



NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION RESPONSE TO EX223

We have the following comments.

We were pleased that the Council deleted some of the sites that had been allocated for development in the Draft Local Plan since we are **strongly opposed to developments in the Green Belt**. We also believe that allocating sites in the Green Belt in the villages has a far more damaging effect on those villages, in some cases potentially changing their character to that of a town. Furthermore we note that the Inspector has commented that the existing distribution of sites within the Borough is disproportionate and that in particular Cuffley is one of those potentially having too large a share.

It is against that background that the following comments are made on the contents of Ex 223. Detailed comments on some of the sites will be repeated in responses to other papers in this series as appropriate.

Proposed approach

It is disappointing that the Council are proposing that in addition to releasing certain sites from the Green Belt they are proposing that natural boundaries (which are a requirement along with very exceptional reasons before Green Belt developments should be allowed) should be created outside the sites where none exist. This would encroach even further into the existing Green Belt. This approach is being suggested in the case of HS27/Cuf 1 The Meadway and HS29/Cuf 12 North of Northaw Road East. **We are opposed to this solution.**

Amongst the exceptions to the above approach are two further sites in our villages at HS28/Cuf6 South of Northaw Road East and HS20/Cuf7 Wells Farm where it is proposed that the necessary planting could be achieved within the site. Although preferable to taking up additional Green Belt land **this solution negates the overall principle that if there is no natural boundary there should be no development.**