

From: Derek Bromley, Bidwells.
Subject: Welwyn and Hatfield Local Plan . Green Belt Study Stage 3.
Aug 2018
Date: 3 September 2018 at 15:56:42 BST
To: "louise@poservices.co.uk" <louise@poservices.co.uk>

Dear Sirs

Bidwells acts for the owners of Cuf 1 also referred to as site HS27.

Cuffley is identified as a large village excluded from the Green Belt. The NPPF identifies the 5 main purposes of the Green Belt, this generally refers to the sprawl of large built up areas, the merging of towns and the special character of historic towns, none of which are applicable to Cuffley. We recognise that this is part of the London Metropolitan Green Belt.

We contest the summary findings in Table 7.1 P89a, release of local plan allocation HS27. The findings assess the harm to the Green Belt as "moderate". We believe the assessment should be "low" as for Cuffley School, but certainly no greater than "low/moderate".

The proposed allocation is a northerly extension of Meadway. This allocation would not spread or extend the Cuffley settlement boundary any further north and neither create a built form further east given the limitations on numbers and the requirement for SUDSs to the eastern part of the site. The site has well defined boundaries denoted by physical features. Considering the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and looking at its broader context to London a level of harm as "moderate" is in our opinion an incorrect analysis.

1 "to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas"

The allocation is situated to the north of Meadway and does not extend the overall settlement north, or the built form to the east.. As such development of this site will not add to a London urban sprawl and for Cuffley itself it is tightly contained and does not sprawl.

2 "to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another"

The nearest Towns are some distance from Cuffley, which itself is a large village. The built form on the site does not encroach into the gap

between Cuffley and its nearest neighbour Goff's Oak; the eastern part of the site would be undeveloped save for a SUDS scheme.

3 "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment"

It is acknowledged that the site reads as part of the countryside, but given its containment with development on 2 sides and its landscape boundaries it is questionable whether this forms part of the open countryside.

4 "to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns"

We do not consider that any of the surrounding towns can be regarded as being of historic character within the intended meaning.

5 "to assist urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land"

The economics of Cuffley and the surrounding settlements combined with the restrictive planning policies has meant the market has eked out urban sites for regeneration, so this purpose of the Green Belt has little or no application in this area

In summary we consider that for the above reasons the harm referred to in the Stage 3 Study relating to Cuf1/ HS27 is not correct and it should be amended to a lower rating of "low" or "low/moderate".

Regards

Derek



Derek Bromley

Partner, Residential Development

John Ormond House, 899 Silbury Boulevard, Milton Keynes,
Buckinghamshire. MK9 3XJ

DD: | M: 07775 667267 | bidwells.co.uk

Bidwells LLP, a limited liability partnership trading as Bidwells, is registered in England & Wales (registered number OC344553). The registered head office is Bidwell House, Trumpington Road, Cambridge, CB2 9LD, where a list of members is available for inspection.

To read our full disclaimer please click [here](#) To read our Privacy Notice please click [here](#)