure.   |
| 2.03 | I do not agree with the position of the spatial focuses.  |
| 2.04 | Do focal areas match where new housing is proposed? Porters Park junction near Black Lion already too busy.   |
| 2.05 | The Village Society tried to register a village green @ Shenleybury where Boswell Close/Bradley Gardens were built. Public enquiry at County Hall. Still to no avail - again!   |
| 2.06 | I do not support this location  |
| 2.07 | There's a danger of turning Shenley into a mini town.   |
| 2.08 | NOT STRONG ENOUGH. Other VIEWS should be protected, especially 1. from the park land at Ribston Close and the path beneath it (from Cow Banks Wood towards the Cricket ground) over countryside towards St Albans; and 2. from Woodhall Lane towards Shenley (Mansion House, Old Chapel, Park etc   |
| 2.09 | Green dot spatial focus has no detail or plans so it is impossible to know what it actually means? Walking paths and cycle lanes are great. But if you are dramatically increasing the size of the village then I fail to see how these new walking paths will have any discernible impact upon the massively increased traffic. This entire draft proposal reads like a sales document rather than an impartial piece of analysis. |
| 2.10 | Buses are not frequent enough especially at weekends and a more regular shuttle bus to and from Radlett train station would reduce car traffic during morning and evening rush hours.   |
| 2.11 | I was against the development of the hospital site and have no desire for the village to be 'connected' to it. The village is a unique place to live and should remain the idyll that we all enjoy, retaining all of its charm and character.   |

### 03 GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.01 | I would like to see the community facilities nearer the Porters Park area of Shenley. Connecting the two areas in more places.   |
| 3.02 | Again - we need to avoid further sprawl towards the M25 and encroaching on a working farm, well used footpaths and lovely views.   |
| 3.03 | Short of rebuilding the entire village and roads and sewers etc.   |
| 3.04 | View from Ribston Close park area also needs protecting.   |
| 3.05 | Clear disconnect between Porters Park and old village - Agreed need additional crossings on Porters Park Drive. Disapprove of development to west of village - movement to joining with Radlett.   |
| 3.06 | Connect Shenley if you want to make it resemble a large town, leave alone if you want to retain at least part of a village atmosphere.   |
| 3.07 | Will only work if Shenley is a village and people want.  |
| 3.08 | This was not evident at the design day, as the whole village envelope if adopted would have connected all of Shenley.  |
| 3.09 | Would footpaths be suitable for people in wheelchairs and on mobility scooters. Would they be safe with adequate lighting and seats?   |
| 3.10 | Is this financially feasible? Often there are buses with the driver and 1 passenger going through Shenley and problems with width of road to Radlett for large buses. We need safer cycle and pedestrian routes from Shenley.  |
| 3.11 | I feel that it is important to find a sympathetic way of further connecting Shenley, without losing the original village look and feel. If this is ignored then Shenley will eventually be absorbed into Borehamwood. There are many examples of where this has happened as "in-fill" sites are developed to the point of no further locations as 2 towns/villages become one. |

# Q11: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S8 New rural edges?

## 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.01 | Support the cordon, will it actually be enforced. Porters park cordon (cant read the word) reduced by half!   |
| 1.02 | Good idea as long as it still allows privacy and flexibility not too dogmatic. A few properties have put up high panelled fencing lately, which is very out of character for the village. |
| 1.03 | Support.  |
| 1.04 | Fully support.  |
| 1.05 | Fully support - open spaces very important for village.   |
| 1.06 | Whilst we can support the concept of developing rural edges, I strongly disagree with the development being located West of London Road.  |
| 1.07 | I agree in principal but not location. The Shenley Plan short (draft) S8.4b refers to to (figure 19). that is not in this draft.  |
| 1.08 | Seems fair and not restrictive.   |
| 1.09 | I support the policy in principle, but do not support development in this location.   |
| 1.10 | Agree but how enforced?   |
| 1.11 | These are absolutely vital with regard to this site.  |
| 1.12 | Nursery Close is a good example of what we should aim the achieve.  |
| 1.13 | This is vital, as without this the Green Belt land will be dissolved, and future mandates will be harder to fight against.  |
| 1.14 | The rural edge should be the priority for preservation, with any new development only possible within the current/new envelope.   |

## 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 2.01 | Don't support children playing in streets with slow moving cars - people will not drive slowly!  |
| 2.02 | Green land in better!  |
| 2.03 | Any development should be contained within the existing perimeter of the village at all costs avoid an urban sprall.                   |
| 2.04 | Play street sounds very unsafe. Better to keep children and old people well away from cars. There are too many bad drivers in a hurry. |
| 2.05 | Quart into pint pot.   |
| 2.06 | Tear down all the tall fences facing Porters Park drive, then I'll be satisfied with a 'rural edge'.                                   |
| 2.07 | Maintaining existing.  |

## 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.01 | 5 - 4b minimum 30m between boundary of envelope and open countryside - Promised that on Porters Park but ignored by developers interest on ramming as many houses as possible onsite - Density on plan not adhered to.   |
| 3.02 | 1 - I would replace 'picket' with post and rail. Picket fences can be used unsympathetically (as by my neighbour !) 10m is too little. A minimum of 30m in all cases.  |
| 3.03 | Hard to understand plan?   |
| 3.04 | Preserve/use/increase rural hedges an hedgerows.   |
| 3.05 | Will this be final? Or will it change once built up with the need for yet more housing in the future?  |
| 3.06 | Need to maintain distinct boundary for the village and individual developments within.   |
| 3.07 | Re: low hedges/fences - people are entitle to privacy in their homes and gardens.  |
| 3.08 | Yes if things are to built they should be built in a considerate way, however its just fluffery isn't it. We are going to massively develop your village changing it in scale beyond recognition, but don't worry we will make sure that the multitude of new houses look nice and have the same street lighting that you have. That's the summary. And the term Rural Edge actually means housing development doesn't it. That's borderline Orwellian in its fast and loose use |

|      |   |
|------|---|
|      | of the English language.  |
| 3.09 | What isn't mentioned is protection of trees and forestry - no mature trees or forests should be destroyed whatsoever. |

## Q12: On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support POLICY S9 Rural Buildings?

### 01 POSITIVE FEEDBACK

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 1.01 | Absolutely essential.  |
| 1.02 | Very comprehensive, glad sensible energy sourcing and sustainable urban drainage systems are included.   |
| 1.03 | Agree.   |
| 1.04 | Fully support.   |
| 1.05 | While I like the idea of Clause 9, half of the Parish or more have UPC or PVC windows so this seems a bit harsh. Especially as it is a cost effective solution for home owners.    |
| 1.06 | Fully Support.   |
| 1.07 | Some are rather quirky but may stand out in Shenley where the house designs are largely traditional. Not objecting to it but would want to see a detailed design / planning model. |
| 1.08 | I support S9.  |
| 1.09 | I would like to see more buildings like this.  |

### 02 CRITICAL OBSERVATIONS

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.01 | No upvc/pvc windows and door to be discourages – don't believe developers will take any notice. Some building will be allowed to be more than 2.5 floors in height. |
| 2.02 | Quite restrictive.  |
| 2.03 | Some proposals in this section are unrealistic.   |

### 03 GENERAL RECCOMENDATIONS

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.01 | If you are using designs on p80/81 as an example they are ugly and look like offices and light industrial buildings.   |
| 3.02 | Please, no aggressivley modern out of scale buildings towering over the rest of us.  |
| 3.03 | More gated communities ?   |
| 3.04 | The Borough Council seems to like black boarding-why? This is not appropriate as brick was/is the main material and if you want to see what can happen then look at Mimms Lane/ Earls Lane junction. Nursery Close was built on an open nursery site which was unsuitable for development outside of the village envelope?   |
| 3.05 | Having bought off plan in Porters Park, the wooden windows were high maintenance (had to be repainted every 3-4 years), weren't energy efficient, had poor security and rotted out after 8 years. Modern PVC windows and doors are indistinguishable from wood, offer high security, energy efficienct and are low maintenance. Subsection f and g of this policy could be considered to be in direct contradiction to each other. |
| 3.06 | But if it cheaper to build to templates???   |
| 3.07 | Any development has to be in keeping with existing buildings in village.   |
| 3.08 | UPVC windows are maintenance free required by older people and for affordable housing.   |
| 3.09 | Is is very important to maintain the rural look of the village.  |
| 3.10 | There should be a strict limitation on external lighting on properties. A particular bad example of this which clearly effects neighbouring properties visual amenity, if you take the two large houses at the back of Charrington Close, once a view of the surrounding countryside now rivals Blackpool Illuminations.   |
| 3.11 | Again this is vital if we are not to become "Milton Keynes" and retain the character of the village for the residents.   |
| 3.12 | How was the Barn allowed to be demolished in the plans for 25 Shenley Road?  |

## 05 Comments

The following table show the additional, comments, questions or concerns provided in the survey. They are split into 8 key areas;

01 Process  
(16 comments)

02 Site Location  
(22 comments)

03 Transport and Infrastructure  
(16 comments)

04 Housing  
(6 comments)

05 Development  
(10 comments)

06 Open Space and Natural Beauty  
(8 comments)

07 Village Character  
(6 comments)

08 Community  
(5 comments)

### PROCESS

|  |
|--|
| This is a great and very comprehensive piece of work, thank you for providing so much detail and information. This draft is a great "straw man" to get the community engaged and commenting. |
| Thank you for all your hard work.  |
| Thank you for all your hard work and time and commitment to Shenley  |
| This is a terrific document! Well written and sensibly explained. An awful lot to take in though! Well done to Nicky, Rosemary, and all concerned!   |

|   |
|---|
| Thank you to the volunteers working on this plan and I hope it succeeds   |
| Thanks to the people who pulled this document together  |
| I thought the plan was excellent and well conceived from start to finish. You are doing a fantastic service for our village. Thank You.   |
| I would like more information on the practicality/mechanics of the policies being enforced.<br>How willing will land owners for Site 4 be to sell at less than "market value"?<br>How willing will developers be to adhere to these policies?<br>What if one is not found--will HBC just over-rule our plan and go ahead and develop as they see fit because our Plan is un-workable?<br>Also, who enforces the Plan and makes sure developers adhere to all of the conditions so another Porters Park scenario does not happen?<br>If it is the SPC, do they have that level of expertise and if not, do they have the funding to get someone in who does?<br>Would the development of Site 4 be considered a major development and deliver items specified in Policy S7 and S8?<br>Lastly, I would like to thank the Shenley Parish Council for trying to get out in front of the development issue in the Parish and proactively protecting a lovely Parish  |
| For someone who doesn't understand things like this. The plan was not that easy to digest.  |
| You need to publicise the closing date of this survey, and if possible have people with clip boards asking the questions at Tesco's and the Post Office. Also provide copies and comment forms at the churches  |
| The concerns I have is that is that this NDO is being proposed with a small amount of villagers (under 50) that are fully involved and informed   |
| All the pledges seem to have got clauses.   |
| I refer again to this document following my e-mail of 10th September 2018 sent to clerk@shenleyvillage.org. I have since received opinion from my father, who was very involved with the production of the successful Wingrave with Rowsham Neighbourhood Plan, which is now made. He in turn asked for opinion from the Chairman of the Wingrave with Rowsham NP, and also the main architect of the successful Winslow Neighbourhood Plan, which is also made.. Taking the draft as it stands, all three are of the opinion that the Shenley Draft Neighbourhood Plan could well be flawed as a consultation tool, in that the consultation process does not have a clear trail, and seems to work through to a final site recommendation without taking views from the residents of Shenley on such a site.<br><br>Neither were the residents offered a choice of developing several smaller sites, which would have been more in keeping with the rural nature of Shenley, rather than one large site, or a real choice of sites. Villages develop piecemeal, and not in large blocks. Such large blocks tend to develop as separate sub-villages with little real connection to the village core.<br><br>They are of the opinion that the draft has a high chance of failing if it goes forward to the Building Inspector as it stands. They consider that a health check on the draft plan would be highly advisable before it becomes a pre-submission plan. An organisation which can do this is NPIERS. NPIERS are advisory examiners. A Consultation Statement will be required at pre-submission stage, and will need to show that the community is on board with principles of the draft, and the steps taken during the consultation address the concerns of the residents. If the community is not on board with the draft plan, there will also be a high likelihood of a failed referendum on the plan. |
| Policy document is so long it will discourage people from participating.  |
| There was in my opinion a very disappointing number of attendees to the recent meeting on the 13th and very very few of the attendees were from porters park / under 60... This is because at present all the development is going in the village and will only marginally affect them and hardly if they leave the village via Radlett / Bell Lane ...   |
| The design day was not carried out transparently... I did not know about it... 2 of the owners of site 4 were not even asked to be involved ... we understand it was paid for by the other 2 land owners ... why has there not or will there not be other design days for the other sites ... People need to be given the choice.... people need to make an informed decision with technical reports and all impacts considered ...   |
| You guys are doing great work and working extremely hard and as a villager I am appreciate ... I will continue to offer my help and advise and try to ensure that we can shape the future of the village in the   |



best possible way.

I will add that my wife and I are highly educated. My wife is an Architect RIBA. We have found this questioner to be very challenging. This may explain why you have had so few returns and we feel that any decision made on this survey does not represent the population of Shenley.

## 02 SITE LOCATION

The Shenley Neighbourhood Plan only offers us one proposed site. It suggests that we should build 200+ houses within the old Shenley Village envelope and the green belt. This would mean the loss of countryside, trees and vegetation.

The only access to the site would have to be from the narrow 2-lane country roads which are already overburdened with traffic: Radlett Lane. A tree lined 2-lane narrow road between Shenley and Radlett at the side of Shenley Park. London Road (the high street). A narrow 2-lane road with the school, 2 churches, the post office. 1 restaurant and 2 public houses. The only access would be by a narrow private road opposite the estate agency. Or by opening access on the footpath opposite the post office next to the White Horse pub. Woodhall Lane. A tree lined narrow lane leading to open countryside and to Green Street, between Shenley and Borehamwood. If used as access to the proposed development, it would mean destroying trees and countryside and increase damaging traffic pressure and would ruin the ambience and views of the ancient Spinney.

May we propose two alternative sites:

1. On page 6 of the Shenley Plan there is a picture of an open empty field. This site is between Harpers Lane and THE B5378 Shenleybury on the outskirts of Shenley village. Harpers Lane runs alongside the M25 and is built for heavy lorries that use it every day. B5378 runs from Shenleybury to the roundabout on Harpers Lane and at that point has ample open space on both sides of the road. Both Harpers Lane and the B5378 provide easy access to the site and would not involve the loss of trees. The site offers open space that easy access and enough space to build the suggested housing plus a new school, new roads, paths and cycle tracks and the amenities to support them.
2. Porters' Park is already a suburban development, with its own amenities and access points. Where the majority of Shenley's population live. It is also where most of the children live. There is room to develop it further, without any threat to the integrity of the older part of the village. A new school sited at Porters Park would serve all the young families living there and take some of the traffic pressure off London Road.

The Shenley Neighbourhood Plan has been presented to the community at three open meetings and the booklet has been produced and distributed at some expense. Why has it only produced one proposition that would destroy our village?

It appears that there is a desire to only seek to delivery Site 4 despite its delivery issues and lack of any technical reports or information to give the site any credence. At present its suggested that circa 180 units will be bought out directly onto London road near the primary school....

London road is already a highways hotspot both in terms of traffic and safety issues with these schools ... this is an ill thought out proposal. Its then suggested that another 40 units could come out on the point of site 4 and Radlett Lane ... this again is without any technical reports.

From a number of recent meetings I have attended and also conversations there is clearly strong feeling within the village that not all of the sites put forward have in fact been properly considered... It appears a decision has been made ...by the steering group and its now only about site 4.... Why is this? Why are other sites not being assessed or discussed with stakeholders? ...

How do you know they are not available for smaller numbers of units which you suggested.. Why at the local meeting on the 13th September did it appear that the Steering group and their consultant were trying to Scare monger the public that if it wasn't option 4 and it were another site then there could be hundreds or thousands more units proposed...

Why would it not be a more sensible idea to look at perhaps 3,4 or 5 sites.... Made up of 35 units x 2, 80

|   |
|---|
| units x2 still with delivery of whatever community facilities are needed ... these could be dispersed across different parts of the village thus widening the impact across various parts of the village and different access points rather than dumping it all in one place and impacting substantially on the Old Village which it will as presently proposed.  |
| We strongly support the objectives and visions of the Shenley Village Neighbourhood Plan, but are concerned that no alternate sites have been evaluated to any extent for future development. A detailed project such as this should provide a number of site options and highlight for each individual proposed site their strengths, weakness and feasibility, before concluding on a preferred option/options.   |
| I do not agree with the proposed site. Is Mr and Mrs Monk on the chair? Why is this the only option being pushed forward, when I believe it to be a very bad site and will be bad for the village? There are better sites on offer such as 8, 2 and 11 - keep it away from the main village and has better access.  |
| I agree with my partner's submission of this survey who I live with:<br>I am NOT happy with the single proposed site for housing currently shown on the Shenley Neighbourhood plan and will 100% object to it. I would like to see other proposals for positioning of new affordable homes.   |
| I have been informed that as a member of Shenley I can help choose the location of new housing which I would say should be placed in an area that will not increase the traffic so much in the old Shenley Village which is a problematic area.   |
| I agree with a proposal from many residents within Shenley that suggest that the area on Page 6 of the Shenley plan should be used for the new development. This is the area between Harpers Lane and the B5378 Shenleybury on the outskirts of Shenley Village. This is built for traffic, unlike the sections of road in the Old Shenley village area. The new builds would fit into the area next to Porters Park and the majority of young families live in this area. Access and space would be less of an issue and the character of Old Shenley would be left intact as well as the woodland countryside of Old Spinney. |
| There are many reasons to oppose the plan, but most importantly, the fact that only one site has been proposed is insulting. Give us a real choice in the plan of our future neighbourhood instead of steering us in one direction!   |
| Please consider:<br>1) any new building to take place north of the village along Harper Lane where building is already taking place and access roads already being laid.<br>2) Further extension of old hospital site (known as Porters Park) and include necessary shops, surgery, school etc between these 2 sites.<br>3) There is also Comer Land, north of the village, south of the Arsenal Ground.  |
| Main concern is the feeling that this is an add on to Old Shenley and it would be good if development has to happen that it connects closer to or in more ways with the Porters Park area, especially.  |
| The consultative process has concentrated on WHAT is to be developed and built rather than WHERE. Inadequate discussion or investigation of other areas   |
| Wrong area being promoted for development.  |
| In principle I support the draft plan but WHY choose ONLY ONE location! 10,000 vehicles travel through the village on a 2 LANE ROAD. The pavements are narrow and the traffic travels so fast along this road. Parking is already a problem. There is surely a SITE between Harpers Lane and the B5378 Shenleybury. The site has easy access and enough space to build all that is needed - houses, schools, roads and amenities without disturbing our village. PLEASE CONSIDER THIS OPTION!   |
| It's very unclear to me why site in the middle of an already very busy village is the recommended option, when there are much less intrusive sites such as to the north of the Porters Park development.  |
| I would like to see alternative sites proposed. In particular either side of the B5378 between Shenleybury and the Harpers Lane roundabout.   |
| Houses should be built at the other end of Shenley Porters Park/Harper Lane not ruin the old part e.g. Green Lane/London Road. I moved here 3 & a half years ago as I wanted to live in a village not a town. Hertsmere should build more in Borenhamwood or London Colney not ruin this village with a mass of houses.   |
| We obviously need to expand but why Shenley is under threat in such a way is very upsetting. Take a look at the brownfield sites all over Herts and these places have better transport!!!   |
| However The Shenley Neighbourhood Plan only offers us one proposal. It suggests that we should build 220 houses within the old Shenley Village envelope and the green belt. This would mean the loss of   |

countryside, trees and vegetation.

The only access to the site would have to be from narrow 2-lane country roads which are already overburdened with traffic: Radlett Lane. A tree lined 2-lane narrow road between Shenley and Radlett at the side of Shenley Park. London Road (the high street). A narrow 2-lane road with the school, 2 churches, the post office. 1 restaurant and 2 public houses. The only access would be by a narrow private road opposite the estate agency. Or by opening access on the footpath opposite the post office next to the White Horse pub. Woodhall Lane. A tree lined narrow lane leading to open countryside and to Green Street, between Shenley and Borehamwood. If used as access to the proposed development, it would mean destroying trees and countryside, add damaging traffic pressure to our Grade 2 listed Thatched Cottages (they have no foundations, so the vibrations from increased traffic are causing settlement cracks in the 200-year-old brickwork) and would ruin the ambience and views of the ancient Spinney.

May I please propose two alternative sites:

1. On page 6 of the Shenley Plan there is a picture of an open empty field. This site is between Harpers Lane and THE B5378 Shenleybury on the outskirts of Shenley village. Harpers Lane runs along side the M25 and is built for heavy lorries that use it every day. B5378 runs from Shenleybury to the roundabout on Harpers Lane and at that point has ample open space on both sides of the road. Both Harpers Lane and the B5378 provide easy access to the site and would not involve the loss of trees. The site offers open space that easy access and enough space to build the suggested housing plus a new school, new roads, paths and cycle tracks and the amenities to support them.
2. Porters' Park is already a suburban development, with its own amenities and access points. There is room to develop it further, without any threat to the integrity of the older part of the village. A new school sited at Porters Park would serve all the young families living there and take some of the traffic pressure off London Road.

The Shenley Neighbourhood Plan has been presented to the community at three open meetings and the booklet has been produced and distributed at some expense. Why has it only produced one proposition that would destroy our village?

I am very concerned about possible building behind Hamblings Close. Would not want access to be via Hamblings Close. It is a close and should remain so.

Strong objection to building behind Hamblings Close to Cow Banks Wood. New access should not be granted via Hamblings Close. It is a close and should remain so.

Strong objection to development behind Hamblings Close to Cow Banks Wood.

This "infilling" proposal is well planned. Building near the M25 is an awful idea.

The proposal of having this site located between old and new Shenley will marry old Shenley and porters Park should help to bring these 2 areas together better and therefore give Shenley more a feeling of being united.

If the development of a new garden village on the land at Bowman's Farm is anticipated and part of this is within Shenley Parish, could this not form part of the housing the village is expected to provide & so ensure less development within the village itself?

There should be LIMITED sympathetic infilling within the extended village boundary, but the proposed extension is too large. it should not extend all the way to the hedgerows or the spinney.

### 03 TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Not clear that there are any ideas/policies to reduce traffic volume. In fact, the proposal on extended village envelope looks set only to significantly increase it!!

Expansion of the village and surrounding areas should not exceed the number of homes which can be supported by existing infrastructure ie roads, schools, medical etc. We have no faith that the required supporting infrastructure for larger developments would ever be forthcoming and thus the quality/character of the area would be destroyed.

Traffic is already a major problem in Shenley. Not just on London Road but on the smaller feeder roads eg Rectory Lane which are not fit for current purpose and totally unsuited to any local development which results in increased traffic whether from new housing or other development.

|  |
|--|
| Do not want Hamblings Close to be an access road, It is by name a Close.   |
| I live on Woodhall Lane and experience a serious issue with traffic all day long. I can hardly back out of my driveway with the steady stream of 10,000 cars speeding through the Village.   |
| Not happy about revised 602 bus route which makes it difficult for less mobile people in "old" village to get to Watford or St. Albans. 658 not frequent enough.   |
| London road is going to be too busy !  |
| The ramps through London Road need taking out and replaced with speed cameras. Also zebra crossing needed to be put in place along London Road   |
| Mass building projects without extra infrastructure regarding roads.   |
| My main concern is how new development will impact on traffic. It seems ridiculous for new properties to be built in an area where there is very little public transport available. If there was a guarantee that cycle lanes and a good bus service would be provided to link with nearby train stations, I would then feel new development would be good for the village. I feel that before any new development begins a better transport infrastructure should be provided.  |
| Additionally, we desperately need a new school, new roads, footpaths and cycle tracks. Shenley has become a nightmare. 10,000 vehicles travel through our village each day on narrow 2-lane roads. The pavements are too narrow, there are not enough pedestrian crossings and the traffic travels too fast. There is not enough parking.  |
| I think the report has concentrated on the new estate and London Road, not enough attention has been given the other serious problems being experienced by Harris Lane parking, and Woodhall Lane in terms of access, dangerous speeding and traffic flow. There is an excess of very large, heavy lorries flowing through Shenley despite there being a weight limit in place. We have abundance of laws that are supposed to protect the village, including parking a blocking the pavement outside the school, none of which are enforced because the police don't have the resources to do it. |
| Road safety is a big concern for me. Extra traffic narrow roads and speeding cars through Shenley are issues that must be addressed realistically.   |
| Shuttle service to Radlett and Borehamwood stations.   |
| Our main concern is the traffic access / impact to London Road - we desperately need traffic calming measures to reduce speed and risk of accidents.   |
| Throughout this draft plan under the various headers regarding traffic control/ healthier living etc., there seems to be a distinct avoidance of including Woodhall Lane/ Green Street in the deliberations despite it being one of the main entrances and exits to Shenley with a dangerous bend, speeding traffic and a record of serious accidents.   |
| I have severe concerns at how/where access and egress roads would be sited within the extended village envelope, should a development get the green light. Egress from New Road is already extremely difficult and at times dangerous due to the increased volume and speed of traffic through the village.  |

#### 04 HOUSING

|  |
|--|
| We have significant concerns about the robustness of the housing need assessment conclusion that 220 houses are needed over the next planning period. This is a simplistic average of the only 3 assessments that vary very widely (0, 220 and 440). Further assessments are needed to provide a more robust average figure.   |
| More housing of all types are needed.  |
| May I comment on and question the Shenley Neighbourhood Plan. I agree that we need more housing, especially affordable homes for first time buyers, people who need to downsize and essential workers. It has been explained to us that our Shenley Neighbourhood Plan would take precedence over the Hertsmere Local Plan, and that because we have had a Housing Needs Assessment the local community can, through a Neighbourhood Development Order, choose exactly where we build our new housing. |
| I am also concerned that social housing/affordable housing would be promised but not delivered, as with Porters Park.  |
| We don't want any more building in green belt except for one bedroom bungalows and for people who have lived in Shenley all life and want to downsize.   |
| The new houses will not be allocated Shenley residents first.  |

#### 05 DEVELOPMENT



|  |
|--|
| I applaud your efforts, but it's a load of words. As you are sincere insist on legal powers to implement these strict considered policies. Then you can influence and defeat the H.C.C, the Borough council and developers in general. Support small developments including self-builders and contemplate physical activities such as reducing fence panel heights, etc.   |
| Who is expected to carry out building works  |
| Please, lets not allow our lovely village to be over developed   |
| The Plan should also protect Porters Park Estate from further development.   |
| I am worried and nervous about these plans. I was before I read the draft plan and after reading I am more so. I think the proposals will ruin the village. The scale of the proposed developments is frightening. The plan itself seems to have been designed to placate and mislead. There are no guarantees, no protection and no power given to residents. It seems to be designed to sell the idea of massively increasing the village or at the very least down play the impact. |
| I am not one to complain usually, I don't have sharp elbows, don't like to kick up a fuss and try to avoid confrontation but none of this is done for the benefit of current residents. I can only assume you guys are trying to make the best of a bad situation given to you from central government, but these plans must and should be resisted they bring no benefit to the area and will have a very negative impact the both the village and life within it.                    |
| Absolutely against any large-scale development by builders who sell up their land, spoils and environment then move to a pleasant rural area somewhere else. We MUST stand up to these people who do not have our interests at heart only interest in their own bank account!  |
| This is just a waste of time. We won't be able to protect Shenley from money men   |
| I strongly object to the proposal for the major development of the new village envelope.   |
| The proposal will double the size of the old village (the total area proposed to be included in the village envelope).. When does it become a town? No one at the public meeting supported this plan, why do you?  |
| Don't get railroaded by Hertsmere into allowing too many houses to be built.   |

## 06 OPEN SPACE AND NATURAL BEAUTY

|   |
|---|
| As a daily walker around Shenley, I would like the paths and green spaces to remain. I also appreciate the lovely views around Shenley and would like them to stay and not be built on.   |
| I'm not sure if I missed it, but protecting the local walks and views around Shenley to the east and west should be part of the statement. People come here to walk - and people come here to live because of these walks.  |
| Views south from Porters Park drive across the fields south of Shenley Park must also be protected (and no development immediately south of Shenley Park in area 5).  |
| Losing the rural feel and the best parts of living in such a lovely village. Losing all the green spaces.   |
| Our biggest concern is having an access road to the new area built behind our house which would destroy our quality of life and tranquillity in our garden. If we can be reassured of this and other concerns re protection of forestry then we could get behind this plan.   |
| Protect the green belt.   |
| We also been told that we shall have a say over the housing styles and layout of this new development on our green belt land: all good news. The risk is that without a Neighbourhood Plan in place, Hertsmere will take these decisions out of our hands and may well build far more of Hertsmere's new homes all over our local Green Belt land, threatening open views of local open farmland or the joining up of Shenley with Borehamwood with swathes of new housing. |
| I do not wish for any further development for Shenley. It will lose its character and open land which at present is enjoyed by all will disappear. It seems no-one in Gov, L.P, will be satisfied until all natural space is no more and everywhere is concreted over.  |

## 7 VILLAGE CHARACTER

|  |
|--|
| Although I support the edge extension to the village it does present a challenge particularly to address the concerns of adjacent property owners and very importantly the sensitively of the existing beautiful landscape. So the design and layout needs to be of exemplary quality. |
| Protect our village.   |

|  |
|--|
| SHENLEY is special and to expand too much would spoil the village now and in the future.   |
| It's not the buildings, its the extra people in the village that concerns me. It will become more like a town than a village once this new development has been completed. |
| And Shenley is supposed to BE a village; this was the reason I moved here recently.  |
| My only concerns at present is Shenley NOT remaining a village.  |

**08 COMMUNITY**

|  |
|--|
| Where is the 75% of the community Infrastructure Levy going ?  |
| The issues are infrastructure and cost - how will the issues of investment in the community v profit by builders be addressed?   |
| Re Andrew Close Green Space use - would rather keep as is. There's play area provision for younger children at tea-rooms & not sure there would be uptake amongst older children for adventure playground? Could become at best a dinosaur, or at worst a communal area for anti-social behaviour (especially as so close to Tesco's, where there has been a problem). |
| No vested interest here - we don't back onto the green, but I am thinking of the residents who do. Perhaps further canvassing amongst residents needed? Bigger need for older children (ie pre-teen/teen) is for organised youth groups, clubs.  |
| Please consider Netball Posts and lines on the current Tennis courts as multi use. The new basketball post is NOT a Netball Hoop.  |
| Ensure appropriate and accessible facilities for older people.   |

