

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
		Wheathampstead and surrounds		
1	GB	Marford Farm, Sheepcote Lane, Wheathampstead	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature. It would constitute encroachment and be visually intrusive in the surrounding countryside and would also create development pressure on land to the south east.</p> <p>Although the site is not in a flood zone, development of the site may increase the existing flood risk around River Lea.</p> <p>The site falls within an area of known and demonstrable archaeological interest.</p>	No
2	U	York House, Place Farm, Station Road Wheathampstead (EMP6a)	<p>A scheme for 12 dwellings has been discussed, but no formal application has been received.</p> <p>These offices comprise a designated employment area (EMP 6A), which was rated as a 'good' site for employment uses in the Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. They constitute the only substantial concentration of offices in Wheathampstead, are well located and fit for purpose. Their loss, for what would only be modest dwelling gain, should therefore be resisted.</p>	No
7	GB	Land off Codicote Road, Wheathampstead	<p>The key constraint to development on this site is the presence of a significant number of trees, which provide a natural visual barrier to existing residential development on the former Murphys Chemicals site from Cory Wright Way and the open countryside to the east. The trees/vegetation also constitute a wildlife habitat and green space. A site of wildlife interest spans the south eastern corner of the site.</p> <p>The site formed part of the storage yard for the Murphys Chemicals site and there is still vehicular access from Codicote Road. It is likely that there are ground contamination issues, which could affect development viability.</p> <p>Whilst the existing landscape bund to the east of the site would mitigate against visual intrusion into the open countryside beyond, part of the land put forward by the owners extends further eastwards and its development would constitute encroachment into open countryside. It would also create development pressure on land to the east (including Site 1).</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
9	GB	Land at Wrights Meadow, Wheathampstead	<p>The site is rural in character, with informal recreational space and allotments along its western and southern boundaries. Its development would constitute encroachment and be visually intrusive in the surrounding countryside. This would also place development pressure on adjoining land, particularly the adjoining farmland, allotments and playing fields.</p> <p>Almost the whole of the northern 'arm' of the site is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain), Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) or Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability).</p>	No
10	GB	Land to the rear of Rose Lane Properties, Wheathampstead	<p>Although some of the residential properties are well screened by woodland, the land rises up on a ridge which is very prominent when viewed from the open countryside to the west and is also visible from the Lower Luton Road to the south. The area is rural in character and is visually distinct from the built up area of Wheathampstead to the south of the Lower Luton Road.</p> <p>Development on all or part of the land to the west of Rose Lane would create significant additional development pressure on adjoining open fields to the west. It could also be argued that further development within the curtilage of these properties would have a detrimental visual impact on the setting and approach to the historic centre of Wheathampstead.</p>	No
11	GB	Folly Meadow, off Lower Luton Road, Wheathampstead (adjacent to the Former Highway Chippings Depot)	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside and be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside. It would also create development pressure on adjoining land to the west of the built up area of the village.</p> <p>Approx 50% of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain and a further approx 10% lies within Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability).</p>	No
111	GB	Land at 15-17 Castle Rise, Wheathampstead	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature. It would result in encroachment and be visually intrusive in the surrounding countryside and would also create development pressure on the open fields to the north, east and west.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
119	GB	Glebe Allotments, Marford Road, Wheathampstead	<p>Development of the allotment site would result in encroachment and visual intrusion into open countryside and would be clearly visible as one approaches the village along Marford Road (the land slopes from east to west). There would also be additional development pressure on adjoining land to the east and north.</p> <p>A development of 70 dwellings (as suggested by the agents) would be large enough to alter the character of Wheathampstead and would place additional strain on existing infrastructure which is already limited, but would not be large enough to secure any significant infrastructure improvements.</p>	No
152	GB	Former Highway Chippings Depot, Lower Luton Road, Wheathampstead	<p>Although this site was a former highway chippings depot, there is no built development and the site is really a green space, screened by substantial mature trees and hedging around most of its perimeter.</p> <p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside. It would also create further development pressure on adjoining land to the north and west (including Site 11).</p> <p>The north western corner of site lies in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain). Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain) also comes up to the edge of the southern, western and part of the northern site boundaries.</p>	No
201	GB	Land to the r/o Cherry Trees Indian Restaurant, Cherry Trees Lane, Wheathampstead	<p>This site is clearly rural in nature and whilst substantially screened by mature trees and hedgerows around its perimeter, residential development would still result in encroachment into open countryside. Development here would also create further development pressure to the open fields to the south and west.</p>	No
Redbourn and surrounds				
20	GB	Land at Redbourn Golf Club, Kinsbourne Green Lane, AL1 3JE	<p>The site (i.e. all 3 parcels of land) is located in an isolated location within open countryside, some distance to any existing settlement. It is rural in character and development would be unsustainable, inaccessible, have a detrimental visual impact and constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside. Development would also be harmful to the setting of Harpendenbury Farmhouse and main barn (both Grade II * listed). Road access would not be suitable for the scale of development proposed and road upgrades would be inappropriate in this part of the District.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
173	GB	Scout Farm (part), 10 Dunstable Road, Redbourn (part of 95)	<p>The site is rural in character and its development would result in encroachment into open countryside. There would also be visual intrusion and additional development pressure on adjoining farmland to the north and east (including Site 95).</p> <p>Development could adversely affect the setting of Grade II Listed Scout Farm Barn close by to the west (and the Locally Listed Scout Farm).</p>	No
199	GB	Land at Builders Yard, Chequer Lane, Redbourn	<p>The site is located in a prominent location to the south of Redbourn. Development would consequently be visually intrusive from countryside to the south and could be considered to affect the setting of the historic centre of the village. Development would also create additional development pressure on adjoining land to the north of the B487.</p> <p>Over 90% of the site is in Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) or Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability).</p>	No
22	GB	Land on the west side of Redbourn (between the built up area and the M1 motorway)	<p>Development would have an adverse effect on the openness and would constitute encroachment into surrounding countryside. It would be visually intrusive and would affect land that is rural in nature.</p> <p>This is a very large site and its development would significantly affect the setting, character and overall size of Redbourn. Proximity of the M1 to the west (and the resultant noise and air quality issues), would also be a constraint to residential development.</p>	No
139	GB	Land to the west of Stephens Way and north of Flamsteadbury Lane, Redbourn	<p>The site is green space, which is also an Urban Survey site with wildlife interest. There are substantial mature trees around most of the site perimeter, especially on its western and northern sides. A public footpath crosses the northern perimeter and there is a children's play area within the site.</p> <p>Overall, the site is rural in nature and whilst any development would be screened from the open countryside beyond by existing vegetation, it would still constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside, beyond the existing built edge of Redbourn.</p> <p>The Tree Preservation Orders and mature trees on the site would require retention and would severely limit any dwellings capacity of the site (as would the children's play area, unless a suitable alternative location were found). The proximity of the M1 to the west would be a further constraint.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
174	GB	No. 98 Lybury Lane, Redbourn	Although this site partly comprises previously developed land, it is rural in character and the structures (bar the existing dwelling) are all temporary in nature. Further residential development would be visually intrusive and would create significant additional development pressure on surrounding open countryside to the north, east and west.	No
95	GB	Land to the north east of Redbourn (north of Harpenden Lane, east of Dunstable Road and west of the A5183) (overlaps 173)	<p>This site is rural in character and its development would result in significant encroachment into open countryside. There would also be visual intrusion and additional development pressure on adjoining farmland to the north. The public footpath crossing the site and the River Ver are constraints to development on the eastern half of the site. The eastern part of the site lies within the flood plain (Flood Zone 2 and Climate Change Flood Zone 3a and 3b).</p> <p>It is a very large site and its development would adversely affect the setting, character and overall size of Redbourn.</p>	No
Harpenden and surrounds				
21	GB	Land at Aldwickbury Park Golf Club, Piggottshill Lane, Harpenden, AL5 1AB	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature. It would constitute encroachment and be visually intrusive in the surrounding countryside and would also create development pressure on land to the north.</p> <p>Ancient Woodland to the north of the site would be a further constraint.</p>	No
66	U	Abbeyfield House, 28 Milton Road. Harpenden	As the building is locally listed, conversion would be preferable to demolition and rebuilding. However, it is unlikely that subdivision of the building into separate flats would be possible, given that the property has been subject to numerous alterations and additions over many years. Furthermore, the building is now used as staff accommodation for the Lawes Agricultural Trust, who have an ongoing need for this type of accommodation.	No
58a	GB	Land to the rear of builders' yard, Westfield Road	<p>The land is essentially rural in character and makes a positive contribution to visual amenity along the Lea Valley walk. Development of the site would be visually intrusive from adjoining open countryside, which is rural in character and would increase development pressure on adjoining land, especially east of the Lower Luton Road and to the rear of Springfield Crescent / Riverford Close.</p> <p>Approximately half of the site is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain) and a further small portion is in Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) or Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability).</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
62	GB	Grove Farm, Piper's Lane, Harpenden	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside. Development would also create additional development pressure on adjoining land to the south east and would result in a small degree of encroachment between Harpenden and Wheathampstead.</p> <p>TPO woodland, a public right of way running around the southern boundary of the site and proximity of the Grade II listed 'The Grove' are all further constraints.</p>	No
63	GB	Land north of Wheathampstead Road, Harpenden (2 sites)	The site is rural in character, with some agricultural buildings and Aldwick Manor along its western edge. The remainder of the site is open green space with a tennis court. Development would constitute encroachment into open countryside and significantly alter the character and setting of the listed buildings (Aldwick Manor and the Granary at Aldwickbury Farm - both Grade II Listed) on the site.	No
176	GB	Land off Riverford Close, Harpenden	Although development of this site is unlikely to create additional pressure on adjoining land to the north, the land is essentially rural in character and makes a positive contribution to visual amenity along the Lea Valley walk, which itself becomes more open northwards. Its development would also be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.	No
177	GB	Land at Bowers Heath Lane, Harpenden	The site is essentially rural in character. The Lower Luton Road and the River Lea form a strong visual edge to the built up area of Harpenden and development of this site would not only have a detrimental impact on the openness and rural character of the countryside to the north east, but would also place development pressure on the grazing land to the south east. The relative visual impact may have been lessened since the implementation of planning permission 5/2006/1255, but would still be significant.	No
103	GB	Land at Batford, off Lower Luton Road, Harpenden, AL5 5EG	Development would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the area and would have a significant visual impact on the surrounding open countryside. It would also increase development pressure on land to the north west (south of Bowers Heath Lane).	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
178	GB	Land at Batford Forge, off Lower Luton Road	<p>Although development of this site is unlikely to create significant additional pressure on adjoining land to the east and over the river to the south, the land is essentially rural in character and makes a positive contribution to visual amenity from the River Lea ford and land to the east.</p> <p>The site lies within an Ecology Database site (55/036). It also serves as a green corridor, given its proximity to the River Lea. Development could have significant implications for wildlife and the natural environment. Approximately a quarter of the site is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain), a further third is in Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) and another fifth is in Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability), making about 75-80% in total.</p>	No
179	GB	Land adjacent Marquis Lane, Harpenden	<p>Residential development would have a significant impact on the open and rural character and amenity of adjoining land to the east of the site and across the river to the north and north east. Development would also create additional development pressure on adjoining land and would result in encroachment into open countryside along the Lea Valley to the east.</p> <p>Development could adversely affect the setting of the adjacent Marquis of Granby Public House (a Grade II Listed Building).</p> <p>The site lies within an Ecology Database site (55/036). It also serves as a green corridor, given its proximity to the River Lea. Development could have significant implications for wildlife and the natural environment. Approximately 3% of the site is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain), a further 3% is in Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) and another 3% is in Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability), making about 10% in total.</p>	No
67	GB	Land at Cross Lane, Harpenden	<p>Substantial mature trees and hedgerows both within and around perimeter of the site would reduce any visual impact of development. However, it is still considered that development would have an unacceptable impact on the openness and rural character of this and adjoining land to the south. It would also result in encroachment towards St Albans and create additional development pressure on land to the south of Cross Lane.</p> <p>Development would result in the loss of good quality agricultural land (mostly Grade 3A).</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
181	GB	Land between Oakfield Road and the golf course, Harpenden	<p>Whilst the site abuts residential development along its eastern edge, it is clearly rural in character, with open countryside and a golf course to the south and west. Development on this site would therefore have an unacceptable visual impact on the openness of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Development would also constitute some degree of encroachment towards Redbourn and would increase development pressure on land to the south/south west.</p>	No
97	GB	Land at Townsend Lane, Harpenden	<p>Development would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature. The site is well screened from Townsend Lane, but is highly visible from the open countryside to the south and south west. Development of the site would therefore result in unacceptable visual impact on the openness and character of the adjoining countryside, whilst placing would place significant additional development pressure on the Townsend Nursery site to the north west of Townsend Lane.</p>	No
94	GB	Land at r/o 1-3 Long Butlers and 1-9 Poynings Close, Harpenden	<p>The site comprises land which it has been argued now forms part of residential curtilages to the rear of 1-3 Long Butlers and 1-9 Poynings Close (although this has never been confirmed).</p> <p>Nevertheless, whilst this land is well screened from the Wheathampstead Road by trees and hedgerows, it still contributes to the openness of the surrounding countryside and its development would constitute encroachment and would increase further development pressure on adjoining land to the east.</p>	No
Site not plotted on GIS	U	11 Longcroft Avenue, Harpenden	<p>Planning application 08/0094 for demolition of existing and erection of two detached five bed dwellings was refused. Whilst there could perhaps be scope for 2 semi-detached or one detached dwelling on the site an appeal lodged against the refusal and there may realistically be no net dwelling gain on the site.</p>	No
203	U	Lea Industrial Estate, Lower Luton Road (EMP1)	<p>In principle, the site would be acceptable for residential development. However, the site lies within a designated employment area (EMP1) which has been classified as a 'good' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review.</p> <p>In addition, approximately 40% of the site is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain). A further part is Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) and approx 75% of the total site is at least Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability). The existing buildings are also at a lower level to the road and are consequently inobtrusive in the street scene. Two storey housing may well have a greater visual impact in this gateway location.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
296	U	Vaughan Road / Bowers Way / Thompsons Close, Harpenden	This is an unallocated employment area which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. It comprises previously developed land within the Harpenden Conservation Area, occupied predominantly by purpose built office buildings, which are not particularly old. Scope for any new housing development is therefore very limited.	No
Site not plotted on GIS	U	50-52 Park Mount, Harpenden	Application 07/3002 for demolition of existing and erection of two four bed semi-detached dwellings and one four bed detached dwelling was refused and a subsequent appeal has been lodged. Whilst there may still be very limited development potential, it is difficult to know what Members may consider acceptable for this site and there may realistically be no net dwelling gain.	No
106	GB	Land at Roundwood Lane/ Brackendale Close, Harpenden	Site was put forward by an agent on behalf of a previous owner, but the site is believed to have been very recently purchased by a collective of local residents, with the express purpose of protecting the site from residential development.	
295	U/GB	Rothamsted Experimental Station, Harpenden	<p>Rothamsted Research is a world leading research institution that has invested heavily in new buildings and facilities on the site in recent years and it provides considerable social and community value in that role.</p> <p>This is a well-located site, consisting of mainly previously developed land, with some land to the south of the site lying within the Green Belt (approx half of which is occupied by a car park). The eastern part of the site lies within the Harpenden Conservation Area and there are listed and locally listed buildings within the Rothamsted complex.</p> <p>It is likely that any new development within the site would be B Class business incubator style units, rather than housing and the owners have no current plans for any consolidation of existing uses which could provide some capacity for residential development, without compromising research operations.</p>	No
St Albans and surrounds				
209	U	St Peter's House, 45 Victoria Street	The possibility of additional residential floors above the existing offices in this building had been explored, however this is not being actively pursued.	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
146	U	Eastbury Court, Lemsford Road	The possibility of an additional 9 flats on top of existing flats has been explored. However, this is a Conservation Area location and the building is already considered to be too high, with an adverse impact on the setting and character of neighbouring properties (including locally listed buildings in the vicinity) and on the street scene.	No
217	U	No. 78 Harpenden Road, St Albans	Appeal against refusal of 5/07/1638 for 8 flats was dismissed. Also application 07/3075 for demolition of detached garage and erection of a 3 bed detached dwelling was refused. Appeal was lodged but subsequently withdrawn. The latest Inspector's Report confirmed that even a single additional dwelling at the rear would be very unlikely to be acceptable. Given the five refusals and three lost Appeals since 2007 on this site, the deliverability of additional housing, whilst not impossible, cannot be considered likely.	No
219	U	Between Nos. 333 and 409 The Ridgeway	Series of applications. Latest application was 5/2006/1129 for two 3 storey blocks (12 flats) which was refused as it failed to demonstrate a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area by massing and design. Would harm the visual amenity of the street scene. Key development constraints are the uncertainty over ownership (more than one owner involved) and the substandard highway access and parking arrangements. The latter could not be overcome, given the present ownership constraints (i.e. they would need to come to agreement over access which is unlikely).	No
144	U	No. 12 Harpenden Road, St Albans	Previous refusals and lost appeals indicate only very limited scope for redevelopment, due to the verdant character of the Conservation Area in this location, trees and TPOs on the site and nearby locally listed buildings. Net dwelling gain may be impossible.	No
79	GB	Land to the rear of No. 57 Fishpool Street, St Albans	Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of Fishpool Street (part of the Conservation Area). Development would be likely to affect the setting and special character of this part of St Albans, views from Verulamium Park, the character of this open area and its visual relationship with Verulamium Park. It would also create additional development pressure on adjoining land.	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
78	GB	Land to the rear of Nos. 113 to 167 Colney Heath Lane	<p>Most of the site is part of County Wildlife Site 68/003 and Grade II listed Smallford Cottage lies approx 75-100m away. The site is part of the Upper Colne Valley, where leisure uses compatible with the nature conservation and ecological interest of the area are promoted.</p> <p>Mature trees bound the northern edge of the site, whilst a copse of mature trees in the south western corner of the site constitutes Green Space. The Alban Way footpath and cycle path runs along much of northern boundary of the site and would be affected by development here. The site is also believed to have been used for sand and gravel extraction, which is now completed and topped.</p> <p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside and the Alban Way and would create additional development pressure on adjoining land.</p>	No
182	GB	Land at the Glen, 148 St Albans Road, St Albans	<p>Development would have a negative impact upon the Scheduled Ancient Monument AM9 Beech Bottom Entrenchment on the south side of the site, across which is the current site access. Development would also result in a degree of encroachment into open countryside and would create additional development pressure on adjoining and nearby land.</p>	No
223	GB	Land at Verulam Golf Club, Napsbury Lane	<p>This site is severed from the developed area of St Albans by the railway line and access is via an underpass underneath the railway line, which is unlikely to be suitable for a substantial increase in local traffic volume. The whole of the site forms part of Ecology Database Site 68/024 and there is a TPO Wood and numerous TPO points located in the northern corner of the site.</p> <p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would result in encroachment into open countryside and (to a degree) would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.</p>	No
228	U	Wick House, 50 Marshal's Drive, St Albans	<p>Previous proposals in the 1980s for additional plots on the site were refused by the Land Tribunal, due to Covenants restricting each plot to one house only. Consequently, there is no realistic chance of additional dwellings on this site, despite its size and location within an existing residential area.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
244	U	64 Lemsford Road, St Albans	<p>The site comprises a residential house (which is locally listed) and its garden. In 2004, an informal scheme for 18 Housing Association flats was considered to be overdevelopment of the site. There are no current plans to redevelop, in order to increase dwelling numbers.</p> <p>The site lies within the St Albans Conservation Area and there are 4 TPO points in the middle of the site and substantial trees along the northern boundary. Ground levels vary significantly between this site and adjoining land. There would also be access problems (access from the Scout Hut land on Sandpit Lane would not be suitable).</p>	No
234	U	61/63 Lattimore Road, St Albans	These premises lie within an existing retail frontage within St Albans City Centre. Conversion from retail to residential would adversely affect the vitality and viability of this frontage.	No
142	U	8 Bricket Road, St Albans	Hightown Praetorian & Churches Housing Association has recently received a grant to renovate the premises as a hostel for the homeless.	No
212	U	City Station car park, Ridgmont Road	First Capital Connect and Hertfordshire County Council consider that there is no realistic likelihood of residential development on this site, due to the need to retain parking on this side of the railway line and the environmental constraints of having development alongside an operational railway.	No
246	U	Loreto College, Hatfield Road/Lattimore Road (i.e. Marlborough House and the tennis courts)	Although well located and with a substantial existing building forming part of the site, the realistic chances of dwelling gain are limited, given that the school has no current plans to redevelop and there is a lack of alternative options for tennis court provision on site.	No
234	U	61/63 Lattimore Road, St Albans	The premises are currently in ground floor retail use, with flats above. This is a very small site with little or no potential for additional housing (i.e. no net gain as there is already residential development on the first floor).	No
282	U	Land to the r/o Nos. 44 to 82 Campfield Road, St Albans	Pre-application discussions for two dwellings. However, the site has very limited potential given the large mature trees along its northern boundary, the narrowness of the access and the proximity of the Alban Way.	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
306	GB	New Barnes Mill, Cottonmill Lane, St Albans	<p>This is an unallocated employment area which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. Given its Conservation Area location and the proximity of Grade II Listed and Locally Listed buildings nearby, the site would only be considered in relation to re-use/adaptation of existing buildings on the site.</p> <p>The site is in a relatively isolated location, outside the urban envelope of St Albans, which makes it one of the less sustainable employment or potential residential locations. Furthermore, the entire site is within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain.</p>	No
307	GB	Prae Wood Farm Barn	<p>This is an unallocated employment area which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. However, the Panel questioned this classification as Prae Wood Farm Barn is considered to be an excellent example of a Grade II listed barn conversion to offices, where the building and its character have been successfully preserved.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is in a relatively isolated location, outside the urban envelope of St Albans, which would make it an unsustainable location for residential uses.</p>	No
301	U	Caxton Centre & Valley Road Industrial Estate, Porters Wood, St Albans	<p>This is a designated employment area (EMP8) which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. It is well-located, comprises previously developed land and could accommodate housing. However, it is a very large, successful employment area, which would result in a significant loss of employment floorspace if it were redeveloped for housing in its entirety. Furthermore, if only part of the site was redeveloped, this could result in undesirable conflict between the new housing and some of the existing employment uses.</p> <p>There is telecom equipment on a large mobile phone mast within the site. Beech Bottom Scheduled Ancient Monument and wildlife site adjoin the site's southern boundary and there are existing trees along the western and northern boundaries. These could all constrain residential development.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
302	U	Ronsons Way, St Albans (southern part of site EMP9. Northern part is SHLAA Site 256)	<p>This is a designated employment area (EMP9) which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review.</p> <p>It is well-located, comprises previously developed land and could accommodate housing. However, it is a very large employment area (with some modern employment premises), which would result in a significant loss of employment floorspace if it were redeveloped for housing in its entirety. Furthermore, if only part of the site was redeveloped, this could result in undesirable conflict between the new housing and the existing employment uses, particularly the County Council's waste and recycling centre (which itself would be difficult to relocate).</p>	No
304	U	181 and 181A Verulam Road, St Albans	<p>This is an unallocated employment area within the Conservation Area which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. It is a well-located site, consisting of previously developed land. However the buildings themselves are Locally Listed and would not be suitable for conversion to residential uses.</p>	No
87	GB	Between the A4147 and the M10, extending beyond the M10 to Potters Crouch and the edge of Chiswell Green	<p>This is a substantial area of Green Belt and ancient woodland. Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside, would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas and would result in increased coalescence between St Albans and Chiswell Green and towards Hemel Hempstead.</p>	No
London Colney and surrounds				
36	U	Land at Watersplash Court and Thamesdale, London Colney	<p>Planning application 5/08/0183 for 14 flats was refused. This open green amenity area is enjoyed by the adjoining and nearby residents and as such contributes significantly to the character of the area and the setting of the development, of which it forms an important part.</p>	No
35	GB	Land at Osier Cottage, Waterside, London Colney	<p>The entire site is in Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain. The site forms part of an important green open space extending into London Colney along the River Colne. Development would create additional development pressure on adjoining land.</p> <p>Approx two-thirds of site is in a TPO Woodland (although aerial photography shows this area as grass now) and falls within the London Colney Conservation Area.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
239	GB	All Saints Pastoral Centre, Shenley Lane London Colney	<p>Owners would like to expand the Pastoral Centre, with funding derived from housing as 'enabling development' on the site. However, this is considered to be a wholly inappropriate site for new residential development, given its isolated and unsustainable location. Further development would also constitute encroachment and visual intrusion into open countryside and would adversely affect the character and setting of the Listed Grade II and Grade II* buildings on the site.</p> <p>The site is also in a known area of high archaeological interest and pre-determination works may need to be carried out. Mitigation may be required, which could affect the viability of any redevelopment.</p>	No
32	GB	Land to the east of the A1081 London Colney Bypass and south of White Horse Lane	The site is located within open countryside and is rural in character. Development would have a detrimental visual impact and would constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside. It would also create significant additional development pressure on adjoining and nearby land.	No
31	GB	Land to the east of the A414 London Colney roundabout, south of the A414 North Orbital Road and north of the A1081 London Colney by-pass	The site is located within open countryside and is rural in character. Development would have a detrimental visual impact and would constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside. It would also create significant additional development pressure on adjoining land.	No
30	GB	Land to the north east of London Colney, north of Coppice Wood and south of A414 North Orbital Road	The site is located within open countryside and is rural in character. Development would have a detrimental visual impact and would constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside. It would also create significant additional development pressure on adjoining land.	No
102	GB	Land off Lovett Road, Napsbury Park, London Colney	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature. It would result in encroachment into open countryside and would increase coalescence between London Colney/ Napsbury and St Albans. Greenfield development here would also remove all sense of separation from the sensitive original Napsbury site.</p> <p>The entire site falls within the Registered Park and Garden of Napsbury and a small part of the site falls within the Napsbury Conservation Area.</p>	No
257	GB	Connolly House, Napsbury Hospital	Given the original Napsbury Redevelopment Plan allocation, the refusal and subsequent dismissed appeal for terraced houses, the recent planning permission for conversion to a nursing home and the understood intentions of the owner to implement this permission, there is no reasonable chance of delivering dwellings on this site.	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
311	U	Berkeley House, Barnet Road, London Colney	<p>This is an unallocated employment area which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. It is a well-located site, consisting of previously developed land and given that it has residential development on all sides, it would be well located if converted to residential use. However, this is a Grade II Listed building in the Conservation Area, so conversion to residential use would not be easy.</p> <p>Furthermore, the property has only recently changed hands and the owners have been discussing proposed works to the offices with the Council. Consequently, the likelihood of conversion to residential is slim.</p>	No
29	U	Cemex Offices, Lowbell Lane, London Colney	<p>This is an unallocated Employment Site, where the main constraint to residential development is flood risk. PPS25 identifies residential dwellings as a 'more vulnerable' type of development which should not be given permission in flood zone 3b (functional flood plain).</p> <p>A Tree Preservation Group to the eastern corner of the site is a further constraint.</p>	No
113	GB	Land r/o Armstrong Close / Willowside, London Colney	<p>Approx 10% of the site is in Flood Zone 3b (Functional Flood Plain) with a further approx 10% in either Flood Zone 3a (High Probability) or Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability), across the north of the site.</p> <p>The site is an open green area (with public footpaths across it and an adjacent children's play area. The area was also subject to sand and gravel extraction, which ceased in the late 1970s, when the land was then filled with domestic waste. Further investigation would need to be carried out with regard to any remediation works necessary to allow new development.</p> <p>Development would affect land that is primarily rural in nature, would result in encroachment into open countryside and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The site is rejected as an individual site and <u>only</u> considered in the context that it forms part of Area Of Search No. 4.</p>	No
		Chiswell Green		

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
41A 41B	GB	Land at Ragged Hall Lane, Chiswell Green (2 separate parcels of land)	Development of these 2 parcels of land would contribute to the coalescence of Chiswell Green and St Albans. Development would result in encroachment into and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding open countryside. It would cut off the open, albeit limited, aspect to the north of Chiswell Green on either side of the A405 and would create significant additional development pressure on adjoining and nearby land.	No
42	GB	Noke Lane Business Centre, Noke Lane, Chiswell Green	Whilst this is a previously developed site (in employment use), its redevelopment for housing would significantly extend the residential envelope of Chiswell Green, in an unsustainable location, distant from existing community infrastructure. More intensive development of the site would also place additional pressure on adjoining and nearby land for housing or employment uses. Given the low heights of existing buildings on site, residential development would be more visually intrusive from surrounding countryside.	No
101	GB	Land to the rear of 28 to 72 Ragged Hall Lane and Westfield Farm, Chiswell Green	This site is rural in nature and contributes towards an important gap between Chiswell Green and the M10 (preventing further coalescence between Chiswell Green and southern St Albans). Development of all (or part of) the area would cause significant harm to the openness and visual character of this important urban fringe area. Development would also place additional pressure on adjoining land for housing and would prevent the land from making a positive contribution to the Watling Chase Community Forest.	No
		Bricket Wood		
186	GB	Land at Ash Dale, Lye Lane, Bricket Wood	A substantial part of the site is a County Wildlife Site 76/056, which is also an Ancient Woodland. The substantial number of mature trees across most of the site constitute a Green Space and give the site a rural rather than urban feel. Approx 80% of the site is a TPO wood. Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of the immediate area, including woodland to the north of Lye Lane. It would also create pressure for more intensified development on land to the north of Lye Lane and south of the M25.	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
120	GB	Copsewood, Lye Lane, Bricket Wood	<p>Development of this site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature (although there are 2 residential properties in the middle of the site). It would result in encroachment into open countryside and would contribute towards encroachment between Chiswell Green and How Wood.</p> <p>Development would significantly extend the residential envelope of How Wood, in a relatively unsustainable location, some distance from existing community infrastructure. It would also adversely affect the openness of land to the south east and south west and be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside. Development would create additional development pressure on adjoining land to the east.</p>	No
188	GB	Land at Wistaria, A405/M1, Bricket Wood	<p>The site suffers from noise and air pollution, as it directly borders the M1, A405 and the M1 slip road. It is therefore not considered to be a site suitable for further residential development. Even though there are two existing dwellings on the site, it is arguable that the site in itself is presently more rural than urban in nature. Further development would also create access problems, due to the layout of the adjacent road network.</p>	No
141	GB	Land at Waterdell, Mount Pleasant Lane, Bricket Wood	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature and would result in encroachment and visual intrusion into open countryside.</p> <p>It would also lead to a marked degree of coalescence between Bricket Wood and Garston/Watford to the south.</p>	No
89	GB	Land north of Five Acres and south of the M25, Bricket Wood	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature and would result in encroachment and visual intrusion into open countryside. This large, open site provides a gap, which serves as an important buffer between Bricket Wood and the M25 (and prevents coalescence between Bricket Wood and How Wood). Development would create further pressure on land to the east (and south of the M25).</p>	No
268	GB	Ash Dale House, Lye Lane, Bricket Wood	<p>The site is clearly more rural rather than urban in nature, development would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding woodland and would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of the surrounding area. Residential redevelopment would also have a detrimental impact on County Wildlife site 76/056, and the TPO Woodlands inside and adjacent to the site.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
187	GB	Land to r/o Nos. 82 & 84 Mount Pleasant Lane, Bricket Wood	Nearly the entire site is covered by woodland. This is protected by a Wood TPO (TPO 1392) and is a County Wildlife Site (76/031). Residential development would also cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of adjacent residential areas.	No
316	GB	Horseshoe Business Park and Smug Oak Business Centre	Whilst this is a previously developed site (categorised as an 'average' employment site in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review), its redevelopment for housing would significantly extend the residential envelope of Bricket Wood, in an unsustainable location, distant from existing community infrastructure. More intensive development of the site would also place additional pressure on adjoining and nearby land for housing or employment uses. Given the low heights of existing buildings on site, residential development would be likely to be more visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.	No
		Colney Heath		
39	GB	Land to r/o The Grove, Roestock Lane, Colney Heath, St Albans	<p>The site comprises private residential curtilage in a relatively isolated and unsustainable rural location. It lies very close to the A1(M) motorway so noise/air quality are constraints to further development.</p> <p>The site is well screened by existing vegetation, therefore any visual impact on neighbouring properties or the surrounding countryside would be minimal. Nevertheless, the existing trees/vegetation would need to be retained, which would limit capacity on what is already a very small site. A further constraint would be the need to protect the character and setting of 'The Grove' which is Grade II listed. Indeed, there would be a need to retain sufficient land as curtilage to ensure the future viability of the listed building (which would further constrain any capacity).</p>	No
37	GB	Land at Roundhouse Farm, Roestock Lane, Colney Heath	<p>The site comprises agricultural land which is rural in character. Its development would constitute visual intrusion and encroachment into open countryside.</p> <p>Development of this relatively large site (approx 5 ha) could have a significant adverse effect on the size and character of Colney Heath village, where infrastructure is already stretched.</p> <p>Development would also be likely to have an adverse effect on the setting of No. 68 Roestock Lane, a Grade II listed house, which lies to the north of the site and could prevent the land from making a positive contribution to the Watling Chase Community Forest.</p> <p>NB: Part of the site lies within Welwyn Hatfield District.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
132	GB	Land at St Mark's Close, Colney Heath	<p>The site lies within Zone 3b of the Flood Plain, where development in the 'more vulnerable' category (including residential dwellings) is not appropriate. It also lies immediately adjacent to the A414, and is sandwiched between two other roads. It therefore suffers from noise pollution and lower air quality.</p> <p>The site currently has community value (the southern half is St Mark's Community Park) and contributes to the objectives of the Watling Chase Community Forest.</p>	No
267	GB	Barley Mow Public House (including commercial site and stables), Barley Mow Lane, near Colney Heath	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside and would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses.</p> <p>It would be inappropriate to locate additional housing in this unsustainable, isolated location in the open Green Belt, which also has considerable access problems.</p>	No
		Park Street/ Frogmore		
242	U	Park Mill (Corville Mill), Burydell Lane, Park Street	<p>A sketch scheme for conversion from offices to 15 flats was discussed in 2005, but there was no subsequent planning application. Whilst it may be possible that the building could be converted to residential flats (although this is not certain, given its internal configuration and former use as a Mill), the building is Grade II listed and situated within the Park Street/Frogmore Conservation Area, where there are other listed and locally listed buildings nearby. Approx 30% of site at its northern end is also in Flood Zone 2 (Medium Risk).</p> <p>Given these development constraints and the building's present use for offices (which are a good source of employment provision, in a sustainable location), a conversion scheme is not considerable appropriate.</p>	No
189	GB	Land south of Burydell Lane and east of the River Ver, Park Street / Frogmore	<p>The site lies within the Park Street/Frogmore Conservation Area and forms an important part of the open land to the east of the River Ver. Development would affect land that is rural in nature and would constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Approximately 10% of the site along the western side of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain. It also contains Ecology Database Site 76/061.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
122	GB	Land south of Burydell Lane & west of River Ver, Park Street / Frogmore	<p>The site lies within the Park Street/Frogmore Conservation Area and forms an important part of the open land to the east of the River Ver. Development would affect land that is rural in nature and would constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The entire site also lies within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain.</p>	No
191	GB	Frogmore Home Park and land to the west of Park Street / Frogmore	<p>Urban Survey Sites and a County Wildlife site lie adjacent. Given these constraints and Listed Building and Conservation Area constraints, residential capacity on this site is likely to be limited.</p> <p>Affordable housing issues (including the future of the mobile home park) which would need to be considered. Ownership of the site is believed to be by individual plot owners, which could impact on the deliverability of any scheme.</p> <p>Almost the entire site is within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain. PPS25 says that more vulnerable uses (including residential dwellings) should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3b.</p>	No
200	GB	Land r/o Brinsmead, Frogmore	<p>Approx 80% of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain and a further 15% is in Flood Zone 2 (Medium Risk). PPS25 says that more vulnerable uses (including residential dwellings) should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3b.</p> <p>Other serious constraints include: 13 TPO points throughout the site, adjacent Urban Survey and County Wildlife Sites and adjacent Listed Building and Conservation Area.</p>	No
45	GB	Land to the south of Frogmore Home Park	<p>The site lies adjacent to a County Wildlife Site (Moor Mill and Park Street Pits). Given these constraints and Listed Building and Conservation Area constraints, capacity on this site for residential development is likely to be limited.</p> <p>Almost the entire site is within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain. PPS25 says that more vulnerable uses (including residential dwellings) should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3b.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
118	GB	Holy Trinity Vicarage and Glebe, 39 Frogmore, St Albans	<p>Site comprises a vicarage with associated buildings and large gardens. It lies immediately to the west of the former Radlett Aerodrome site. There are a substantial number of mature trees around site perimeter and inside the site, with approximately 20 TPO points and a TPO Group, together with an ecology database site 77/007.</p> <p>Development would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of the immediate area and be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside, particularly if development necessitated a reduction in the number of trees not covered by TPOs.</p> <p>Development would also result in increased coalescence between Park Street/Frogmore and Radlett Road/Frogmore. The degree of separation at present is small and this green space contributes to maintaining at least some degree of separation between the settlements.</p>	No
190	GB	Land at Frogmore Garage (Minster Court), Park Street / Frogmore	<p>This site comprises vacant land with trees, scrub & grass. Approx 10% of the site lies within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain and a further approx 20% lies within Flood Zone 2 (Medium Probability). The front edge of the site lies within Park Street/Frogmore Conservation Area, whilst County Wildlife Site 76/023 lies immediately adjacent.</p> <p>Development would result in complete coalescence between the settlements of Park Street/Frogmore and Radlett Road/Frogmore. This green space contributes to maintaining at least some degree of separation between settlements.</p>	No
46	GB	Land at St Julian's Farm, off Watling Street, Park Street Part of 255	<p>The site is part of the Upper Colne Valley, where leisure uses compatible with the nature conservation and ecological interest of the area are promoted.</p> <p>Development would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of adjoining land, would be visually intrusive and result in encroachment into surrounding open countryside. Development would also result in increased coalescence between How Wood and St Albans and could prevent the land from making a positive contribution to the Watling Chase Community Forest.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
14	GB	Land north of Tippendell Lane, Park Street Part of 255	<p>Development would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of adjoining land, would be visually intrusive and result in encroachment into surrounding open countryside.</p> <p>Development would contribute to coalescence between Park Street and How Wood and between Park Street and Chiswell Green. It could also prevent the land from making a positive contribution to the Watling Chase Community Forest.</p>	No
47	GB	Land north of Tippendell Lane, Park Street Part of 255	<p>Development would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas, would be visually intrusive and result in encroachment into surrounding open countryside.</p> <p>Development would also result in complete coalescence between Park Street and How Wood and could prevent the land from making a positive contribution to the Watling Chase Community Forest.</p>	No
255	GB	Park Street Sewage Works site (Area covers Sites 46, 14 & 47)	<p>Development would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas, would result in encroachment into open countryside and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Development would also result in coalescence between Park Street and How Wood and significant encroachment between Park Street and Chiswell Green and Park Street and St Albans.</p> <p>Much of the site is inside area UVC1, covered by Local Plan Policy 143, relating to Land Use Proposals within the Upper Colne Valley.</p> <p>This site has been looked at in the past for a possible comprehensive development scheme including one or more of the following: Park and Ride, football stadium, hotel, Watling Chase Community Forest enhancement. In this context, housing was considered <u>only</u> as enabling development.</p> <p>Only development of strategic and District-wide importance would ever be considered acceptable in this location.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
314	U	88 Park Street, Park Street/Frogmore	<p>This is an unallocated employment area which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review. It is a well-located site, consisting of previously developed land and could accommodate housing. The site is an unusual shape, with residential uses close by on several sides and it could be argued that residential redevelopment would be more in keeping with the immediate area. Care would have to be taken due to its Conservation Area location, Grade II Listed and Locally Listed buildings nearby.</p> <p>However, almost the entire site is within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain. PPS25 says that more vulnerable uses (including residential dwellings) should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3b.</p>	No
313	GB	Hall & Co Builders Yard, Moor Mill Lane, Frogmore	<p>Residential development would not be appropriate for this isolated and exposed site immediately adjacent to the M25, inside the Air Quality Management Area. Additionally, whilst it is Previously Developed Land, it consists primarily of an area of hardstanding, containing only two single storey buildings. Residential development would be more visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Approximately 65% of the site is within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain</p>	No
		How Wood		
12	GB	Land at 'Alpha', 91 Mayflower Road, How Wood (adjacent to North Orbital Road)	<p>The site comprises a single detached dwelling in large grounds. Further residential development on this site would be visually intrusive and result in encroachment into the surrounding countryside, which is more rural than urban in nature. The site forms an important part of the wider landscape, contributing to its openness (albeit that a small part of the site is previously developed and most of the site is in a poor condition).</p> <p>Development would result in coalescence between How Wood and Chiswell Green (particularly when considered in conjunction with adjoining site 13). Proximity of the North Orbital Road poses another constraint (although screening could be introduced to reduce any noise or pollution for new development).</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
162	GB	Birklands Detached Playing Field, London Road (Part of Area Of Search No. 2) (overlaps 76)	<p>The site is designated as a County Wildlife Site. The County Council has allowed public access onto the land but on-site signage indicates that the land is not public open space and there are no established rights to roam. The site also contains Birklands Meadow Community Orchard.</p> <p>Some concerns were raised by the Panel in relation to the above constraints and also regarding potential coalescence which could result between St Albans and London Colney, if this area were developed. In light of these concerns, this site was rejected as an individual SHLAA site and was considered <u>only</u> in its broader context within Area Of Search No. 2 (South East of St Albans).</p>	No
109	GB	Land at Llys Eira, Birklands Lane, St Albans (falls within Area Of Search No. 2)	<p>The site comprises a large listed house in a heavily wooded location. Additional dwellings in this isolated part of the wider site and their impact on the Listed building would not be acceptable. Consequently, the site has been rejected as an individual SHLAA site and <u>only</u> given consideration in its broader context within Area Of Search 2.</p>	No
74a,b,c	GB	Land at A1081/Nightingale Lane/ Highfield Park Drive/London Road (Part of Area Of Search No. 2)	<p>There were strong objections to the shortlisting of this site from several of the Panel members. Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside, would create additional development pressure on adjoining and nearby land and would lead to substantial encroachment towards London Colney at least and possibly complete coalescence.</p> <p>Given the Panel's concerns, this site was rejected as an individual SHLAA site and has <u>only</u> been given further consideration in its broader context within Area Of Search No. 2 (South East of St Albans).</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
270	GB	Fields adjacent to Oaklands College (Smallford Campus) – part of Area Of Search No. 5 (East of St Albans).	<p>There were strong objections to the shortlisting of this site from several of the Panel members.</p> <p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside (particularly if positioned within the middle of the site where there is a very prominent ridge). It could result in unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and create additional development pressure on adjoining land. Development would also contribute to coalescence between St Albans and Hatfield.</p> <p>The overall site includes County Wildlife Site 68/015 and 68/010, which is also an Ancient Woodland (although not the part of the site that would be most appropriate for housing).</p> <p>Given the Panel's concerns, this site was rejected as an individual SHLAA site and has <u>only</u> been given further consideration in its broader context within Area Of Search No. 5 (East of St Albans).</p>	No
		Sandridge		
150	GB	Great Barn Dell, St Albans Road, Sandridge (part of 263)	This site (and the immediately surrounding area) are rural in character, with an open aspect broken up only by sporadic buildings. Any intensification of development along the western side of St Albans Road would result in visual intrusion and encroachment into open countryside. It would also constitute undesirable ribbon development, leading to further coalescence between Sandridge and St Albans.	No
116	GB	East of Woodcock Hill, Sandridge (overlaps 198)	<p>SHLAA site 198 forms part of site 116 and comprises garage buildings and hardstanding, together with green space and trees/vegetation). Site 198 has been shortlisted on the basis that it is (partially) previously developed land and that some limited residential development could constitute 'enabling development' to secure a new cemetery in the northern part of the site, for which there is a demonstrable need.</p> <p>However, development over the full extent of Site 116 would constitute unacceptable encroachment into open countryside to the north east and would adversely affect land that is rural rather than urban in nature.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
151	GB	Land at r/o Shottfield Close, Sandridge (overlaps with site 26)	The site is located within open countryside and is rural in character. Development would result in visual intrusion and would constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside. Development of such a large site could also have a significant adverse effect on the size and character of Sandridge village, where infrastructure is already stretched.	No
26	GB	Land to the north east of Sandridge (overlaps with site 151)	The site is located within open countryside and is rural in character. Development would result in visual intrusion and would constitute encroachment into the surrounding countryside.	No
24	GB	Land to the west of St Albans Road (south of Hopkins Crescent), Sandridge (part of 263)	This site is rural in character, with an open aspect broken up only by sporadic buildings. Any intensification of development along the western side of St Albans Road would result in visual intrusion and encroachment into open countryside. It would also constitute undesirable ribbon development, leading to further coalescence between Sandridge and St Albans.	No
107	GB	Former Baptist Chapel, St Albans Road, Sandridge (part of 263)	This site is rural in character, with an open aspect broken up only by sporadic buildings. Any intensification of development along the western side of St Albans Road would result in visual intrusion and encroachment into open countryside. It would also constitute undesirable ribbon development, leading to further coalescence between Sandridge and St Albans.	No
108	GB	The Willows, St Albans Road, Sandridge (part of 263)	This site is rural in character, with an open aspect broken up only by sporadic buildings. Any intensification of development along the western side of St Albans Road would result in visual intrusion and encroachment into open countryside. It would also constitute undesirable ribbon development, leading to further coalescence between Sandridge and St Albans.	No
263	GB	Land at St Albans Road, Sandridge. Overlaps 24,107,108 &150)	<p>This site is rural in character, with an open aspect broken up only by sporadic buildings. Any intensification of development along the western side of St Albans Road would result in visual intrusion and encroachment into open countryside. It would also constitute undesirable ribbon development, leading to further coalescence between Sandridge and St Albans.</p> <p>Development of this large site (approx 7 ha) could also have a significant adverse effect on the size and character of Sandridge village, where infrastructure is already stretched.</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
261	GB	Land at Fairshot Court, Woodcock Hill, Sandridge	The site comprises large formal gardens to the front of Fairshot Court and is situated in a relatively isolated location to the east of the main village of Sandridge. It is also highly prominent in the landscape. Development would constitute serious visual intrusion and encroachment into surrounding countryside, especially to the south and east and would adversely affect land that is rural rather than urban in nature.	No
265	GB	Land at Highfield Road, Sandridge	The site is rural in nature, with a substantial number of trees/vegetation and is situated in a sensitive location on high ground above neighbouring built development, with views into the site from the countryside around (including long views from beyond the village to the west). Development would also result in encroachment into open countryside and would contribute towards coalescence between Sandridge and St Albans (Jersey Farm).	No
27	GB	Land adjacent to Meadows Lodge, Hammonds Lane, Nr Sandridge	This site is located in an isolated, rural location, some distance from the closest settlement (Sandridge). Development would be unsustainable, inaccessible, would constitute visual intrusion and would result in encroachment into the surrounding countryside. It would also be harmful to the setting of Symondshyde Great Wood (ancient woodland and a county wildlife site). Road access would not be suitable for new residential development and road upgrades would be inappropriate in this part of the District.	No
104	GB	Land to west of B651 Sandridge High Street, between Sandridgebury Lane and recreation ground	Development would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would constitute visual intrusion and result in encroachment into open countryside.	No
290	GB	Land to the rear of Bridge Cottage, Sandridgebury Lane, near Sandridge	Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside and would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses. It would be inappropriate to locate additional housing in this unsustainable, isolated location in the open Green Belt, which also has considerable access problems.	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
318	GB	35 High Street, Sandridge	<p>This site was included in the 'long list' as it is an unallocated employment area which is classified as an 'average' site for employment uses in the interim Central Hertfordshire Employment Land Review.</p> <p>However, whilst the site consists of previously developed land within the Sandridge Conservation Area, it is essentially just a single building in office use, with extremely limited, if not no, potential for housing.</p>	No
		Smallford		
156	GB	Smallford Farm, Colney Heath Lane, Smallford (overlaps with 158)	<p>Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would cause demonstrable harm to the character of surrounding open land and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Approx 15% of the total site is in Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain. The site also includes County Wildlife Site 68/003 and Ecology Database Site 68/047.</p>	No
123	GB	BT Trial Site, Oaklands Lane, Smallford	<p>The site already has planning permission (won on appeal) for 13 dwellings and public open space. It is <u>not</u> recommended for large scale redevelopment (as proposed by the landowner in their SHLAA submission or in previous applications), which would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside and would be large enough to significantly change the size and character of the Smallford.</p> <p>It would also significantly reduce the openness of the Green Belt between St Albans and Hatfield and its development would not secure the same benefits as other sites in forming part of Area Of Search No. 6, in terms of relocating undesirable uses in the Watling Chase Community Forest/Green Belt.</p>	No
157	GB	Former Detached Playing Field of Sandfield Girls School, Oaklands Lane	<p>The site currently comprises football and rugby pitches, with associated clubhouse and a children's play area. Its development would result in encroachment into open countryside and would contribute to coalescence between Smallford and St Albans (particularly taking into account the residential redevelopment of the Oaklands Smallford Campus to the west). Development would also constitute visual intrusion and result in encroachment into open countryside, which is more rural than urban in nature.</p> <p>NB: This site has been proposed as part of a potential relocation of leisure facilities to Smallford Pit (plotted as site 158).</p>	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
243	GB	No. 601 Hatfield Road, Smallford	<p>Looked at in isolation or as part of Area Of Search No. 6, this site is not considered appropriate for further residential development, given its segregated location on the western side of Station Road, adjoining the Harvester playing fields (which visually form part of the open countryside beyond).</p> <p>Recent proposals to extend existing premises within the original residential curtilage of the site have all been refused as 'excessive cumulative additions to this rural locality'.</p>	No
86		Smallford Works, Smallford Lane, Smallford	<p>Site is previously developed land and the Council has long had aspirations to remove the poorly located industrial uses on the site, in order to secure some major environmental enhancement of the area as part of Watling Chase Community Forest. It is recognised that this is unlikely to happen without some 'enabling development'. However, almost the entire site is within Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain. PPS25 says that more vulnerable uses (including residential dwellings) should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3b.</p>	No
		Sleapshyde		
121b	GB	Land adjacent to Sleapshyde Lane (either side of Ye Olde House)	<p>Development would cause demonstrable harm to the open and rural character of the Sleapshyde Conservation Area. The 'old' part of Sleapshyde is a pleasant rural niche where traditional buildings, intervening spaces and narrow lanes combine to retain a particular character. Grade II Listed Ye Olde House lies immediately adjacent on three sides, whilst there are also several other Grade II Listed and locally listed cottages, farmhouses and barns in the vicinity of the site.</p>	No
121a	GB	Land adjacent to the North Orbital Road, off Sleapshyde Lane	<p>Development would cause demonstrable harm to the open and rural character of the Sleapshyde Conservation Area. The 'old' part of Sleapshyde is a pleasant rural niche where traditional buildings, intervening spaces and narrow lanes combine to retain a particular character. Grade II Listed Ye Olde House is close by and there are also several other Grade II Listed cottages, farmhouses and barns in close proximity to the site. Eastern side of the site, approx 15% of total area, is inside Flood Zone 3b Functional Flood Plain.</p>	No
		Colney Street		

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
48	GB	Colney Street Farm, Radlett Road, Colney Street	Development would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas, would constitute visual intrusion and result in encroachment into open countryside. Approx 5% of the site is inside Flood Zone 3b Functional Floodplain and a further approx 15% is in Flood Zone 2 Medium Probability. Site is in a known area of gravel and sand deposits.	No
		Other Sites		
194	GB	Land at Mutchetts Wood, Garston	Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would cause demonstrable harm to the character of the adjoining Ancient Woodland and would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside. Development would also contribute to the coalescence of Bricket Wood and Garston.	No
99a 99b	GB	98 Harper Lane, Shenley, Radlett	Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside, would cause demonstrable harm to the character and amenity of surrounding areas/land uses and would create additional development pressure on adjoining land.	No
269	GB	Twitchells Farm, west of St Albans Lane, outside Bedmond	Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside and would create additional development pressure on adjoining land. Existing access via Bedmond Lane is narrow and unsuitable for substantial new housing development.	No
271	GB	Land to the south west of Redbourn, to the north west of Hemel Hempstead Road (Site A)	Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside and would create additional development pressure on adjoining land. Given the extensive expansion planned for Hemel Hempstead, it is crucial to maintain green separation between the settlements. Site is adjacent to the M1, consequently air quality is a development constraint.	No

Appendix 8 - Rejected Sites (following first & second Panel sessions)

SHLAA Site Ref	Urban or Green Belt	Site Address	Officers' Comments	Site to be taken forward
272	GB	Land to the south west of Redbourn, to the south-east of Hemel Hempstead Road (Site B)	Development of the site would affect land that is presently rural rather than urban in nature, would result in encroachment into open countryside, would be visually intrusive from the surrounding countryside and would create additional development pressure on adjoining land.	No