



## Decision Notice and Statement of Reasons

Site visit made on 14 February 2025

**By C Shearing BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**A person appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 March 2025**

---

**Application Reference: S62A/2025/0076**

**Site address: Land at Colne Spring Villa, Colney Heath, St Albans AL4 0PB**

- The application is made under section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
  - The site is located within the administrative area of St Albans City and District Council.
  - The application dated 6 January 2025 is made by Dr C Ogunmakin and was validated on 15 January 2025.
  - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of eco-village comprising 9 dwellings and community hub with associated access, parking and landscaping'.
- 

### Decision

1. Planning permission is refused for the development described above, for the following reasons:
  - 1) The proposed development would be inappropriate by definition and would cause substantial harm to the Green Belt's openness. In the absence of other considerations which would clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, it would conflict with Policy 1 of the St Albans City and District Council Local Plan Review 1994, and the Green Belt objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
  - 2) The proposed development, through the introduction of a residential character together with the loss of trees on the site, would fail to respect the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies 69, 70 and 74 of the St Albans City and District Local Plan Review 1994.
  - 3) In the absence of suitable bat surveys and details of the effects of the proposal on the designated Local Wildlife Site, it cannot be established that the proposal would have acceptable effects on biodiversity and protected species, contrary to Policy 106 of the St Albans City and District Local Plan Review 1994.

# Statement of Reasons

## Procedural Matters

2. The application was made under Section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, which allows for applications to be made directly to the Planning Inspectorate where a Council has been designated by the Secretary of State. St Albans City and District Council (the Council) have been designated for non-major applications since 6 March 2024.
3. Consultation was undertaken which allowed for responses by 20 February 2025. Within that period responses were received from the parties listed in Appendix 1. A number of interested parties and local residents also submitted responses. The Council submitted an officer report dated 18 February 2025. The consultation response summarises these documents and sets out the Council's objections to the proposed development on a number of grounds. I have taken account of all written representations received during the consultation period in reaching my decision.
4. I carried out a site visit on 14 February which enabled me to view the site and the surrounding area.

## Main Issues

5. Having regard to the application, the consultation responses, comments from interested parties, together with the findings of my site visit, the main issues for this application are:
  - Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies;
  - The effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including effects on trees;
  - Ecology;
  - Living conditions;
  - Flood risk;
  - Highways effects, and;
  - Whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances required to justify the proposal.

## Reasons

### Whether Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt

6. The Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The Framework establishes that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate, but gives exceptions, which are considered in turn below.

7. Policy 1 of the St Albans City and District Local Plan<sup>1</sup> (the LP) relates to Metropolitan Green Belt and gives circumstances where development in the Green Belt will be granted planning permission. The proposal would not adhere to any of the exceptions or the purposes of development listed. Subject to consideration of very special circumstances below, the proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 1 of the LP.

*Paragraph 154 Assessment*

8. The Framework lists exceptions to inappropriate development at paragraph 154. Of those exceptions listed, the most relevant to the proposal is 154g), which relates to the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (PDL), whether redundant or in continuing use which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
9. The definition of PDL in the Glossary of the Framework includes land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land. The only existing structures within the red line of the application site are two open sided car ports. Associated infrastructure includes the gravel tracks which lead through the site. While the car ports do not appear in the planning history for the site listed by the Council, I see no reason why these elements together should not be treated as part of the lawful development of the land. The site can therefore be considered as previously developed land by definition.
10. Under paragraph 154g) then it is necessary to assess whether the proposal would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Openness has a spatial aspect, as well as a visual aspect. It is open textured, and a number of factors can be relevant in its consideration.
11. The site lies within a predominantly rural area outside any settlement. The openness of the wider area is established by the dispersed pattern of development and the predominance of open fields, areas of woodland and vegetation. The application site is largely free of development, other than two modest sized open sided car ports, which are formed by a flat roof supported by four tree trunks, allowing visibility through. The remaining site comprises reasonably dense woodland, formed of species including larch and pine trees with high canopies, and an unmade gravel track demarcated by low level timber edging strip and with some lighting columns. Despite its wooded nature the site therefore contributes significantly to the spatial aspect of the Green Belt's openness. In visual terms, views into the site from the road are restricted by close boarded fencing along the site's western boundary, which limits views of the ground level of the site to gaps in the fencing. The absence of buildings on the site, and its open and wooded character are however apparent to users of the road. The site therefore also contributes to the visual qualities of the Green Belt's openness.

---

<sup>1</sup> City and District of St Albans District Local Plan Review 1994 (Adopted 30 November 1994), saved and deleted policies version July 2020

12. The proposal would introduce ten new buildings which would be dispersed across much of the site and which would entail a very substantial uplift in built form in terms of both footprint and volume. The majority of the new buildings would be single storey with pitched roofs, and some would include a partial first floor above with associated first floor level windows and pitched roofs above. In addition, each of the nine new houses would be set within its own plot including front and rear gardens, bound by new boundary treatments, and which would accommodate paraphernalia arising from the residential occupation of each dwelling including on patios. The track through the site would also be widened and altered to provide parking areas for each new house as well as associated turning areas. Cumulatively, these attributes of the proposal would result in a very substantial loss to the Green Belt's openness in spatial terms.
13. As above, due to the fencing to the western site boundary, visibility of the lower levels of the development would be limited to glimpses from the road. Nonetheless, due to the proximity of some of the houses and private gardens to the road, the development and increased activity on the site would be apparent in those glimpses. The houses closest to the road would also be very likely to be apparent above the fence. Similarly, while the proposed two storey buildings would be positioned more centrally on the site, it is very likely that their upper levels would be visible from the road, especially when the windows were lit. This visibility would draw attention to the presence of development on the site. There is not substantial evidence to suggest that the new planting to the western boundary would effectively screen the effects of the development throughout the year, and in any event this planting would take some time to establish. While the visual effects of the proposal would be limited to localised views from the road and surrounding private land, the effects on openness would nonetheless be significant.
14. When these factors are taken together, the harm to openness would be substantial, and the proposal would not accord with the exception to inappropriate development at paragraph 154g) of the Framework. Based on the information before me, I find no reason for the proposal to be considered under any other exception to inappropriate development in paragraph 154. Accordingly, paragraph 154 does not provide a reason for the proposal not to be inappropriate development.

#### *Paragraph 155 Assessment*

15. Paragraph 155 of the Framework also gives circumstances where the development of homes should not be regarded as inappropriate, and lists criteria where all should apply. Given my finding above that the site constitutes PDL, the site would conform to the definition of Grey Belt given by the Framework. While the proposal would entail encroachment of development into the countryside, given its scale and location in relation to towns and large built-up areas, I do not consider it would affect the ability of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in the meaningful way. This view is reached having regard to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Accordingly, the

proposal would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. Criteria a) of paragraph 155 would therefore be met.

16. In terms of criteria 155b), as the Council is unable to demonstrate an appropriate housing land supply, I am satisfied that there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed. This would not, however, extend to the proposed community hub and there is not evidence of an unmet need for such a facility. In terms of 155c), the site is not in a sustainable location given its distance from the nearest settlement and the absence of reasonable or attractive alternatives to car use for future occupiers on a daily basis. I have provided further reasoning on this point below. For the reasons set out in the next paragraph, the proposal would also not meet the 'golden rules' set out. Therefore, not all the criteria of paragraph 155 would be met. Accordingly, the provisions of paragraph 155 do not provide a reason for the proposed development to be considered other than inappropriate.

#### *'Golden Rules'*

17. Based on the application form, the site has an area of 0.84ha and the proposal therefore falls under the definition of Major Development set out in the Glossary to the Framework. Paragraph 156 of the Framework sets out the 'Golden Rules' of contributions which should be made, relating to affordable housing, infrastructure and green space, which I shall consider in turn. In respect of affordable housing, none is proposed. Based on the information before me, I cannot be satisfied that the development plan policies were produced in accordance with paragraphs 67-68 of the Framework and the proposal would not provide affordable housing at 15 percentage points above the highest existing requirement, or the default 50% contribution. While paragraph 157 allows for a site-specific viability assessment on this matter, in the absence of information on this matter I cannot be satisfied that the Golden Rule in respect of affordable housing would be met.
18. There is not strong evidence to suggest that improvements to infrastructure would be necessary here. In terms of green space, spaces would exist within the blue line boundary, for example to the south east of the site, and the proposal refers to improvements including the provision of allotments. However, it is not apparent that this would constitute green space that was accessible to the public. On this basis, the proposal would not adhere to the Golden Rules set out in paragraph 156.

#### *Whether Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt- Conclusion*

19. In conclusion on this main issue, the proposal would be inappropriate development and it would cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Very special circumstances are considered below, once any other harms have been identified.

#### Character and Appearance

20. As set out above, the site is in a rural location which is characterised by areas of open fields, interspersed with woodland. There is a dispersed pattern of development across the surrounding area, comprising predominately large detached homes within generous plots and farmsteads. This pattern of development distinguishes the countryside landscape from the more dense pattern of residential development within nearby settlements including Colney Heath.
21. The application site comprises an area of dense woodland which adjoins the eastern side of Coursers Road. While there is variation in the species of the trees on the site, a significant proportion are larch or pine trees which have high canopies rising to a height of around 20m, based on the applicant's reports. The trees and cumulative woodland of the application site therefore contribute positively to the landscape character of the area, and this is particularly appreciated by those traveling on Coursers Road.
22. The wider site of Colne Spring Villa includes a large house to the northern part of the site, as well as some low level detached homes with timber clad elevations to the south east of the site. These are, however, set back a substantial distance from the road and sit fairly unobtrusively at the edge of the woodland.
23. The proposal would see the introduction of residential and domestic character across the majority of the site, arising from the buildings themselves, the division of the site into gardens and the formalising of the access road. Together these alterations would be heavily at odds with the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would include houses with an irregular layout, and the buildings would include a natural palette of materials, together reducing the formality of the development and providing some affinity to its woodland setting, however this would do little to dilute the heavy contrast of the residential development with the surrounding area.
24. In addition, the proposal would result in the loss of a substantial number of trees to facilitate the development. This includes 12 individual trees, as well as 3 groups of trees which together cover a large part of the centre and southern parts of the site and would amount to the loss of a very significant number of trees. While the applicant has shown these do not include any 'category A' trees, they nonetheless still have a reasonable life expectancy and together contribute strongly to the verdant and rural character of the area and the wooded character of the site, which would be substantially lost as a result of the proposal. Incursions would occur into the root protection areas of other retained trees. Many of these would result from new hard surfacing where appropriate measures may be used to prevent root damage. However, in other instances the incursions result from the footprint of new buildings which may cause harm to those trees and could result in further losses.
25. The proposal would include some new tree planting dispersed across the development at intervals. Many would be positioned within the private front or rear gardens of the new houses, and in some cases close to proposed windows and patio areas, where they would be likely to be subject to

pressure for pruning or removal by future residents, for example to improve natural lighting to the houses and gardens. The new planting also includes non-native species. The replacement planting would not therefore mitigate for the effects of the lost trees on the character of the area, even after having become established.

26. In conclusion on this main issue, for the reasons given, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with policies 69, 70 and 74 of the LP which require, among other things, that developments respect the character of their surroundings and retention of trees and landscaping features. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework where it requires development to be sympathetic to local character including landscape setting.

### Ecology

27. The site has the ability to accommodate some protected species due to its woodland characteristics and the presence of nearby water courses. The applicant has submitted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) which considers these matters.
28. The PEA recommends bat activity surveys to establish the use of the site by foraging and commuting bats, given that the existing woodland provides very good foraging and commuting bat habitat, and is well connected to other woodland habitats. Given the need to establish the extent of the effects on bat species prior to the grant of any planning permission, it would not be appropriate to secure the required bat surveys by condition. Other mitigation, for example through lighting, soft-felling of an existing tree with roosting potential, and details of construction arrangements, could be secured by condition if the proposal were otherwise acceptable.
29. With regard to great crested newts, the applicant notes the presence of two potential breeding ponds within 100m of the site. Accordingly, details of a Great Crested Newt District Level Licensing Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate have been submitted, which are completed by the applicant and Natural England. I am therefore satisfied that the effects on Great Crested Newts are capable of being addressed if the proposal was otherwise acceptable.
30. In addition to the above, the site forms part of the Frederick's Wood Local Wildlife Site, which the Council acknowledge is important for its woodland indicator species and remnants of heathland and acid grassland. Policy 106 of the LP contains a presumption against planning applications which could adversely affect sites of wildlife importance. This designation is not recognised by the PEA and, in the absence of information regarding the other effects of the proposal on this area, for example in terms of fragmentation, damage to soils and air pollution, it cannot be established that there would not be adverse effects as set out in the policy.
31. The proposal would be subject to the statutory requirement for biodiversity net gain (BNG) and the applicant has provided a BNG assessment with supporting information including a biodiversity metric. This demonstrates

that through on site habitat creation the proposal would be capable of achieving an uplift in habitat units of 32.5%, exceeding the statutory requirement. On this basis I am satisfied that a solution exists to meet the BNG condition if the application were otherwise acceptable.

32. In conclusion on the matter of ecology, there is insufficient information to demonstrate the effects of the proposal on foraging and commuting bats using the site, and there is not substantive evidence to demonstrate that effects on the designated Local Wildlife Site would be acceptable. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 106 of the LP which relates to sites of wildlife importance, and the Framework where it relates to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in local wildlife rich habitats.

### Living Conditions

33. The proposed homes would be of a suitable size with outlook from windows in multiple directions and with access to private outdoor spaces. While the proposed houses are close together and would have some habitable windows facing one-another, it is likely that overlooking could be reduced between the single storey homes through the use of appropriate boundary treatments. Obscure glazing could also be secured where necessary. Similarly, while the taller homes would be close to others, given the orientation of the buildings and windows which provide outlook in multiple directions, even if some overshadowing or overlooking were to occur, this would not result in unacceptable living conditions overall. As above, the proximity of new trees could result in reduced natural lighting to some windows, although this is likely to give rise to pressure to prune those trees, it would also not result in a substandard quality of accommodation. When considered as a whole, the proposal would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupants.
34. In terms of other existing occupants on the site, the proposal would increase vehicle movements along the shared access and would intensify activity on the site. However, given the scale of development this would not result in unacceptable noise or disturbance. Given the distance of the proposal from the other homes on the site, and the ability to use boundary treatments to reduce inter-visibility, acceptable living conditions would be maintained.
35. In conclusion on this issue, the proposal would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupants and have acceptable effects on the living conditions of those adjoining occupants. The proposal would comply with policies 70 and 72 of the LP which relate to living conditions and effects on adjoining properties. It would also comply with the Framework insofar as it relates to healthy living conditions.

### Flood Risk

36. The application site lies within flood risk zone 1 and is at low risk of flooding, as is the main access and escape route from the site. The majority of the site is also within an area designated as being as very low risk of surface water flooding, with only a small amount of flooding noted. Given



the proposal would increase hard surfaces on the site, details of the treatment of surface water could be secured by condition if the application were otherwise acceptable. The applicant has provided details of an intended sustainable drainage strategy and I am satisfied that an acceptable final solution could be achieved for this site. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of its effects on flood risk and drainage and would comply with Policy 84 of the LP regarding drainage infrastructure and the objectives of the Framework on this matter.

### Highways

37. The proposal would provide an appropriate level of off street parking for future occupants, compliant with the Council's parking standards for residential development. Adequate space exists within the site for the storage of cycles and the internal layout would appear to be suitable for manoeuvring of vehicles within the site while not causing prejudice to highway safety within the site itself. Access to the site would remain as existing, with the access from Coursers Road being at the north of the site in front of Colne Spring Villa and this would be adequate to serve as an access for the proposed additional homes. The applicant has also demonstrated that the cumulative impact of the development on the road network would not be severe, and I have no strong reason to reach a different view, given the quantum of development proposed. I note the concerns of the County Council's Highway Officer for the sustainability of the site's location and I return to this matter below.
38. The proposal would otherwise be acceptable in terms of its effects on highway safety, and would comply with Policy 34 of the LP and the Framework insofar as they relate to highway safety.

### Very Special Circumstances

39. The Framework makes clear that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
40. The Framework requires that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. In addition, harm has been found to the character and appearance of the area and potentially to the site's biodiversity including protected species. These matters also attract very significant weight.
41. The proposal would provide nine new homes. These would contribute to the national objective to boost the supply of homes and would be of particular importance here, given that the Council is unable to demonstrate a suitable supply of land for homes. It may also be likely that some of the Council's future delivery would be reliant on development on Green Belt land. The proposed homes, and the community hub, would be energy efficient, incorporating passive design measures to reduce energy demand and CO2

emissions, and could exceed the building regulations requirement. The materials would be capable of being locally sourced and waste materials from construction could be reused, although it is not clear how this would be secured. Residents would also have access to allotments providing an opportunity to grow their own food, and biodiversity enhancements could be delivered to the site, at a level in excess of the statutory requirement. There could also be some social benefit through providing a community hub on site to facilitate social interaction among residents. Taken together these benefits can be given significant weight. This would be the case even if the level of shortfall in the housing land supply and previous levels of delivery were as low as alleged by the applicant.

42. The proposal would make use of PDL, which is supported by paragraph 124 of the Framework. However, the associated footnote makes clear that this should not be the case where it would conflict with other policies in the Framework, which is the case here. Accordingly, I do not give the use of PDL additional weight in favour of the development.
43. I have not given weight to the provision of the shuttle bus service given the uncertainty surrounding its provision and maintenance. The applicant asserts that the age of the Local Plan also contributes to a case of very special circumstances. However, the Framework is clear that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because of their age and due weight should instead be given to them according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. Based on the information before me, I have no strong reason to find the policies inconsistent with the Framework. The applicant refers to comments of an Inspector relating to the age of the Local Plan in Castle Point Borough in 2020, however I cannot be satisfied that the circumstances or considerations are the same. As such this matter does not weigh in favour of the development. Where the proposal has been found to be policy compliant in other respects, such as highway safety, these are neutral matters and do not weigh in favour of the development.
44. Overall, there are not considerations of sufficient weight which would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, as set out in the Framework. As a consequence, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.

## **Other Matters**

### *Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development*

45. As above, the Council accept that it cannot demonstrate a five year land supply for housing and as such the provisions of paragraph 11d) are relevant to the application. However in considering the proposal against paragraph 11)d)i), for the reasons set out, the application of policies in the Framework insofar as they relate to Green Belt provide a strong reason for refusing the proposed development. The proposal would not therefore benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

### *Heritage Assets*

46. There are some grade II listed buildings a short distance from the application site, including The Mill on the opposite side of Coursers Road. Based on the findings of my site visit, while a rural setting forms part of how that listed building is appreciated, given its distance from the application site, presence of the intervening road and structures, and limited views from where the development and The Mill would be appreciated together, I am satisfied that the proposal would not form a part of its setting. The same applies for the other listed buildings slightly further afield.

#### *Location for Housing*

47. I note the comments of the Highways Authority (HA) regarding the suitability of the site for housing in light of its accessibility to services and facilities. This matter has been discussed above insofar as the assessment against paragraph 155 of the Framework is concerned. The HA refer to conflict with the policies of the Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan, however, it is not apparent that those policies form a part of the Council's development plan and they have not been referred to among the policies relevant to the application in the Council's officer report. Given this uncertainty I have not treated them as such.
48. In expansion to the conclusion above regarding the sustainability of the site's location, the site access would be onto Coursers Road, which is a largely unlit carriageway without footpaths and with a speed limit of 60mph. There is a public footpath to the north of the site's access which provides a link through to Tollgate Road and the services and facilities in that area, including bus routes. However, to access that path users would need to walk on the verge of Coursers Road, which could be unsafe, and particularly unattractive to those with mobility issues or children, and particularly in dark hours or inclement weather. The public footpath itself is also an unlit route without surveillance, and is unlikely to be an attractive alternative to car use throughout the year. Given the speed limit on Coursers Road and absence of lighting, this is also unlikely to be a viable route for many cyclists.
49. The applicant proposes a shuttle mini-bus providing a service from the site to London Colney four times a day. However, it is not clear how effective this would be in reducing private car use, or how it would be secured or maintained in perpetuity. The HA has also suggested a condition to secure delivery of a new footpath linking the site's access to the entrance to the public footpath. However, based on the information before me, the edge of the highway would appear to be outside the applicant's control and I do not have sufficient certainty that such a footpath could reasonably be delivered. For the reasons given, the proposal cannot be concluded to be one where sustainable transport modes are prioritised. My attention has not been drawn to a development plan policy in this regard, however these conclusions inform the Green Belt assessment above.

#### *Other Developments*

50. The applicant has highlighted appeal decisions relating to residential development in the Green Belt<sup>2</sup> where very special circumstances were found to exist. However, I do not have details of those proposals and their locations, and I note the quantum of development proposed was different to that before me. As such the balance of considerations would likely have been different and I cannot be satisfied that the circumstances were the same.

### **Conclusion**

51. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are not material considerations of sufficient weight, including the provisions of the Framework, which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Planning permission is therefore refused.

*C Shearing*

Inspector and Appointed Person

---

<sup>2</sup> APP/B1930/W/20/3265925 and APP/C1950/W/20/3265926, and APP/M1520/W/20/3246788

### **Informatives:**

- i. In determining this application the Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the Secretary of State, has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. In doing so the Planning Inspectorate gave clear advice of the expectation and requirements for the submission of documents and information, ensured consultation responses were published in good time and gave clear deadlines for submissions and responses.
- ii. The decision of the appointed person (acting on behalf of the Secretary of State) on an application under section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the Act") is final, which means there is no right to appeal. An application to the High Court under s288(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is the only way in which the decision made on an application under Section 62A can be challenged. An application must be made within 6 weeks of the date of the decision
- iii. These notes are provided for guidance only. A person who thinks they may have grounds for challenging this decision is advised to seek legal advice before taking any action. If you require advice on the process for making any challenge you should contact the Administrative Court Office at the Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, WC2A 2LL (0207 947 6655) or follow this link: <https://www.gov.uk/courts-tribunals/planning-court>

## **Appendix 1 - Consultee responses**

British Pipeline Agency Limited

Colney Heath Parish Council

CPRE Hertfordshire

Crime Prevention Officer- St Albans City and District Council

Ecology Advisor- Hertfordshire County Council

Environment Agency

Forestry Commission

Growth and Infrastructure Unit- Hertfordshire County Council

Highways Authority- Hertfordshire County Council

Landscape Officer- Hertfordshire County Council

Local Planning Authority- St Albans City and District Council

Natural England

Recycling and Waste Officer- St Albans City and District Council