10 GREEN BELT

10.1 The Core Strategy does not indicate a need for a full review of the Green Belt. However it does set out that detailed changes to the established boundary may be made through the Site Allocations DPD in order to accommodate growth at the most sustainable locations on the edge of existing settlements. Only minor changes to the Green Belt boundary, where appropriate, should be considered in this regard.

10.2 Reviewing the Green Belt boundaries around some sites should ensure that there are sensible and defensible Green Belt boundaries in future, however many proposed development sites are in sensitive locations and retaining Green Belt status will enable the Council to maintain greater control over future development on these sites.

10.3 All proposed housing and employment sites within the Green Belt have been reviewed to identify any areas where the boundary should be amended. Green Belt boundary reviews have only been suggested where there would be significant development at the Green Belt boundary as a result of the allocation of sites for development.

10.4 To assist in reviewing whether Green Belt boundaries should be reviewed and to provide a consistent approach, a set of criteria have been developed building on guidance in national planning policy (PPG2: Green Belts).

- **Edge of Green Belt**: boundary review should take place where allocations are at the edge of the Green Belt.
- **Significant Development**: as a full Green Belt review is not proposed, boundary review should only be required where necessary to provide for a significant level of development (as a guide it is suggested that significant is defined as more than 50 dwellings or 2ha employment land).
- **Check Unrestricted Sprawl**: boundary review should not lead to unrestricted sprawl of urban areas.
- **Prevent Neighbouring Towns from Merging**: boundary review should not lead to coalescence of settlements.
- **Safeguard Countryside from Encroachment**: boundary review should not lead to loss of areas of nature/geological value, loss of access to the countryside (e.g. footpaths), loss of trees or woodland, particularly if protected or loss of high grade agricultural land.
- **Preserve Setting and Special Character of Historic Towns**: boundary review should not lead to harm to heritage assets.

10.5 Where it is identified that a review of the Green Belt boundary may be appropriate, the review should ensure that there is a strong, defensible boundary. Strong boundaries include motorways, district distributor road, railway lines, rivers, streams, canal or other watercourses, prominent physical features such as ridgelines, protected woodlands or hedges and residential or other development with strong established boundaries. Weak boundaries include disused railways, private/unmade roads, field boundaries, park boundaries, power lines, non-protected woodlands, trees or hedges and residential or other development with weak or spaced out boundaries.

10.6 Following the review of proposed sites, we are only proposing changes to the Green Belt boundary in relation to two sites. Details of the proposed changes are below.
Current Green Belt Boundary

Reason for Change
Current Green Belt boundary includes area already developed which does not contribute to Green Belt objectives. Proposed boundary is defensible and removes existing development at Huntonbury Village and Leavesden Park from the Green Belt. Hill Farm Avenue housing site is also removed from Green Belt as it is already a developed site, while the Leavesden Aerodrome housing site to the north of Aerodrome Way remains in the Green Belt, retaining control over future development on this significant site.

Proposed Green Belt Boundary
Site Ref | GB(2) | Site | South of Heysham Drive, South Oxhey

**Current Green Belt Boundary**

**Reason for Change**
Land south of Heysham Drive is identified as a proposed housing site. The site is surrounded by development on two sides (and local nature reserve to the east). The land to the south within the administrative boundary of the London Borough of Harrow is designated as Green Belt.

**Proposed Green Belt Boundary**
10.7 The Local Plan identifies two Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt at Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works and Leavesden Studios. Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt are referred to by Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belt. These sites remain subject to Green Belt policies, but where they are identified, infilling or redevelopment meeting certain criteria is not inappropriate development.

10.8 Core Strategy Policy CP11 states that the Council will retain ‘Major Developed Site in the Green Belt’ status for the Maple Lodge Sewage Treatment Works and review ‘Major Developed Site Status in the Green Belt’ status in relation to Leavesden Aerodrome, having regard to the important contribution that the site is expected to make to meeting needs for housing and employment.

10.9 Planning permissions have now been granted on the Leavesden Aerodrome site for both redevelopment of the studios, and for new residential development to the east of the studios. In light of the development now permitted on the site, it is not considered appropriate to retain the Major Developed Site status on the Leavesden Studios site and it is proposed to remove this designation.

10.10 No change is proposed to the designation of the Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. It is a substantial developed feature in the local landscape to the east of Maple Cross and has an industrial character. The site of the works is identified below as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt where redevelopment or limited infilling for its continued use would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt subject to the provisions of national planning policy and policy SA8.

**POLICY SA8: MAPLE LODGE WASTEWATER TREATMENT WORKS**

- Maple Lodge Wastewater Treatment Works is designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt.

- The landscaped setting provided by mature vegetation on the site boundaries and area surrounding the site should be retained in any proposals for infilling or redevelopment.

- Any further buildings should be of comparable height to other nearby structures on the site.