

**Examination of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan (2011-2031)**  
**Examination hearing sessions**  
**Statement of North Hertfordshire District Council**

**Matter 25 – new land proposed for allocation through the main modifications  
MM389 – Site BK3 – Land between Cambridge Road & Royston Road, Barkway**

**Question 25.1 For each of the new areas of land proposed through the main modifications:**

***a) Is the inclusion of the new area of land for allocation necessary for soundness***

1. Yes, for the reasons set out in paragraphs 29 to 31 of the Council's November 2019 'Paper E' on additional land ([ED175](#)). This additional land extends the proposed housing allocation further to the south to additionally cover land secured as a reserve site for primary education.

***b) Is the new area of land proposed deliverable? In particular, is it***

***i) confirmed by all of the landowners involved as being available for the use proposed?***

2. Yes, the land is held by Hertfordshire County Council as a reserve school site. Through their statements and evidence to the hearing sessions, they have confirmed the availability of the site for this purpose.

***ii) supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?***

3. Yes. The site has a frontage to the Royston Road providing the opportunity for access to be created (subject to appropriate clearances from any other access points to the remainder of the site). In the alternate, any future scheme could propose for access to this land through any proposed internal road layout; The policy criteria for BK3 (as proposed to be amended) require the site layout to be designed to integrate with any future use of the school site. This would be assessed on its merits at the time of any relevant application(s) through the Development Management system.

***iii) deliverable, having regard to the provision of the necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?***

4. Yes, for the reasons set out in Paragraphs 4 to 7 of the Council's [Matter 11 \(Barkway\) Statement](#). The additional land does not alter the dwelling estimate or any of the

infrastructure requirements arising from the site. The additional land is presently within the same field as the eastern half of BK3 and does not result in the identification of any additional constraints beyond those already considered.

***c) Is the inclusion of the new area of land justified and appropriate in terms of the likely impacts of the development***

5. Yes, for the reasons set out in Paragraphs 8 to 9 and 14 to 16 of the Council's Matter 11 (Barkway) statement. The prospective use of the reserve school site was known to all participants at the time of the original hearing session on 8 February 2018 and this matter was specifically discussed.
6. The actions arising from that hearing session requested NHDC consider its position with regards the reserve school site. The Council's subsequent note set out the rationale for the proposed approach ([ED148a](#), p.3).

***Question 25.2 If / where the new area of land proposed for allocation is currently in the Green Belt:***

- a) Do exceptional circumstances exist to warrant its allocation? If so, what are they?***
- b) What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt of removing the site from it?***
- c) To what extent would the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent?***

***If / where relevant***

- d) If this site were to be developed as proposed, would the adjacent Green Belt continue to serve at least one of the five purposes of Green Belts, or would the Green Belt function be undermined by the site's allocation?***
  - e) Will the Green Belt boundary proposed need to be altered at the end of the plan period, or is it capable of enduring beyond then?***
  - f) Are the proposed Green Belt boundaries consistent with the Plan's strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development?***
  - g) Has the Green Belt boundary around the site been defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent? Does it avoid including land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open?***
7. The proposed additional land does not lie within the current Green Belt. These questions are not applicable.