



Centre for Sustainability at TRL Ltd



Halcrow Group Ltd

## **Dacorum Borough Council**

### **Dacorum Site Allocation Development Plan Document Issues and Options Paper**

### **Sustainability Appraisal & Strategic Environmental Assessment Working Note on Initial Issues and Options**

December 2006

**Report Number: UPR/IE/211/06**

**Authors: Rob Gardner, Charlotte Brannigan and Clare Harmer - Centre for Sustainability (C4S)**

**Quality reviewed by Julian Wooderson - Halcrow**

**Client: Dacorum Borough Council**

Copyright TRL Limited December 2006

This report has been prepared for Dacorum Borough Council is unpublished and should not be referred to in any other document or publication without the permission of Dacorum Borough Council. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of Dacorum Borough Council.

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	BACKGROUND .....	1
1.2	SITE ALLOCATIONS ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER .....	1
1.3	APPRAISAL APPROACH .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>GENERAL APPRAISAL OF ISSUES AND OPTIONS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	SPATIAL STRATEGY .....	2
2.2	HOUSING .....	3
2.3	EMPLOYMENT.....	5
2.4	RETAILING.....	6
2.5	TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE.....	7
2.6	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT .....	8
2.7	LEISURE AND RECREATION .....	9
2.8	LANDSCAPE, BIODIVERSITY AND HISTORIC HERITAGE.....	10
2.9	DESIGN.....	11
<b>3</b>	<b>APPRAISAL OF SITE ALLOCATION ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF SITE ALLOCATION APPRAISAL SUSTAINABILITY CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: INITIAL ASSESSMENT OF SITE APPRAISALS .....</b>	<b>18</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

This Working Note sets out the results of the appraisal of the Dacorum Borough Councils' (DBC) Site Allocation Issues and Options Paper (November 2006). This Working Note does not form part of the formal Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) reporting process. It has been produced to contribute to the plan making process, by providing independent appraisal of the issues discussed, with a view to guiding the production of the preferred options towards contributing to sustainable development principles. Sustainability appraisal is a decision aiding tool rather than a decision making one and the contents of this report should therefore be considered in this light.

## 1.2 Site Allocations Issues and Options Paper

The Site Allocations Development Plan Document Issues and Options Paper sets out in very broad terms the issues which the Council believes should be considered when identifying land for future development, and suggesting a number of options for tackling these issues. Specific sites that may be promoted for particular use(s) such as housing or employment are looked at, in addition to broader designations, such as the location of town and village boundaries and the extent of local centre designations. Where the Council has not proposed any changes, it is assumed that these sites and designations will remain unchanged from the current Local Plan. A Schedule of Site Appraisals (November 2006) has also been issued, which contains DBC's initial appraisal of all of the sites considered or proposed within in the Issues and Options Paper.

## 1.3 Appraisal Approach

Whilst the sustainability appraisal for the Core Strategies' Issues and Options Papers utilised the framework of objectives that had been developed for the sustainability appraisal Scoping Report, it has been decided that this approach is not appropriate for the Site Allocations Issues and Options Paper (although it will be used at the Preferred Options stage).

### Issues and Options

Many of the issues raised and questions posed are not easily appraised using the framework. Therefore a brief commentary of the issues within each chapter, dealing with settlement strategy; housing; employment; retailing; transport infrastructure; community development; leisure and recreation; landscape, biodiversity and historic heritage; and design, is provided in terms of the likely sustainability implications. Where questions can be appraised, these have been identified and their potential sustainability impacts explored.

### Assessment of Site Appraisal Methodology

This sustainability appraisal has assessed the appraisal methodology used by Dacorum when initially appraising the proposed sites as set out in the *Schedule of Site Appraisals* (November, 2006).

### Assessment of Site Sustainability Conclusion

Finally, this sustainability appraisal has assessed the Council's sustainability conclusions reached for each of the proposed sites, and made recommendations for the sites that are recommended not to be progressed to the Preferred Options stage.

## 2 General Appraisal of Issues and Options

This section of the SA Working Note summarises the potential sustainability implications of the proposed issues and options set out by DBC. It also includes a series of recommendations to be taken forward as part of future stages of the development of the related Development Plan Documents (DPDs).

A number of questions posed in the Dacorum Site Allocation Issues and Options Paper ask for suggestions regarding additional sites for a variety of uses. No alternatives have been recommended as part of this report. However, if new sites are put forward as part of this consultation exercise, they will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

### 2.1 Spatial Strategy

The Issues and Options paper for the Core Strategy proposed a number of options for the Green Belt. The Sustainability Appraisal supported the proposed option to '*maximise urban capacity and limit greenfield/site development*' as it outperformed other options considered.

#### ***Issue 1 - Selected small villages in the Green Belt***

Questions are posed as to whether any changes should be made to existing boundaries of selected small settlements in the Green Belt. Although development within the Green Belt should remain restricted, exceptions for minor housing proposals and facilities should be considered in order to meet the needs of those who have to live and/or work in the Green Belt. Through the provision of facilities, the need to travel is also reduced. However, any development should fully consider the impacts on the character of the settlement and the Green Belt location.

#### ***Issue 2 - Major developed sites in the Green Belt***

Six major developed sites (MDS) have already been identified for redevelopment or infilling, but they are subject to the same controls as other development within the Green Belt. Options are posed by the Council for some of these MDSs, including whether existing boundaries should be extended to accommodate new development. Development in the Green Belt should only be considered after all other 'reasonable' capacity has been exhausted, primarily previously developed land. Where sites are expanded, there may be landscape and biodiversity implications. Dispersed employment patterns can also have adverse sustainability implications in terms of increasing car use and possibly reducing accessibility for those who do not have access to a private vehicle.

#### ***Issue 3 - The extent of the Green Belt in rural areas***

The Issues and Options paper considers whether it is necessary to provide compensatory additions to the Green Belt. This sustainability appraisal supports the Council's view that any changes that are proposed to Green Belt boundaries should comply with the stated purposes set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (PPG2). Only if these criteria are met should changes be made. The Issues and Options paper identifies that the only realistic area for extension of the Green Belt is north of Lovett's End. This is a small area which has some overlap into the Chilterns AONB. Such an overlap has been previously discouraged in the Hertfordshire County Structure Plan and it would therefore be recommended that any change to the Green Belt boundary reflects this situation.

#### ***Issue 4 - Selected small villages in the rural area***

The Council asks whether changes should be made to existing boundaries of selected small villages in the Rural Area. It should be ensured that any changes to the existing boundaries do not adversely affect the vitality of the settlement and its surrounding area, and do not cause any damage to its existing character. In changing the boundaries, there may be adverse sustainability effects, including increased car use (implications for air quality and greenhouse gas emissions), and changes in the visual amenity.

#### ***Issue 5 - Towns and large villages***

The Council asks whether changes should be made to existing boundaries of the Borough's towns or large villages. Making changes to the boundaries for the reasons of making them more clearly defined and more easily identifiable may have adverse sustainability impacts if development subsequently takes place that changes the character of the settlement or the landscape. Development should ideally be focused towards the centre of settlements, which will ensure that it is easily accessible. It will be difficult to have a single rule that applies across the board, and each individual case will need to be reviewed on its own merits, taking into account the particular setting of the settlement and the needs of the local community. Strategic green links or networks should be established between greenspace and peripheral countryside. Any development that does extend into rural areas should incorporate sensitive design, scale, form and materials, preferably utilising the landscape character assessment approach.

## **2.2 Housing**

#### ***Issue 1 - Selecting housing sites for the site schedule***

This sustainability appraisal supports the Council in following the advice set out in PPS3 to give highest priority to housing sites within urban areas. The Council have subsequently pointed towards giving priority to sites set out in the Urban Capacity Study (January 2005) for the Borough and other sites benefiting from existing planning permission. Sites on greenfield land are also mentioned for accommodating future housing, particularly in relation to growth at Hemel Hempstead. The issues relating to these greenfield sites and their sustainability impacts are outlined in the *Sustainability Appraisal of the Supplementary Issues and Options Paper – Growth at Hemel Hempstead* (November 2006).

#### ***Issue 2 - Unimplemented Local Plan housing proposal sites***

The Council are looking to carry forward the unimplemented Local Plan housing sites. If the sites are required to help meet the housing needs of the Borough, then they should be carried through to form part of the Sites Allocation document. Sites will then be appraised alongside others as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

#### ***Issue 3 - Urban capacity sites***

Use of Urban Capacity sites should be fully maximised to ensure that greenfield sites are protected, thereby reducing adverse sustainability impacts, including dispersed development, increased car use and associated impacts, and adverse effects on biodiversity, landscape and community open space resources.

#### ***Issue 4 - New sites***

#### ***Q12 – Do you agree with this approach to prioritising new sites?***

This question refers to the Council's approach to prioritising new sites for housing. It is proposed that Dacorum will give priority to brownfield sites over greenfield ones. In

addition, Dacorum will also discount sites that have a detrimental impact on any key environmental designation, or have a poor sustainability assessment.

The use of brownfield sites is certainly more sustainable in contrast to using greenfield sites for new housing. Dacorum has been consistently building high levels of new housing on previously developed land (brownfield sites) since 2001/2, achieving level in excess of 90%. This compares favourably to Government targets of 60%. Brownfield sites are not a finite resource and the challenge is to continue delivering these consistently high levels in order to reduce the need to develop greenfield sites.

This sustainability appraisal also supports the view that the Council should discount sites that have a detrimental impact on any key environmental designation, or have a poor sustainability assessment. It is assumed that 'key' environmental designations include the following (as set out in the *Schedule of Site Appraisal, November 2006*):

- Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC);
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR);
- Semi-Natural Ancient Woodland;
- Historic Parks and Garden;
- Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM); and
- Floodplain (only in relation to greenfield sites).

There are a number of other environmental designations that should be considered in the selection of sites, including amongst others, the presence of sites of archaeological interest, conservation areas, listed buildings, Wildlife Sites and priority habitats and species listed in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan. Whilst they are not statutory designations, they are nonetheless important in terms of local landscape, biodiversity and heritage reasons. It should be decided whether these designations, if present, could be accommodated in the planned development, for example, incorporating Wildlife Sites into the green infrastructure of a housing development.

These and other additional environmental considerations will be identified and utilised when undertaking more detailed sustainability appraisal on those sites which are taken forward to the Preferred Options stage of the DPD process.

#### ***Issue 5 - Greenfield sites***

The Council outlines the issues relating to the use of greenfield sites for residential purposes within the Borough. This primarily relates to the proposed urban extensions to accommodate housing growth at Hemel Hempstead through new neighbourhoods or smaller urban extensions. Please refer to the *Sustainability Appraisal of the Supplementary Issues and Options: Growth at Hemel Hempstead* (November 2006) for further details on these proposals.

When meeting affordable housing needs, or providing housing to meet demand, brownfield sites should be given priority. However, there may be a strong need for affordable housing in more rural areas, requiring the development of greenfield sites. These circumstances should be considered on a site by site basis, considering fully the possible adverse sustainability implications.

#### ***Issue 6 - Other sites***

This issue relates to other sites that may not yet have been put forward or identified for consideration. Any sites put forward as part of this consultation exercise will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

#### **Issue 7 - Gypsy and Traveller sites**

Issue 7 is concerned with possible sites for gypsy and traveller sites. Any sites put forward as part of this consultation exercise will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

**Q14. Do you agree that provision for gypsy and traveller sites should be located:**

**a) With good access to local services and facilities?**

**b) In order to avoid local concentrations?**

**c) On previously developed land in preference to Greenfield sites?**

Gypsy and Traveller groups are often considered to be socially excluded groups. The social inclusion of these groups, through providing sites with good access to services and facilities, will ensure and promote a balanced and integrated community. Benefits may also be realised in terms of health and educational levels within the Gypsy and Traveller community, and the potential social integration and cohesion between these groups and the settled community. The need to travel to access these services and facilities would also be reduced, having positive sustainability implications for air quality and reduction of greenhouse gases.

By limiting the size and concentration of Gypsy and Traveller sites, some of the perceived nuisance attached to Gypsies and Travellers may be limited, however this may also limit the ability of families to remain together. This could potentially lead to family/friendship groups leaving designated Gypsy and Traveller sites and moving to uncontrolled sites, where nuisance, health and safety may become an issue. Constraining the size of sites could also lead to an increase of motorised trips between sites as a result of separation of family groups or social networks, with adverse environmental impacts.

The use of brownfield sites are preferable for Gypsy and Traveller sites and should be encouraged to preserve agricultural resources, minimise landscape impacts and avoid environmental effects such as pollution incidents.

### **2.3 Employment**

#### **Issue 1 - Employment area and boundary**

The amount and distribution of employment land is being considered through the Council's Core Strategy. The Council asks whether any changes to specific boundaries of the sites are necessary. This decision should take into consideration the outcomes of the South West Hertfordshire Employment Space Study (identifying employment needs in the area), and the implications that changes could have on sustainability. This includes widening the boundary to increase the employment development capacity, which could lead to encroachment of open or green space, and encouragement of increased travel demands to the site, with adverse air quality and greenhouse gas emission effects.

#### **Issue 2 - Types of employment designations**

Issue 2 looks at the type of employment designations at General Employment Areas (GEA) in Dacorum. GEAs are currently designated for a particular type or types of employment use, based on locational characteristics and whether appropriate amounts of land are available for different employment uses. Various options are

proposed for three GEAs, including continuation of current use, residential use or mixed use development. Important considerations that should be taken into account by the Council include the results of the South West Hertfordshire Employment Space Study (to determine the needs of employment types within the area), and the potential sustainability implications if the sites are fully or partially redeveloped for alternative uses. This may include accessibility to the site by the existing road network, but also access to other key services and opportunities from the site (i.e. if it were used for residential development).

### ***Issue 3 - Unimplemented employment proposals***

The Council are seeking suggestions for potential uses of an employment site (Miswell Lane, Tring) from the Local Plan that is currently unimplemented. Options include retention of employment use, redesignation for residential use, or redesignation for residential use, with expansion of the GEA westwards (requiring a new reserve of land). It is thought that the third option will be positive in terms of providing housing to meet demand within Tring, whilst providing employment land for businesses relocating from smaller or older premises, ensuring a continuing supply of land for local businesses. However, this would require the release of a small area of Green Belt land.

### ***Issue 4 - Other potential employment sites***

This issue relates to other sites that may not yet have been put forward or identified for consideration. Any sites put forward as part of this consultation exercise will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

### ***Issue 5 - Conversion of employment land to other uses***

One of the main economic challenges listed for Dacorum is '*ensuring sufficient land and a range of development opportunities are safeguarded to meet the economic needs of the Borough in the long term*'. Therefore, careful consideration should be given when deciding whether existing employment land should be converted for other uses. It may be that employment sites have poor accessibility, and it would therefore be more sustainable to seek alternative sites. Where housing needs are identified, it may be more sustainable to convert employment land. This would help to utilise previously developed land, contribute towards achieving housing targets and help to safeguard greenfield sites and land. However, if employment land is converted for other uses, it is important to identify alternative sites.

### ***Issue 6 - Potential locations for live/work uses***

Live/work units are specifically designed for dual use, combining both employment and residential space. Live/work sites provide an opportunity to reduce the need the travel through the provision of dwellings within close proximity of employment opportunities. Live/work buildings should therefore also be built in areas with excellent public transport provision to reduce car use for other purposes. Such developments will often comprise of one and two bedroom apartments.

## **2.4 Retailing**

### ***Issue 1 - Town and local centre boundaries***

Town and local centre boundaries are important considerations in terms of the appropriate location of new retail development and other main town centre uses. The Council is seeking views on whether any changes should be made to existing detailed boundaries of town and local centres.

### ***Issue 2 - The extent of the primary shopping area***



**Q27. Do you agree with the Council's approach to defining the primary shopping area in the town centre?**

This question relates to the Council's intention to closely follow the existing spread of mixed and main frontages in defining the boundary of the primary shopping area. This implies that the Council will be focusing on town centre retail development, rather than out of town shopping areas. This option will be sustainable as it will encourage town centre shopping, for which existing infrastructure can be used for access. It is more likely that town centre retail areas are located closer to where people live or are more accessible by sustainable modes, therefore reducing the need to travel and the impact of transport on a variety of factors including air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, noise, severance and health/accidents.

**Issue 3 - Town centre shopping frontages**

The Council asks whether there should be any changes made to the type and spread of shopping frontages in Dacorum's town centres, and presents options for the Riverside shopping development (Hemel Hempstead) with regards to uses. Any changes should ensure that the vitality and viability of town centres is not diminished. It is possible that securing new retail premises will help the town's economy and provide employment opportunities.

**Issue 4 - Local centre shopping frontages**

The Council asks whether there should be any changes made to the extent of the defined shopping areas of Dacorum's local centres. Any changes should ensure that the vitality and viability of local centres is not diminished. It is possible that securing new retail premises will help the town's economy and provide employment opportunities.

**Issue 5 - The future of current shopping proposal sites**

This issue considers the future of four, as yet unimplemented, shopping proposals from the Local Plan. If the sites are brought forward to the site allocation document, they will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

**Issue 6 - New shopping location in Hemel Hempstead town centre**

**Issue 7 - New shopping location in Tring town centre**

Issues 6 and 7 consider new shopping locations in Hemel Hempstead and Tring town centres. These sites will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability process.

**Issue 8 - Main out of town centre retailing**

A number of out of town retailing sites have been identified. As the council states, the expansion of out of town retail centres is discouraged in favour of more central locations, which this sustainability appraisal supports. Therefore it is not recommended that boundaries of the out of town retailing areas are changed to encourage expansion at the sites.

## **2.5 Transport Infrastructure**

**Issue 1 - Road proposal schemes**

Transport infrastructure improvements that aim to reduce congestion at hotspots should be supported as they have the potential to improve local air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, road proposals must be careful not to increase capacity to a level where new trips are generated or traffic increases overall. Wherever possible, demand management measures should be implemented to first try to reduce traffic volumes before additional capacity is provided.

### ***Issue 2 – Parking***

The provision of additional car parking can result in adverse sustainability effects, including increased car use, leading to poor local air quality, increases in greenhouse gas emissions, and other negative impacts associated with car travel (noise, severance, accidents and poor health). To avoid increases in car use, it should be ensured that adequate accessible and attractive alternatives to the car are provided (public transport, provision for cyclists and pedestrians). If parking is required, it should preferably be provided on previously developed land.

### ***Issue 3 - Accessibility***

Accessibility is extremely important and the way in which people access key services and opportunities can affect sustainability, particularly if non-sustainable modes are favoured. Sustainable travel and working towards an improved modal split (in favour of sustainable modes – walking, cycling, public transport) is supported as they are likely to deliver a range of sustainability impacts, including improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced impact on biodiversity, improvements in health and improvements in equity and social inclusion.

A Park and Ride scheme has been proposed to the east of Hemel Hempstead, which may help to alleviate traffic problems within the town centre. However, it should be ensured that the proposed scheme does not encourage an increase in car journeys to the Park and Ride site as a result of its development. Improving the attractiveness and viability of alternative transport options could help to achieve a mode shift.

Additional parking plans by Network Rail may encourage drivers to use rail for longer journeys, however this new parking provision would be at the expense of an area of Green Belt and the Chilterns AONB and therefore alternatives should be considered.

<b><i>Q43. Should the line of Strategic cycle routes be identified in the Site Allocation DPD?</i></b>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Through inclusion of the strategic cycle route lines in the proposals map, the status of alternative and more sustainable modes of transport may be raised. Cycling and walking is not only beneficial in terms of reducing car use, but can also contribute to a healthier lifestyle. Improvements to cycling and walking infrastructure (e.g. dropped kerbs, network improvements, and safer crossings) can also promote inclusivity, increased mobility and access to key services and opportunities, to reduce social exclusion.

### ***Issue 4 – Infrastructure: Utilities***

The issue of water supply and sewers was raised in the Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper consultation. Thames Water has indicated that it may be easier to supply water to a small number of large sites, rather than a large number of small sites.

## **2.6 Community Development**

### ***Issue 1 - The future of current social and community facility proposal sites***

This issue looks at the remaining social and community facility proposal sites identified within the Adopted Local Plan, and their potential future uses. Where sites are carried forward, they will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

### ***Issue 2 - West Herts Hospital***

Issue 2 considers the future use of land adjacent to the West Hertfordshire Hospital after it is downsized. This down sizing provides an opportunity to retain the land for hospital or medical related purposes, including housing for hospital staff.

***Issue 3 - Other potential social and community facility proposal sites***

This issue explores other potential sites that could be used for social and community facilities. It has been identified that there is a particular need for facilities for religious and culture groups. For equity and social inclusion reasons, it should be ensured that these groups are adequately provided for. Sites selected should be easily accessible by a range of transport modes.

***Issue 4 -Release of existing land in social and community use***

There is currently a surplus in primary school places within the borough. Therefore, a number of school sites have been identified for release for other uses. For three of the schools, the Council questions whether the open land designation should be removed to enable redevelopment to take place on the greenfield site. As it is pointed out within the Issues and Options paper, the removal of open land can have detrimental impacts on the visual amenity, character of the area, nature conservation and the general environment. Therefore, this sustainability appraisal does not support the loss of this open land for other redevelopment purposes. The redevelopment of school buildings for other community facility purposes and the retention of open land, will result in positive sustainability implications, promoting equity, social inclusion and access to possible educational, training and social opportunities. If safeguarded, the biodiversity value of open land may develop in the future.

It should be noted that if extensive residential development does take place at Hemel Hempstead as proposed (see *Core Strategies Supplementary Issues and Options Paper: Growth at Hemel Hempstead, November 2006*), then new schools will need to be provided to meet the demand from a large increase in population.

## **2.7 Leisure and Recreation**

***Issue 1 - Open land boundaries***

Issue 1 in the Leisure and Recreation chapter focuses on Open Land boundaries.

***Q56. Should any changes be made to the existing designated open land to make their boundaries more clearly defined?***

***Q57. Do you agree that proposals for built sport facilities on open land should continue to be assessed on a site by site basis?***

Dacorum currently assesses open land on a site by site basis and it is proposed that this will continue when considering proposals for built sports facilities, rather than the inclusion of a general policy. There is an important argument for not developing existing open land within towns/built up areas, as it can negatively affect the character and structure of the town, in addition to reducing the potential to convert to open space in the future. There may also be adverse biodiversity implications if open land is developed. Therefore, the Council's proposal to assess each open land site on a site by site basis will provide some protection for valuable open land sites from development. Once open land has been converted for other uses, its potential to be returned to open land in the future is diminished.

Green/open space in the urban environment has been found to have positive benefits for health<sup>1</sup>, including an increase in life expectancy and decrease in health complaints. It is thought that this is as a result of a favourable environment to exercise in. The psychological benefits may increase the motivation to exercise, as will social outcomes if the activities are shared.

### ***Issue 2 - New open land sites***

This issue explores the possibility of new sites for open land designation and leisure proposals. Leisure facilities are important community resources and should be easily accessible. Any sites put forward as part of this consultation exercise will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

### ***Issue 3 - New potential leisure sites***

This issue refers primarily to sites for indoor leisure facilities and various options are proposed. Leisure facilities are important community resources and should be easily accessible. Any sites put forward as part of this consultation exercise will be appraised as part of the ongoing sustainability appraisal process.

### ***Issue 4 - Hemel Hempstead town stadium***

Issue 4 considers the location of a town stadium within or close to Hemel Hempstead, and possible uses of the current Football Club ground. Options for the location of the new stadium include; within the settlement of Hemel Hempstead, within the surrounding Green Belt, or on the former Lucas Sport Field. Whilst development of the stadium within the Green Belt would be discouraged, locating it within the settlement may lead to housing having to be developed within the Green Belt, which could have potentially worse sustainability implications. Depending on accessibility to the site, using the Lucas Sports Field, which has a similar current use, may be the more sustainable option.

### ***Issue 5 - Bunkers Park caravan site***

Issue 5 considers whether a new caravan site at Bunkers Park should be covered by a leisure designation to safeguard it from alternative development. As the Council points out, caravan sites are important in terms of the provision of leisure facilities and support local tourism, having a positive effect on the local economy and designating it as a leisure site will protect it from alternative development.

## **2.8 Landscape, Biodiversity and Historic Heritage**

### ***Issue 1 - Landscape***

#### ***Q66. Do you agree with the Council's suggested approach for Landscape Character Assessment?***

The Council considers that the detail of Landscape Character Assessments is best left, and reviewed as appropriate, as supplementary advice. However, the Council proposes that the depiction of the (boundaries of the) landscape character areas are retained in the supplementary advice (as now), rather than be shown on the proposals map. This option is unlikely to have an adverse impact on sustainability, but it is suggested that the Council refer to or reference the supplementary advice within the Local Development Framework so that it does not get overlooked.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bird, W (2004) *Natural Fit: Can Green Space and Biodiversity Increase Levels of Physical Activity?* RSPB, UK.

Issue 1 asks for submission of any further landscape conservation designations or areas that should be considered as Regionally Important Geological or Geomorphological Sites (RIGS). The identification of such sites will ensure the appropriate protection is given in the future.

### ***Issue 2 - Biodiversity***

***Q69. Do you agree with the Council's proposed approach to Wildlife Sites (by identifying them on Proposals Maps?)***

The Council are proposing to identify Wildlife Sites (non-statutory designations, currently in excess of 200 sites identified in the Habitat Survey for Dacorum) on future Proposals Maps. They are currently protected through a policy which cross-refers to the Habitat Survey. It is agreed that fuller recognition could be given to the Wildlife Sites through their inclusion in the maps.

Issue 2 also asks for suggestions for other areas of Ancient Woodland that need protecting. The identification of such sites will ensure the appropriate protection is given in the future.

### ***Issue 3 - Historic Heritage designations***

***Q72. Which of the parks and gardens should not be identified on the Proposals Map for their importance to the landscape and local history?***

Thirteen unlisted historic parklands of local importance are currently included on Proposals Map, as the Council feels that their inclusion would provide an additional degree of protection against future development pressures that may otherwise harm their historic structure, character, principal components or setting. This sustainability appraisal supports the inclusion of the parklands in the Proposals Map for this reason.

Issue 3 also asks for suggestions for other sites that should be considered as Areas of Archaeological Significance. The identification of such sites will ensure that appropriate protection is given in the future.

Heritage issues could be taken into further consideration if reference is made to the Hertfordshire Historic Landscape Classification when considering the suitability of sites for development.

### ***Issue 4 - The Grand Union Canal***

This sustainability appraisal supports the safeguarding of areas along the Grand Union Canal so as to not detract from the canal's historic heritage and recreational/leisure uses.

## **2.9 Design**

***Q75. Do you agree we should define urban design areas (with related policies) in the towns and large villages as recommended in the Urban Design Assessment?***

The Urban Design Assessment (January 2006) covered Dacorum's towns (Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamstead and Tring) and three villages (Bovingdon, Kings Langley and Markyate). The study recommended a strategy plan for each of the settlements. These plans divide the settlements into broad design zones or areas,

and then different design advice related to each area type. This option may have positive sustainability implications for design and development within the Borough as important character and historical aspects should be taken into consideration, which could help to protect historic assets.

### 3 Appraisal of Site Allocation Assessment Methodology

Dacorum Borough Council have provided summary information and have undertaken a preliminary assessment of each of the proposed sites that have been considered through the initial 'Issues and Options' stage up to the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2006. The scope of the initial sites appraisals undertaken by Dacorum Borough Council is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1: Scope of Initial Scope Appraisals (taken from Schedule of Sites Appraisal, November 2006)**

<b>Site reference</b>	Unique code allocated on the basis of location and land use proposed, to allow sites to be identified on accompanying map
<b>Site address</b>	Location of site
<b>Area (Ha)</b>	Gross site area (where known)
<b>Current use</b>	Summary of the current land use(s)
<b>Proposed use</b>	Summary of the land use(s) being proposed
<b>Potential site capacity</b>	Estimated level of development that could be accommodated on-site e.g. number of residential units
<b>Identified by</b>	Information regarding the source of the proposal
<b>Preliminary site assessment</b>	
<b>Type of site</b>	Site category – Note 1
<b>Affects type of site key environmental designation(s)?</b>	If the site falls within one of the key categories listed, it will normally be discounted from further consideration – Note 2
<b>Key land issues raised</b>	Summary of key land issues that can be identified through information available
<b>Timescale</b>	An indication of when the site is likely to become available for development, if known
<b>Sustainability conclusion</b>	A broad assessment of the sustainability of the type of site proposed. This may involve a cross-reference to another document, which looks in more detail at sustainability issues of sites
<b>Next steps recommended</b>	What happens next? An initial assessment of whether the site should be taken forward for further consideration, and if so, how this will be done, i.e. through Site Allocations DPD, the Area Action Plan, separate supplementary guidance or site held in reserve if required in the future

**Note 1**

Sites have been sub-divided into the following broad categories. More than one category can apply to each site.

1. Greenfield
2. Previously developed land
3. In settlement
4. Outside of settlement<sup>2</sup>
  - (a) settlement edge
  - (b) countryside
5. Green Belt
6. Chilterns AONB
7. Settlement type
  - (a) primary settlement (Hemel Hempstead)
  - (b) secondary settlement (Berkhamsted & Tring)
  - (c) large village
  - (d) selected small village

<sup>2</sup> The term 'Settlement' refers to the towns, villages and selected small villages identified in the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011.

**Note 2**

The following are defined as key environmental designations by Dacorum Borough Council for the purposes of this assessment:

- Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
- Local Nature Reserve (LNR)
- Semi-Natural Ancient Woodland
- Historic Park and Garden
- Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM)
- Floodplain (only in relation to greenfield sites)

The following comments have been made regarding the appraisal of sites methodology used by DBC.

**Key environmental designations:** This sustainability appraisal supports the Council's selection of 'key' environmental designations (as stated in Note 2) that would result in an affected proposed site being 'sieved' out from the preferred issues and options stage.

**Key land issues raised:** This section intends to include information related to land use issues from available information. This section does well in providing a range of land use issues that need to be taken into consideration. However, it should be ensured that accessibility issues are covered in more detail (as intended) at the Preferred Options stage.

**Sustainability Conclusion:** As stated in the site appraisal proforma, the 'Sustainability Conclusion' for each site provides a broad assessment of the sustainability of the type of site proposed, including references to other documents that look in more detail at sustainability issues of the sites where available. An initial assessment of the Sustainability Conclusions for each site has been undertaken and the results are discussed in Section 4 and Appendix A.



## 4 Assessment of Site Allocation Appraisal Sustainability Conclusions

The final element of this sustainability appraisal involves an initial assessment of Dacorum Borough Council's 'Sustainability Conclusion' for each of the potential sites as set out in the *Schedule of Site Appraisals*. A brief Sustainability Conclusion has been made for each site before recommending the next steps to be taken. To aid this initial appraisal, each of the sites was plotted (using GIS) against the key environmental designations identified within Dacorum's Site Appraisal Proforma (as set out in Note 2 of Table 1). Sites were allocated into one of three categories; those that:

- Avoid Key Environmental Designations;
- Lie within Key Environmental Designations; and
- Are adjacent/within close proximity of Key Environmental Designations.

This information was cross-checked with the information provided in the *Schedule of Site Appraisals*. Comments were made relating to three factors:

- Whether the assessment agreed with the Sustainability Conclusion provided by the council;
- Reasons why the assessment does not agree with the Council's appraisal of the site, or elements that should be considered at the Preferred Options stage; and
- An indication of whether the assessment recommends that the site should be taken forward to the Preferred Options stage.

The full assessment of the Council's Sustainability Conclusions can be found in Appendix A. This initial assessment largely agreed with the Sustainability Conclusions put forward by the Council.

Of the 181 sites proposed, the initial sustainability appraisal identified very few conflicts. Those that were identified are outlined in Table 2. As they conflict with key environmental designations defined by the council, it is recommended that these sites are not taken forward to the Preferred Options stage. However, where a designation may conflict with a small area of a proposed site, the site may still be considered at the Preferred Options stage with the intention of avoiding conflict with or damage to the designation.

**Table 2: Initial Assessment of Site Appraisals – Identified Conflicts**

Site Reference	Site Name	Comments	Take forward to Preferred Options Stage?
H/t10	Water Gardens North Car Park	The area conflicts with Flood zone 2 – greenfield site	Yes – Is actually a brownfield site and not greenfield as stated in Schedule of Site Appraisals document.
Be/h8	Land at Bank Mill Lane	The greenfield site is within close proximity to the AONB and conflicts with flood zones 2 and 3	No
M/h4	Dammersley Close	Loss of Green Belt, remote from local facilities and services, close proximity to the AONB and entirely within flood zone 2 and 3 on a greenfield site.	No
M/t1 (a)/(b)	Land at Slip End/Pepsal End	Loss of Green Belt and Ancient Woodland	No

In addition to the sites identified in Table 2 in this initial assessment of sites, DBC have identified 20 sites that are recommended not to be progressed to the Preferred Options stage, which are displayed in Table 3. This assessment agrees with these recommendations.

**Table 3: Sites Recommended not to be progressed to the Preferred Options Stage (DBC)**

Site Reference	Site Name	Comments
Be/h4	Pea Lane, Northchurch	Area conflicts with AONB
B5/h5	Land at Shooters Way	Area conflicts with AONB
Be/c1	Hospice Site, Shooters Way	Area conflicts with AONB
T/h11	Station Road/Cow Lane	Area conflicts with AONB*
T/h12	South of Park Street	Area conflicts with AONB*
T/L4	Land east of Cow Lane	Area conflicts with AONB*
T/t1	Land adjacent to Tring Station car park, Station Road	Area conflicts with AONB*
Bov/h3	Little Gables Long Lane	Loss of Green Belt – Site insufficient capacity to merit allocation
Bov/h5	Land at Shantock Hall Lane	Loss of Green Belt and severely burden on local services – lack of exceptional circumstances to warrant new building
Bov/h6	Land at Grange Farm	Loss of Green Belt and severely burden on local services – lack of exceptional circumstances to warrant new building
Bov/L1	Drive-thru cinema, Bovington Airfield	Loss of Green Belt and impact on traffic – inappropriate development in the Green Belt
KL/h4	Rucklers Wood, Rucklers Lane	Semi-natural ancient woodland
M/h1	Land at Cheverells Green (east)	Area conflicts with AONB*
M/h6	Land at Buckwood Road	Area conflicts with AONB*
M/h7	Land at Buckwood Road/Cavendish Road	Area conflicts with AONB*
O/h2	The Twist, Wiggington	The site conflicts with AONB and an Area of Archaeological Significance
O/h8	End of Nunfield Chipperfield	Loss of open countryside
O/h9	Ackwell Simmons Ltd, Chapel Croft	Loss of Green Belt and pressure on existing facilities
O/L1	Piccotts End Pumping Station	Greenfield site conflicts with flood zones 2 and 3
O/t1	Water End A4146	Greenfield site conflicts with flood zones 2 and 3 and AONB*

\* Take to the Preferred Options stage if an exceptional overriding need is identified; consider the need for the proposed use.

All Urban Capacity Sites (as identified in the *Urban Capacity Study, January 2005*) propose to utilise brownfield sites for residential development or intensification, and do not present any conflicts with the key environmental designations. Therefore, DBC has suggested that they should be taken forward to the Preferred Options stage. This sustainability appraisal agrees with this approach.

## 5 Next Steps

### **Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment – Next Steps**

This sustainability appraisal agreed with the key environmental designations used by the Council in their initial appraisal of proposed sites; however the council should be mindful of other environmental designations that should be considered in the selection of sites. This includes, amongst others, the presence of sites of archaeological interest, conservation areas, listed buildings, Wildlife Sites and priority habitats and species listed in the Local Biodiversity Action Plan. Whilst they are not statutory designations, they are nonetheless important in terms of local landscape, biodiversity and heritage reasons. It should be decided whether these designations, if present, could be accommodated in the planned development, for example, incorporating Wildlife Sites into the green infrastructure of a housing development. These and other additional environmental considerations will be identified and utilised when undertaking a more detailed sustainability appraisal on those sites which are taken forward to the Preferred Options stage of the DPD process.

Although the flood plain is currently considered in relation to greenfield sites, Dacorum Borough Council intends to undertake a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the Borough. The results of this assessment can then be used to inform the future selection of sites at the Preferred Options stage.

Two important aspects of the sites that have not been fully considered at the Issues and Options stage by DBC or within this Issues and Options Working Paper are the feasibility/suitability of sites, and accessibility requirements/constraints of sites. Feasibility/suitability of sites relates to a number of factors, including the size of the site, its potential for accommodating the proposed use, topography of the site etc, whereas accessibility relates to the site's location and existing transport infrastructure, and constraints of the site in terms of access to other key services and opportunities (employment, education, grocery shopping) or to existing residential areas. It is intended that these two elements will be investigated in more detail at the Preferred Options stage.

Following on from this initial Issues and Options stage for site allocations, the identification of preferred options, or preferred sites, for the Site Allocations DPD will be undertaken. The preferred sites identified by Dacorum Borough Council will be subjected to a full sustainability appraisal against the 20 Sustainability Objectives contained in the SA Framework that was presented in the SA/SEA Scoping Report and subsequently modified following consultation.

The results of this more detailed appraisal will be presented within the Site Allocations DPD SA Report which will be produced to accompany the Sites Allocations Preferred Options Report. This next stage of the sustainability appraisal will need to concentrate on the potential secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects that the sites may have on sustainability, and will also be required to propose monitoring measures that could be implemented to track the significant sustainability effects that may result from the implementation of the DPD.

## Appendix A: Initial Assessment of Site Appraisals

Appendix A contains the full initial assessment of the site appraisals which were undertaken by Dacorum Borough Council.

### Key to Table A1

✓	Proposed site avoids key environmental designations
?	Proposed site is within close proximity or adjacent to key environmental designations
×	Proposed site conflicts with key environmental designations
Y	Yes
N	No

\* 'Overall Score' is a summary of whether the proposed site conflicts with any of the key environmental designations (see key above)

\*\*Where information relating to key environmental designations and the proposed sites is not included (✓, ×, or ?), it is due to the site being unavailable in a GIS format. Only the DBC site appraisal has been referred to in this case.

**Table A1: Initial Assessment of Site Appraisals**

Location	Use	List of sites considered			Key Environmental Designations										Agree with Sustainability Conclusion?	Comments - Things to consider	Recommended to take forward to Preferred Options Stage
		Site code	Site address	Size (ha)	Ancient woodland	Area of outstanding natural beauty	Flood zone 2	Flood zone 3	Historic Parks & Gardens (no)	Scheduled Ancient Monuments	Sites of Special Scientific Interests or Nature Reserve	Special Areas of Conservation	Overall score*				
Hemel Hempstead	Greenbelt to residential	H/h1	Marchmont Farm (agent submission/landowner submission)	5.72445	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y	
		H/h23	The Hive, Featherbed Lane, Felden	1.18351	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and issues with access	Y	
		H/h25	Marchmont Farm (Inspector's Report)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y	
		H/h32	Shendish Manor (agent submission)	64.7782	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Access issues and potential congestion problems	Y	
		H/h40	Wider Gorhambury Estate (agent submissions)											Y		Y	
		H/h41	Marchmont Farm (core strategy)	13.2535	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y	
		H/h42	Shendish Manor (core strategy)	42.5554	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and visual intrusion	Y	

H/h54	Bunkers Park (core strategy)	50.1072	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y
H/h44	Nash Mills (core strategy)	9.14722	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Development should not take place on Green Belt land which is in the flood zone	Y
H/h45	Felden (core strategy)	17.1167	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and access to facilities	Y
H/h46	Grovehill and Woodhall Farm (core strategy)	83.4051	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Intensification of development in the Green Belt	Y
H/h47	Boxmoor (core strategy)	38.3227	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3 on greenfield/brownfield site	Y
H/h48	Gadebridge North (core strategy)	35.719	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt and close proximity to Dell Wood (an ancient woodland)	Y
H/h49	Old Town (core strategy)	9.82177	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	Y	Intensification of development in the Green Belt and adjacent to Howe Grove (Ancient Woodland and Nature Reserve)	Y
H/h62	Pouchen End, West Hemel Hempstead (core strategy)	43.7425	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt, poor access to facilities and adjacent to Shrubhill Common (Nature Reserve)	Y
H/h63	Land beside M1											Y	Loss of Green Belt and poor access to facilities	Y
H/h64	Land at Beakspear Way	15.0301	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Site within an Area of Archaeological Significance and poor access to local facilities (except employment)	Y
H/h65	Land North of Gadebridge (landowner submission)	10.5601	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y
H/h66	Beakspear Way (inspector's report)	15.0301	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Poor access to facilities	Y
H/h67(a)	West Hemel Hempstead (inspector's report)	20.2769	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt, visual intrusion, poor accessibility to local facilities and adjacent to Shrubhill Common (Nature Reserve)	Y
H/h67(b)	West Hemel Hempstead (inspector's report)	5.63231	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt, visual intrusion, poor accessibility to local facilities and adjacent to Shrubhill Common (Nature Reserve)	Y

	H/h68	Shendish Manor (inspector's report)	12.1719	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt, visual intrusion, poor access and potential congestion.	Y
	H/h71	London Road, Boxmoor (inspector's report)	1.20881	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Intensification of development in the Green Belt and poor access to local facilities	Y
	H/h72	Sheethanger Lane, Felden (inspector's report)	2.03254	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and poor access to facilities	Y
Garage sites to residential	H/h54	Windmill Road, Adeyfield	50.1072	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y
	H/h6	Driftway, Adeyfield	0.15235	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h7	Paston Road, Adeyfield	0.06767	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h8	Mimas Road, Highfield	0.14594	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h9	Malvern Way, Highfield	0.05774	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h10	Eastwick Row end of Mariner Way, Adeyfield	0.08647	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h11(a)	Marlins Turn	0.12646	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h11(b)	Warners End	0.11029	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h12	Cuttsfield Terrace/Chaulden Terrace, Chaulden	0.29812	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h13	Cumberlow Place, Leverstock Green	0.04731	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h14(a)	Kimpton Close, Woodhall Farm	0.07461	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h14(b)	Cleaves Road, Woodhall Farm	0.07303	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h15	Claymore, Grovehill	0.04615	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h16(a)	Eskdale Court, Highfield	0.09103	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h16(b)	Barrowdale Court, Highfield	0.11696	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h16(c)	Westerdale, Highfield	0.06665	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h33	Barnacres Road/Candlefield Road, Bennetts End	0.26599	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h35	Deansway, Bennetts End	0.21163	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h36	Horselers, Bennetts End	0.05858	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h37	Lime Walk, Bennetts End	0.02129	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h38	Reddings, Bennetts End	0.27631	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y

	H/h39	Ritcroft Street, Bennetts End	0.24096	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
Existing housing allocations for retention/amendment	H/h4	Paradise Fields (H40)	0.72015	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
	H/h26	Land south of Redbourn Road (H41)	1.11233	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
	H/h27	Buncefield Lane/Green Lane (H38)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
	H/h28	Westwick Farm, Pancake Lane (H42)	2.2801	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
	H/h29	Three Cherry Trees Lane/North East Hemel Hempstead (H18)	11.8977	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
	Employment to residential/mixed use	H/h17	Ebbens Road/Frogmore Road	2.85404	✓	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2. Consideration needs to given to the type of residential development built within the flood zone on previously developed land
H/h18		1 to 13 Frogmore Road	1.3608	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of employment land. Good access to public transport.	Y
H/h19		Frogmore End, Frogmore Road	4.21181	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Consideration needs to given to the type of residential development built within the flood zone on previously developed land	Y
H/h22		Three Cherry Trees Lane (East) (E4)	21.4677	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of employment land	Y
H/h30		74 to 78 Wood Lane End	0.79229	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of employment land and poor accessibility to local facilities	Y
H/h31(a)		Hemel Gateway	47.1382	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
H/h31(b)		Hemel Gateway	0.36718	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
H/h31(c)		Hemel Gateway	5.8187	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
H/h34		Gas Board site, London Road (TWA5)	3.38719	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
H/h53		Former Kodak Tower, Cotterells	0.87623	✓	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	The area is in close proximity to flood zone 2 and 3.	Y
H/h59		Land at former John Dickinsons, London Road (TWA7)	0.27065	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	The area is in close proximity to flood zone 3.	Y



	H/h60	Sappi Site, Nash Mill, Belswains Lane	7.56231	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Consideration needs to given to the type of residential development built within the flood zone on previously developed land	Y
	H/h61	Lord Alexander House, Waterhouse Street	0.13644	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Consideration needs to given to the type of residential development built within the flood zone on previously developed land	Y
	H/h69	Buncefield Lane (inspector's report)	3.53072	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
Leisure to residential	H/h21	Leverstock Green football club	1.82502	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h50	Hemel Hempstead football club	1.53855	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h51	Land adjacent to 37 Coleridge Crescent	0.02654	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
Social & community to residential/ mixed use	H/h2	West Herts College	3.30124	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this type of development is appropriate in a flood zone on previously developed land	Y
	H/h3(a)	Hemel Hempstead Hospital (C5)	0.68944	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h3(b)	Hemel Hempstead Hospital (C5)	1.26925	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/h55	Martindale Primary School, Boxted Road	1.40129	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of a school	Y
	H/h56	Pixies Hill JMI School, Pixies Hill Crescent	1.17298	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of a school	Y
	H/h57	Barncroft Primary School, Washington Avenue	1.456	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of a school	Y
	H/h58	Jupiter Drive JMI School, Jupiter Drive	1.81167	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of a school	Y
Retail/Local Centre/Town Centre to residential	H/h24	Three Horseshoes Petrol Filling Station, Leverstock Green	0.14688	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y

and/or mixed use	H/h52	Civic Zone	12.3012	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Consideration needs to be given as to whether these types of development are appropriate in a flood zone on previously developed land	Y
Leisure to employment	H/L1	Caravan site, Buncefield Lane, Bedmond Road	1.97467	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of open land and poor access to local facilities	Y
Employment to amended general employment area, Employment	H/e1	Junction of Eastmand Way and Swallowdale Lane	0.44648	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	The area is adjacent to Widmore Wood (an Ancient Woodland)	Y
Social & Community	H/c1	Land at Featherbed Lane, Two Waters Way, Apsley	0.18446	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y
Retail/Local Centre to mixed use	H/r1	Marlowes/Bridge Street/Waterhouse Street	1.51656	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Consideration needs to be given as to whether these types of development are appropriate in a flood zone on previously developed land	Y
	H/r3	Jarman Fields Local Centre	2.02898	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	H/r2	Marylands business area											Y		Y
Other transport proposals	H/t1	Dacorum Cycle Route											Y		Y
	H/t2	Dacorum Pedestrian Route Network											Y		Y
	H/t3	Hemel Hempstead Northern Bypass	113.165	?	✓	✗	✗	✓	?	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. The area is in close proximity to the Chilterns AONB, Gade Valley, Dell Wood and to a SAM. It is a partly greenfield and previously developed land site.	Y
	H/t4	A414 Maylands Avenue Roundabout											Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
	H/t5	A414 Breakspear Way/Greenland Roundabout											Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y

		H/t6	North East Relief Road														Y		Y
		H/t7	Swallowdale Lane														Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
		H/t8	A4147 Redbourn Road														Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
		H/t9	Breakspear Way	3.41117	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
		H/t10	Water Gardens North Car Park	0.73028	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗		N	The area conflicts with flood zone 2 - on a brownfield site	Y
		H/t11	A4251 London Road, Apsley														Y		Y
		H/t12	Plough Roundabout														Y		Y
	Greenbelt to leisure	H/L4(a)	Land at Hemel Hempstead	5.90305	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?				Y	The area is adjacent to Shrubhill Common	Y
		H/L4(b)	Land at Hemel Hempstead	3.60351	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?				Y	The area is adjacent to Shrubhill Common	Y
		H/L6	Shendish Manor - Southside fields	5.36577	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Y	Access issues and potential congestion problems	Y
	Open land to residential or leisure	H/L2	Land north of H42	2.02564	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y
		H/L5	Lucas Sports Ground, Breakspear Way	8.37955	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Y		Y
		H/h70	Field between Westwick Farm & Green Lane (inspector's report)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Y	Loss of open land and impacts on the landscape	Y
		H/h73	Land at Horseshoe, Leverstock Green	2.45332	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Y	Loss of open land	Y
		H/h74	Land between Westwick Farm & Green Lane	2.25637	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Y	Loss of open land and falls within an area of archaeological importance	Y
	Amend existing open land designation	H/L3	Bunkers Farm	47.734	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	?				Y	The area is adjacent to Longdeans Nature Reserve	Y
Berkhampstead	Greenbelt to residential	Be/h1	Ivy House Lane	5.2709	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?				Y	The area is in close proximity to the Chilterns AONB and poor accessibility to local facilities	Y
		Be/h2	Land south of Berkhampstead	111.093	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y

		Be/h3	Lockfield, New Road	1.93291	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt and in close proximity to the Chilterns AONB	Y	
		Be/h4	Pea Lane, Northchurch	7.26489	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The area conflicts with the AONB	N	
		Be/h5	Land at Shootersway	3.57771	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The area conflicts with the AONB	N	
		Be/h6	Blegberry, Shootersway	0.75255	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and poor access to local facilities	Y	
		Be/h7	Land to the west of Durrant's Lane	5.89859	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y	
		Be/h8	Land at Bank Mill Lane	4.09902	✓	?	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	N	The area is within close proximity to the AONB and conflicts with flood zones 2 and 3. Development should not take place on Green Belt land which is in the flood zone	N	
		Be/h9	Land at Ashlyns School	1.89223	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y	
	Other transport proposals	Be/t1	Tunnel Fields, Northchurch	0.19399	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y	
		Be/t2	A41 Chesham Road Junction												Y		Y	
	Retail	Be/r1	Land off High Street/Water Lane												Y		Y	
	Greenbelt to social & community use	Be/c1	Hospice site, Shootersway	2.82737	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The area conflicts with the AONB	N	
Tring	Greenbelt to residential	T/h2	Marchcroft Lane (landowner submission)	1.9545	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y	
		T/h3	Land north of Icknield Way	8.73692	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt and the area is in close proximity to the AONB	Y	
		T/h4	Land adjacent to Icknield Way GEA	15.1628	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The area is partially within the AONB	Y	
		T/h5	Land at New Mill	14.5887	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	The area is within close proximity to the AONB	Y	
		T/h6	Marshcroft Lane/Station Road (landowner submission)	53.4842	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Site within an Area of Archaeological Significance, loss of Green Belt and poor access to local facilities	Y
		T/h10	Land between Station Road (landowner submission)	44.8589	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	The area is within close proximity to the AONB and there are already local infrastructure and services capacity problems	Y	
		T/h11	Station Road/Cow Lane	2.66112	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The site conflicts with the AONB	N	
		T/h12	South of Park Street	0.16046	✓	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The site conflicts with the AONB	N	

	Town Centre to residential	T/h13	Cattle Market, Brook Street	0.48829	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	Leisure to residential	T/h14	Land at Miswell Lane	1.23674	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of open land	Y
	Employment to residential/mixed use	T/h1	Rear of Western Road	0.85978	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
		T/h7	Akeman Street, General Employment Area	0.82783	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
		T/h8	Brook Street, General Employment Area	0.89132	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The area conflicts with flood zones 2 and 3. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this type of development is appropriate in a flood zone - it is located within a settlement	Y
		T/h9	Miswell Lane	0.80219	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Consider existing Environmental Appraisal at next stage	Y
	Greenbelt to employment	T/e1	Land adjacent to Icknield Way General Employment Area	1.00911	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	The area is within close proximity to the AONB	Y	
		T/e2	Land between Marshcroft Land and Station Road	53.5985	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt, the area is in close proximity to the AONB and is within an Area of Archaeological Significance	Y	
		T/e3	Dunsley & Cow Farm Lane		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y	
	Retail/Local Centre to mixed use	T/r1	Cattle Market & Forge car park	1.0099	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	The area falls within a Conservation Area	Y	
	Greenbelt to leisure	T/L1	Dunsley & Cow Lane Farms	35.7973	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y	
		T/L2	Land at Hastoe Lane/Park Road	3.57488	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	The site conflicts with the AONB so consideration needs to be given to the type of leisure activity	Y	
		T/L3	Land west of Cow Lane	35.7973	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y	
		T/L4	Land east of Cow Lane	1.05576	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	The area conflicts with the AONB	N	
	Greenbelt to transport	T/t1	Land adjacent to Tring Station car park, Station Road	1.25314	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	The area conflicts with the AONB	N	
Bovingdon	Greenbelt to residential	Bov/h1	Land at Duckhall Farm	3.84509	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and the village is already suffering from traffic congestion	Y	
		Bov/h2	Land off Louise Walk	2.63051	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and the village is already suffering from traffic congestion	Y	

		Bov/h3	Little Gables Long Lane	0.03997	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	N
		Bov/h4	Land at Middle Lane, Bovington	2.76591	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and the village is already suffering from traffic congestion	Y
		Bov/h5	Land at Shantock Hall Lane	23.3341	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and severely burden local services	N
		Bov/h6	Land at Grange Farm	7.99578	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and severely burden local services	N
		Bov/h7	Land at Long Lane	0.88559	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Loss of Green Belt	Y
	Greenbelt to employment	Bov/e1	Land between Ley Hill Road & Bakers Wood	8.4066	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y
	Greenbelt to leisure	Bov/L1	Drive-thru cinema, Bovington Airfield	11.3801	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and impact of traffic	N
	Amend existing major developed sites in the greenbelt designation	Bov/c1	Bovington Prison	12.4715	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt	Y
Kings Langley	Greenbelt to residential	KL/h3	Rectory Farm, Rectory Lane	9.37442	✓	✓	✗	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	N	The site conflicts with flood zone 2 and is in close proximity to zone 3. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this type of development is appropriate in a flood zone - partly on greenfield and previously developed land.	Y
		KL/h4	Rucklers Wood, Rucklers Lane	0.19217	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	The site is an Semi Ancient Woodland	N
		KL/h5	Hill Farm, Love Lane	1.48771	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓	?	Y	Loss of Green Belt and the site is within close proximity to a SAM	Y
	Employment to residential/mixed use	KL/h1	Sunderlands Yard, Church Lane	1.38996	✓	✓	✗	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The site conflicts with flood zone 2 and is in close proximity to zone 3. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this type of development is appropriate in a flood zone on previously developed land	Y
		KL/h2	Ex Kings Langley Building Supplies	0.16597	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y

	Greenbelt to leisure	KL/L1 (KL/H3)	Rectory Farm	14.1558	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	The site conflicts with flood zone 3. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this type of development is appropriate in a flood zone	Y
	Historic Heritage	KL/hh1	Rucklers Lane flint bungalows	12.821	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	The site is on the edge of a flood zone	Y
		KL/L2	Rucklers Wood, Rucklers Lane											Y	The site is a Semi Ancient Woodland	Y
Markyate	Greenbelt to residential	M/h3	Foxdall Farm, Luton Road	1.81656	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of Green Belt and remote from local facilities and services	Y
		M/h4	Dammersley Close	6.43261	✓	?	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	Loss of Green Belt, remote from local facilities and services, close proximity to the AONB and entirely within flood zone 2 and 3 on a greenfield site	N
		M/h5	Land at Welsey Road, Albert Street												Y	Site is within a Conservation Area
	Rural area to residential	M/h1	Land at Cheverells Green (east)	0.41754	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	Site conflicts with the Chilterns AONB	N
		M/h6	Land at Buckwood Road	1.13639	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	Site conflicts with the Chilterns AONB	N
		M/h7	Land at Buckwood Road/Cavendish Road	1.08001	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	Site conflicts with the Chilterns AONB	N
		M/h9	Land at Cheverells Green (west)	1.03197	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	Site is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB, loss of Green Belt and poor access to local facilities	Y
	Open land to residential	M/h8	Land rear of Pickford Road, Cleveland Road, Sursham Court & Farrer Top	1.28107	✓	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	Y	Site is within close proximity to the AONB and loss of open space	Y
	Employment to residential/mixed use	M/h2	Hicks Road/A5	0.71107	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The site conflicts with flood zone 3. Consideration needs to be given as to whether this type of development is appropriate in a flood zone on previously developed land	Y
	Rural area to mixed transport/community use	M/t1(a)	Land at Slip End/Pepsal End	59.0493	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	Loss of Green Belt and Ancient Woodland	N
M/t1(b)		Land at Slip End/Pepsal End	93.6458	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	Loss of Green Belt and Ancient Woodland	N	
Other Settlements	Greenbelt to residential	O/h2	The Twist, Wiggington	0.35206	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	Y	The site conflicts with the AONB and an Area of Archaeological Significance	N
		O/h6	Bourne End Lane, Bourne End	0.53514	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	N	The site conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Development should not take place on Green Belt land which is in the	Y

				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	flood zone - on previously developed land	
	O/h8	End of Nunfield Chipperfield	0.76813	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Loss of open countryside	N
	O/h9	Ackwell Simmons Ltd, Chapel Croft												Y	Loss of Green Belt and put pressure on existing facilities	N
Rural area to residential	O/h4	Grange Road, Wilstone (DBC Housing submission)	0.23248	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	The site is within a Conservation Areas and Area of Archaeological Significance.	Y
	O/h5	Grange Road, Wilstone (landowner submission)	1.60353	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y		Y
	O/h7	Wilstone Bridge, Tring Road, Wilstone	0.40355	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	The site is adjacent to a wildlife site	Y
Employment to residential/mixed use	O/h1	Bourne End Mills (employment & residential)	3.37439	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Y	Poor accessibility to facilities and public transport	Y
	O/h3	Bourne End Mills (elderly persons complex)	3.37439	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	N	The site conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Consideration needs to given to the type of residential development built within the flood zone on previously developed land	Y
Greenbelt to leisure/tourism	O/L1	Piccotts End Pumping Station	1.51048	✓	✓	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The site conflicts with flood zone 2 and 3. Loss of greenbelt	N
Other transport proposals	O/t1	Water End A4146	10.0425	✓	x	x	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	x	Y	The site conflicts with the AONB and flood zone 2 and 3.	N