



Centre for Sustainability

## **Dacorum Borough Council**

Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic  
Environmental Assessment) Addendum to Working  
Note for the Emerging Core Strategy

Appendix B – Additional Strategic Development  
Locations and Sites  
Assessment

Appendix C - Additional Locations Information  
(provided by DBC)

February 2010

## Appendix B: Additional Strategic Development Locations and Sites Assessment

This appendix includes the assessment tables for the additional strategic development location and site options that have been put forward as part of Dacorum Borough Council's Emerging Core Strategy. Additional options have been put forward for Berkhamsted and Tring.

The additional locations and sites have been assessed against the SA/SEA framework objectives in terms of their overall performance ranked from 'very sustainable' to 'very unsustainable', using the scoring criteria outlined below. The assessment for Egerton Rothesay School (in Berkhamsted) also includes a comparison assessment, specifically comparing the differences between the two options for that location.

### Key to Assessment Scores

The following table outlines the symbols and abbreviations used to document the results of the assessment process.

| Significance Assessment | Description   |
|-------------------------|---|
| ✓✓                      | Very sustainable - Option is likely to contribute significantly to the SA/SEA objective           |
| ✓                       | Sustainable - Option is likely to contribute in some way to the SA/SEA objective                  |
| ?                       | Uncertain – It is uncertain how or if the Option impacts on the SA/SEA objective                  |
| –                       | Neutral – Option is unlikely to impact on the SA/SEA objective                                    |
| x                       | Unsustainable – Option is likely to have minor adverse impacts on the SA/SEA objective            |
| xx                      | Very unsustainable – Option is likely to have significant adverse impacts on the SA/SEA objective |

### SA Objectives

The table below outlines the Sustainability Objectives that have been used to focus the assessment process and details the reference term which is used in the assessment tables for the sake of brevity. The full framework of objectives and associated sub-objectives can be found as Appendix A in the main working note.

| SA Objective |   | Reference Term           |
|--------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1            | To protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity at all levels, including the maintenance and enhancement of Biodiversity Action Plan habitats and species in line with local targets | Biodiversity             |
| 2            | To protect, maintain and enhance water resources (including water quality and quantity) while taking into account the impacts of climate change   | Water quality/ quantity  |
| 3            | Ensure that new developments avoid areas which are at risk from flooding and natural flood storage areas  | Flood risk               |
| 4            | Minimise development of land with high quality soils and minimise the degradation/loss of soils due to new developments   | Soils                    |
| 5            | Reduce the impacts of climate change, with a particular focus on reducing the consumption of fossil fuels and levels of CO <sub>2</sub>   | Greenhouse gas emissions |
| 6            | Ensure that developments are capable of withstanding the effects  | Climate change proof     |

|    |  |                                    |
|----|--|------------------------------------|
|    | of climate change (adaptation to climate change)   |                                    |
| 7  | Achieve good air quality, especially in urban areas  | Air Quality                        |
| 8  | Maximise the use of previously developed land and buildings, and the efficient use of land   | Use of brownfield sites            |
| 9  | To use natural resources, both finite and renewable, as efficiently as possible, and re-use finite resources or recycled alternatives wherever possible              | Resource efficiency                |
| 10 | To identify, maintain and enhance the historic environment and cultural assets   | Historic & cultural assets         |
| 11 | To conserve and enhance landscape and townscape character and encourage local distinctiveness  | Landscape & Townscape              |
| 12 | To encourage healthier lifestyles and reduce adverse health impacts of new developments  | Health                             |
| 13 | To deliver more sustainable patterns of location of development.   | Sustainable locations              |
| 14 | Promote equity & address social exclusion by closing the gap between the poorest communities and the rest  | Equality & social exclusion        |
| 15 | Ensure that everyone has access to good quality housing that meets their needs   | Good quality housing               |
| 16 | Enhance community identity and participation   | Community Identity & participation |
| 17 | Reduce both crime and fear of crime  | Crime and fear of crime            |
| 18 | Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth   | Sustainable prosperity and growth  |
| 19 | Achieve a more equitable sharing of the benefits of prosperity across all sectors of society and fairer access to services, focusing on deprived areas in the region | Fairer access to services          |
| 20 | Revitalise town centres to promote a return to sustainable urban living  | Revitalise town centres            |

**Berkhamsted Spatial Strategy: Land South of Berkhamsted**

| SA Objective |                            | Option 5  |   |
|--------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 1            | Biodiversity               | The option is greenfield and there would therefore be loss or damage of some habitats. The site also includes Long Green wildlife site and Brickhill Green wildlife site, which could be affected by development.   | x |
| 2            | Water quality/ quantity    | No predicted effects.   | - |
| 3            | Flood risk                 | This option is in a low risk flood zone and not in flood risk zone 2 or 3.  | - |
| 4            | Soils                      | This option would result in a loss of greenfield land, and development would result in soil sealing.  | x |
| 5            | Greenhouse gas emissions   | This option is located some distance from the town centre which could increase the need to travel. However, a circular bus route is proposed within the scheme, so this could increase use of public transport over private car use, depending on the uptake of this mode. There are also plans for a local centre which could provide the amenities required, reducing the need to travel. These factors could help reduce the growth in ghg emissions.  | ✓ |
| 6            | Climate change proof       | Neutral Effects.  | - |
| 7            | Air Quality                | This option is located a distance from the town centre, so there could be an increased use of the car. However, a circular bus route is proposed within the scheme, as well as provision of a local centre, both helping to reduce the need to travel. There could be beneficial implications for air quality depending on the uptake of this mode and the provision of services in the local centre being adequate for the needs of the local community. | ✓ |
| 8            | Use of brownfield sites    | This option uses a greenfield site for development.   | x |
| 9            | Resource efficiency        | Neutral Effects.  | - |
| 10           | Historic & cultural assets | The option is located in an area of archaeological significance. The area is classified as "pre 18 <sup>th</sup> century enclosure" (40%), "20th century agriculture" (15%), "woodlands" (10%) and "parks, gardens, recreation" (35%) (HLC <sup>1</sup> ).  | x |
| 11           | Landscape & Townscape      | The option is located in the Greenbelt and would also impact on the Green Gateway. There could be a possible impact on the transition area from urban to countryside.   | x |
| 12           | Health                     | The option is located at a distance from the town centre, which could discourage walking and cycling. The site is located near the A41 which could result in noise levels that could affect health and wellbeing.   | x |
|              |                            | There are plans for enhanced sports facilities, however it is uncertain what these facilities will be and whether they would encourage residents to have more active lifestyles.  | ? |

<sup>1</sup> Hertfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC)

| SA Objective |                                    | Option 5   |   |
|--------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 13           | Sustainable locations              | The option is located at a distance from the town centre, however there is a local centre planned. There is a local school, however the option could impact on the school places available, as these are already under pressure.   | ✓ |
|              |                                    | The option is located close to the British Film Institute (BFI) site which should reduce the need to travel for any new residents working at the site.   | ✓ |
| 14           | Equality & social exclusion        | The option is located at a distance from the town centre, however a local centre is planned. There is a local school, however the option could impact on the school places available, as these are already under pressure.   | ✓ |
|              |                                    | The option is located close to the BFI site which should reduce the need to travel for any new residents working at the site.  | ✓ |
| 15           | Good quality housings              | This option covers a large area, and should provide a significant amount of more affordable housing.   | ✓ |
| 16           | Community Identity & participation | A new local centre is planned with community facilities such as a local community hall. This should make the area a more attractive place to live and work.  | ✓ |
| 17           | Crime and fear of crime            | Neutral Effects.   | - |
| 18           | Sustainable prosperity & growth    | As this should provide a large amount of additional housing, this increased number of residents in the town would make facilities and shops more viable. The option also includes a local centre which could offer employment opportunities. The option could also support the expansion of the BFI site, which is a key local employer. This could create more jobs, helping the local economy. | ✓ |
| 19           | Fairer access to services          | Provision of housing could help the local economy and encourage provision of local services.   | ✓ |
| 20           | Revitalise town centres            | The option could help to revitalise the town or local centres by providing additional housing to help maintain community vibrancy and vitality.  | ✓ |

**Berkhamsted Spatial Strategy: Egerton Rothesay School**

| SA Objective |                            | Option 1<br>Redevelopment of the site as<br>currently proposed in the Local Plan   | Option 2 Redevelopment of the site<br>in accordance with a revised<br>landowner proposal | Option Comparison   |   |   |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| 1            | Biodiversity               | The site is partly greenfield and there would therefore be loss of some habitats. The option is adjacent to a wildlife site.   | x  | The site is partly greenfield and there would therefore be loss of some habitats. The option is adjacent to a wildlife site.  | x | No difference has been identified between the options for this topic.   |
| 2            | Water quality/<br>quantity | Neutral Effects.   | -  | Neutral Effects.  | - | No difference has been identified between the options for this topic.   |
| 3            | Flood risk                 | The option is in a low risk flood zone and not in flood risk zone 2 or 3.  | -  | The option is in a low risk flood zone and not in flood risk zone 2 or 3.   | - | No difference has been identified between the options for this topic.   |
| 4            | Soils                      | Additional development could result in soil sealing.   | x  | Additional development could result in soil sealing. This option has additional playing pitches and a larger proposed housing development which could increase soil compaction, as part of the site is currently fields.  | x | Given the lower number of houses proposed, option 1 would be slightly more beneficial than option 2 for this SA objective.                  |
| 5            | Greenhouse gas emissions   | This option would allow for a smaller number of dwellings (approx 100). However this could still result in an increase in traffic and use of car, especially due to the distance from town and lack of easy access to public transport. These factors could result in an increase in the level of ghg emissions. | x  | This option would allow for a larger number of dwellings (approx 220), so the increase in traffic and use of car could increase, especially due to the distance from town and lack of easy access to public transport. These factors could result in an increase in the level of ghg emissions. | x | Option 1 would have a lower impact on ghg emissions than option 2 as there will be a lower amount of building and travel related emissions. |
|              |                            | Demolishing the existing buildings and rebuilding from scratch is likely to result in more energy efficient buildings.   | ✓  | The energy efficiency of the redeveloped buildings may not be as high as for new build.   | - | Option 1 would be likely to result in lower ghg emissions than option 2 as 'new build' should be more energy efficient when in use.         |

| SA Objective |                            | Option 1<br>Redevelopment of the site as<br>currently proposed in the Local Plan  | Option 2 Redevelopment of the site<br>in accordance with a revised<br>landowner proposal | Option Comparison   |   |  |
|--------------|----------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| 6            | Climate change proof       | This option could result in a more climate change resilient development as building from scratch would enable the increased consideration of adaptation measures including solar gain and installation of water efficiency measures.  | ✓  | Neutral Effects.  | - | Option 1 would be more beneficial than option 2 for this SA objective due the greater potential for the new build to incorporate climate change adaptation measures. |
| 7            | Air Quality                | This option would allow for a smaller number of dwellings (approx 100) although it is still likely to result in an increase in traffic and the use of cars, especially due to the distance from town and lack of easy access to public transport. These factors could result in adverse impacts on air quality. | x  | This option would allow for a larger number of dwellings (approx 220) and could increase traffic and the use of cars, especially due to the distance from town and lack of easy access to public transport. These factors could result in adverse impacts on air quality. | x | Option 1 would have a lower impact on air quality than option 2 as there should be a lower number of additional cars linked to the new development.                  |
| 8            | Use of brownfield sites    | This option uses a predominantly greenfield sites for development.  | x  | This option uses a predominantly greenfield site for development.   | x | No difference has been identified between the options for this topic.  |
| 9            | Resource efficiency        | This option involves the refurbishment of the existing building so would be a more efficient use of resources.  | ✓  | Neutral Effects.  | - | Option 1 makes use of the existing buildings which would be a more efficient use of resources than option 2 which is an entirely new development.                    |
| 10           | Historic & cultural assets | The option is located in an "area of archaeological significance". The area is classified as "20th Century Agriculture" (approx 70%); "Built-up Areas Modern" (approx. 25%) and "Woodlands" (approx 5%) (HLC).  | x  | The option is located in an "area of archaeological significance". The area is classified as "20th Century Agriculture" (approx 60%); "Built-up Areas Modern" (approx. 20%); "Woodlands" (approx 3%) and "Parks, Gardens, Recreation" (approx. 17%) (HLC).                | x | The proposed development for option 1 would be concentrated nearer to the Area of Archaeological Significance than option 2.   |
| 11           | Landscape & Townscape      | Option 1 is located entirely outside of the Greenbelt. However, this option could have a visual impact as it would result in the use of open space for  | x  | The additional playing fields in this option are located within the Greenbelt. This option could also have a visual impact as it would  | x | Option 1 is more beneficial than option 2 in that it would not result in any further loss of Greenbelt.  |

| SA Objective |                                    | Option 1<br>Redevelopment of the site as<br>currently proposed in the Local Plan   |   | Option 2 Redevelopment of the site<br>in accordance with a revised<br>landowner proposal   |   | Option Comparison  |
|--------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
|              |                                    | development and the playing pitches.   |   | result in the use of open space for development and the playing pitches.   |   |  |
| 12           | Health                             | The option is located at a distance from the town centre, which could discourage walking and cycling. In addition, the site is located near the A41 which could result in noise levels that could affect health and wellbeing. Although there are plans for enhanced sports facilities there are uncertainties with regard to whether local residents would be encouraged to use them. | x | The option is located at a distance from the town centre, which could discourage walking and cycling. In addition, the site is located near the A41 which could result in noise levels that could affect health and wellbeing. Although there are plans for enhanced sports facilities there are uncertainties with regard to whether local residents would be encouraged to use them. | x | Option 2 provides more playing pitches than option 1 and therefore could encourage more participation in leisure activities. |
| 13           | Sustainable locations              | The option is located at a distance from the town centre; however it is located next to leisure space.   | x | The option is located at a distance from the town centre; however it is located next to leisure space.   | x | Option 2 provides more leisure space than option 1.  |
| 14           | Equality & social exclusion        | The option is located at a distance from the town centre.  | x | The option is located at a distance from the town centre.  | x | Option 2 provides more leisure space than option 1.  |
|              |                                    | The option is located next to leisure space. A new school building should improve the quality of the education facility.   | ✓ | The option is located next to leisure space. Upgrading the existing school building should improve the quality of the education facility.  | ✓ |  |
| 15           | Good quality housing               | This option allows for 100 dwellings, which should provide some affordable housing.  | ✓ | This option has a larger number of dwellings (220) which has the potential to provide a larger amount of affordable housing.   | ✓ | Option 2 is more beneficial than option 1 as it would provide more housing, including affordable housing.                    |
| 16           | Community Identity & participation | Neutral Effects.   | - | Neutral Effects.   | - | No difference has been identified between the options for this topic.  |
| 17           | Crime and fear of crime            | Neutral Effects.   | - | Neutral Effects.   | - | No difference has been identified between the options for this topic.  |

| SA Objective |                                 | Option 1<br>Redevelopment of the site as<br>currently proposed in the Local Plan  | Option 2 Redevelopment of the site<br>in accordance with a revised<br>landowner proposal | Option Comparison  |   |  |
|--------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| 18           | Sustainable prosperity & growth | As this option should provide housing, there is potential for more residents to live in the town, making facilities and shops more viable. This would help support the local economy. | ✓  | As this option should provide more housing, there is potential for more residents to live in the town, making facilities and shops more viable. This would help support the local economy. | ✓ | Option 2 would have a larger beneficial impact on this SA objective than option 1 as more houses are provided.   |
| 19           | Fairer access to services       | Provision of housing could help the local economy and encourage provision of local services.  | ✓  | Provision of a larger number of dwellings could help the local economy and encourage provision of local services.  | ✓ | Option 2 would have a higher beneficial impact on this SA objective than option 1 as more houses are provided, thereby providing a larger population to support local services.  |
| 20           | Revitalise town centres         | The option could help to revitalise the town or local centres as providing additional housing should help to maintain community vibrancy and vitality.                                | ✓  | The option could help to revitalise the town or local centres as providing additional housing should help to maintain community vibrancy and vitality.                                     | ✓ | Option 2 would have a higher beneficial impact on this SA objective than option 1 as more houses are provided thereby providing a larger population to support local businesses. |

**Tring Spatial Strategy**

| SA Objective |                            | Option 1<br>Waterside Way  |   | Option 2<br>Land adjacent to Station Road   |   |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 1            | Biodiversity               | The site is greenfield and there would therefore be loss of some habitats.   | ✘ | The site is greenfield and there would therefore be loss of some habitats. The site also overlaps with Station Road/Grove Road Fields wildlife site, so a small part of the wildlife site could be affected by this option. The site is also located adjacent to the Grand Union Canal wildlife site.   | ✘ |
| 2            | Water quality/<br>quantity | The option is located on the Grand Union Canal watercourse, of which the quality is currently good <sup>2</sup> . Depending on the amount of run off the new development creates, this could lead to adverse impacts on the water quality.   | ✘ | Neutral Effects.  | - |
| 3            | Flood risk                 | The site is in a low flood risk zone.  | - | The site is in a low flood risk zone.   | - |
| 4            | Soils                      | This option would result in a loss of greenfield land, and development would result in soil sealing.   | ✘ | This option would result in a loss of greenfield land, and development would result in soil sealing.  | ✘ |
| 5            | Greenhouse gas emissions   | This option is located at a distance from the town centre, which could increase the use of car. This could increase the growth of ghg emissions. There are however strong pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre, which could reduce the need to travel by private car, however the impact on ghg emission levels depends on these sustainable options being taken up. The option promotes an increase in woodland cover, helping carbon sequestration. | ✘ | The option is located a distance from the town centre and it is uncertain whether local amenities would be provided. This could increase the use of the car to access town centre facilities and services, thereby increasing the growth of ghg emissions. The site is located close to the railway station, and there are existing cycle links to both the station and town. The impact on ghg emission levels would depend on these sustainable options being taken up. | ✘ |
| 6            | Climate change proof       | Neutral Effects.   | - | Neutral Effects.  | - |

<sup>2</sup> Water Framework Directive- River Basin Management Plans accessed at: [http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=492500.0&y=211500.0&topic=wfd\\_rivers&ep=map&scale=3&location=Tring,%20Hertfordshire&lang=e&layerGroups=default&textonly=off#x=492304&y=212230&lq=1,7,8,9,5,6,&scale=5](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=492500.0&y=211500.0&topic=wfd_rivers&ep=map&scale=3&location=Tring,%20Hertfordshire&lang=e&layerGroups=default&textonly=off#x=492304&y=212230&lq=1,7,8,9,5,6,&scale=5)

| SA Objective |                            | Option 1<br>Waterside Way  |   | Option 2<br>Land adjacent to Station Road   |   |
|--------------|----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 7            | Air Quality                | This option is located at a distance away from the town centre, which could increase the use of private cars, increasing the growth of ghg emissions, and thus having adverse effects on air quality. However there are strong pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre which could help reduce emissions to air. However, the affect on air quality depends on these sustainable options being taken up. | x | The option is located a distance from the town centre and it is uncertain whether local amenities would be provided. This could increase the use of private cars for accessing town centre facilities and services, thereby increasing emissions to air, which could result in adverse effects on air quality. However, there are existing cycle links to the station and town centre which could encourage more sustainable travel. The affect on air quality depends on these sustainable options being taken up. | x |
| 8            | Use of brownfield sites    | The option would result in loss of greenfield land.  | x | The option would result in loss of greenfield land.   | x |
| 9            | Resource efficiency        | Neutral Effects.   | - | Neutral Effects.  | - |
| 10           | Historic & cultural assets | This option is located in an area classified as "18th – 19th Century Enclosure" (approx. 80%) and "20th Century Agriculture" (approx 20%) (HLC).   | - | This option includes a listed building. This option also is located in an area of archaeological significance and is classified as "18th – 19th Century Enclosure" (approx. 75%) and "Parks, Gardens, Recreation" (approx. 25%) (HLC).  | x |
| 11           | Landscape & Townscape      | The site is located in the Greenbelt and is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB.  | x | The site is located in the Greenbelt. Part of the site south of the road is located in the Chilterns AONB. Development would extend outside the town's current built form and would therefore have some adverse effects on landscape character.   | x |
| 12           | Health                     | This option would provide the wider town with areas of open space. The strong pedestrian and cycle links could encourage the local residents to have more active lifestyles.   | ✓ | This option would provide the wider town with significant areas of open space, and improved facilities. The cycle links to the town centre and the station could also encourage the local residents to have more active lifestyles.   | ✓ |
| 13           | Sustainable Locations      | The option is located at a distance from the town centre; however it is located near a few local amenities and schools.  | x | The option is located at a distance from the town centre; however, it is located relatively close to schools and the railway station. It is uncertain whether this option would allow for local amenities to be provided.   | x |

| SA Objective |                                    | Option 1<br>Waterside Way   |   | Option 2<br>Land adjacent to Station Road   |   |
|--------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 14           | Equality & social exclusion        | The option is located at a distance from the town centre; however it is located near a few local amenities and schools.   | x | The option is located at a distance from the town centre; however it is located relatively close to schools and the railway station. It is uncertain whether this option would allow for local amenities to be provided.  | x |
| 15           | Good quality housing               | This option would have potential for significant levels of affordable housing.  | ✓ | It is not clear how many dwellings are proposed, so the impact on this objective is uncertain. However as the site would only be suitable for a relatively low density of development due to the local character of the area, the option could provide for a relatively low number of dwellings, and with this a low number of affordable houses.   | ? |
| 16           | Community Identity & participation | This option could improve the community identity and participation for the residents of Tring, due to the significant area of open space proposed, especially in the Marina.  | ✓ | Neutral Effects.  | - |
| 17           | Crime and fear of crime            | Neutral Effects.  | - | Neutral Effects.  | - |
| 18           | Sustainable prosperity and growth  | Development of this site could involve provision of some employment space, thereby helping to support the local economy. Also, the new housing should help to support the local services in the town, maintaining their viability and boosting the local economy. | ✓ | It is uncertain as to what this option would provide in terms of local amenities and employment opportunities. However, the new housing should help to support the local services in the town, maintaining their viability and boosting the local economy.  | ✓ |
| 19           | Fairer access to services          | This option provides new housing which could result in improved services and jobs for the town and should help to support the local services, thereby maintaining their viability.  | ✓ | This option provides new housing which could result in improved services and jobs for the town and should help to support the local services, thereby maintaining their viability.  | ✓ |
| 20           | Revitalise town centres            | The new housing should help to support the local services in the town, maintaining their viability and boosting the local economy, thereby helping to support sustainable urban living.   | ✓ | The new housing should help to support the local services in the town, maintaining their viability and boosting the local economy, thereby helping to support sustainable urban living. This option could have more of a significant impact on supporting the vitality of the town's facilities due to the site being a larger site than Waterside Way. However the uncertainty over the number of houses means that the scale of this effect is unknown. | ✓ |

## Appendix C - Additional Locations Information (provided by DBC)



### INFORMATION ON ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS TO BE APPRAISED

#### BERKHAMSTED

##### Land to the South:

**Area:** 43 ha (landowner has significant land to the south of the A41 too)

**Dwelling capacity:** up to 2,000 units plus a range of other supporting uses

**Owned by:** City and Provincial Properties plc (formerly owned by Legal and General)

**Promoted by:** Savills

**Current use:** predominantly agricultural land with built and recreational development.

The location was broken down into three smaller areas in the Emerging Core Strategy consultation (June 2009). This was because although the wider site would fail to comply with regional planning policies (in terms of the scale of new development a town such as Berkhamsted should accommodate), it was considered reasonable to consider smaller options within this broad area. These options also have different characteristics that needed to be assessed separately.

However, all three locations were discounted as appropriate future options for the following reasons:

Table 1

| Emerging Core Strategy (June 2009)   |  | Parcel Reference(s) on Land Ownership map provided by Savills |
|--|--|---|
| Site description   | Reasons for discounting site from further consideration  |   |
| Land south east and south west of BFI site, Kingshill Way / Chesham Road (adjacent to the A41) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Much of this area has poor direct access onto Kingshill Way.</li> <li>▪ Erosion of buffer between bypass and existing built up area.</li> <li>▪ Impact on important green gateway from A416 and A41.</li> <li>▪ Potential impact on setting of cemetery.</li> </ul> | 1,2,3   |

|  |  |         |
|--|--|---------|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development here could set a precedent for future development of land southwards to the A41.</li> </ul>   |         |
| Land in the Ashlyns area, between Chesham Road and Swing Gate Lane | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.</li> <li>▪ This could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41.</li> <li>▪ Not well related to existing housing.</li> <li>▪ Visual impact on important gateway to town from A416 and A41.</li> <li>▪ Proximity of A41 bypass.</li> <li>▪ Potential impact on setting of Ashlyn's Hall.</li> </ul> | 4,5,6,7 |
| Land south of Upper Hall Park                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strong countryside / Green Belt boundary.</li> <li>▪ Development would be highly visible from this prominent ridge top location.</li> <li>▪ Erosion of buffer between bypass and existing built up area.</li> <li>▪ Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.</li> </ul>   | 8       |

The following information has been provided:

- map showing the extent of City and Provincial's ownership
- draft masterplan for the area
- extract from Savill's submission to the RSS Review process, promoting the site
- extract from the November 2006 Schedule of Site Appraisals. The area currently being promoted forms part of site Be/h2.

An initial desk-based assessment of the site suggests the following pros and cons. The SA may pick up others.

Table 2:

|                                  | <b>Pros</b>  | <b>Cons</b>  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Land South of Berkhamsted</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site could provide a significant level of housing plus associated community and leisure facilities.</li> <li>▪ Masterplan includes a local centre comprising small shops and offices and</li> </ul> | <p>See Table 1 above. Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contrary to East of England Plan (Policy SS4).</li> <li>▪ Scale of development out of keeping with scale of existing town and its locally generated housing needs.</li> </ul> |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>community uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhanced sports facilities for the town.</li> <li>▪ Improved public transport for the area.</li> <li>▪ Reasonably located in terms of first and upper schools</li> <li>▪ Could help support expansion of facilities on the British Film Institute (BFI) site (and thus retention of the facility).</li> <li>▪ Site delivery could be phased over (and beyond) the plan period.</li> <li>▪ Single landowner assists with ensuring a comprehensive and deliverable scheme.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Potential impact on ‘Green gateway’ highlighted on Berkhamsted Vision Diagram (within Emerging Core Strategy).</li> <li>▪ Impact on school places (which are already under pressure within the town)</li> </ul> |
|--|---|--|

**Egerton Rothesay School:**

Background:

Egerton Rothesay is an independent school catering for all educational abilities. However, it has a particularly strong reputation for providing specialist support for children with specific educational needs.

The redevelopment of the school is already proposed in the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011, where it is subject to a number of linked proposals (H37, C1 and L1). Copies of these are attached, together with the Proposals Map for Berkhamsted. This scheme would see the existing school redeveloped for housing and a new school and playing pitches provided on land to the south.

The site is proposed as a ‘Strategic Site’ within the Core Strategy – as it is seen as of great importance in delivering a number of the town’s planning objectives (market and affordable housing, and improved school and playing pitch provision).

It was referred to in the Emerging Core Strategy consultation, but no specific questions were asked relating to it, and the site did not form part of the SA work.

Options:

An assessment is required for two site options.

|                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>Option 1</b> | Redevelopment of the site as currently proposed in the Local Plan.   |
| <b>Option 2</b> | Redevelopment of the site in accordance with a revised landowner proposal. This involves a different site configuration, with an increased number of residential units (moved to the east of the site), and additional sports pitches on land outside of the current Local Plan site boundary (to the west). The school would remain on its current site and the current buildings improved rather than demolished and replaced. |

A significant amount of technical work has been carried out on behalf of the landowner to support Option 2 (although some will also be relevant to consider for Option 1). Extracts of the following have been provided:

- Great crested Newt Survey
- Indicative site layout / masterplan for Option 2
- Initial transport assessment
- Ecological Appraisal
- Archaeological Desk Based Assessment
- Geo-Environmental Desk Based Assessment

The landowners (in consultation with the Council) will also be preparing a full masterplan for the site in the coming months.

*Please note that for this appraisal the assessment should relate to the differences between the 2 options, rather than weighing up the pros and cons of the actual location. It is acknowledged that there are some issues with the site itself (e.g. distance from town centre, lack of easy access to public transport, topography not being conducive to trips being made by foot and bicycle), but these have already been appraised as part of the Environmental Assessment work carried out for the last Local Plan.*

An initial desk-based assessment of the site options suggests the following pros and cons. The SA may pick up others.

|                 | <b>Pros</b>   | <b>Cons</b>   |
|-----------------|---|---|
| <b>Option 1</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivers new building for school to better meet their current and future needs.</li> <li>▪ Physical extent, and hence Green Belt impact, of site is more limited than Option 2.</li> <li>▪ Existing residents in Coppins Close will suffer minimal disturbance from new playing fields to rear (although school building will probably be located near to some houses).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Built development would be concentrated on / nearer to the Area of Archaeological Significance (Grims Ditch).</li> <li>▪ Questions raised by landowners regarding viability (and hence deliverability) of scheme.</li> <li>▪ Delivers lower number of residential units (open market and affordable) to help meet locally generated need within the town.</li> </ul> |

|                        |  |  |
|------------------------|--|--|
|                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lower number of housing units would generate lower level of vehicle movements than Option 2.</li> <li>▪ Configuration of site allows the retention of a soft edge to the town, by concentrating built development to the north of the site.</li> <li>▪ Impact on character of town likely to be less of an issue as numbers of units provided will be less than for Option 2.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Resource implications of demolishing existing school and rebuilding it on another part of the site.</li> <li>▪ Lower number of residential units may mean a new bus route to serve the site is not viable.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Option 2</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Delivers higher number of playing pitches than Option 1 (due to expansion of site to the west).</li> <li>▪ Provides a higher number of houses (open market and affordable) to help meet locally generated need within the town.</li> <li>▪ Understood to be a more financially viable – and hence deliverable scheme.</li> <li>▪ Existing school buildings re-used and improved, rather than demolished.</li> <li>▪ Impact on Grims Ditch may be reduced as there is less development in this part of the site than in Option 1.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extent of Green Belt encroachment is greater than in Option 1 (although the additional encroachment is for playing pitches rather than built development).</li> <li>▪ Potential impact upon an Area of Archaeological Significance (Grims Ditch).</li> <li>▪ No new school building delivered (although the existing school would be upgraded),</li> <li>▪ Current scheme put forward for consideration by landowner shows a lack of integration between new and existing residential areas. (This could be corrected, but would probably result in the loss of mature hedgerows).</li> <li>▪ Greater impact on residents of Coppins Close due to closer proximity and higher number of houses.</li> <li>▪ Issues over the density of development versus local character and loss of ‘green wedge’ in this area.</li> </ul> |

**Waterside Way**

**Area:** 8.8ha

**Dwelling capacity:** c260 (depending upon level of other uses)

**Owned by:** Land Planning Group plc

**Promoted by:** Emery Planning Partnership

**Current use:** agricultural land (which has historically been used for an annual community event - canal festival).

Site was considered in the Emerging Core Strategy for Tring, where it was referred to as ‘North and North West of Tring, off Icknield Way.’ However, it was discounted from further consideration for the reasons set out in Table 1. It was therefore not assessed as an option as part of the original SA work.

Table 1

| <b>Emerging Core Strategy (June 2009)</b>       |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Site description</b>                         | <b>Reasons for discounting site from further consideration</b>   |
| North and North West of Tring, off Icknield Way | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strong Countryside boundary (Icknield Way) to the Green belt would be breached.</li> <li>▪ Environmental impacts to the Grand Union Canal and Tring Reservoirs SSSI.</li> <li>▪ Development would detract from the compact nature of the settlement.</li> </ul> |

The following information has been provided:

- a ‘Schematic Master Plan’ for the development, put forward as part of the landowner’s response to the Emerging Core Strategy consultation.
- extract form the November 2006 Schedule of Site Appraisals (Site T/h3)

The site has generated quite a lot of support from the Tring Sports Forum / Tring Corinthians Football Club (many of whose members live outside of the town). This is due to the proposed inclusion of sports pitches etc within the masterplan.

An initial desk-based assessment of the site suggests the following pros and cons. The SA may pick up others.

Table 2:

|                      | <b>Pros</b>   | <b>Cons</b>  |
|----------------------|---|--|
| <b>Waterside Way</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site could provide a significant level of housing plus associated community</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contrary to East of England Plan (Policy SS4).</li> <li>▪ Would detract fro the compact nature</li> </ul> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>and leisure facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Masterplan includes new sports facilities for the town, plus woodland planting and a new canalside marina.</li> <li>▪ Aim of delivering a 'context sensitive' and 'environmentally-driven' design proposal for the site.</li> <li>▪ Distance to the town centre facilities is no greater than for some of the other 'preferred' options put in the June 2009 consultation.</li> <li>▪ Strong cycle and pedestrian connection to the town centre services and facilities.</li> <li>▪ Site is approximately 500m from a co-op store, Post Office and community centre (off Silk Mill Way) and 1200m from Tring Secondary School and 500m from Dundale JMI school.</li> </ul> | <p>of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Scale of development out of keeping with scale of existing town and its locally generated housing needs.</li> <li>▪ Breaches the 'Countryside border' highlighted on Tring Vision Diagram (within Emerging Core Strategy).</li> <li>▪ Impact on school places (which are already under pressure within the town).</li> <li>▪ Questions about the deliverability and viability of the site bearing in mind the high level of non-residential uses put forward in the masterplan and the fact that it is known that the landowner has been marketing individual 'plots' of land to investors who wish to development their own homes.</li> <li>▪ Distance from Tring station (though this is the same for the majority of locations within the town).</li> <li>▪ Development may deliver an over-provision of leisure facilities for the town. This may cause existing facilities to close and attract users from outside of Tring (with traffic implications)</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|

### **Land adjacent to Station Road**

**Area:** tbc

**Dwelling capacity:** tbc

**Owned by:** Previously owned and promoted by landowner (Clifford Selly), but may have been subsequently sold.

**Current use:** agricultural land

Comprises part of a much larger site (T/h6) which was put forward for consideration through the Site Allocations consultation (extract attached). This smaller area was suggested by a number of attendees at the Place Workshops and through responses to the Emerging Core Strategy consultation (June 2009).

Larger site was considered in the Emerging Core Strategy for Tring, where it was referred to as 'North East of Tring between Bulbourne Road and Station Road (Marshcroft Farm).' However, it was discounted from further consideration for the reasons set out in Table 1. It was therefore not assessed as an option as part of the original SA work.

Table 1

| <b>Emerging Core Strategy (June 2009)</b>                                      |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Site description</b>  | <b>Reasons for discounting site from further consideration</b>  |
| North East of Tring between Bulbourne Road and Station Road (Marshcroft Farm). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Environmental impact upon the Grand Union Canal</li> <li>▪ Development would detract from the compact nature of the settlement.</li> </ul> |

An initial desk-based assessment of the site suggests the following pros and cons. The SA may pick up others.

Table 2:

|                                      | <b>Pros</b>   | <b>Cons</b>  |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Land adjacent to Station Road</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proximity to Tring Station.</li> <li>▪ Existing cycle links along Station Road, connecting station and Tring town centre.</li> <li>▪ Relatively close to schools (primary and secondary).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development would detract from the compact nature of the settlement.</li> <li>▪ Questions about the deliverability of the scheme as no recent contact from landowner.</li> <li>▪ Southern part of the site falls within the Chilterns AONB.</li> <li>▪ Impact upon historic setting of Pendley Manor.</li> <li>▪ Environmental impact upon Grand Union Canal.</li> <li>▪ Distance from town centre services and facilities.</li> <li>▪ Only suitable for relatively low density development due to local character.</li> <li>▪ Loss of mature trees and hedgerows.</li> </ul> |