

Green Belt Assessment – Further proposed amendments

The following lists the changes between the DPEP version of the Green Belt Assessment and the Executive version.

Main Report

- Reference added in the main report within the bulleted list at para 3.18 to *Local Green Spaces* as a Footnote 7 designation (Agenda page 1282).
- Addition prior to section entitled 'Assessment of Green Belt contribution and definition of grey belt land' (Agenda page 1286 / 1287) to set out how future development is considered, as follows:

3.28 *The assessment process assumes that land adjacent to, but inset from, the Green Belt which is not currently developed will, unless it is constrained by footnote 7 designations, be developed in the future. When assessing the relationship between urban and open land, such areas are treated as though already developed, but with the assumption that existing Green Belt edge boundary features will be retained.*

3.29 *Similarly, where land within the Green Belt has consent (or a resolution to consent) for major development, it has been assumed that this will go ahead with a consequent loss of openness but retention of existing boundary features. There has been no consideration of specific development or associated landscaping proposals.*

- Also, the reflect this change, and the accommodation of future development, bullet 3 and 4 under the previous para 3.29 (now **3.31**) (Agenda page 1287 / 1288)). has been amended from:

Perception of urban development (influenced by boundaries, landform, the scale and extent of urban development and distance from urban areas)

Urbanising influences within the Green Belt; the extent of development and/or activity in the Green Belt that would increase urbanising influence.

to

Perception of urban development (either existing or forthcoming) - influenced by boundaries, landform, the scale and extent of urban development and distance from urban areas;

Urbanising influences within the Green Belt; the extent of development (existing or consented) and/or activity in the Green Belt that would increase urbanising influence.

- The findings table, Table 4.1, has been updated to reflect the change in the status of parcel HH10, seeing the purpose A assessment change to 'Moderate' and the grey belt status become 'yes' (Agenda page 1312).
- Sense and spelling checks have been carried out as far as is possible and other minor changes are possible in this respect.

Local Green Space amendments

The following are Local Green Spaces identified in the **District Plan 2018** or in adopted **Neighbourhood Plans** and are added to the relevant parcel maps within the assessments. This is only an addition to the maps and key, and have no impact on the assessments:

Bishop's Stortford Green Wedges	
North eastern corridor along River Stort	Parcels affected: BSNE1 – BSNE2 (Green Belt) BSNE3 – BSNE5 (grey belt)
North western incursion north and south of Dane O'Coys Road	Parcels affected: BSNW1, BSNW2, BSNW3 (part) (grey belt)
Western incursion through Bishop's Park and College Fields	Parcels affected: BSW4 – BSW6 (grey belt)
South western corridor through Thorley Wedge and Northern Parkland	Parcels affected: BSW1 – BSW3 (grey belt)
Hertford Green Fingers	
'Great Molewood' (north western, River Beane)	Parcels affected: HFN6, HFN9 (part) (Green Belt)

'Hertingfordbury Park' (south western, River Mimram)	Parcels affected: HFW1, HFW2, HFW3 (most), HFW4, HFW5 (part), HFW9 (part) (Green Belt) .
'Balls Park' (south eastern)	Parcels affected: HF1 (part), HF2 – HF7, HF8 (part) (Green Belt)
'Hartham Common' (north eastern)	Parcels affected: HFN15, HFN17, HFN18, HFN19 (part) (Green Belt)

The following are Local Green Spaces within the Green Belt identified in **adopted Neighbourhood Plans**:

Gilston (2)	
Fiddlers Brook / Lowland Fens. South of Eastwick Road and east of Terlings Park, skirting the River Stort (LGS n). <i>Probably extends into HA2 on the western boundary</i>	Parcel affected: HA1 (Green Belt)
Terlings Park. Woodland and open land around development at Terlings Avenue (LGS m). <i>Probably extends into HA1 on the eastern boundary.</i>	Parcel affected: HA2 (grey belt)
Stanstead Abbots and St. Margaret's (7)	
- Allotments off Cappell Lane (LGS13). - Village Meadow and playground north of High Street (LGS14). - Allotments north of High Street (LGS15).	Parcel affected: SM1 (grey belt)

Land between Kitten Lane and Hunsdon Road and Roydon Road (LGS10).	Parcel affected: SM5 (Green Belt)
• St Margaretsbury Recreation Ground (LGS1) • Wilderness woodlands by New River Path and south of St Margaretsbury (LGS2) • St Margaretsbury Estate by New River Path (LGS3). <i>Adjacent sites surrounding St. Margaretsbury Club and covering the New River Path on the eastern side.</i>	Parcel affected: SM9 (grey belt)
Thundridge and Wadesmill (5)	
• Allotments (LGS2). West side of Cambridge Road, close to the central part of Thundridge village and north of Ermine Street. • Rennesley Gardens and Castle (LGS4). Wooded area to the north west of Wadesmill and south west of High Cross. • The Bourne (LGS6). Dry river channel running north from the northern end of Wadesmill village and forming the eastern edge of parcel WN8 at its northern extent	Parcel affected: WN8 (Green Belt)
• The Pit (LGS1). Within the village of Thundridge, contained within Woodlands Road and Ducketts Wood. • Jean's Orchard (LGS3). East side of the properties fronting Ermine Street and south of Old Church Lane.	Parcel affected: WN9 (grey belt)
Walkern (1)	
War Memorial (LGS8). Very small piece of space around the war memorial, located at the southern end of the village at the junction of High Street and Bennington Road.	Parcel affected: SE2 (Green Belt)

Watton-at-Stone (3)	
- The Meadow (LGS1). Playing field and sports pitch on the south side of the village behind Nigel Poulton Community Hall. - Cemetery and Church Baulk (LGS2 and LGS3). Adjacent sites on the south side of the village associated with Church Lane and the St. Andrew and St. Mary Church.	Parcel affected: WA6 (grey belt)

Parcel Assessments

	Original	Proposed change	Reason
HFW12 Parcel Location, Land Use and Boundaries	'B100'	'B1000'	Factual correction
	'There is some perception of urban development outside of the parcel. There isn't a year round boundary feature or change in landform to reduce perception of development to the north of the parcel'.	'There is a weak perception of urban development outside of the parcel. Woodland forms a strong buffer to the urban edge to the east, and mature tree cover alongside the B1000 will limit perception of forthcoming development to the north'.	<i>Urbana letter, 22 June 2026</i> Separation between the forthcoming urban area and the parcel is weaker for HFW14, so there would be more urbanising influence than is the case in HFW12.
	'There is some perception of connectivity with the wider countryside, limiting the impact of any existing urbanising influence. Woodland bands limit perception, though filtered views provide some perception'.	'There is some perception of connectivity with the wider countryside, limiting the impact of any existing urbanising influence. Woodland belts largely contain views but there are some gaps'.	On reflection, the HFW12 write-up has overstated urbanising influence from outside of the parcel. The Purpose A assessment should state that development would negate existing strong boundaries

			between the urban area and the parcel (including the B1000 and strong associated tree cover between the parcel and Archers Spring). It is this rather than lack of outer containment that gives it a strong rating, so the write-up needs amending.
HFW12, Purpose A	‘There is some urbanising influence associated with development outside of the parcel’.	‘The parcel is predominantly free from urbanising influence associated with development outside of the parcel’.	
	‘There are no physical features in reasonable proximity strong enough to restrict and contain development. Development in the parcel would negate the role of woodland, Welwyn Road and hedgerows which currently give the parcel a strong sense of separation from urbanising influences’.	‘The parcel lies beyond physical features which are restricting and containing development. Therefore its weakening or loss would have an impact on this purposes. It would negate the role of woodland, and the B1000 and associated tree cover, which currently give the parcel a strong sense of separation from urbanising influences’.	
	‘Development of land in the parcel would have an incongruous impact on the urban pattern. Woodland, Welwyn Road and hedgerows between the parcel and the urban edge mean that the parcel has a strong sense of separation from the urban area, so development here would be incongruous with the urban pattern’.	‘Development of land in the parcel would have an incongruous impact on the urban pattern. Woodland, the B1000 and associated tree cover between the parcel and the urban edge mean that the parcel has a strong sense of separation from the urban area, so development here would be incongruous with the urban pattern’.	
HFW12, Purpose C	‘There is some urbanising influence associated with development outside of the parcel. There isn’t a year	‘The parcel is predominantly free from urbanising influences associated with development	

	round boundary feature or change in landform to reduce perception of development to the north of the parcel'.	outside of the parcel. There isn't a year round boundary feature or change in landform to reduce perception of development to the north of the parcel'.	
HH10, Purpose A	Assessment Conclusion: Strong	Assessment Conclusion: Moderate	<i>High Consulting letter</i>
HH10, Grey Belt	Assessment Conclusion: No	Assessment Conclusion: Yes	
HH10, Parcel Location, Land Uses and Boundaries		Land located south-west of Hertford Heath. Parcel size: 50ha. Strong consistent boundary features within the gap between the settlement and the parcel combine to create strong separation. Mature tree cover gives the parcel a strong sense of distinction from Hertford Heath. There is no significant change in landform to create a sense of separation between the settlement and the parcel. There is a weak perception of urban development outside of the parcel. There is no significant urbanising development or activity in the Green Belt affecting this parcel. Natural features limit perception of the wider Countryside. Balls Wood to the west limits the connection to the wider Green Belt.	

HH10, Purpose A: Is the parcel adjacent or near to a large built-up area?		The parcel is close to a small urban area but also near enough to a large built-up area to contribute to preventing its sprawl. Hertford is a town and so is defined as a large built-up area. Hertford Heath has a strong enough relationship with Hertford to be associated with the large built-up area. The parcel also has some association with Hoddesdon.	
HH10, Purpose A: What is the extent of urbanising development in the parcel?		The parcel is predominantly free from urbanising development.	
HH10, Purpose A: What is the extent of urbanising influence from outside the parcel?		The parcel is predominantly free from urbanising influences associated with development outside the parcel.	
HH10, Purpose A: Are there physical features in reasonable proximity that could restrict		There are physical features in reasonable proximity that could restrict and contain development. Development in the parcel would negate the role of tree cover in currently give the parcel a strong sense of separation from	

and contain development?		urbanising influences. However, woodland creates a relatively strong sense of containment in relation to the location of the large built-up areas of Hertford and Hoddesdon.	
HH10, Purpose A: Would development form an incongruous pattern in relation to the large built-up area?		Development of land in the parcel would not have an incongruous impact on the urban pattern. Development here would be incongruous with the urban form of Hertford Heath but would not significantly reduce perceived separation from either Hertford or Hoddesdon, and so would not be incongruous in relation to a large built-up area.	
Parcel HH10, Grey Belt conclusion		The parcel does not make a strong contribution to the Green Belt purposes A, B or D and therefore has the potential to be grey belt land. NPPF footnote 7 areas and assets within or connected to the parcel may provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development within it. Such locations can only be provisionally defined as grey belt land until further relevant and necessary specialist assessment work has been undertaken.	

SM11, Purpose A	'The parcel forms the entirety of]the gap between Great Amwell and St Margarets. St Margarets in turn has only fragile separation from the large built-up area of Hoddesdon. Any partial development of the parcel would weaken the remainder, increasing the urban relationship between Great Amwell and Hodddesdon'.	'The parcel forms the entirety of the gap between Great Amwell and St Margarets. St Margarets in turn has only fragile separation from the large built-up area of Hoddesdon. Any partial development of the parcel would weaken the remainder, increasing the urban relationship between Great Amwell and Hoddesdon'.	Typo and spelling error. Remainder of document to be spell checked.
BSNE1, BSNE2 HFN6, HFN9, HFN15, HFN17, HFN18, HFN19 HFW1, HFW2, HFW3, HFW4, HFW5, HFW9 HF1, HF2, HF3, HF4, HF5, HF6, HF7, HF8 HA1 SM5 WN8 SE2		Add the following text to the end of each of the parcel conclusions, 'NPPF footnote 7 areas and assets within or connected to the parcel may provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development within it. Such locations can only be provisionally defined as grey belt land until further relevant and necessary specialist assessment work has been undertaken'.	For consistency. Parcels with footnote 7 sites have this caveat. Sites with Local Green Spaces that have no other Footnote 7 site will need to have this caveat added.