

Please note that by law this meeting can be filmed, audio-recorded, photographed or reported electronically by the use of social media by anyone attending. This does not apply to any part of the meeting that is held in private session. The Council will webcast the meeting.

Please ask for:
Jonah Anthony

19 January 2022

Dear Councillor

You are requested to attend a meeting of the WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL to be held on Thursday 27 January 2022 at 7.30 pm in Roller City, Campus West, Welwyn Garden City, Herts, AL8 6BX.

Yours faithfully



Governance Services Manager

AGENDA
PART 1

1. **APOLOGIES**

To receive apologies for absence, if any.

2. **MINUTES**

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 November 2021 (previously circulated).

3. **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS BY MEMBERS**

To note declarations of Members' disclosable pecuniary interests, non-disclosable pecuniary interests and non-pecuniary interests in respect of items on the Agenda.

4. **LOCAL PLAN - ADDITIONAL SITES AND MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLAN (FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE FP1083) (Pages 3 - 16)**

Recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet on 18 January 2022 on additional sites and further modifications to the Local Plan.

Circulation: The Mayor and Members of the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
Corporate Management Team
Press and Public (except Part II Items)

If you require any further information about this Agenda please contact Jonah Anthony, Principal Governance Officer by email – democracy@welhat.gov.uk

Agenda Item 4

Part I
Item No:
For Decision

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
SPECIAL COUNCIL – 27 JANUARY 2022

Recommendation from the Cabinet on 18 January 2022:-

| | |
|-------|---|
| 74. | <p><u>Local Plan - Additional Sites and Modifications to the Plan (Forward Plan Reference FP1083)</u></p> <p>Recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel on 13 January 2022 on additional sites and further modifications to the Local Plan.</p> |
| 75 | <p><u>STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER (ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING, ESTATES AND DEVELOPMENT)</u></p> <p>At the Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel on 13 January 2022, the panel considered the recommendations for modification to the Local Plan and in particular housing numbers and sites as set out in the officer report and the recommendation that option D be accepted. The panel unanimously rejected option D of 15,200 dwellings and the required sites. A further motion was put to the panel to recommend a strategy is put forward for 13,277 dwellings. This motion was approved by the panel (10 in Favour, 2 against, 1 abstention). In the interim officers had confirmed that 13,279 dwellings can be obtained from sites which have been found sound by the inspector.</p> |
| 76 | <p><u>PRESENTATION BY THE PLANNING AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION MANAGER</u></p> |
| 76.1. | <p><u>Key Stages</u></p> <p>There were 3 informal consultations for the Local Plan to identify issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Issues and Options were consulted upon in 2009• Emerging Core Strategy in 2012• Site Consultation in 2015 <p>Consultation on the draft Local Plan was undertaken in 2016 and the Plan was submitted for examination in May 2017.</p> <p>There were further consultations on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Additional Sites in 2019• Proposed Changes consultation 2020• Interim Inspector's report October 2020 |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <p>The Council then submitted Additional Sites for examination in November 2020.</p> <p>The Council then received the inspector's report on the additional sites and sites in villages in July 2021.</p> |
| 76.2. | <p><u>Hearing Sessions</u></p> <p>The hearing sessions had begun in 2017 and there had been a total of 10 hearing sessions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 Legal Soundness and Duty to Cooperate in September 20217 • Stage 2 Overarching Strategy in October 2017 • Joint session with East Herts on Birchall Garden Suburb in January 2018. • Stage 3 Topic Specific Policies in February 2018 • Stage 4 Hatfield and Welwyn Garden City policies and allocations in June 2018 • Stage 4 Green Belt Assessment in November 2018 • Stage 6 Birchall Garden Suburb, Housing and Employment Land Needs in December 2019 • Stage 7 Birchall Garden Suburb and Symondshyde in March 2020 • Stage 8 Village site in July/ August 2020 • Stage 9 Additional Sites, OAN, Windfall and Greenbelt boundaries in February/March 2021 |
| 76.3. | <p><u>Inspector's Reports</u></p> <p>After the stage 9 hearing sessions, the Council received a number of documents from the inspector. This included an overall letter to the Council, a report on the full objective assessment of housing need (FOAHN), a supplementary report providing guidance for the Council and what it needs to do to achieve a sound plan, the stage 9 round up notes on sites, the inspector's conclusions on windfall and the approach to be considered when taking land out of the greenbelt. Options for making the plan sound were considered at Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel on 13 January 2022.</p> |
| 76.4. | <p><u>Strategy for 13,277 dwellings</u></p> <p>A strategy for 13,277 dwellings was agreed at Full Council in November 2020. It was based on meeting the objective assessment of housing need (OAN) of 13,800 dwellings and it resulted in additional sites being selected which gave a housing supply of 13,277 dwellings.</p> <p>This comprised of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completions, commitments and small sites (3,097) |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windfall assumption (1,402) • Allocation in plan (8,029) • Sites where capacity changed (679) • New Sites (1,702) • Sites to be removed from the plan where they harmed the greenbelt (1,632) |
| 76.5. | <p><u>Changes</u></p> <p>Since November 2020 there have been a number of changes to the underlying basis for these figures.</p> <p>The inspector's conclusions on what would be appropriate windfall assessment had increased from 1,402 to 1,668.</p> <p>Completions, commitments and small sites had increased from 3,097 to 3,334.</p> <p>For site capacity, an additional 130 dwellings were found suitable and potentially further increased site in Little Heath from 34 to 63.</p> <p>Not all sites were found sound, including sites in employment areas, whilst some sites were advised to be unlikely to be found sound if not required to meet local need.</p> |
| 76.6. | <p><u>Capacity Changes to submitted sites</u></p> <p>Members noted a list of sites where capacity had changed over the course of the examination, in 2016, 2020 and 2022. For example, the Panshanger site (north east of Welwyn Garden City), had its capacity increased from 815 in 2020 to 845 in 2022; while the Birchall Gardens suburb site SDS2 had decreased from 1,200 dwellings in 2016, but had increased by 100 dwellings since November 2020.</p> |
| 76.7. | <p><u>Additional Sites</u></p> <p>Members noted a list of additional sites. The majority of the sites were found sound but there were a number of sites in the employment areas particularly in Welwyn Garden City which had been found unsound. There were concerns about the suitability of a number of sites as there were other sites that had be found to be in more sustainable locations and therefore these sites should only come forward if those other sites also came forward and there was a general local need for those sites to come forward.</p> |
| 76.8. | <p><u>Sites proposed for removal</u></p> <p>Members noted a list of proposed sites to be removed from the local plan. This included Symondshyde, BrP4/HS22, BrP7/HS24, Cuf7/HS30, Cuf12/HS29 and Barbaraville (which is the extension of the traveller site).</p> |

BrP4/HS22 had been found sound, whereas there were options for the other sites which could be found sound if more sustainable sites also came forward or if there was a general local need.

76.9.

Additional sites found unsound

Members were shown a list of sites which were found unsound.

| Settlement | HELAA Ref | Green Belt / Urban | Site | Capacity 2020 |
|------------|-----------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| WGC | Pea106 | Urban | 73-83 Bridge Road East | 235 |
| WGC | Pea103 | Urban | 29 Broadwater Road | 128 |
| WGC | Pea105 | Urban | 61 Bridge Road | 21 |
| WGC | Pea97 | Urban | Former Norton Building | 122 |

76.10.

Sites soundness dependent on Strategy

Members were shown a list of sites where the soundness is dependent on the strategy.

| Settlement | HELAA Ref | Plan Ref | Green Belt / Urban | Site | Capacity 2020 |
|----------------|-----------|----------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Brookmans Park | BrP1 | | GB | Upper Bell Lane | 104 |
| Little Heath | BrP7 | HS24 | GB | Land south of Hawkshead Road | 100 |
| Cuffley | Cuf7 | HS30 | GB | Wells Farm, Northaw Road East | 72 |
| Cuffley | Cuf12 | HS29 | GB | Land North of Northaw Road East | 73 |

Three of the sites were part of the sites proposed for removal. The other site was BrP1 which the inspector had confirmed was not a particular sustainable site in comparison to other sites in Brookmans Park and was unlikely to be found sound unless there was a genuine local need for additional housing which could not be met by more sustainable location.

76.11.

Summary Table

Members were shown a table which showed a summary of sites by type in 2020 and 2022.

| | Total 2020 | Total 2022 | Total 2022 with sites removed (which had been found to be unsound or likely to be found unsound) |
|--------------------|------------|------------|--|
| Total Sites | 8,778 | 8,887 | 8,277 |
| Small Sites | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Windfall | 1,402 | 1,668 | 1,668 |
| Completions | 2,121 | 2,514 | 2,514 |
| Commitments | 961 | 806 | 806 |
| Total | 13,277 | 13,889 | 13,279 |

76.12.

Risks

Officers set out the risks with submitting to the Inspector a strategy which would deliver 13,279 dwellings. The key points included:

- The figure of 13,279 did not meet the FOAHN
- The strategy did not conform to the Inspector’s guidance on selecting sites or proportionate distribution
- It proposes the removal of sites which had been found sound
- The Inspector had already rejected this strategy so there is a strong likelihood of the strategy being found unsound
- There is a lost opportunity for stepped trajectory
- Decision on specific planning application would need to be made with reference to the current plan, which is out of date and has limited weight in decision making. Officers noted that the Council had lost appeals because of lack of five year housing land supply and Housing Delivery Test.
- Five-year housing land supply would be assessed on standard methodology – which would mean a target of 875 dwellings per annum
- The lack of an up-to-date plan will likely result in ad hoc development and impact on level of developer contributions.

77

CABINET MEMBERS COMMENTS

Members stated that there were risks involved in whichever decision the Council took with regards to the Local Plan. The lower target of 13,277 was in no way anti-growth. Even with the target, there will be a loss of Green

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>Belt, which Members acknowledged must be protected given the benefits it brought to the borough and the community.</p> <p>Members asked if the 13,279 as opposed to the 13,277 included Symondshyde? Officers confirmed that the figure did not include Symondshyde and that all the sites that Members had wanted to be removed from the plan had been removed. Officers agreed to provide a detailed table of sites to accompany the Cabinet recommendations that would be submitted to Full Council. [Supporting document Appendix B Housing Supply Note]</p> <p>Members acknowledged the full debate had at CPPP which informed the recommendations made and agreed that it was for elected Councillors and their communities to take planning decisions which were in the best interest of the residents, businesses and communities of the borough.</p> <p>Members acknowledged the risk as outlined by Officer. However, Members were minded to support the CPPP recommendation given the feedback received from the community and their own understanding of the impact of the higher housing figure. It was agreed that the recommendation from CPPP should be tweaked to reflect the more up to date figures and be in a form suitable for adoption by Full Council.</p> |
| 77.1 | <p><u>CABINET DECISION</u></p> <p>RESOLVED: (unanimous)</p> <p>(1) Cabinet recommended to Full Council the proposed dwelling numbers of 13,279 which can be formed from sites which the Inspector found sound.</p> |

Supporting Documents

- Appendix A Extracted Minutes from CPPP (13.01.22)
- Appendix B Housing Supply Note

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
SPECIAL CABINET – 18 JANUARY 2022

Recommendation from the Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel on 13 January 2022:-

39. LOCAL PLAN - ADDITIONAL SITES AND MODIFICATIONS TO THE PLAN

Report of the Head of Planning on the Local Plan – additional sites and modifications to the Plan. Members received a presentation which set out the background to the Local Plan including the key stages and consultation; Hearings Sessions; the content of the submitted plan the Development Strategy; and, the key reports and letters received from the Inspector. The Inspector had advised that the Local Plan should make provision for 15,200 homes. The Inspector had found that allocation totalling 8,557 dwellings to be either sound or could be found sound. An additional 1,641 dwellings were required to be allocated from sites considered by the Inspector. The presentation set out options to meet the housing need while meeting the Inspectors tests.

Recommendation 1:

Consider the results of the Site Selection Addendum and the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum and the merits and disadvantages of the different options.

Recommendation 2:

That Members accept the Officers recommendation set out in paragraph 4.30 of the report and recommend to Cabinet and Full Council Option D as set out in Appendix D to this report for submission to the examination along with the relevant supporting information.

Recommendation 3:

That Members recommend to Cabinet and Full Council that public consultation take place on Main Modifications to the Local Plan once the Inspector has confirmed the content of the Main Modifications required to make the Plan sound.

Members sought clarification on the inspector's position on the number of dwellings proposed at the Symondshyde site. Officers stated that the site does not need to be selected and more sustainable sites had to be selected first. Officers stated that the site had revised changes which could not change the funds allocated for infrastructure such as transport. Officers concluded that not the complete number of dwellings needed to be built in the Plan period, but the site would need the full amount to be deemed sustainable.

Members asked about infrastructure at the Symondshyde site. Officers stated that critical mass was examined to find what would be needed for school, shops and public transport provisions. As the site would be near North-West Hatfield and the two sites are owned by the same landowner, the site promoter would make a relationship

between the sites. Officers stated the inspector was happy with the viability of public transport infrastructure.

Members expressed concerns over the inclusion of Symondshyde into the Plan. Members felt that the transport and sustainability was inadequate, highlighting that the bus service would not be sufficient, the housing would be expensive therefore most homeowners would have cars which would increase stresses on the roads. Members felt it would be a blight on the greenbelt landscape.

Members stated that they could not support options A – D in the report as they included Symondshyde and other sites which were not sustainable. Members felt that the Inspector's OAN number of 15 200 was too high. Members stated that the metrics to calculate the target were not as certain as before as growth had been stagnant and inward migration had decreased which meant that the housing need would decrease.

Members had heard several concerns from Welwyn Hatfield residents and those outside of the borough over the loss of greenbelt proposed in this Local Plan. Members wanted the Local Plan to work for local people. Members stated that residents' concerns had been ignored, other local authorities were also building which would add stress to infrastructure and resources within the borough.

Members were aware that any Plan suggested, land from the greenbelt would be lost but felt it would be best to lessen the impacts. Members stated the greenbelt in the borough was crucial for many during the pandemic lockdowns, therefore as much of the greenbelt should be protected. Members stated that the greenbelt was created to prevent urban sprawl. Members highlighted that the density of developments would need to be reconsidered to keep the greenbelt protected.

Members felt there were limited options, the officers' recommendations would not be welcomed by the residents of the borough, and if an agreement was not made then the Council would be subject to Planning by appeal which would be a costly process. Members stated that appeals would still happen even if the Officer recommendations were accepted.

Members expressed that the Plan started in 2009 was focussed on Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield which was wrong. Members felt perhaps it was too late to reduce the OAN. Members felt the inspector was dictating the Plan as only he could approve or remove site allocations.

Members proposed a motion to reject the officers' recommendations and revert to the Plan discussed in November 2020 that had 13 377 homes for the borough.

In response to the Motion, Officers advised that the Inspector had found an overall figure of 15,200 new homes to be sound and had made it clear that unless the Council added in more sites to the Local Plan to achieve the Full Objectively Assessed Housing Need the Plan will be found unsound. Should the Inspector find the Plan unsound (e.g., because it did not make provision for what he regarded as the appropriate level of new housing development and / or because he did not regard the sites put forward to meet the need for new housing to be appropriate) the Council would be unable to adopt the Plan. In that eventuality, the Council would not have an up-to-date Plan as the current adopted District Plan dates from 2005 and therefore largely out-of-date, particularly in relation to policies relating to new residential development. If the emerging plan were withdrawn or found unsound the Council would have to largely rely on policies in the NPPF for decision making. Because the Council no longer had

a five-year land supply and had failed the Housing Delivery Test, the presumption in favour of sustainable development already applies. In the absence of an up-to-date local plan, policies that sought to protect areas from residential development would carry less weight and the Council would be more likely to lose decisions on appeal. There would be a risk that the Council's vulnerability to opportunistic speculative planning applications and associated appeals would increase significantly by not having an up-to-date Local Plan. By virtue of its date of submission for examination the emerging Local Plan was being judged against the version of national planning policy (the NPPF) which was published in 2012 rather than against more recent versions. The housing requirement was lower than it would be under more recent Government policy. If the emerging plan was not adopted the housing figure of 760 per annum would be replaced by a higher figure of 875 per annum generated by the "standard methodology". Officers stated they have a duty to alert members of the risks associated with departing from the principles set out by the Inspector in his letter dated June 2021.

Members sought clarification on the legal process of the recommendation from CPPP to Cabinet. The Executive Member stated that Cabinet makes recommendation for Council to decide.

Members sought clarification whether Option D from the report could be accepted and at the 5-year review to reduce the number of dwellings and remove sites. Officers stated that they had investigated that, however once land had been removed from the greenbelt it would be hard to put it back in. Members agreed in principle with the idea however once the land had been designated building land it would then be built upon.

Members stated they could not support the motion as the distribution of housing was incorrect however they would like to see a lower OAN. Members raised concerns regarding to the Inspectors comments and the Plan potentially being found unsound which would be a waste of time and money.

Members sought greater detail on the proposed motion as they had not seen the Plan mentioned.

Members stated that they had a difficult decision to make as the Inspectors OAN of 15 200 was too high, the Council Advisors, Turleys, figure of 14 000 was high and local resident would not support such large developments in the borough due to the quantity of correspondence regarding the Local Plan.

RESOLVED:
(Unanimous in Favour)

Panel members considered the results of the Site Selection Addendum and the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum and the merits and disadvantages of the different options

RESOLVED:
(Unanimous against)

Panel Members accept the Officers recommendation set out in paragraph 4. 30 of the report and recommend to Cabinet and Full Council Option D as set out in Appendix D to this report for submission to the examination along with the relevant supporting information.

A motion was proposed and seconded by Councillors S. Thusu and D. Richardson and,

RESOLVED:

(10 in **Favour**, 2 against, 1 abstention)

That Members recommend to Cabinet and Full Council the proposed dwelling numbers agreed and recommended by the Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel on 17 November 2020, specifically that a strategy is put forward for 13,277 dwellings.

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel Document Link - [Thursday 13 January 2022](#)

List of Sites submitted to the Examination in 2021

Table 1: Showing proposed allocations submitted to the Examination in 2020 that led to a total of 13,277 dwellings (column E). Showing where changes to site capacity have taken place since 2020 (column F). Showing an amended site selection removing sites the Inspector has concluded are unsound or unlikely to be sound if not required to meet local need.

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I |
|------------|--------|-----------|--|-------------------|------------------|--|-----------------|---|
| Settlement | LP Ref | HELAA Ref | Site | Dwellings at 2020 | Dwelling at 2022 | Dwelling at 2020 + Inspectors views on soundness | Green Bet/Urban | Notes |
| WGC | SDS1 | WGC4/4a | North east of Welwyn Garden City | 815 | 845 | 845 | GB | Sound |
| WGC | SDS2 | WGC5 | South east of Welwyn Garden City | 500 | 600 | 600 | GB | Sound |
| WGC | SDS3 | Pea02b | Broadwater Road West SPD Site | 2003 | 2003 | 2003 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | SDS4 | Pea02c | Broadwater Road West SPD Site (West) - Pall Mall | 171 | 171 | 171 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | HS1 | Pan01b | Land at Bericot Way (North) | 21 | 0 | 0 | Urban | Sound included in completion figures |
| WGC | HS2 | WGC1 | Creswick | 300 | 300 | 300 | GB | Sound |
| WGC | HS3 | Pea08 | 80 Bridge Road East | 32 | 32 | 32 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | HS4 | Hal03 | Ratcliff Tail Lift Site, Bessemer Road | 110 | 110 | 110 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | HS5 | Hol19 | Hyde Valley House, Hyde Valley | 17 | 17 | 17 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | MUS1 | Han40 | Welwyn Garden City Town Centre North SPD Site | 100 | 100 | 100 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | HS6 | Han91 | Land at Gosling Sports Park, Stanborough Road | 100 | 100 | 100 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | HS8 | Pea24 | St Michaels House, Holwell Road | 22 | 22 | 22 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | | Han40a | Town Centre North- Campus | 250 | 250 | 250 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | | Pea106 | 73-83 Bridge Road East | 235 | 235 | 0 | Urban | Unsound |
| WGC | - | Pea103 | 29 Broadwater Road | 128 | 0 | 0 | Urban | Unsound but has planning permission included in commitments figures |
| WGC | | Pea102 | Bio Park, Broadwater Road | 250 | 250 | 250 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | | Pea104 | YMCA, 90 Peartree Lane | 15 | 15 | 15 | Urban | Sound |
| WGC | | Pea105 | 61 Bridge Road | 21 | 21 | | Urban | Unsound |
| WGC | | Hol23 | Neighbourhood Centre, Hollybush Lane | 16 | 16 | 16 | Urban | Sound |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|------|---------|--|------|------|------|-------|--|
| WGC | | Pea97 | Former Norton Building | 122 | 63 | 0 | Urban | Unsound but has planning permission for 59 dwellings and is included in commitments figures (63 relates to difference between 122 and consent) |
| Hatfield | SDS5 | Hat1 | North West Hatfield | 1750 | 1750 | 1750 | GB | Sound |
| Hatfield | MUS2 | HC100b | 1-9 Town Centre | 71 | 71 | 71 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | MUS3 | HW100 | High view (Hilltop) SPD Site | 140 | 140 | 140 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | HS9 | HE80 | Land at Onslow St Audrey's School, Howe Dell | 86 | 86 | 86 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | HS10 | HS31 | Garages at Hollyfield | 12 | 12 | 12 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | HS11 | Hat11 | Land at Southway | 120 | 120 | 120 | GB | Sound |
| Hatfield | HS13 | HS91 | Land south of Filbert Close | 37 | 37 | 37 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | HS14 | HE23 | L Kahn Manufacturing, Wellfield Road | 62 | 62 | 62 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | - | HC11 | Meridian House, The Common | 11 | 11 | 11 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | | HE17 | Link Drive (Site F) | 80 | 80 | 80 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | | HC08 | Lemsford Road (Site H) | 32 | 32 | 32 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | | HSW92 | Minster Close | 49 | 49 | 49 | Urban | Sound |
| Hatfield | | HSW94 | College Lane | 115 | 115 | 115 | Urban | Sound |
| Woolmer Green | HS15 | WGr1 | Land east of London Road | 150 | 150 | 150 | GB | Sound |
| Woolmer Green | | WE100 | 51-53 London Road | 34 | 34 | 34 | Urban | Sound |
| O&MH | HS16 | OMH8 | 2 Great North Road | 5 | 5 | 5 | GB | Sound |
| O&MH | HS32 | GTLAA04 | SG - Four Oaks, Great North Road | 6 | 6 | 6 | GB | Sound |
| O&MH | HS17 | OMH5 | Land rear of 2a-12 Great North Road | 20 | 20 | 20 | GB | Sound |
| Welwyn | HS18 | Wel11 | The Vineyards | 30 | 30 | 30 | GB | Sound |
| Welwyn | HS19 | Wel4 | Sandyhurst, The Bypass | 30 | 30 | 30 | GB | Sound |
| Welwyn | HS20 | Wel3 | School Lane | 9 | 9 | 9 | GB | Sound |
| Welham Green | HS35 | GTLAA01 | Foxes Lane, Dixons Hill Road | 12 | 12 | 12 | GB | Sound |
| Welham Green | SDS7 | WeG4b | Marshmoor | 100 | 100 | 100 | GB | Sound |
| Welham Green | | WeG1 | 51 Welham Manor | 16 | 16 | 16 | GB | Sound |
| Welham Green | | WeG3a | Land South of Welham Manor | 68 | 68 | 68 | GB | Sound |
| Welham Green | | WeG10 | Dixons Hill Road | 120 | 120 | 120 | GB | Sound |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------|--------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Brookmans Park | HS21 | BrP13 | Land west of Golf Club Road | 14 | 14 | 14 | GB | Sound |
| Brookmans Park | HS23 | BrP14 | Land east of Golf Club Road | 10 | 10 | 10 | GB | Sound |
| Brookmans Park | | BrP1 | Upper Bell Lane | 104 | 104 | 0 | GB | Unlikely to be sound if not required to meet local need |
| Little Heath | HS24 | LHe1 | Land north of Hawkshead Road | 35 | 35 | 35 | GB | Sound |
| Little Heath | | LHe4/5 | Part of Studlands/Videne, Hawkshead Road | 36 | 36 | 36 | GB | Sound but larger site could deliver 63 dwellings |
| Cuffley | HS26 | No02 | 36 The Ridgeway and land to the rear | 5 | 5 | 5 | Urban | Sound |
| Cuffley | HS27 | Cuf1 | Land at The Meadway | 60 | 60 | 60 | GB | Sound |
| Cuffley | HS28 | Cuf6 | Land south of Northaw Road East | 121 | 121 | 121 | GB | Sound |
| Total | | | | 8,778 | 8,700 | 8,277 | | |

Notes:

BrP1 - The Inspector concluded that the evidence before the examination suggests that in comparison with other options at Brookmans Park, this is not a particularly sustainable site for new residential development. Unless there is a genuine local need for additional housing that cannot be met in a more movement sustainable location and where exceptional circumstances for GB release can be justified, then the development of this site is unlikely to be found sound.

Table 2: House Supply

| | Total 2020 | Total 2022 | Dwelling at 2020 + Inspectors views on soundness |
|--|------------|------------|--|
| TOTAL Sites (As above) | 8,778 | 8,700 | 8,277 |
| Small Sites - Suitable HELAA 2016 sites below allocation threshold | 15 | 14 | 14 |
| Windfall | 1,402 | 1,668 | 1,668 |
| Completions (2016 - 2020) | 2,121 | 2,514 | 2,514 |
| Commitments | 961 | 806 | 806 |
| Total | 13,277 | 13,702 | 13,279 |

This page is intentionally left blank