

# **Examination of the Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan 2013-32**

## **Stage 8 Site Allocations**

**Hearing 27 August 2020 at 09:30**

### **Cuffley**

### **AGENDA**

#### **Issue**

In the context of the plan's overall vision and strategy are the site allocations positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy and therefore a sound basis for the location of development within the Borough during the plan period?

1. Inspector's Introduction
2. Clarification

#### **Policy SADM 33 Cuffley**

#### **Part 1 Generic Matters**

3. Environment

##### Flooding

How would the surface water from the proposed sites be managed comprehensively and individually?

Are there any on or off-site ramifications for flood risk that would result from the implementation of some or all of the proposed developments?

If so how are they to be mitigated?

Would the development of any of the sites require (a) balancing pond(s)?

If so, how extensive would this/they be and where would it/they be located?

##### Countryside

What impact would the proposals have on the wider countryside landscape? In particular on, Broxbourne Wood, Hoddesden Park Wood and Northaw Great Wood SSSIs.

Is any harm likely to be adverse and if so to what extent can the harm be overcome through mitigation?

Would there be any long-term impact on the wildlife at these sites from the development of any of the Cuffley sites?

If so would there be any potential unacceptable impact that could not be satisfactorily mitigated?

### Atmospheric Pollution

Is atmospheric pollution a potential issue at any of these sites or in combination.

If so, how would it be mitigated?

## 4. Infrastructure

### Foul Drainage

How would foul drainage be dealt with?

Are there any foul drainage constraints that would impede the implementation of any of the developments?

### Education

Is there sufficient capacity within the local schools to provide places for the children likely to be generated by these developments?

If not, what extra capacity is required and where would it be located?

### Health

Is there sufficient capacity within local health services to meet the primary health care needs of the persons who would reside in the developments?

If not, what extra capacity is required and where would it be located?

### Highways

What are the off-site highway ramifications of these proposals?

Have the considerations included the impact of the significant development proposed at Goff's Oak in adjacent Broxbourne?

Without improvements, would there be unacceptable harm to highway safety and/or the free flow of traffic within Cuffley?

Are the sites' overall viabilities sufficient to be able to support any required highway improvements as well as any other required contributions to additional infrastructure and facilities?

## 5. Movement Sustainability

Is Cuffley a sustainable settlement from a travel to work perspective?

How many of its residents are economically active?

What proportion of its economically active residents work locally or travel to work by public transport?

How many jobs are located in Cuffley?

Are the sites in a sustainable location for development?

How far is it to Cuffley railway station and its village centre from a median location on each site?

Are these acceptable walking distances for commuters travelling by train?

Are these acceptable walking distances to local shops and other facilities?

Have these sites been appropriately assessed in the sustainability appraisal?

## **PART 2 Sites HS29 and 30 Land North of Northaw Road East**

### **6. Green Belt**

Is the overall assessment of high harm a sound interpretation of the contribution that sites HS29 and 30 make to the purposes and openness of the Green Belt?

Can this level of harm be appropriately applied to the entirety of the sites?

Do sites HS29 and 30 impinge in a meaningful way upon the existing gap in built development between Cheshunt/Hoddesdon and Potter Bar?

Would sites HS29 and 30 impinge in a meaningful way upon any Green Gap in built development between Cuffley and Northaw?

Do these sites contribute to the checking of the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas?

Is there mitigation that could be implemented to reduce any harm to openness?

Would the proposed new boundary to urban development be as robust as the existing one, in the context of visually preventing urban sprawl and maintaining openness?

If the boundary is to be moved, is the current proposal the most appropriate location for a new Green Belt boundary.

If not are there other more defensible boundaries that could be chosen?

Is there scope to improve the permanence of any new boundary through the introduction of woodland planting to create enhanced physical features?

In the above contexts, is the allocation of these sites justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

Do exceptional circumstances exist to release these sites from the Green Belt and if so, (other than Welwyn/Hatfield's housing need), what are they?

### **7. Implementation**

When would these sites realistically come forward for development and begin to contribute to housing supply?

## 9. Sustainability Appraisal

## 9. Any other matters