

Green Belt Review (Part 2)

Sites and Boundaries Study

February 2014

Errata sheet:

1. Page 31, para 4.6.13 Should read Site 2b.
2. Page 45, para 5.6.12 Should read 33 hectares.
3. Page 47, Para 6.1.4 First sentence should read "...Parcel GB 38 makes a significant contribution towards three of the five Green Belt purposes; by preventing merging (of St Albans and Harpenden), safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and preserving the setting of Childwickbury conservation area." Delete second sentence. (This is an error arising from inclusion of text referring to Parcel GB 38 – see related Purposes Assessment report).
4. Page 47, Para 6.1.5 Second sentence should read "Each application.....from 2011 to 2013 and a number of decisions have been upheld by the Inspector at appeal." And add new final sentence "A 2014 application is also outstanding, (see Para 6.6.6)."
5. Page 48, 6.3.1 should read "measured" rather than measures.
6. Page 48, 6.3.3 should also mention High Oaks Local Centre (LC 1 in District Local Plan Review (located approximately 500m from the sub area).
7. Page 48, 6.3.4 should read "north east".
8. Page 49, 6.3.6 Add "An additional service (653) serves the area from Cavan Drive (approximately 400m from the west of the sub area) to the City Centre and Station and beyond to Hatfield and Welwyn Garden City".
9. Page 49, Para 6.3 Add a new second sentence. Depending on the point of measurement, Garden Fields JMI and Bernards Heath Infant and Junior schools to the south are within approximately a 1 Km – 1.5 Km walking distance. Continue previous second sentence to complete paragraph.
10. Page 49, 6.4.2 should read "125m above".

11. Diagram Page 53 Key should read: green / yellow - area of lower landscape / visual sensitivity and purple – area of higher landscape / visual sensitivity.
12. Page 55, 6.5.2 should read “eastern edge is defined by the adjacent railway line”.
13. Page 56, Para 6.6.4 Final sentence should read: “In such cases, St Albanswill need to consider implications in respect of future master planning....”
14. Pages 56/58, Para 6.6.6 and Fig 6.3 For clarity it should be noted that the study uses the site area of planning application reference 5/2014/0093 as a proxy for a potential area within the sub area that may not remain available for longer term development (i.e. should it receive a planning permission in the near future). This approach is taken so as to avoid any suggestion (in the context of the Study) that residential development capacity for the sub area as a whole is over estimated. It does not mean that SADC is assuming that development will certainly take place on the planning application area indicated. It is also noted that various boundaries could be taken to reflect the alternative development proposals in this vicinity. The minor variations involved are not considered material in the context of this report.
15. Page 71, Para 8.1.5 Delete final sentence (included in error as this text relates to area S5).
16. Page 73, Para 8.3.8 Should include mention of Porters Hill Park; a significant recreational open space which lies within the strategic sub area.
17. Page 78, Figure 8.1 Title should read Sub Area 6 Northeast of Harpenden.
18. Page 81, Para 8.6.11 should read “....19 hectares of land would yield...”