



**SUPPLEMENTARY SITE ALLOCATIONS
CONSULTATION REPORT**

**ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER
(NOVEMBER 2008)**

Volume 2

**November 2008 – January 2009
(Issues and Options Stage)**

Published: July 2013 (based on the position as at 2009)

Consultation Reports

The Consultation Reports outline steps taken in preparing the Site Allocations Development Plans Document.

The responses and information contained in this report is based on the position as at 2009. It covers the nature of the consultations carried out, the means of publicity employed, and the outcomes. The document explains how the Statement of Community Involvement (October 2005) is being implemented, and how the Planning Regulations (and any changes to them) have been taken into account.

The Consultation Report is presented in a set of volumes.

Volumes currently available are:

Volume 1 November 2006 – February 2007
Site Allocations Issues and Options Stage

Volume 2 November 2008 – January 2009
Site Allocations Issues and Options Stage

Further volumes will be prepared to reflect the Local Development Framework consultation process.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES:	5
- Public Consultation	5
- Place Workshops	18
- People Workshops	22
- Citizens' Panel	22
<i>Appendices:</i>	
Appendix A: Schedule of Sites Considered	24
Appendix B: List of Housing Sites from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2008)	35
Appendix C: Public Notices (November 2008)	38
Appendix D: General letter of notification (November 2008)	40
Appendix E: List of organisations contacted	42
Appendix F: Summary of consultation results	45

1. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report contains the results of the consultation to the Supplementary Site Allocations Issues and Options Paper (November 2008), which was published for comment between 3 November and 19 December 2008. The information and responses contained is based on the position as at 2009.
- 1.2 The document sets out new sites and designations that have emerged since the earlier stage of consultation on the Site Allocations DPD in 2006/07. It covers all the sites in the consultation paper except Gypsy and Traveller sites which was dealt with in a separate report published in June 2009. A schedule of the sites consulted on can be found in Appendices A and B. The Gypsy and Traveller sites report was originally considered by Cabinet on 31 March 2009.
- 1.3 The report focuses on the different sites put forward for housing, suggested new Open Land designations, and some other uses and designations in Dacorum (Chapters 1 and 3 of the Supplementary Site Allocations Issues and Options Paper).

2. SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

2.1. The consultation on housing and other issues comprised:

- (a) direct public consultation;
- (b) Place Workshops; and
- (c) People Workshop.

2.2 The public notice and general letter of notification can be found at Appendices C and D. A range of organisations and members of the public were consulted during this period including:

- Government Office for the East of England;
- Hertfordshire County Council;
- Adjoining authorities;
- Other government bodies;
- Regional bodies;
- Town and parish councils;
- Primary Care Trust;
- Developers, housing associations and agents;
- Utility providers;
- Schools and colleges;
- Faith, charity and community groups;
- Sports clubs;
- Civic societies;
- Resident associations; and
- Conservation bodies and historic trusts.

A full list of organisations consulted during this period can be found in Appendix E.

A. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

2.3 Around 3,000 responses have been analysed. This report focuses on comments received on new sites and designations, listed in the Supplementary Schedule of Site Appraisals accompanying the Supplementary Issues and Options Paper (2008). Both documents complement the earlier stage of consultation on the Issues and Options DPD in 2006/07. A number of respondents have also put forward comments on sites that were originally part of the earlier round of consultation. These are not being considered in detail at this stage. Table 1 below list these sites and indicates whether respondents were supporting or objecting to them.

Table 1: comments received on sites from the earlier Issues and Options Consultation (2006).

Schedule of Sites	No. supporting	No. objecting
H/h7	1	-
H/h56	-	3
Be/h3	-	2
Be/h4	-	3
Be/h5	-	2
Be/h6	-	2
Be/h7	-	5
Be/h8	-	2
Be/h9	-	1
Bov/h12	-	1
Bov/h14	-	1
KL/h15	-	2
O/h7	-	1

Overview of Comments

2.4 The analysis of comments received is detailed in Appendix F. Table 2 summaries this by question and response rates. Table 3 list responses by type of respondent and area.

Table 2: All Responses Assessed

Question	Numbers		
	No. of responses	Yes	No
1	495	303	168
2	1840	-	-
3	112	-	-
7	186	-	-
8	201	127	74
9	146	71	217
Total	2,980	501	459

Table 3: Responses by area and type of organisation

Area	Numbers		
	Residents	Organisations	Total
Berkhamsted	835	49	884
Bovingdon	484	22	506
Hemel Hempstead	1452	68	1520
Kings Langley	138	23	161
Markyate	13	12	25
Tring	154	33	187
Elsewhere	51	32	83
Total	3127	239	3366

Note: Organisations includes landowner/developer representatives, Councils and other groups (e.g. residents association, medical practice)

HOUSING

- 2.5 Appendix F Annex 1) a) sets out an overview of responses to Questions 1 and 2 in support of or objecting to each site. Annex 1) b) sets out the reasons stated for supporting or excluding sites from further consideration.
- 2.6 Of the sites set out in the Schedule of Site Appraisals those located outside of the existing settlement boundary received the most responses, the majority of which thought they should be excluded from further consideration. A range of different issues were raised depending on the site and its location, although there were a number of common themes:
- (a) loss of Green Belt land and coalescence of settlements;
 - (b) environmental impacts;
 - detrimental effect on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Chilterns Conservation Board were concerned over the impact of a number of housing sites on the setting of the CAONB;
 - detrimental effect on the character of (and existing uses in) the countryside;

- negative impact on local wildlife and loss of Wildlife Sites. This was also raised by a number of organisations such as the Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre, Natural England, Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the RSPB ;
 - increased run-off and flooding – current or increased future risk; and
 - the potential effect on archaeological remains.
- (c) social impacts;
- local services and facilities are inadequate or over stretched – particular reference is given to (primary) schools, Hemel Hempstead hospital, doctors surgeries and shops.
 - Impact on utilities – power, water pressure, sewerage.
 - Loss of productive farmland.
- (d) traffic issues;
- Increasing existing congestion and parking problems.
 - Lack of capacity of existing roads to accommodate additional vehicles.
 - Impact of extra traffic on highway safety and road users.

Settlement and Site Related Comments

Hemel Hempstead

2.7 There was no significant support for any one site in Hemel Hempstead. Some general comments were made suggesting all new development should be accommodated here to avoid putting pressure on the infrastructure and road network of smaller settlements. There was no significant objection either to any sites coming forward within the existing settlement boundary, except APS 34 – The Manor Estate where outline planning permission already exists. However, respondents expressed concerns over the following sites:

- HHC 45 – Hemel Hempstead General Hospital:
 - Land should be safeguarded for hospital / health care needed for the increasing population.
- H/h80 – Leverstock Green Lawn Tennis Club:

- Loss of a valuable leisure facility and Hemel Hempstead's only tennis club.
- H/h92 – Boxmoor House School:
 - A special school required for ongoing service delivery.
 - Loss of open playing fields for community needs.
 - Overdeveloped area with significant traffic problems - busy through route to Bovingdon.
- 2.8 There was a clear objection to sites located outside the existing settlement boundary, particularly:
- H/h48a – Land at Gadebridge North:
 - There is no reasonable access route.
 - Coalescence with Potten End will impact on the character and identity of the village.
 - Dell Woods buffer and the green corridor need protecting.
 - APS 54 – Shendish Manor:
 - Too much development has already taken place in Apsley.
 - A Historic Park and garden and valuable public amenity.
 - Coalescence with Rucklers Lane as raised by the previous Local Plan Inspector.
 - GH 59 – Land adjacent to Grovehill Park:
 - Highly visible location.
 - Deprived area, more houses will add to this.
 - Poor access arrangements.
 - H/h86 – Land off Featherbed Lane:
 - Important Flood Storage for the Manor Estate (SUDS) – development would pose a risk to the water course.
 - There are already a large number of new dwellings being built in the area.
 - Sites at West Hemel Hempstead:
 - Unsustainable location with little services and facilities – considered unsuitable by the previous Local Plan Inspector.
 - Poor accessibility.
 - Coalescence with Potten End and Bourne End.
- 2.9 Site H/h62d – Land west of Hemel Hempstead, did however receive a comparatively large amount of support (second most supported site listed in the Schedule of Site Appraisals after the Crown Estate land at East Hemel Hempstead (STA2)). This site was considered to form a natural extension to Hemel Hempstead, in a sustainable location with easy access to public transport,

the town centre and infrastructure. It was considered that Pouchen End Lane would offer a good new natural Green Belt Boundary.

- 2.10 The Council sought comments on two sites (STA1 and 2) even though they were in the adjoining St Albans district. These originally formed sites the two Councils were jointly working on prior to the successful High Court challenge to housing growth in the East of England Plan. They were being considered as part of a number of options for strategic growth around the town. However, we did acknowledge that we could not make decisions on these two sites.
- 2.11 The Crown Estate continues to support site STA2, which is in their ownership, for housing. The land (the Gorhambury Estate) was originally promoted by them for new housing as part of the East of England Plan process. They argued that due to its size and location it would be able to accommodate a significant proportion of the growth needed, including supporting infrastructure and it is within easy access of main transport routes. Alternatively, the site was felt by others to be too close to the Buncefield Oil Depot, in an unsustainable location at a distance from the station and town centre, and would be a significant encroachment into the open Green Belt that would risk coalescence with St Albans.
- 2.12 Site H/h60a Sappi (Site A) also received support. It is considered a good use of a redundant industrial / brownfield site for housing while not encroaching into the Green Belt or open land. Respondents throughout the consultation clearly preferred an approach that made the optimum use of such land to avoid allocating greenfield/Green Belt sites.
- 2.13 We received a number of objections to sites on environmental grounds from the Environment Agency, the Herts Biological Records Centre and the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust. The Environment Agency objected to sites H/h17a, H/h60a, H/h76, H/r5, H/tcb1, H/h77, H/h83, H/h89, H/L7 and NM13 on flood risk grounds. All the sites sited outside the existing urban area were subject to objections from a variety of organisations regarding possible impact on nature conservation.

Berkhamsted

- 2.14 Sites within and around Berkhamsted received the largest number of responses. There was no clear support for any of them, even sites within the existing urban area. A large number of objections were focussed on land to the south of the town put forward by the (then) landowners, Legal and General Assurance Society (Sites Be/h2 a-e). Concerns were voiced over development increasing pressure on the local infrastructure (especially school places), amenities and road network.
- 2.15 Berkhamsted Town Council supported this general view. They made reference to the East of England Plan not supporting the release of land from Green Belt around Berkhamsted, inadequate local services and infrastructure, and noise

from the A41 bypass making a number of these sites unsuitable for new homes. The adjacent woodlands were also seen as an important biodiversity habitat/corridor.

- 2.16 There was limited support expressed for the relocation of the football stadium as an opportunity for housing within the settlement boundary (Site Be/h13). However, retaining access to open land within the existing urban area was considered more important. The stadium's central location was also a consideration, currently easily reached by foot, bus, rail and car. Relocating the facility to what was considered to be an unsustainable and out of town location (Site Be/L3) was seen as increasing car use and traffic flows through the town.
- 2.17 There was a considerable volume of objection to all sites located outside the existing urban area, and site Be/h2a – Land South of Upper Hall Park proved notably unpopular with local residents (119 responses received). Site specific reasons included:
- Development Contrary to East of England Plan, which does not support Green Belt release around Berkhamsted (Be/h2a – Be/h2e, Be/h10, Be/h14, BW30).
 - Creation of a new hamlet in a remote location within the AONB. Not near local facilities and no public transport links. (Be/h15 & Be/h17 – This view was also expressed by Northchurch Parish Council).
 - Important national role of the British Film Institute (Be/h14).
 - Development would detract from the setting of Ashlyns Hall (Be/h2b).
 - Land should be safeguarded as replacement common land, lost during the construction of the A41, for leisure use (Be/h2c, Be/h2d).
- 2.18 Land at Durrants Lane and Shootersway (Be/h12), although already removed from the Green Belt, continued to receive a high level of objections for many of the same reasons as those sites located outside of the settlement boundary (para 2.5 (a) – (d)). This site is still regarded by respondents as valuable open space for the town. Other objections related to the level of development proposed (too high), location of dwellings (should be confined to land currently occupied by the school) and no development should front Shootersway (to avoid a hard urban boundary and to protect the rural edge). The tree boundary should be retained for the same reason.
- 2.19 A number of objections were received on environmental grounds from the Environment Agency, the Herts Biological Records Centre and the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust. The Environment Agency objected on flood risk grounds to sites Be/c3, BC12 and BW7. Almost all sites would have some form of impact on designated Wildlife sites, Wildspace or Eco Sites.

Tring

- 2.20 There was very limited support for any of the housing sites in Tring (no more than 3 respondents supported any one site). A widely held view amongst respondents was that Tring should not accommodate additional housing. They considered it to be an unsuitable location to support any of the additional growth proposed because it is a small, remote settlement at the edge of the Borough and County with poor transport links and infrastructure. Schooling is particularly seen as a critical issue in the town.
- 2.21 Again, many respondents objected to the release of any land outside the existing settlement boundary, including Tring Town Council. Some of the concerns raised were:
- Remote location within the AONB and on a key Biodiversity Area (T/h16).
 - Remote, woodland location within an SSSI and AONB (T/h17).
 - Development is contrary to East of England Plan, which does not support Green Belt release around Tring (T/h15, T/h16, T/h17, T/L5, TE17).
 - Icknield Way provides a strong settlement boundary and should not be breached (T/h15).
 - Marshcroft Lane is narrow and difficult to access which will affect road safety. Widening it would destroy the ancient hedgerow and other natural features. It is a well used public amenity site for recreation (TW17).

Bovingdon

- 2.22 There was considerable objection to all sites identified in and around the edge of Bovingdon. A number of representatives, including Bovingdon Parish Council, stated that they did not think any development should be located within Bovingdon for the following reasons:
- the infrastructure is at breaking point;
 - the existence of the Prison already has an impact on the rural nature of the settlement through increased noise and traffic;
 - the market and stock car racing on Bovingdon Airfield brings extra traffic into the village causing traffic congestion and parking problem; and
 - there is no public transport system.
- 2.23 The Parish Council did, however, feel that, subject to the necessary infrastructure being put in place, the village should welcome a number of small quality developments. This would include affordable housing for the young, Council provided sheltered housing, and private 'Courtyard housing' for the elderly.
- 2.24 There was some limited support for development at Bovingdon Airfield (Bov/h10) and at Duck Hall Farm (Bov/h8):

- Bov/h8 – Site already partly developed and it is in a sustainable location adjacent to the village centre. Part of the site could be used for amenity purposes.
- Bov/h10 – Grassland of no particular merit with good road/access links. Large site able to support new services needed and a country park.

Kings Langley

- 2.25 Sites in Kings Langley proved very unpopular, particularly the major rural sites put forward by the County Council (Hertfordshire Property) (Sites KL/h 8, 9 and 10). However, in their response to the consultation they did clarify that they did not want these sites considered nor were they intended for development. The key concerns related to the possible coalescence of the village with Watford, Nash Mills and Hemel Hempstead, impact on the rural character of the area, the loss of public amenity space, and the increased pressure on already over stretched facilities. Respondents felt that a lot of development had already taken place in Kings Langley (including on the Ovaltine site in the adjoining Three Rivers district) which had spoilt the character of the village.
- 2.26 The Highways Agency considered that sites KL/h8 and 9 would have a significant impact on the operational capacity of J20 of the M25. Others were concerned over the loss of working farms.
- 2.27 The Environment Agency objected to sites KL/c2, KL/h10 and KL48 on flood risk grounds.

Markyate

- 2.28 The low response rate from Markyate reflects the small number of sites identified in the area. There was a mixed response to site M/h2a (Hicks Road industrial area) with almost equal numbers for and against the site. While some supported the allocation as an opportunity to improve what was seen as a rundown gateway site, other felt local employment opportunities should be retained in the village.
- 2.29 The Highways Agency is particularly concerned that development here would have a significant impact on the A5. Their advice is that Markyate would not be a suitable location for this type of development unless public transport facilities are improved. The Environment Agency was also concerned over flooding.
- 2.30 Site WA51 (London Road) was considered inappropriate for housing because the sewage treatment works was close by, it lay in the floodplain (allocation not supported by the Environment Agency) and was a distance from the village centre, schools and facilities. It was suggested that the Council could consider the site for commercial use instead.

Other Locations

2.31 There were a few respondents that expressed support for sites elsewhere in the Borough where local housing need could be met (Sites O/h13 & 20 – Bourne End) or sites that already supported buildings on them (O/h15 & O/h18). Tring Rural Parish Council, while not supporting significant housing development in the villages, was in favour of small sites for affordable housing. However, the majority of respondents felt sites should be excluded from further consideration. Site specific reasons included:

- Isolated / remote location not bearing any relation to existing settlements with no access to local amenities or public transport links (O/h10, O/h30, O/h25, O/h26, O/h27, O/h28, O/h29, and O/h15).
- Within the AONB and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the area (O/h11, O/h13, O/h20, O/h22, O/h23, O/h25, O/h26, O/h27, O/h28, O/h29, ALD16, ASH4, WA55).
- Loss of local employment is unsustainable (O/h15).
- Coalescence of settlements (O/h11, O/h21, O/h22, O/h23, O/h24, O/h30).
- Impact on wildlife sites (O/h16, O/h17, O/h11, O/h24, O/h29, ALD16, and TW25).

2.32 Many of these sites are sensitive in terms of their wildlife designations (e.g. SSSI) or the habitats they support. Therefore, these tended to draw objections from a number of key environmental organisations such as the Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre, Natural England, Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust and the RSPB.

Other Sites Raised

2.33 Respondents were given the opportunity to suggest other site options under Question 3 (see Appendix E Annex 2). 112 responses were received, but only 23 new sites were suggested that had not already been considered either in this consultation or the earlier Issues and Options consultation in 2006/07 (Table 4).

Table 4: Additional Site Options Suggested

Location	No. of Responses
New site options	
<i>Hemel Hempstead</i>	
• Marchmont – Land to the north of A4147 between Marchmont Farm and Grovehill	2
• Cupid Green Extension	1
• B&Q site, Two Waters Road	1
• Inclusion of the former Hewden Plant Hire site within site H/h83	1
• Vacant land in Maylands / Buncefield / the ex-Lucas	8

sites	
<i>Berkhamsted</i>	
• Land South of Grand Union Canal, Billet Lane	1
• Latimer House, Gravel Path	2
• Field Adjacent to Garden Field Lane	1
• Community Boat yard and sites at the north end of Bridge Street	1
• Re-designate the British Film Institute as a Major Developed site within the Green Belt.	1
<i>Tring</i>	
• Land at Tring School	2
• Land between Duckmore Lane, Aylesbury Road and Fox Lane	1
• Former household waste site and land opposite Grove Road just past the school	1
• Former Grove garage	3
• Historic parkland behind Tesco	1
	1
<i>Bovingdon</i>	
• Land adj. to Church Lane House, Vicarage Lane	1
<i>Kings Langley</i>	
• Area between Site APS54 and Love Lane School.	1
• Royal Mail Sorting Office, High Street	1
<i>Wiggington</i>	
• Land to the rear of 2 -8 Fieldway	1
• Land south of Wiggington	1
<i>Long Marston</i>	
• Glebe Field, next to the Church	1

OTHER ISSUES

2.34 Respondents were asked whether they supported suggested new Open Land Designation sites. On the whole, these designations proved very popular with those that commented who were keen to see existing open land protected. Table 5 lists the sites by settlement in order of preference.

Table 5: Open Space Preferences.

Site	No. of Respondents
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD	

H/o3: Warners End Wood	79
H/o1: Hunting Gate Wood	68
H/o9: Martindale School	67
H/o10: Woodland belt Maylands Avenue	65
H/o2: Woodland between Hawthorn Lane and Martindale Road	64
H/o7: Longdeans School and Woodfield School	63
H/o5: Brickmakers Lane Allotments	63
H/o4: Trouvere Park	61
H/o11: Woodland belt off Tewin Road	61
H/o8: Hobletts Manor School	60
H/o6: Dell at The Crofts	56
H/o13: Datchet Close	50
H/o14: Adjoining Howe Grove	50
H/o12: Berkeley Square/Cuffley Court, Bayford Close	48
BERKHAMSTED	
Be/o6: Swing Gate Junior School	90
Be/o1: St Mark's Church grounds	87
Be/o4: St Peter's Church grounds	85
Be/o2: Bridle Way	79
Be/o5: Edgeworth House, High Street	79
Be/o3: Victoria Junior School	76
TRING	
T/o1: Frances de la Salle School	55
BOVINGDON	
Bov/o1: Old Dean	75
Bov/o2: Lancaster Drive	74

- 2.35 There is strong support for these sites (Appendix F Annex 3). The Herts Biological Record Centre particularly supported sites identified within Hemel Hempstead, to protect and enhance the existing Wildlife Sites or areas of Wildspaces. Berkhamsted Town Council supported sites identified in Berkhamsted. There were, however, a few objections raised (although the objections to sites Bov/o1 and 2 appear to relate to a misunderstanding of these designations as Open Land).
- 2.36 Hertfordshire County Council objected to the suggested designations covering their school sites. They argued that the designation should not be carried forward because the school sites were largely previously developed land and that they would also prevent other appropriate uses coming forward. For example, the Building Schools for the Future Programme could lead to significant redevelopment on school sites. As a result, the County Council felt that Open Land designations should be removed from school sites because they should not be unnecessarily fettered with policy designations. School playing fields were also seen to already benefit from a number of other protections anyway.

Other Sites Raised

- 2.37 Respondents had the opportunity under Question 4 to put forward other additional areas which could be considered as designated Open Land (see Appendix F Annex 4).
- 2.38 The question asked for suggestions of sites within the urban area. However, the majority of respondents suggested sites within the Green Belt, many of which were actually housing sites listed within the Schedule of Site Appraisals. They saw the designation as a way of safeguarding the land from development. In any event, if any of these sites were considered appropriate for Green Belt release consideration would be given to designating the larger open part of the sites as Open Land. While the land remains within the Green Belt, however, they are already afforded protection from development under Green Belt policies.
- 2.39 Additional sites suggested, not located within the Green Belt or currently already designated as Open Land, are listed below (Table 6).

Table 6: Additional Open Land Suggested.

SITE	No. Of Responses
HEMEL HEMSPTEAD	
Site NM13 (Sappi site)	1
Buncefield/Mayland Business Area/Redbourn Area	3
BERKHAMSTED	
Berkhamsted Colleigate Sports Ground	1
Green Space in Lombardy Drive (south of the main road)	2
Open Space in Dell Field and Castle Hill Estates	1
Park adjacent to Victoria school	1
All school grounds	1
TRING	
Land around Marshcroft Lane which is not in the Green Belt	1
BOVINGDON	
Rear of school playing fields / Playing area behind the Memorial Hall to the NW of Church Lane	2
Land around the Moody Estate and in the surroundings of the main road.	1

Other Issues

- 2.40 Appendix F Annex 5 outlines additional comments raised on any other sites listed in the Schedule of Sites Appraisals. The majority of respondents used this opportunity to re-emphasise earlier concerns raised regarding release of Green

Belt land for development and impact on local infrastructure. Some acknowledged the need to identify sites to accommodate future growth. Others stressed that expansion into the Green Belt should only take place once all brownfield sites were exhausted and the infrastructure is properly upgraded.

B. PLACE WORKSHOPS

- 2.41 A series of interactive place workshops were held between September 2008 and January 2009 to help inform issues, actions and policy direction in the Emerging Core Strategy and Site Allocations (Issues and Options).
- 2.42 The place workshops engaged with local residents and organisations to help understand what was different and special about the towns and villages and the countryside. Invitees included a wide range of local representatives including residents, local councillors, businesses, and other organisations. The workshops were aimed at identifying local issues and helping the Council to prepare place strategies (for later consultation with the Emerging Core Strategy). Attendance was as follows:
- Hemel Hempstead – 54 people
 - Berkhamsted – 39 people
 - Tring – 19 people
 - Bovington – 21 people
 - Kings Langley – 27 people
 - Markyate – 15 people
 - Countryside – 30 people
- 2.43 Attendees discussed a range of issues at each workshop, including development options. They were able to comment in each case on the schedule of sites in both the 2006 and 2008 consultation papers. The results of the place workshops are set out in detail as part of the Report of Consultation on the Core Strategy (Volume 3) and associated Annex:
- <http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/pdf/SPAR-11.29.11-ConsultationReport-Vol3-1.pdf>
<http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/pdf/SPAR-11.29.11-ConsultationReport-Vol3AnnexA.pdf>
- 2.44 The Hemel Hempstead place workshop also considered three options for the growth of the town in relation to levels of development signalled by the Regional Spatial Strategy (East of England Plan). This was a strategic issue to be chiefly tackled through the emerging Core Strategy.
- 2.45 A summary of the main points raised regarding development options is given below. Most of the comments were of a general rather than site-specific nature.

(i) Hemel Hempstead

- 2.46 The workshop commented on a range of Site Allocation sites. Attendees stressed the importance of delivering affordable homes, more dwellings (rather than flats), and smaller properties for the elderly, together with appropriate levels of infrastructure.
- 2.47 The group also considered three growth options for the town (a northern, eastern and dispersed option). These options comprised of various groupings of sites that were consulted on as part of the earlier consultation on the Site Allocations (Issues and Options) in 2006 (e.g. H/h1, H/h25, H/h32, H/h40, H/h41, H/h42, H/h44, H/h45, H/h46, H/h47, H/h48, H/h49, H/h54, H/h62, H/h63, H/h65, H/h67, H/h68). There was also overlap with some of the current sites (e.g. H/h48a, H/h62 a-d, H/h67a, H/h93, APS54, GH59, STA1 and 2).
- 2.48 The participants wanted the new development brought forward in the form of a sustainable new neighbourhood supported by matching infrastructure. With regards to the latter, a Northern Bypass was not generally supported because of its perceived cost and impact. The eastern option received the most support of the three strategies because of its close proximity to employment and the motorway, its ability to deliver large-scale infrastructure, and that it did not involve prime farmland.
- 2.49 The role of the hospital in the town and its future proved to be a key concern of the workshop. Participants referred to the use of the hospital site for a new cultural centre and that it could also relocate to Breakspear House. The future of the hospital land and its development potential can be considered through rolling forward the Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy in the Core Strategy and through progressing the associated town centre master plan.

(ii) Berkhamsted

- 2.50 Attendees considered that growth should be proportionate and linked to protecting the character of the town, the delivery of affordable housing and the provision of supporting infrastructure. They supported retaining the British Film Institute site for employment (Be/c2 and Be/h14) and the former social services site on Manor Street for community purposes e.g. for the elderly or for a travellers site (Be/h16). Any development opportunity on the Manor Street site could be dealt with through the normal development management process.
- 2.51 Be/h1 (Ivy House Lane) and Be/h17 (land rear of Shootersway) were both considered to have poor road access. It was highlighted that Ashlyns School (Be/h9) had surplus land that could be released for development. The latter would require the release of Green Belt land and the loss of school playing fields. A number of greenfield sites were considered appropriate for development

including land to the rear of Shootersway (Hanburys Be/h17) and to the south east of the town (sites Be/h2a-b).

- 2.52 It was suggested that if the Post Office site, High Street were to become available for development, then this would be a good site for a GP surgery. However, this could be considered if and when the site is made available, although its town centre location would make it equally suitable for a mix of other uses.

(iii) Tring

- 2.53 The participants attached a high priority to retaining the market town character of Tring, the need to improve local facilities, and preserving the Green Belt around the settlement. Therefore, major housing development was not supported.
- 2.54 A number of people commented on the Site Allocations sites. Generally, the countryside to the north and north-west of the town was considered to be too attractive to develop (T/h15). However, smaller portions of sites proved acceptable in the case of land at New Mill (T/h5), Marchcroft Lane (T/h2), and land adjacent to the employment area on Icknield Way. The participants did support housing on land off Miswell Lane (T/h9) and the Akeman Street employment area (T/h7). The latter would result in the loss of employment opportunities. They also supported two sites within the residential parts of the town (Park Street/Mortimer Hill and land to the west of Brook Street). These would involve multiple land ownership which could prove difficult to bring forward.

(iii) Bovingdon

- 2.55 The workshop generally supported new opportunities for housing (especially in order to secure smaller, affordable homes) and business, and wanted the High Street improved. However, they did not support Gypsy and Traveller sites around the village. Comments were made about the need for leisure/recreational facilities/open space and the shortage of small business start-up units.
- 2.56 Housing on Green Lane (sites Bov/h2a and h9) was considered to have a significant effect on residents.
- 2.57 The workshop opposed significant housing development at Bovingdon Airfield (Bov/h10). A small release of Green Belt land was considered to be acceptable given its degraded nature and the resultant scope for improvements. Land adjacent to the prison was suggested as a potential site. Such a suggestion could be pursued through the Core Strategy process as part of considering local housing needs in the village under the Place Strategy work. In addition, attendees did not rule out other uses of the airfield (e.g. leisure).

(iv) Kings Langley

- 2.58 Comments were made about development sites, including the telephone exchange. Its housing potential has already been identified through the SHLAA under site KL21. There was support for safeguarding land in and around Hill Farm and Wayside Farm from development (resp. KL/h5 and KL/h8). The Council does not support the release of land from the Green Belt in these rural locations.
- 2.59 Some participants sought the retention of local employment opportunities at Sunderlands Yard (KL/h1), but others felt it had potential for meeting local housing need. The Council would have to balance the loss of the site against the reuse of previously developed land in a residential area and its contribution towards housing in the village. Alternatively, there was strong support to keep Rectory Farm (KL/h3) in industrial use.
- 2.60 The workshop did not support large-scale greenfield development for housing given the sensitivities of the Green Belt around the village, although there was a degree of support for controlled releases of smaller parcels of land at KL/h4 and KL/h8. There were mixed views over the potential for development at land east of Watford Road (KL/h10). Some supported its contribution to providing affordable housing, whereas others were concerned over its proximity to the motorway and its impact on local heritage interests.

(v) Markyate

- 2.61 The workshop attendees commented on the importance of maintaining the character of the village and in the provision of affordable housing. Participants were concerned over the implications on the village of the potential redevelopment of the Hicks Road industrial estate, including the loss of local employment. Some considered it could be an acceptable site if employment were to be relocated to the edge of the village (possibly M/h4 Dammersley Close) or community facilities were provided. The site is considered under M/h2 and M/h2a.
- 2.62 Participants felt there were access problems with M/h4 and that land east and west of Cheverells Green (M/h1 and 9) were too peripheral. However, there was acceptance over a small development of land either side of Buckwood Road (M/h6 and M/h7).

(vi) Countryside

- 2.63 Workshop attendees stressed the importance of safeguarding the quality of the landscape and the smaller villages, and their sensitivity to development. They also emphasised the importance of affordable housing in meeting local needs of young people and families, and the need to protect and support local facilities

within the villages. However, no specific development opportunities were identified.

C. PEOPLE WORKSHOP

2.64 Two sets of workshops were held with community groups:

- Senior Voice and Community Groups; and
- The Youth Environment Forum.

While their focus was on policy direction of the Core Strategy they did consider development options. The results of the people workshops are similarly set out in the Report of Consultation on the Core Strategy (see para. 2.43 above).

2.65 No new detailed sites were put forward by these workshops. However, in considering growth of Hemel Hempstead the Senior Voice workshop broadly supported growth to the east and west of the town whereas the Youth workshop preferred northern and western growth options. The latter also supported modest growth on the periphery of the other towns and larger villages.

D. CITIZENS' PANEL SURVEY

2.66 The Council did not seek a response from the Citizens' Panel. Feedback was considered to be too complicated and difficult to respond to. However, their views were sought through the Emerging Core Strategy (May – September 2009) and the associated Place Strategies (which explored a number of greenfield development options for housing). The responses can be found in Volume 4 Annex B of the Core Strategy Report of Consultation:

<http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/pdf/SPAR-11.29.11-ConsultationReport-Vol4AnnexB.pdf>

Appendices

Appendix A: Schedule of Sites Considered

The following sites are considered in more detail in the **Supplementary Schedule of Site Appraisals** (November 2008)

NOTES:

- Sites within or adjacent to the Borough's towns and large villages are listed by settlement. Sites within or adjacent to the small villages or within the open countryside are listed under 'Other Settlements.' Within these broad locational categories the sites are then divided into land use (i.e. housing, retail) and then subdivided into more detailed categories as appropriate.
- This list only includes sites submitted to the Council on or before 8th September 2008.
- Where submissions have been made through more than one source for the same or similar sites, the source(s) is noted in brackets.

HEMEL HEMPSTEAD

RESIDENTIAL

Green Belt to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/h48a	Land at Gadebridge North (Boxted Farm)		GAD43
H/h62a	Land at Pouchen End	SS	CHA28, CHA31
H/h62b	Land at Pouchen End Farm	SS	CHA28
H/h62c	Land at Chaulden Lane	SS	CHA31
H/h62d	Land west of Hemel Hempstead	SS	
H/h67a	<i>Land at Fields End Farm</i>	SS	CHA28
H/h71a	Land at Friend at Hand, London Road		
H/h77	Land south of Link Road, Gadebridge		
H/h82	Hendalayk, off Roughdown Villas road		BOV61
H/h84	Land at Fields End Lane		WE28
H/h86	Land off Featherbed Lane		APS33
H/h89	Land adj. Red Lion PH, Nash Mills Lane	SS	HSP68
H/h90	Land adj. 7-8 Meadow Way		BOV64
H/h93	Land at Holtsmere End	SS	

Garage Sites to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/h87	Garage block, adj. 69 Long John		BEN35
H/h88	Garage block, The Noakes		GAD44

Employment to Residential / Mixed Use			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/h17a	East Frogmore Road		
H/h60a	Sappi (Site A), Belswains Lane	SS	NM13
H/h75	Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue		
H/h76	Former Texaco petrol filling station, adjacent Plough Roundabout		CH28, CH32
H/h85a	Bishops Yard, Mark Road / Farmhouse Lane		
H/h85b	Land adjacent to Bishops Yard, Mark Road / Farmhouse Lane		

Leisure to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/h80	Leverstock Green Lawn Tennis Club, Grasmere Close		LG42

Social and Community to Residential/Mixed Use			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/h92	Boxmoor House School, Box Lane		BOV59

Other to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/h78	Greenhills Day Centre, Tenzing Road		AE41
H/h79	Land at Fletcher Way		
H/h81	Land adjacent to Hemel Hempstead Railway Station, London Road		

SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY

Employment to Social and Community			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)

H/c4	Maylands Business Area and adjoining land		AE44
------	---	--	------

RETAIL

Employment to Retail			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/r4	Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue		AE44
H/r5	Former Texaco PFS, adjacent Plough Roundabout	PP	CH28, CH32

LEISURE & RECREATION

Green Belt to Leisure			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/L7	Sappi (Site B), Belswains Lane	SS	

Open Land to Residential or Leisure			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/h83	Two Waters East		APS55
H/h91	Land adj. Highfield House, Jupiter Drive		

Amend Existing and create new Open Land Designations			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/o1	Hunting Gate Wood		
H/o2	Woodland between Hawthorn Lane and Martindale Road		
H/o3	Warners End Wood		
H/o4	Trouvere Park		
H/o5	Brickmakers Lane Allotments		
H/o6	Dell at The Crofts		
H/o7	Longdeans School and Woodfield School		
H/o8	<i>Hobletts Manor School</i>		
H/o9	Martindale School		WE29
H/o10	Woodland belt Maylands Avenue		
H/o11	Woodland belt off Tewin Road		
H/o12	Berkeley Square/Cuffley Court, Bayford Close		
H/o13	Datchet Close		
H/o14	Adjoining Howe Grove		

Amend Existing Town Centre Designation			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
H/tcb1	Former Texaco PFS, adjacent Plough Roundabout		CH28, CH32

BERKHAMSTED

RESIDENTIAL

Green Belt to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Be/h2a	Land south of Upper Hall Park		BE25
Be/h2b	Land adjacent to Ashlyns Farm and Ashlyns Hall		
Be/h2c	Land adjacent to Ashlyns Lodge, Chesham Road		BE24
Be/h2d	Land west of Chesham Road		
Be/h2e	Land south of Kingshill Way		BW26
Be/h10	Hanburys, Shootersway		BW25
Be/h14	British Film Institute, Kingshill Way		BW24
Be/h15	Land at Darfield, Shootersway / Darrs Lane		
Be/h17	Land rear of Shootersway, Berhamsted		

Other to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Be/h11	Land north east of Admiral Way / Tortoiseshell Way		
Be/h12	Land at Durrants Lane and Shootersway		N13, NM13
Be/h13	Berkhamsted Football Club, Broadwater		BC40
Be/h16	Land at Manor Street		

SOCIAL / COMMUNITY

Green Belt to Social and Community Use			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Be/c2	British Film Institute, Kingshill Way		BW24

Other to Social and Community Use			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Be/c3	Water Lane / High Street		BC41
Be/c4	Land at Durrants Lane and Shootersway		N13, NM13

LEISURE & RECREATION

Green Belt to Leisure			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Be/L2	Land at Durrants Lane and Shootersway		N13, NM13
Be/L3	Land south of Upper Hall Park and east of Swing Gate Lane		

Amend Existing and create new Open Land Designations			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Be/o1	St Mary's Church grounds		
Be/o2	Bridle Way		
Be/o3	Victoria Junior School		
Be/o4	St Peter's Church grounds		
Be/o5	Edgeworth House, High Street		
Be/o6	Swing Gate Junior School		

TRING

RESIDENTIAL

Green Belt to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
T/h15	Land north of Icknield Way / south of Grand Union Canal		
T/h16	Land north of A41 (adj. London Lodge)		
T/h17	Land south of A41 (West Leith Woodlands)		

Employment to Residential / Mixed Use			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
T/h7a	64-68 Akeman Street		TW46

LEISURE & RECREATION

Green Belt to Leisure			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
T/L5	Waterside Way, land north of Icknield Way		

Amend Existing and create new Open Land Designations			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
T/o1	Frances de la Salle School		

BOVINGDON

RESIDENTIAL

Green Belt to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Bov/h2a	Land rear of Green Lane and Austin Mead		
Bov/h5a	Land off Shantock Lane		
Bov/h8	Land at Duck Hall Farm		
Bov/h9	Land at Green Lane		
Bov/h10	Land at Bovington Airfield		

SOCIAL / COMMUNITY

Other			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Bov/c2	Land rear of Green Lane and Austin Mead, Bovington		

LEISURE & RECREATION

Amend Existing and create new Open Land Designations			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
Bov/o1	Old Dean		
Bov/o2	Lancaster Drive		

KINGS LANGLEY

RESIDENTIAL

Green Belt to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
KL/h8	Land north-east of A41 Bypass		
KL/h9	Land south-west of A41 Bypass		
KL/h10	Land east of Watford Road		
KL/h11	Land adjacent 119 Hempstead Road		
KL/h12	Land at Rucklers Lane		

Other to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
KL/h6	Garages rear of Waterside		
KL/h7	Scout Hall, rear of Great park		

EMPLOYMENT/COMMUNITY

Green Belt to Employment/Community			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
KL/c2	Rectory Farm, Rectory Lane		

MARKYATE

RESIDENTIAL

Employment to Residential / Mixed			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
M/h2a	Markyate General Employment Area, Hicks Road		WA21, WA40

OTHER SETTLEMENTS

RESIDENTIAL

Green Belt to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
O/h10	Land opposite Bowling Cottage, Chequers Hill, Flamstead		
O/h11	Land at The Orchard, Little Heath Farm, Little Heath Lane, Potten End		
O/h13	Land in Bourne End village, Bourne End		
O/h20	Land off Bourne End Lane, Bourne End		
O/h21	Land west of Woodcroft Farm, Water End Road, Potten End		
O/h22	Land off Potten End Hill, Potten End		
O/h23	Land south of the A41 Bypass, Wigginton		
O/h24	Land north of Wigginton		
O/h30	Land adjacent The Willows, Potten End Hill, Water End		

Rural Area to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
O/h12	Land at Rosebarn Lane, Wilstone		
O/h16	Land at Astrope Lane, Long Marston		
O/h17	Land at Marston Place, Chapel Lane, Long Marston		
O/h19	Land south west of Wilstone		
O/h25	Land at James Farm, Wilstone		
O/h26	Land north of Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone		
O/h27	Land south of Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone		
O/h28	Land south of Tringford Farm, Wilstone		
O/h29	Land at The Green, Little Gaddesden		

Employment to Residential / Mixed Use			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
O/h15	Egg Packing Facility, Lukes Lane, Gubblecote		TW54

Other to Residential			
Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
O/h18	Garage Block, Nunfield, Chipperfield (DBC		BOV60

	submission)		
--	-------------	--	--

SELECTED SMALL VILLAGE BOUNDARY

Amend Existing boundary to Selected Small Village in the Green Belt Designation

Site Code	Site Address	(1)	(2)
O/smlvb1	Garden Scene Nursery, Chipperfield		BOV56
O/smlvb2	Vicarage Road, Potten End		

Suggested new Open Land designations

Site Code	Site Address	Tick
Hemel Hempstead:		
H/o1	<i>Hunting Gate Wood</i>	
H/o2	Woodland between Hawthorn Lane and Martindale Road	
H/o3	Warners End Wood	
H/o4	Trouvere Park	
H/o5	Brickmakers Lane Allotments	
H/o6	Dell at The Crofts	
H/o7	Longdeans School and Woodfield School	
H/o8	Hobletts Manor School	
H/o9	Martindale School	
H/o10	Woodland belt Maylands Avenue	
H/o11	Woodland belt off Tewin Road	
H/o12	Berkeley Square/Cuffley Court, Bayford Close	
H/o13	Datchet Close	
H/o14	Adjoining Howe Grove	
Berkhamsted:		
Be/o1	St Mark's Church grounds	
Be/o2	Bridle Way	
Be/o3	Victoria Junior School	
Be/o4	St Peter's Church grounds	
Be/o5	Edgeworth House, High Street	
Be/o6	Swing Gate Junior School	
Tring:		
T/o1	Frances de la Salle School	

Bovingdon:		
Bov/o1	Old Dean	
Bov/o2	Lancaster Drive	

Appendix B: List of Housing Sites from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (November 2008).

NOTES: These sites are additional to housing sites in Appendix A (to avoid duplication).

- The list excludes sites that were completed by the base date of 1st April 2007 and sites estimated to have a capacity of fewer than 5 units.
- The site reference relates to the ward in which the site is located and is taken from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The codes translate as follows:

AE	Adeyfield East
AW	Adeyfield West
Ald	Aldbury & Wiggington
APS	Apsley
BEN	Bennetts End
BC	Berkhamsted Castle
BE	Berkhamsted East
BW	Berkhamsted West
BOV	Bovingdon, Flaunden & Chipperfield
BOX	Boxmoor
CHA	Chaulden
CH	Corner Hall
GH	Grove Hill
HHC	Hemel Hempstead Central
HSP	Highfield St Pauls
KL	Kings Langley
LG	Leverstock Green
NM	Nash Mills
N	Northchurch
TC	Tring Central
TE	Tring East
TW	Tring West
WE	Warners End
WA	Watling
WH	Woodhall

APPENDIX B:

THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED

HEMEL HEMPSTEAD

(2) Site Code	Site Address	(1)
AE 39	Adeyfield Youth Centre, The Queens Square	
AE 54	31 Wood Lane End	PP
AE 55	Oatridge Gardens	PP
APS 34	The Manor Estate	PP
APS 41	APS (UK) Ltd, White Lion Street	
APS 54	Shendish Manor	SS
AW 37	Farm Way	
CH 15	R/O 1-3 & 5 St Albans Hill	
GH 59	Land adjacent to Grovehill Park	SS
HHC 45	Hemel Hempstead General Hospital	
HHC 81	Andersons Croft, Cotterells	PP
NM 13	Former Nash Mills Depot and Sappi Graphics	SS
STA 1	Land adjacent to Holtsmere End Road and Redbourn Road	SS
STA 2	Crown Estate Land east of Hemel Hempstead	SS
WH 7	End of Kimpton Close, Redbourn Road	

BERKHAMSTED

(2) Site Code	Site Address	(1)
BC 2	New Lodge, Bank Mill Lane	
BC 12	The Old Maltings Scout Hall, Chapel Street	
BC 38	Rose Cottage, Bank Mill Lane	PP
BC 44	Squash Courts, R/O 110 High Street	PP
BC 45	Land R/O New Road and Springfield Road	PP
BE 28	Nursery, Montessore School, 1 Park View Road	PP
BW 29	The Old Orchard, Shooterway	
BW 30	Land at Little Kingshill, Kingshill Way	
BW 34	St Francis Close, Shrublands Road	PP
BW 35	The Chilterns & Cherry Laurel Court, Stoney Close	PP
BW 7	Land at Sacred Heart Church, Park Street	

BOVINGDON

(2) Site Code	Site Address	(1)
BOV 03	R/O 10-22 (even numbers only) Church Street	
BOV 74	Land adjoining Chaulden View, London Road	

KINGS LANGLEY

(2) Site Code	Site Address	(1)
KL 15	R/O Jubilee Walk, Watford Road	PP
KL 48	Land Behind Nash Mills Depot	

TRING

(2) Site Code	Site Address	(1)
TE 17	Land off Marshcroft Lane	
TW 8	R/O Western Road	
TW 10	101 High Street	

MARKYATE

(2) Site Code	Site Address	(1)
WA 19	Corner of Hicks Road and High Street	
WA 36	R/O 50 & 52 High Street	
WA 51	London Road	

OTHER

(2) Site Code	Site Address	(1)
ALD 16	Land at Tom's Hill	PP
ASH 4	Garage at Hudnall Corner	PP
TW 25	Marston Court	
WA 55	Bradden Meadow, Jockey End, Gaddesden Row	PP

Appendix C: Public Notice (November 2008)



Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

NOTICE OF CONSULTATION ON THE SUPPLEMENTARY ISSUES AND OPTIONS PAPER OF THE SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLANS DOCUMENT

Dacorum Borough Council has prepared a Site Allocations Supplementary Issues and Options Paper for consultation. The document sets out issues relating to future development in the Borough and possible locations for accommodating it. This includes potential new housing sites and sites for Gypsies and Travellers. It supplements previous Issues and Options consultation carried out between November 2006 and February 2007.

Copies of the full document, a summary version and associated supporting documents are available for inspection:

- on the Council's website www.dacorum.gov.uk
- at Borough Council's offices during their normal opening hours
- at public libraries.

Normal opening hours of the Council offices are as follows:

Planning Reception Office, Civic Centre, Hemel Hempstead
Monday – Thursday 8.45 a.m. to 5.15 p.m.
Friday 8.45 a.m. to 4.45 p.m.

Borough Council Office, Civic Centre, Berkhamsted; and

Borough Council Office, Victoria Hall, Akeman Street, Tring

Monday – Thursday 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.
Friday 9 a.m. to 4.30 p.m.

Representations on the document can be submitted on-line on the Spatial Planning pages of the Council's website (www.dacorum.gov.uk/planning), or using the questionnaire that accompanies the document. Responses must be received by **4.45pm on 19 December 2008**.

Completed questionnaires should be sent to:

Senior Manager – Spatial Planning, Planning and Regeneration, Dacorum Borough Council, Civic Centre, Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, Herts HP1 1HH
or by e-mail to development.plans@dacorum.gov.uk

Further information is available from the Spatial Planning (formerly Development Plans) Unit on 01442 228660.

Appendix D: General letter of notification (November 2008)

Date: 30th October 2008
Our Ref: File 7.16
Contact: Spatial Planning
E-mail: Developmet.plans@dacorum.gov.uk
Directline: 01442 228660
Fax: 01442 228771



Civic Centre
Hemel Hempstead
HP1 1HH

(01442) 228000 Switchboard
(01442) 228656 Minicom
DX 8804 Hemel Hempstead

SITE ALLOCATIONS - SUPPLEMENTARY ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

The Council has published a Supplementary Issues and Options Paper relating to its Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) for consultation.

Scope of the Consultation:

This consultation looks at sites put forward by both technical studies and landowners since November 2006. It includes suggestions for new (and amended) housing sites, possible sites for Gypsies and Travellers and proposals to formally designate additional areas of open land within some of our towns and large villages.

We are not re-consulting on sites that formed part of the previous Site Allocations Issues and Options consultation carried out between November 2006 and February 2007. No decisions have yet been taken by the Council regarding these previously considered sites. Responses received to both consultations will be taken into account before we move onto the next stage of narrowing down our choice of sites. There will be further opportunities to put forward your views on short-listed sites at this time.

Consultation Documents:

The following documents are available as part of this consultation:-

- Supplementary Issues and Options Paper, (£5)

- A summary version of the Supplementary Issues and Options Paper (Free);
- Supplementary Schedule of Site Appraisals (£10)
- Sustainability Appraisal Report (£10)
- Frequently Asked Questions on Gypsies and Travellers (Free); and
- A questionnaire, to help you respond (Free)

Information regarding how you can obtain copies of these documents is set out in the attached Notice.

How to Respond:

You can let us have your views online via the Spatial Planning pages of the Council's website www.dacorum.gov.uk/planning or by filling in a questionnaire.

The consultation begins on Monday 3rd November 2008. All consultation responses must be received by **5.15pm on Monday 15th December**.

If you would like copies of any of the consultation documents, or have any questions regarding the consultation itself please contact the Spatial Planning team (formerly 'Development Plans') on 01442 228660 or email development.plans@dacorum.gov.uk

Yours sincerely,

Francis Whittaker
Senior Planning Officer – Spatial Planning
Planning and Regeneration

Enc.

Appendix E: List of organisations contacted

	Recipient
DBC	Councillors (excluding Ward Cllrs)
	Group Rooms (x2)
	James Doe - Head of Planning
	Mike Peters – Director of Env & Planning
	Manager of DC
	Spatial Plans
	SP LIBRARY
	Paul Newton / Fiona Bogle, DC
	DC Case Officers
	PLANNING RECEPTION
	BERK deposit point
	TRING deposit point
	Barbara Ansell - Registry
	Brian Scott – Head of Street Care
	Claire Covington, Landscape & Recreation
	Chris Taylor – Economic & Business Dev Mngr
	Roy Bain – Maylands Regeneration
	Kate Bowles – Housing Enabling Manager
	Mark Brookes – Planning Solicitor
	Noel Pope – Legal Services Manager
	Emma Adams – Conservation & Design Manager
	Pam Haliwell – Regeneration & Implementation
	Peter Hamilton – Valuation & Estates Manager
	Ruth Chapman – Trees and Woodland Manager
	Dave Gill – Senior Manager, Community Partnerships
	Claire McKnight – Corporate Consultation
Louise Manders – Comms	
SECTION TOTAL	
HCC	Forward Planning - John Tiley
	HBRC - Martin Hicks
	Head of Landscape - Simon O'Dell
	Corp services – Matthew Wood
	Herts Property – Jacqueline Nixon
	HCC Highways – James Dale
	County Archaeologist – Stuart Bryant
SECTION TOTAL	
LIB	County
	HH
	Adeyfield
	Berkhamsted
	Bovingdon
	Kings Langley
	Tring

	Recipient
	Leverstock Green
	Herts Local Studies
	SECTION TOTAL
TPC	Nash Mills
	Flamstead
	Great Gaddesden
	Nettleden with Potten End
	Kings Langley
	Northchurch
	Berkhamsted
	Aldbury
	Bovingdon
	Chipperfield
	Flaunden
	Little Gaddesden
	Tring Rural
	Tring Town
	Wigginton
	Markyate
	Leverstock Green Village Association
SECTION TOTAL	
OTHER STATUTORY CONSULTEES	Natural England, Shaun Thomas
	Environment Agency
	Highways Agency
	English Heritage
	British Waterways
	Network Rail
	British Telecom
	Transco
	British Gas
	Three Valleys Water
	Thames Water
	Primary Care Trust
	Strategic Health Authority
	Herts Constabulary
	GOEast
	SECTION TOTAL

	Recipient
OTHER / NON STAT	County Councillors (10)
	Adjoining Councils & Parish Councils (26)
	Ethnic Minority Groups (12)
	Disability Groups (15)
	Residents Associations (44)
	Key Land Owners/Developers (57)
	LSP (Local Strategic Partnership) (14)
	Estate Agents (37)
	Local Pressure Groups (37)
	Local Residents (No. not known-aprox)
	Planning & Dev. Consultants (50)
	Voluntary Orgs (23)
	Public Bodies (37)
	Local Pressure Groups (30)
	Govt. Depts (20)
	National Pressure Groups (12)
	Stat Undertakers & Services (23)
	Economic Development (8)
	Education & Employers (65)
	Clubs & Societies (23)
	Ward Councillors
	Database Contacts – Misc (237)

APPENDIX F: Summary of consultation results

Annex 1: QUESTION 1 & 2

a) Respondents sites preferences

Q1. Are there any new sites put forward for consideration in the Supplementary Schedule of Site Appraisals that you particularly support?			
<p>Respondents could make comment on more than 1 site therefore there was more responses generated (495) than actual respondents (107).</p> <p>Yes - 303 responses No - 168 responses</p>			
Q2. Do you think that there should be any sites excluded from further consideration at this stage?			
1840 responses received from 495 respondents.			
Site	No. of respondents in support (Q1)	No. who think site should be excluded (Q2)	Actions
SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED			
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD			
Sites within the existing settlement boundary			
H/h87: Garage block, adj. 69 Long John	5	0	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD. If considered to be surplus to requirements, progress to next stage.
H/h88: Garage block, The Noakes	6	0	
H/h17a: East Frogmore Road	4	2	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority and in the context of the update of the employment space study.
H/h60a: Sappi (Site A), Belswains Lane (NM13)	11	1	Consider further through Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD. Progress to next stage. Consideration should be given to the potential for a mixed-use development on the site.
H/h75: Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue	6	0	Consider further through Core Strategy and East Hemel

			Hempstead Town Gateway Action Area Plan DPD.
H/h76: Former Texaco petrol filling station, adjacent Plough Roundabout	9	2	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD and Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Master Plan.
H/h85a: Bishops Yard, Mark Road / Farmhouse Lane	1	1	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
H/h85b: Land adjacent to Bishops Yard, Mark Road / Farmhouse Lane	1	0	
H/h80: Leverstock Green Lawn Tennis Club, Grasmere Close	2	10	Do not progress to next stage.
H/h92: Boxmoor House School, Box Lane	5	11	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD. Progress dependent on operational decision of HCC in respect of education or other service.
H/h78: Greenhills Day Centre, Tenzing Road	1	2	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
H/h79: Land at Fletcher Way	2	2	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD
H/h81: Land adjacent to Hemel Hempstead Railway Station, London Road	2	3	Do not progress to next stage. Site too small to warrant consideration as an allocation.
H/c4: Maylands Business Area and adjoining land	4	1	Consider further Core Strategy DPD and East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan.
H/r4: Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue	2	0	Consider further through Core Strategy and East Hemel Hempstead Town Gateway Action Area Plan DPD.
H/r5: Former Texaco PFS, adjacent Plough Roundabout	2	1	Do not progress to next stage.
H/L7: Sappi (Site B), Belswains Lane	4	2	Consider further through Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD, although dependent on progress of related site H/h60a. Progress to next stage.
H/h83: Two Waters East	5	7	Do not progress to the next stage.
H/h91: Land adj. Highfield House, Jupiter Drive	1	3	
H/o1: Hunting Gate Wood	1	1	Progress to next stage.
H/o2: Woodland between Hawthorn Lane and Martindale Road	2	0	Do not progress to the next stage.
H/o4: Trouvere Park	3	0	
H/o5: Brickmakers Lane Allotments	1	0	
H/o6: Dell at The Crofts	1	0	
H/o7: Longdeans School and Woodfield School	1	1	
H/o8: Hobletts Manor School	1	2	Progress to the next stage.
H/o9: Martindale School	5	1	Do not progress to the next stage.

H/o10: Woodland belt Maylands Avenue	1	1	Progress to next stage.
H/o11: Woodland belt off Tewin Road	1	1	Do not progress to the next stage.
H/o12: Berkeley Square/Cuffley Court, Bayford Close	1	0	Progress to next stage.
H/o13: Datchet Close	1	0	Do not progress to the next stage.
H/o14: Adjoining Howe Grove	2	1	
H/tcb1: Former Texaco PFS, adjacent Plough Roundabout	0	1	Do not progress allocation to the next stage, but consider further the potential for a town centre boundary change through the Core Strategy and the Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Master Plan.
Sites outside the existing settlement boundary			
H/h48a: Land at Gadebridge North (Boxted Farm)	3	39	Consider further through Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD.
H/h62a: Land at Pouchen End	5	22	Consider further as a strategic housing site through the Core Strategy.
H/h62b: Land at Pouchen End Farm	5	21	
H/h62c: Land at Chaulden Lane	3	14	
H/h62d: Land west of Hemel Hempstead	12	15	
H/h67a: Land at Fields End Farm	4	24	
H/h71a: Land at Friend at Hand, London Road	2	6	Consider further through Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD.
H/h77: Land south of Link Road, Gadebridge	1	10	Do not progress to next stage.
H/h82: Hendalayk, off Roughdown Villas road	1	7	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
H/h84: Land at Fields End Lane	8	19	Consider further through Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD.
H/h86 (APS33): Land off Featherbed Lane	1	27	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority in the context of the Site Allocations DPD.
H/h89: Land adj. Red Lion PH, Nash Mills Lane	4	5	Consider further through Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD.
H/h90: Land adj. 7-8 Meadow Way	0	4	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
H/h93: Land at Holtsmere End	2	11	Consider further through Core Strategies of Both Dacorum and St Albans and East Hemel Hempstead Town Gateway Action Area Plan (to be prepared jointly with St Albans Council).
H/o3: Warners End Wood	1	2	No action required.
BERKHAMSTED			
Sites within the existing settlement boundary			
Be/h11: Land north east of Admiral Way /	1	4	Do not progress further.

Tortoiseshell Way			
Be/h12, Be/c4 & Be/L2: Land at Durrants Lane and Shootersway	9	47	Consider further through the the Site Allocations DPD and Core Strategy DPD as a strategic site.
Be/h13 (BC40): Berkhamsted Football Club, Broadwater	4	11	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through Core Strategy DPD and in the context of the East of England Plan. However, unlikely to be progressed given loss of leisure / community facility.
Be/h16: Land at Manor Street	2	2	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
Be/c3: Water Lane / High Street	0	3	Do not progress to next stage.
Be/o1: St Mark's Church grounds	1	0	Do not progress to next stage.
Be/o2: Bridle Way	0	0	
Be/o3: Victoria Junior School	0	0	
Be/o4: St Peter's Church grounds	0	0	
Be/o5: Edgeworth House, High Street	1	0	Progress to next stage.
Be/o6: Swing Gate Junior School	0	0	Do not progress to next stage.
Sites outside the existing settlement boundary			
Be/h2a (BE25): Land south of Upper Hall Park	3	119	Scale of development should not be progressed if contrary to East of England Plan. A smaller scale of development could be considered further in the Core Strategy DPD, dependent upon the need for the proposed uses and their relative priority.
Be/h2b: Land adjacent to Ashlyns Farm and Ashlyns Hall	2	58	
Be/h2c (BE24): Land adjacent to Ashlyns Lodge, Chesham Road	3	45	
Be/h2d: Land west of Chesham Road	1	22	
Be/h2e (BW26): Land south of Kingshill Way	3	16	
Be/h10 (BW25): Hanburys, Shootersway	1	11	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through the Core Strategy DPD and Site Allocations DPD.
Be/h14 (BW24): British Film Institute, Kingshill Way	3	8	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through the Core Strategy DPD and Site Allocations DPD.
Be/h15: Land at Darfield, Shootersway / Darrs Lane	1	20	Do not progress further.
Be/h17: Land rear of Shootersway, Berhamsted	2	18	
Be/c2: British Film Institute, Kingshill Way	0	4	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through the Core Strategy DPD and Site Allocations DPD and

			DPD.
Be/L3, Be/L1: Land south of Upper Hall Park and east of Swing Gate Lane	0	22	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through the Core Strategy DPD and in the context of the East of England Plan.
TRING			
Sites within the existing settlement boundary			
T/h7a; 64-68 Akeman Street	1	2	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through Site Allocations DPD and in the light of the update of the employment study.
T/o1: Frances de la Salle School	0	1	Do not progress to next stage.
Sites outside the existing settlement boundary			
T/h15: Land north of Icknield Way / south of Grand Union Canal	3	36	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority. Could only be progressed through Core Strategy DPD if there is an overriding need.
T/h16: Land north of A41 (adj. London Lodge)	2	21	Do not progress to next stage.
T/h17: Land south of A41 (West Leith Woodlands)	1	31	
T/L5: Waterside Way, land north of Icknield Way	1	9	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority.
BOVINGDON			
Sites within the existing settlement boundary			
Bov/o1: Old Dean	2	8	Do not progress to next stage.
Bov/o2: Lancaster Drive	1	7	
Sites outside the existing settlement boundary			
Bov/h2a: Land rear of Green Lane and Austin Mead	1	32	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through the Core Strategy DPD and Site Allocations DPD.
Bov/h5a: Land off Shantock Lane	1	31	Do not progress further.
Bov/h8: Land at Duck Hall Farm	5	29	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority through the Core Strategy DPD and Site Allocations DPD.
Bov/h9: Land at Green Lane	2	31	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority in the context of the Site Allocations DPD.
Bov/h10: Land at Bovingdon Airfield	6	32	Do not progress to next stage.
Bov/c2: Land rear of Green Lane and Austin	1	14	Consider further the need for

Mead, Bovington			proposed use / designation and relative priority through the Core Strategy DPD and Site Allocations DPD.
KINGS LANGLEY			
Sites within the existing settlement boundary			
KL/h6: Garages rear of Waterside	1	5	Do not progress to next stage.
KL/h7: Scout Hall, rear of Great park	2	9	Do not progress to next stage unless further evidence is provided as to the replacement of this community facility / suitable alternative available.
Sites outside the existing settlement boundary			
KL/h8: Land north-east of A41 Bypass	4	67	Do not progress to next stage.
KL/h9: Land south-west of A41 Bypass	2	72	
KL/h10: Land east of Watford Road	2	29	
KL/h11: Land adjacent 119 Hempstead Road	1	17	
KL/h12: Land at Rucklers Lane	0	25	
KL/c2: Rectory Farm, Rectory Lane	1	19	
MARKYATE			
Sites within the existing settlement boundary			
M/h2a: Markyate General Employment Area, Hicks Road	4	5	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority, particularly in relation to the update of the employment land study. Consider further in the Core Strategy DPD as a strategic site for a mixed use development.
OTHER SETTLEMENTS			
Sites within the existing settlement boundary			
O/h18: Garage Block, Nunfield, Chipperfield (DBC submission)	2	0	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD. Progress to next stage.
Sites outside the existing settlement boundary			
O/h10: Land opposite Bowling Cottage, Chequers Hill, Flamstead	0	5	Do not progress to next stage.
O/h11: Land at The Orchard, Little Heath Farm, Little Heath Lane, Potten End	0	17	Do not progress to next stage.
O/h13: Land in Bourne End village, Bourne End	1	3	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority in the context of the Site Allocations DPD. Progress in part dependent on Government advice in PPS3: Housing – current advice is that a “rural exception site” for affordable housing can be shown in the development plan.
O/h20: Land off Bourne End Lane, Bourne End	1	3	
O/h21: Land west of Woodcroft Farm, Water	0	25	Do not progress to next

End Road, Potten End			stage.
O/h22: Land off Potten End Hill, Potten End	0	27	
O/h23: Land south of the A41 Bypass, Wigginton	0	22	
O/h24: Land north of Wigginton	0	25	
O/h30: Land adjacent The Willows, Potten End Hill, Water End	0	20	
O/h12: Land at Rosebarn Lane, Wilstone	1	5	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority on the basis of a smaller site and its merits relative to site O/h5 in the Site Allocations DPD.
O/h16: Land at Astrope Lane, Long Marston	0	7	Do not progress to next stage.
O/h17: Land at Marston Place, Chapel Lane, Long Marston	0	3	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority in the context of the Site Allocations DPD. Progress in part dependent on Government advice in PPS3: Housing – current advice is that a “rural exception site” for affordable housing can be shown in the development plan.
O/h19: Land south west of Wilstone	0	5	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority on the basis of a smaller site and its merits relative to site O/h5 in the Site Allocations DPD.
O/h25: Land at James Farm, Wilstone	0	15	Do not progress to next stage.
O/h26: Land north of Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone	0	17	
O/h27: Land south of Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone	0	19	
O/h28: Land south of Tringford Farm, Wilstone	0	17	
O/h29: Land at The Green, Little Gaddesden	0	13	
O/h15: Egg Packing Facility, Lukes Lane, Gubblecote	3	5	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
O/smlvb2: Vicarage Road, Potten End	1	3	Do not progress to next stage.
O/smlvb1: Garden Scene Nursery, Chipperfield	0	2	Consider further the need for proposed use / designation and relative priority.

THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED			
	No. of respondents in support (Q1)	No. who think site should be excluded (Q2)	Actions
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD			

AE 39: Adeyfield Youth Centre, The Queens Square	0	3	Consider further the need for current use. However, unlikely to be progressed given loss of community facility.
AE 44: Maylands Avenue	0	1	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD and East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan.
AE 54: 31 Wood Lane End	0	0	Planning permission already granted.
AE 55: Oatridge Gardens	0	1	
APS 34: The Manor Estate	0	29	
APS 41: APS (UK) Ltd, White Lion Street	2	1	Engineering works and land used for car parking next to new residential development. Developer intentions unknown but within proposal site TWA10.
APS 54: Shendish Manor	0	39	Consider further through Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs.
AW 37: Farm Way	0	1	Planning permission already granted.
CH 15: R/O 1-3 & 5 St Albans Hill	0	0	A local or regional house builder may be interested. Developer intention is unknown. Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
CHA28: Land at Pouchen End/Fields End Farm	2	1	See response to H/h62 a-b and H/h67a.
GH 59: Land adjacent to Grovehill Park	0	48	Consider further through Core Strategy DPD.
HHC 45: Hemel Hempstead General Hospital	0	7	Consider further through Core Strategy DPD and Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Master Plan.
HHC 81: Andersons Croft, Cotterells	0	0	Planning permission already granted.
NM 13: Former Nash Mills Depot and Sappi Graphics3	7	4	See response to H/h60a
STA 1: Land adjacent to Holtsmere End Road and Redbourn Road	4	8	Consider further through Core Strategies of both Dacorum and St Albans and East Hemel Hempstead Town Gateway Action Area Plan (to be prepared jointly with St Albans Council).
STA 2: Crown Estate Land east of Hemel Hempstead	14	18	
WH 7: End of Kimpton Close, Redbourn Road	0	0	To be progressed further.
BERKHAMSTED			

BC2: New Lodge, Bank Mill Lane	1	3	Progress further.
BC12: The Old Maltings Scout Hall, Chapel Street	1	1	Consider further the need for current use. However, unlikely to be progressed given loss of community facility.
BC 38: Rose Cottage, bank Mill Lane	1	3	Already has planning permission.
BC44: Squash Courts, R/O 110 High Street	2	1	
BC 45: Land R/O New Road and Springfield Road	1	6	
BE28: Nursery, Montessore School, Shooterway	1	2	
BW 29: The Old Orchard, Shooterway	2	2	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
BW 30: Land at Little Kingshill, Kingshill Way	0	10	
BW 34: St Francis Close, Shrublands Road	0	2	Already has planning permission.
BW 35: The Chilterns & Cherry Laurel Court, Stoney Close	1	2	
BW7: Land at Sacred Heart Church, Park Street	1	2	Consider further the need for the proposed use and balance against Flood Zone advice through Site Allocations DPD.
BOVINGDON			
BOV 03: R/O 10-22 (even numbers only) Church Street	0	10	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
BOV 74: Land adjoining Chaulden View, London Road	0	4	
KINGS LANGLEY			
KL15: R/O Jubilee Walk, Watford Road	2	8	Retain in schedule until complete.
KL 48: Land Behind Nash Mills Depot	4	6	Consider further the need for the proposed use and balance against Flood Zone advice. Consider the site further through Site Allocations DPD.
TRING			
TE17: Land off Marshcroft Lane	0	41	Consider further the need for the proposal through the Site Allocations DPD and Core Strategy DPD.
TW 8: R/O Western Road	2	1	Consider further through Site Allocations DPD.
TW 10: 101 High Street	2	2	
MARKYATE			
WA 19: Corner of Hicks Road and High Street	0	0	Consider the need for the proposed use against the floodplain designation and national advice.
WA 36: R/O 50 & 52 High Street	0	1	Consider further the need for the proposed use and relative priority.
WA 51: London Road	0	5	Consider further the need for the proposed use and balance against the loss of

			Green Belt, and significant addition to size of village.
OTHER SETTLEMENTES			
ALD 16: Land at Tom's Hill	0	4	Planning permission already granted.
ASH 4: Garage at Hudnall Corner	0	3	
TW 25: Marston Court	0	5	Consider further the need for the proposed use through Site Allocations DPD.
WA 55: Bradden Meadow, Jockey End, Gaddesden Row	0	3	Planning permission already granted.
BROAD LOCATIONS			
	No. of respondents in support (Q1)	No. who think site should be excluded (Q2)	Actions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Sites in the Green Belt • All Sites in Bovington • All Sites in Berkhamsted • All Sites in Tring • All sites in Hemel Hempstead 	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>2</p>	<p>6</p> <p>6</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>-</p>	No action required. It is important to consider a mix of development locations. This will ensure a spread of development opportunities in order to contribute to total housing requirements and to better meet local housing needs where they arise. Levels of development will need to be balanced against local constraints in all cases.

b) Summary of reasons for supporting or excluding sites by location.

NOTE: Sites in Italics are those located within the existing settlement boundary.

HEMEL HEMPSTEAD		
Site	Reasons for supporting sites (Q1)	Reasons for excluding sites (Q2)
SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> H/h48a: Land at Gadebridge North (Boxted Farm) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an extension of an existing built up area in a sustainable location with access to infrastructure. Does not break up the Green Belt and has no environmental or landscape constraints. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt would lead to coalescence of Hemel Hempstead and Potten End. Would impact on the character of the village and adjacent AONB. Farm land should be retained. Lack of reasonable access routes, school accommodation, local facilities and public transport. Roads are inadequate to cope with additional traffic. No easy access to railway or bus station. Adjacent to a wildlife site and a Key Biodiversity Area (Upper Gade Valley) There is dramatic under-provision of local services in the town which needs to be addressed. Must protect Dell Wood with a buffer as well as ensure green corridors of sufficient width retained to Warners End open spaces.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> H/h62a: Land at Pouchen End 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural extension to Hemel Hempstead with access to infrastructure. Should retain significant open corridor to the west reinforcing shrubhill common. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife corridor identified along western boundary and northern edge. Access issues – narrow congested lanes. Poor public transport links with no easy access to the railway or bus stations. Loss of Green Belt currently preventing coalescence of Hemel Hempstead with Potten End and Borne End impacting on the character and identity of the villages, Warners End and Chaulden. Near the AONB.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure not able to support more growth. • Unsustainable location with little services and facilities. Comments made by the Inspector at the previous local plan enquiry regarding poor accessibility to local services and the prominent position in the landscape still apply and should be taken into consideration. • Brownfield site are available and should be used first.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h62b: Land at Pouchen End Farm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural extension to Hemel Hempstead with access to infrastructure already in place. • Should retain significant open corridor to the west reinforcing shrubhill common. • Well screened by taller hedges and tree belt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access issues – narrow congested lanes. • Poor public transport links with no easy access to the railway or bus stations. • Loss of Green Belt currently preventing coalescence of Hemel Hempstead with Potten End and Borne End impacting on the character and identity of the villages, Warners End and Chaulden. Near the AONB. • Infrastructure not able to support more growth. • Unsustainable location with little services and facilities. Comments made by the Inspector at the previous local plan enquiry regarding poor accessibility to local services and the prominent position in the landscape still apply and should be taken into consideration. • Brownfield site are available and should be used first. • Wildlife corridor identified along western boundary. • The site is prone to flooding.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h62c: Land at Chaulden Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural extension to Hemel Hempstead with access to infrastructure already in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildspace along southern edge. • Poor public transport links with no easy access to the railway or bus stations. • Loss of Green Belt currently preventing coalescence of Hemel Hempstead and Borne End. Need to retain the identity of the western edge of town. Near the AONB. • Infrastructure not able to support more growth. • Unsustainable location with little services and

		<p>facilities. Comments made by the Inspector at the previous local plan enquiry regarding poor accessibility to local services and the prominent position in the landscape still apply and should be taken into consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site are available and should be used first.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h62d: Land west of Hemel Hempstead 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural extension to Hemel Hempstead with access to infrastructure already in place. • Sustainable site which fits well with the original new town neighborhood concept. • Easy access to the stations, bus and cycle routes and the town centre. • Pouchen End Lane will provide a good new natural Green Belt boundary. • Site is easily deliverable with good access. • Unsubscribed schools in the area will accommodate growth. • Should retain significant open corridor to the west reinforcing Shrubhill Common. • Low grade farmland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildspace/corridor along western edge. • The area is poorly served by road and public transport links with no easy access to the railway or bus stations. • Loss of Green Belt currently preventing coalescence of Hemel Hempstead with Potten End and Borne End. Near the AONB. • Infrastructure not able to support more growth. • Unsustainable location with little services and facilities. Comments made by the Inspector at the previous local plan enquiry regarding poor accessibility to local services and the prominent position in the landscape still apply and should be taken into consideration. • Brownfield site are available and should be used first.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h67a: Land at Fields End Farm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural extension to Hemel Hempstead with access to infrastructure already in place. • Should retain significant open corridor to the west reinforcing Shrubhill Common. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must ensure sufficient corridor link to Shrub Hill Common - should be eastern fields rather than just Green Lane. • Erosion of the rural landscape, within the Green Belt and adjacent to the AONB. Need to prevent coalescence of Hemel Hempstead and Potten End impacting on the character and identity of the village and Warners End. • Poor access and public transport links. • On an Eco Site and adjacent to a Wildlife site. • Inadequate infrastructure to support more development. • Area prone to flooding. • Very visible and likely to have significant

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact on the environment. • Should be retained for farming.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h71a: Land at Friend at Hand, London Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site with good access to public transport. Should consider together with site BOV74 and realign the green Belt Boundary to exclude the house and industrial complex also. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green belt land which should be retained for farming. • Inappropriate for residential development and endorse the findings of the Borough Local Plan Inquiry Inspector that its release would damage the form and function of the Green Belt. • Loss of Wildspace and impact corridor and adjacent to a Wildlife Site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h77: Land south of Link Road, Gadebridge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good transport, local shops and services and ample schooling. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated green wedge within the Green Belt and near the AONB, impacting on the setting of Gadebridge Park and blocking the green corridor of the River Gade. • The site is used as a playing field and has many pitches, its central location means it is of strategic importance in terms of meeting Hemel's playing fields needs. Its size and location imply that it would be impractical to relocate the site in a location with the same level of accessibility. It would therefore be contrary to guidance in PPG17. • Object to loss of major Wildspace (woodland). • On a Key Biodiversity area (Upper Gade Valley)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h82: Hendalayk, off Roughdown Villas road 	None given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inaccessible - access to Roughdown Villas is along single track unmaintained road which couldn't accommodate more traffic.. • Impractical - steep wooded hillside adjacent to the A41. Doubts that the site is 0.35ha. If development is to relate to surroundings, then you can't fit any on the site. • Loss of wildspace (woodland) and likely impact on adjacent Wildlife Site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h84: Land at Fields End Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural extension to Hemel Hempstead with access to infrastructure already in place. • Should retain significant open corridor to the west reinforcing Shrubhill Common. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must ensure sufficient corridor link to Shrub Hill Common - should be eastern fields rather than just Green Lane. • Erosion of the rural landscape, within the

		<p>Green Belt and adjacent to the AONB. Need to prevent coalescence of Hemel Hempstead and Potten End impacting on the character and identity of the village and Warners End.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on road system which is already under strain. No easy access to railway and bus stations in Hemel Hempstead. • Wildspace and corridor protection. Loss of woodland and hedgerows - connectivity is important for networks and biodiversity. • Inadequate infrastructure to support more development. • Area prone to flooding. • Very visible and likely to have significant impact on the environment. • Should be retained for farming.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h86 (APS33): Land off Featherbed Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area surrounding Box Moor Trust land however should be left untouched. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Green Belt, erosion of the rural landscape, and green space. Too much Green Belt land is being taken for houses. • Important Flood Storage for the Manor Estate (SUDS) – development would pose a risk to the water course. • There is already planning permission for a large number of houses in the area and other development in the surrounding area causing strain on the local infrastructure and traffic congestion. Area cannot support more development. • Site rich in wildlife, loss of Wildspace – protect Green Lane.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h89: Land adj. Red Lion PH, Nash Mills Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good use of redundant industrial site with access to good existing infrastructure. However an EIA should be undertaken to determine the effects on local infrastructure, particularly in view of the Manor Estate development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt development should be avoided and within a floodplain. Coalescence of Hemel and Rucklers Lane/Kings Langley. • Land covered by an article 4 direction. • Adjacent to a Wildlife Site and protection of Wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h93: Land at Holtsmere End 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good transport, local shops and services and ample schooling. Will have the least impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt development and lose of farmland should be avoided.

	on nearby residential areas and is least likely to cause additional congestion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot develop number of dwellings on the site while retaining the character of the area. • Access in the area is already difficult. • Need to protect adjacent Wildspace.
• H/h87: Garage block, adj. 69 Long John	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site with access to services and public transport links. Green space should be retained. 	None
• H/h88: Garage block, The Noakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site with access to services and public transport links. Would not damage the identity of the neighborhood. 	None
• H/h17a: East Frogmore Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield sits with access to good existing infrastructure. • Current use of land leads to noise pollution, light pollution, visual ugliness and heavy traffic coming into the area. • Would not impact on the Green Belt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apsley is overdeveloped and cannot accommodate any more housing - it is also a gateway into the town. • It is designated by the water authorities as one the areas with the worst water supply problems within the borough. Water and sewerage is a high risk factor. • The infrastructure is at breaking point. • Adjacent to Wildlife Site
• H/h60a: Sappi (Site A), Belswains Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good use of redundant industrial / Brownfield site with access to good existing infrastructure and transport routes. However an EIA should be undertaken to determine the effects on local infrastructure, particularly in view of the Manor Estate development. • Would not impact on farm or green belt land. • Should retain gap between Kings Langley and Apsley. 	Adjacent to a Wildlife Site.
• H/h75: Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to improve quality and visual amenity of key gateway site into Maylands area. • Brownfield site which is well placed to cope with more traffic, school children and utilities. • Would not impact on farm or green belt land. • A mix of uses, including residential, will provide additional facilities to support the residential community and Maylands business area. It will also enable a more intensive and sustainable use of land. There is a 	None

	demonstrated lack of demand for office accommodation, and the Council should therefore accept alternative uses in order to allow the site to come forward.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h76: Former Texaco petrol filling station, adjacent Plough Roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessible Brownfield site with access to services and public transport links. Would not damage the identity of the neighborhood. • Would not impact on farm or green belt land. • Complete eyesore at present. Any development would improve the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should not be lost to housing. • Adjacent to a Wildlife Site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h85a: Bishops Yard, Mark Road / Farmhouse Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would not impact on farm or green belt land. 	The site is an attractive part of the borough with little services and facilities for new residents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h85b: Land adjacent to Bishops Yard, Mark Road / Farmhouse Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would not impact on farm or green belt land. 	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h80: Leverstock Green Lawn Tennis Club, Grasmere Close 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to bus routes, schools and other amenities. • Will an equivalent leisure space be provided elsewhere? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of valuable leisure facility (contrary to Government's wish to improve fitness in the community). • Hemel Hempstead's only tennis club should not be compromised for development (if developed and alternative site must be provided and identified in the LDF). • Will add to traffic congestion and put pressure on existing services and facilities. • Protect adjacent Wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h92: Boxmoor House School, Box Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield / infill site of limited extent. It would have minimal additional impact on traffic infrastructure or environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boxmoor special school required for ongoing service delivery. • Object to the development of the school's playing field unless it is either re-allocated or it can be proven that the playing fields are not required to meet community playing fields needs. • On an Eco Site. • Unsuitable area – already over developed and traffic problems as a busy through route to Bovingdon.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h78: Greenhills Day Centre, Tenzing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHLAA considers that the site is capable of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead to coalescence with Kings Langley.

Road	providing 26 -42 dwellings (phased 6 to 10 yrs). SA and SEA identify that the site is free of environmental designations and recommend that the site is carried forward for further consideration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate development in Green Belt and within flood plain. • On an Eco Site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h79: Land at Fletcher Way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infill site within the urban area. • HCC propose that the site is developed for special needs housing, but does not want the site to be restricted to this use in case it is not viable in which case normal residential would be appropriate. The SHLAA considers that the site is capable of accommodating 7-14 dwellings (phased 6-10 yrs). SA and SEA identify that the site is free of environmental designations and recommend that the site is carried forward for further consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would threaten coalescence of Woodhall Farm and Redbourn, and is very distant from the railway station. • Protect adjacent Wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h81: Land adjacent to Hemel Hempstead Railway Station, London Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be infill and of limited extent. It would have minimal additional impact on traffic infrastructure or environment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land needed for the expansion of the Railway station. • Increase in traffic on an already dangerous cross road and busy roundabout. • Noise pollution.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/c4: Maylands Business Area and adjoining land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site with access to amenities. Will not affect local residents any more than new offices would. 	Protect all possible Wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/r4: Breakspear House, Maylands Avenue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessible Brownfield site close to amenities. • Potential to improve quality and visual amenity of key gateway site into Maylands area. A mix of uses, including residential, will provide additional facilities to support the residential community and Maylands business area. It will also enable a more intensive and sustainable use of land. There is a demonstrated lack of demand for office accommodation, and the Council should therefore accept alternative uses in order to allow the site to come forward. 	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/r5: Former Texaco PFS, adjacent Plough Roundabout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideal retail location. Careful consideration should however be given to the access because is a very congested area. 	Adjacent to a wildlife site.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/L7: Sappi (Site B), Belswains Lane 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will prevent coalescence from development of the site. • Opportunity to provide a defensible and robust green belt boundary. Sustainable location within a short distance of a range of facilities. Close to major bus routes and bus stops, and Apsley Station. 	Green Belt land adjacent to a wildlife site. Would lose farming land.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h83: Two Waters East 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infill site within the urban area. • Should not be discounted in advance of conclusions on the Urban Park review. Edge of town centre sites need to be considered for reanimation complementary to that of the centre itself. • Landscape and Recreation (DBC) Would support leisure use not housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is part of a main gateway to the town from the A41 and it should be left as a green space. • Apsley is overdeveloped and cannot accommodate more houses. The area already suffers from significant traffic congestion. • Inadequate utilities and infrastructure to support more development. • Loss of part of a County Wildlife sites. Development unlikely to enhance the ecological function of the river corridor as suggested.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h91: Land adj. Highfield House, Jupiter Drive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Recreation (DBC) would support leisure use not housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Wildspace and on an Eco Site. • Been suggested from various groups and individuals from Highfield that the site could be used for a community youth facility.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/o1: Hunting Gate Wood 	HBRC support - Wildspace - Protect and enhance.	On an Eco Site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/o2: Woodland between Hawthorn Lane and Martindale Road 	HBRC support. Adjacent to LNR/Wildlife Site - buffer and enhance.	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/o3: Warners End Wood 	HBRC support - Wildlife Site - Protect and enhance.	One a Wildlife Site and Key Biodiversity Area (Upper Gade Valley)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/o4: Trouvere Park 	HBRC support - Wildlife Site - Protect and enhance.	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/o5: Brickmakers Lane Allotments 	HBRC support – Wildlife Site - Protect and enhance.	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/o6: Dell at The Crofts 	HBRC support – Wildlife Site - Protect and enhance.	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/o7: Longdeans School and Woodfield School 	HBRC support. Protect and enhance adjacent Wildspace.	School playing fields benefit from other protections. Majority of the site is already

		developed. Not make a significant contribution to the character of the settlement. Support Council's views that the designations should not be taken forward.
• H/o8: Hobletts Manor School	HBRC support. Protect and enhance adjacent Wildspace.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School playing fields benefit from other protections. Majority of the site is already developed. Not make a significant contribution to the character of the settlement. Support Council's views that the designations should not be taken forward. • On an Eco Site
• H/o9: Martindale School	HBRC support. Protect and enhance adjacent Wildspace. Would provide local recreation.	School playing fields benefit from other protections. Majority of the site is already developed. Do not make a significant contribution to the character of the settlement. Support Council's views that the designations should not be taken forward. Inappropriate to designate site as Open Land in advance of decisions regarding its future use. The designation might prevent other appropriate uses coming forward. Site is largely previously developed land.
• H/o10: Woodland belt Maylands Avenue	HBRC support - Wildspace - Protect and enhance.	School playing fields benefit from other protections.
• H/o11: Woodland belt off Tewin Road	HBRC support - Wildspace - Protect and enhance.	School playing fields benefit from other protections.
• H/o12: Berkeley Square/Cuffley Court, Bayford Close	Wildspace (largely). Protect and enhance.	None
• H/o13: Datchet Close	HBRC support - Wildspace - Protect and enhance.	None
• H/o14: Adjoining Howe Grove	HBRC support. Protect and enhance adjacent Wildspace.	Adjacent to a Wildlife Site
• H/tcb1: Former Texaco PFS, adjacent Plough Roundabout	None	Adjacent to a Wildlife Site
THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED		
AE 39: Adayfield Youth Centre, The Queens Square	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site too small to accommodate number of dwellings. Loss of essential parking in local centre.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth facilities should not be used for houses. Protect Wildspace
AE 44: Maylands Avenue	None	HCC question whether it is sensible to develop 644 dwellings within such close proximity to Buncefield given the geographic extent of the damage caused by the explosion.
AE 54: 31 Wood Lane End	None	None
AE 55: Oatridge Gardens	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caution/object. Loss of Wildspace. Adjacent to Wildlife Site.
APS 34: The Manor Estate	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much development has already taken place in Apsley. Road network and infrastructure cannot support more development. Impact on local wildlife and biodiversity. Vital green space for social skills. Access and bridge inadequate. On and adjacent to Wildlife sites and Eco Sites. Leisure and open space should not be compromised by housing.
APS 41: APS (UK) Ltd, White Lion Street	Brownfield/Infill site within the existing urban area. Would not damage the identity of the neighbourhood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apsley is overdeveloped and cannot accommodate any more housing - it is also a gateway into the town. It is designated by the water authorities as one the areas with the worst water supply problems within the borough. Water and sewerage is a high risk factor. The infrastructure is at breaking point.
APS 54: Shendish Manor	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much development has already taken place in Apsley. Road network and infrastructure cannot support more development. Poor access onto the site. Important historic park and garden with a number of protected species, TPOs, listed buildings and archaeology. Highly visible Green Belt land, contrary to PPG2. Would have a significant impact on

		<p>the character of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of amenity and leisure facilities. • Surface water and drainage issues. • Massive intensification on remaining side of the Gade Valley. Coalescence between Hemel and Rucklers Lane (raised by previous local plan inspector). • On and adjacent to an Eco site and considerable extent of Wildspace affected.
AW 37: Farm Way	None	Caution. Protect/enhance adjacent Wildspace.
CH 15: R/O 1-3 & 5 St Albans Hill	None	None
CHA28: Land at Pouchen End/Fields End Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable site with south facing slope. Well related to town and station. Low grade farmland that is not CAONB. Not prone to flooding. • Obvious extension to the town. 	<p>Site adjoins the Shrubhill Common Local Nature Reserve which is a valuable habitat and leisure resource. Development here would cut off the common from open countryside and restrict movement of wildlife to and from the common. Foxes, Muntjac, badgers and Brown Hares have been recorded on the proposed development site and on the Common itself. Any wildlife corridor would have to be extensive. It should be 100m wide and ideally follow the natural valley north from the common. The AONB is also very close to the site. The previous inspector considered that the site was not a sustainable location for housing. Nothing has changed.</p>
GH 59: Land adjacent to Grovehill Park	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly visible location in the Green Belt. • Local road network and infrastructure cannot support more development. Lack of services and facilities and roads congested. Poor access arrangements. • Protect/enhance Wildspace and corridors relating to Grove Hill Park. • Loss of valuable environment. Well used open space and should be protected. • Deprived area and more houses would add to this.
HHC 45: Hemel Hempstead General Hospital	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to retain the land use (hospital). Should be safeguarded. The increased

		<p>population will need hospital access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On an Eco Site, adjacent to a Wildlife site and Loss of Wildspace.
HHC 81: Andersons Croft, Cotterells	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
NM 13: Former Nash Mills Depot and Sappi Graphics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site requiring regeneration. • Good access to main transport links. • Good use of redundant industrial site however an EIA should be undertaken to determine the effect on local infrastructure, particularly in view of the Manor Estate development. • Will not impinge on the Green Belt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to a Wildlife Site and Wildspace boundaries. • Very bust, there are already traffic issues in the area. • Object to housing mix of private / social.
STA 1: Land adjacent to Holtsmere End Road and Redbourn Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large site able to accommodate a significant proportion of required growth with minimal impact on the majority of the borough. • The size of the site would allow facilities like schools etc to be incorporated. • Little scenic quality. • Would have the least impact on nearby residential areas and is least likely to cause additional congestion on already busy roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality farm land. • Unsustainable location – too far from the train station, town centre and shops. Would be contrary to PPS1, PPG2 and PPS3. • Close proximity to Buncefield. • No easily defined Green Belt boundary. • Highly visible from Redbourne Road. • The site is located with St. Albans City and District and should not have been included in the consultation document. The growth of the town to the east is of strategic importance and is being addressed through the Dacorum and St. Alban's core strategies.

<p>STA 2: Crown Estate Land east of Hemel Hempstead</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large site able to accommodate a significant proportion of required growth with minimal impact on the majority of the borough. • The size of the site would allow facilities like schools etc to be incorporated. • Opportunity to deliver a sustainable development that provides substantial biodiversity gain. • Good transport links to main roads and close to the industrial estate. • Minimal impact on the landscape compared to other sites. Would have the least impact on nearby residential areas and is least likely to cause additional congestion on already busy roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality farm land. • Unsustainable location – too far from the train station, town centre and shops. Would be contrary to PPS1, PPG2 and PPS3. • Close proximity to Buncefield. • Massive encroachment into the open Green Belt. • Excessive loss of Green Belt leading to coalescence with St Albans. • The site is located with St. Albans City and District and should not have been included in the consultation document. The growth of the town to the east is of strategic importance and is being addressed through the Dacorum and St. Alban's core strategies. • On a number of Eco and Wildlife sites.
<p>WH 7: End of Kimpton Close, Redbourn Road</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>

<p>BERKHAMSTED</p>		
<p>Site</p>	<p>Reasons for supporting sites (Q1)</p>	<p>Reasons for excluding sites (Q2)</p>
<p>SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h2a (BE25): Land south of Upper Hall Park 	<p>Land to the south of Berkhamsted could deliver a sustainable mixed use community in the form of a logical urban extension bounded by the A41. The site is also in single ownership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Green Belt (inconsistent with EoE plan) and would impact the AONB, Bourne Gutter, Wildlife sites and existing recreational users. Loss of farmland and rural environment. • Remote location, not near local facilities. • Too large, would dominate the rest of the settlement. • Area bounded by woodland that needs protecting. Should be allocated to leisure. • Noise impact from the bypass. • Density of development will have an impact on the skyline

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate access and transport/traffic congestion issues. Swing Gate Lane cannot cope with more traffic. Insufficient parking in the town. • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Inadequate utilities which cannot support more development. Concern over flooding. • Berkhamsted is already over developed. Impacts on the built heritage and character of the town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h2b: Land adjacent to Ashlyns Farm and Ashlyns Hall 	<p>Land to the south of Berkhamsted could deliver a sustainable mixed use community in the form of a logical urban extension bounded by the A41. The site is also in single ownership. Will spread the amount of traffic using Swing Gate Lane.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt (inconsistent with EoE plan) and would impact the AONB, Bourne Gutter, Wildlife sites and existing recreational users. Loss of farmland and rural environment. • Remote location, not near local facilities. • Too large, would dominate the rest of the settlement. • Noise impact from the bypass. • Density of development will have an impact on the skyline • Inadequate access and transport/traffic congestion issues. Swing Gate Lane cannot cope with more traffic. Insufficient parking in the town. • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Inadequate utilities which cannot support more development. Concern over flooding. • Berkhamsted is already over developed. Impacts on the built heritage and character of the town. • Loss of wildspace • Would detract from the setting of Ashlyns Hall.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h2c (BE24): Land adjacent to Ashlyns Lodge, Chesham Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land to the south of Berkhamsted could deliver a sustainable mixed use community in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prominent gateway location. Should be reserved for employment development.

	<p>the form of a logical urban extension bounded by the A41. The site is also in single ownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will spread the amount of traffic using Swing Gate Lane. • Good arterial road access via A41 avoiding the town. Access to local amenities and employment opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not available, nor suitable for housing. Should be safeguarded as replacement common land lost during the construction of the A41 for leisure use. • Within the green belt (inconsistent with EoE plan) and would impact the AONB, Bourne Gutter, Wildlife sites and existing recreational users. Loss of farmland and rural environment. • Remote location, not near local facilities. • Too large, would dominate the rest of the settlement. • Noise impact from the bypass. • Density of development will have an impact on the skyline • Inadequate access and transport/traffic congestion issues. Swing Gate Lane cannot cope with more traffic. Insufficient parking in the town. • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Inadequate utilities which cannot support more development. Concern over flooding. • Berkhamsted is already over developed. Impacts on the built heritage and character of the town. • On a wildlife site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h2d: Land west of Chesham Road 	<p>Land to the south of Berkhamsted could deliver a sustainable mixed use community in the form of a logical urban extension bounded by the A41. The site is also in single ownership.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prominent gateway location. Should be reserved for employment development. • Not available, nor suitable for housing. Should be safeguarded as replacement common land lost during the construction of the A41 for leisure use. • Within the green belt (inconsistent with EoE plan) and would impact the AONB, Bourne Gutter, Wildlife sites and existing recreational users. Loss of farmland and rural environment. • Remote location, not near local facilities.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too large, would dominate the rest of the settlement. • Noise impact from the bypass. • Density of development will have an impact on the skyline • Inadequate access and transport/traffic congestion issues. Swing Gate Lane cannot cope with more traffic. Insufficient parking in the town. • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Inadequate utilities which cannot support more development. Concern over flooding. • On a wildlife site. • The parks help to define the transition area between the town and the open countryside.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h2e (BW26): Land south of Kingshill Way 	<p>Land to the south of Berkhamsted could deliver a sustainable mixed use community in the form of a logical urban extension bounded by the A41. The site is also in single ownership. Access potentially a problem.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prominent gateway location. Should be reserved for employment development. • Within the green belt (inconsistent with EoE plan) and would impact the AONB, Bourne Gutter, Wildlife sites and existing recreational users. Loss of farmland and impact on semi-rural environment. • Remote location, not near local facilities. • Too large, would dominate the rest of the settlement. • Noise impact from the bypass. • Density of development will have an impact on the skyline • Inadequate access and transport/traffic congestion issues. Swing Gate Lane cannot cope with more traffic. Insufficient parking in the town. • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Inadequate utilities which cannot support more development. Concern over flooding. • Wildspace around boundaries. • Impact on the character of Kingshill Way

		Cemetery.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h10 (BW25): Hanburys, Shootersway 	None given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote location, not near local facilities. Poor public transport connections. Traffic congestion will be increased and access poor. • Prominent sites within the green belt (inconsistent with EoE plan) and adjacent to the AONB. Impact on wildlife site and semi-rural character. • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Object to mix of housing types. • Need to retain open space.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h14 (BW24): British Film Institute, Kingshill Way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site that will not generate extra traffic along Swing Gate Lane due to good arterial road access via A41. • Access to local amenities and employment opportunities. • Smaller site which will have a more balanced impact on local services / infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt (inconsistent with EoE plan) and AONB. Impact on local wildlife (adjacent to wildspace) and semi-rural environment. • Traffic congestion will be increased and access poor. Road junction improvements required. • Development to support improvements of existing facilities is not an adequate reason for allowing development into the open countryside. • Important national role of the British Film Institute.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h15: Land at Darfield, Shootersway / Darrs Lane 	Good arterial road access via A41 avoiding the town. Access to local amenities and employment opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt and AONB. Loss of rural environment. • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Inadequate utilities which cannot support more development. • Need to retain open space and wildlife sites. On an Eco site and object to loss of wildspace. • Remote location, not near local facilities. Poor public transport connections. • Previously listed as 'do not consider further'
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h17: Land rear of Shootersway, Berhamsted 	Good arterial road access via A41 avoiding the town. Access to local amenities and employment opportunities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt and AONB. Impact on character of the countryside • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure

		<p>already to support the existing population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate utilities which cannot support more development. • On a county wildlife site. Need to retain open space and wildlife sites. • Remote location, creation of a new hamlet not near local facilities and no public transport links.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h11: Land north east of Admiral Way / Tortoiseshell Way 	<p>Natural extension of existing housing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate local amenities/infrastructure already to support the existing population. • Need to retain open space. • Loss of wildspace • Oppose increased density through infill. • Contain a sub-station, tunnels underground and poor access
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h12, Be/c4, Be/L2: Land at Durrants Lane and Shootersway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reasonable extension of the town boundary only if necessary improvements are made to the infrastructure. • Land is within the settlement boundary. More leisure space is needed as well as improved school facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenfield site. Loss of open space. Designated open land on this site should remain and not compromise the setting for woodcock Hall. • Level of development is too high. • Inadequate utilities and infrastructure which cannot support more development. • Remote location, not near local facilities. Poor public transport connections. Traffic congestion will be increased and access and local road conditions are poor (subject to flooding). • Should avoid building fronting Shootersway to avoid hard urban edge. Loss of rural environment. • On an Ecological site and area of scientific interest. • Density too high and currently too many vacant properties not being sold. • Covenants on the land prevent development. • Should confirm sports facilities and playing fields are provided as part of the new school development.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development for housing should be confined to the land currently occupied by the school. • Trees along Shootersway provide a buffer from the A41 and should be retained.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h13 (BC40): Berkhamsted Football Club, Broadwater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central location. • No objection provided the football ground is provided with a new location. • Redevelopment would need to comply with the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Association's aims and subject to the approval of the Charity Commissioners. 	Loss of football club/open land in a good central location. Stadium should not be moved because current location has excellent access by rail, foot and car. Sports facility should remain. Need more green space in the town as it is.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h16: Land at Manor Street 	Small Brownfield site with good access to town amenities.	Loss of social and community facilities. No more houses needed in the town centre. Might be suitable for 'extra care' housing provided designated as social and community use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/c2: British Film Institute, Kingshill Way 	None	EoE plan does not support Green Belt release. Unsuitable for housing. Not near existing facilities, schools at capacity and will cause further traffic congestion. Inadequate local utilities. Should protect Grims Ditch. Adjacent to a wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/c3: Water Lane / High Street 	None	Should not progress. Would impact on an already heavily congested area with inadequate parking.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/L3: Land south of Upper Hall Park and east of Swing Gate Lane 	Leisure use could be in many of the Green Belt locations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental impact on / loss of wildlife sites. Corridors north and south of the site should be protected and enhanced. • Traffic increase – Swing Lane cannot cope with more traffic. • Loss of amenity. • Green belt (contrary to EoE plan) and should not be released. Proposed sports facilities and football stadium not acceptable within the Green Belt.
THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED		

BC2: New Lodge, Bank Mill Lane	Brownfield site in poor state and development would improve it. Good route into Berkhamsted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of local habitat and impact on attractive countryside. • Loss of Wildspace.
BC12: The Old Maltings Scout Hall, Chapel Street	Redevelopment of Brownfield land within the boundaries of the town.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would support the Maltings being regenerated for residential use within the existing building, with garage being replaced with development in sympathy with Maltings. Alternative community use should be identified.
BC 38: Rose Cottage, Bank Mill Lane	Brown field site with good access to service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of local habitat and impact on attractive countryside. • On Eco Site. • Has Planning consent.
BC44: Squash Courts, R/O 110 High Street	Brownfield sites within the town boundary with good access to amenities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has Planning consent.
BC 45: Land R/O New Road and Springfield Road	Good access to amenities. Loss of open land but close to existing development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Wildlife Site and on Eco Site. • Has planning consent. • Object to any creation of a link between New Road and Springfield Road.
BE28: Nursery, Montessore School, Shooterway	Involves changing the use of land already built upon within the boundaries of the town.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has planning consent. • Adjacent to Wildspace boundary.
BW 29: The Old Orchard, Shooterway	Access road is within town boundary and neighbours are supportive of development, as buildings will be a good distance from existing boundaries. Good site for more intensive development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway concerns. Delay until traffic congestion at junction with Kings Road resolved.
BW 30: Land at Little Kingshill, Kingshill Way	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prominent gateway location – should be reserved for employment development. • Forms part of historic common land. The land should be safeguarded as replacement common land lost during the construction of the A41 Bypass. • Road/Junction improvements required before more development is allowed. • Green Belt (contrary to EoE Plan) and AONB. Loss of amenity and impact on the character of the countryside. • Current infrastructure unable to support more development.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to a Wildlife site and loss of Wildspace.
BW 34: St Francis Close, Shrublands Road	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to Wildspace. • Site built
BW 35: The Chilterns & Cherry Laurel Court, Stoney Close	Good site for more intensive development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect/enhance adjacent Wildspace boundary. • Site built.
BW7: Land at Sacred Heart Church, Park Street	Involves changing the use of land already built upon within the boundaries of the town.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park Street poor road access. • Loss of social and community use. Important amenity to users of Sacred Heart Church. • Floodplain -Sensitive to flood risk.

TRING		
Site	Reasons for supporting sites (Q1)	Reasons for excluding sites (Q2)
SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T/h15: Land north of Icknield Way / south of Grand Union Canal 	Would be suitable with little disruption to residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located within the Green belt (contrary to EoE plan) part within the AONB and on a site of major archaeological significance. • Would represent large urban sprawl and have a significant impact on the setting of Tring. • Current Infrastructure and transport links inefficient to support more growth. Would require significant investment in social and physical infrastructure. • Lies adjacent to Tring reservoir SSSI, on a wildlife site, Eco Site, Key Biodiversity Area and would impact on Wildspace feature. • Icknield Way provides a strong settlement boundary and should not be breached. Development should be restricted to within the settlement boundary. • Field should be retained for leisure use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T/h16: Land north of A41 (adj. London Lodge) 	Would be suitable with little disruption to residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Remote site located within the Green belt

		<p>(contrary to EoE plan), within the AONB, within the floodplain and is woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would have a significant impact on the rural setting of Tring. • Local infrastructure cannot support more development • Adjacent to Wildspace and on a Key Biodiversity Area (Tring Park/high scrub).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T/h17: Land south of A41 (West Leith Woodlands) 	<p>Would be suitable with little disruption to residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Remote site located within the Green belt (contrary to EoE plan and PPG2), within the AONB, within the floodplain and is woodland. • Would have a significant impact on the rural setting of Tring. • Local infrastructure cannot support more development and is poorly located to public transport. • Object – within an SSSI.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T/h7a; 64-68 Akeman Street 	<p>Brownfield development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tring should be excluded as a housing location as it is smaller and significantly distant from the other locations on the edge of the County. • Infrastructure and transport links are poor. • Akeman Street is very congested, would a change of use add to or reduces this problem?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T/L5: Waterside Way, land north of Icknield Way 	<p>Marina and associated leisure facility is part of mixed use development (including residential) in line with PPS7, PPG13 and PPG17. Could contribute to restoration of Wendover Arm, and relocate Tring Corinthians FC with improved facilities within the site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt, AONB, Special Areas of Conservation. East of England Plan advises no further development takes place at Tring. • Falls outside current settlement boundary of Icknield Way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T/o1: Frances de la Salle School 	<p>None</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects as a housing site. Supports proposal to designate as open land, thus excluding it from potential housing development.

THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED		
TE17: Land off Marshcroft Lane	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good quality farmland in the Green Belt (Contrary to EoE Plan). Impact on AONB, adjacent Wildspace, SSSI and an area of archaeological significance. • Narrow, difficult access lane. Will affect road safety. Widening would result in destruction of ancient hedgerow and other natural features. • Public amenity, site well used for recreational purposes. • Will impact on the semi rural character and boundary of Tring. • Local infrastructure cannot support more development in the area. Site prone to flooding.
TW 8: R/O Western Road	Brownfield site which may justify further consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard local employment sites for vitality of town and to minimise home to work travel.
TW 10: 101 High Street	Brownfield site which may justify further consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard local employment sites for vitality of town and to minimise home to work travel. • Protect adjacent Wildspace.

BOVINGDON		
Site	Reasons for supporting sites (Q1)	Reasons for excluding sites (Q2)
SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bov/h2a: Land rear of Green Lane and Austin Mead 	Infill development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be protected (release of green belt is contrary to the EoE Plan and PPG2). No widespread development is needed or desired. Land should remain as Green Belt because it was designated as such in exchange for development a Yew Tree Farm estate 20 years ago to prevent urban sprawl. • Sustainability concerns: The infrastructure cannot support further development. Village

		<p>amenities have closed and public transport facilities are poor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on already congested roads and inadequate parking in the village, particularly on market and stock car racing days. The quality of the roads could not support more vehicles. Access onto Hempstead road is dangerous as a result of overdevelopment. • Access onto the site would cause traffic problems for existing residents. • Can the utilities, power and drainage, support more development? • Land should be retained as open space as it is a natural barrow for the village. The open space provides an important resource to the existing residents. • Object to loss of wildspace and corridor.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bov/h5a: Land off Shantock Lane 	<p>Isolated, plus in low density housing area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remote location outside the settlement boundary accessed via a narrow country lane. The area is not served by public transport or utilities and it is not within easy access of local village services. • Near the AONB and would neither conserve nor enhance it. • Green Belt should be protected (release of green belt is contrary to the EoE Plan). Sustainability concerns: The infrastructure cannot support further development. Village amenities have closed. • Impact on already congested roads and inadequate parking in the village, particularly on market and stock car racing days. The quality of the roads could not support more vehicles. Access onto Hempstead road is dangerous as a result of overdevelopment. • Wildspace boundaries should be protected and enhanced.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bov/h8: Land at Duck Hall Farm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In fill development on the edge of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be protected (release of

	<p>settlement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the site could be used for amenity purposes. • Site partly developed with an existing dwelling and substantial outbuildings adjacent to the village centre and so is a sustainable location. 	<p>green belt is contrary to the EoE Plan and PPG2). Would create urban sprawl and change the rural aspect of the area. Widespread development is neither needed nor desired.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability concerns: The infrastructure cannot support further development. Village amenities have closed and public transport facilities are poor. Bovingdon has enough houses. • Impact on already congested roads and inadequate parking in the village, particularly on market and stock car racing days. The quality of the roads could not support more vehicles. Access onto Hempstead road is dangerous as a result of overdevelopment. • Can the utilities, power and drainage, support more development? • Site is too close of existing housing estates. • The area contains evidence of medieval strip farming and 'ridge and furrow' cultivation. A preservation order was supposed to have been put on it some years ago.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bov/h9: Land at Green Lane 	<p>If development is required this would be the best location because it has access on 2 sides, it is adjacent to other development sites, with access to village and would form a natural boundary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be protected (release of green belt is contrary to the EoE Plan and PPG2). • Sustainability concerns: The infrastructure cannot support further development. Village amenities have closed and public transport facilities are poor. The village floods in places. Bovingdon has enough houses. • Impact on already congested roads and inadequate parking in the village, particularly on market and stock car racing days. The quality of the roads could not support more vehicles. Access onto Hempstead road is dangerous as a result of overdevelopment. • Access onto the site would cause traffic problems for existing residents.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the utilities, power and drainage, support more development? • Land should be retained as open space as it is a natural barrow for the village. The open space provides an important resource to the existing residents. • Wildspace boundaries should be protected and enhanced.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bov/h10: Land at Bovingdon Airfield 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large site with good road / access links • Grassland of no particular scenic merit. Potential to improve the area. • Not too near existing residents. • Acceptable provided the site provides adequate services including a new school. • Should be compulsory purchased and turned into a high quality residential development with a country park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be protected (release of green belt is contrary to the EoE Plan). No widespread development is needed or desired. Would be a huge encroachment into open land, contrary to PPG2. • Substantial site detached from the village centre and an unsustainable location. • The infrastructure cannot support further development and lack of public transport. Amenities in the village have been closing. • Impact on already congested roads and parking problems in the village. Entry onto Hempstead Road is dangerous as a result of over development, market traffic, stock car racing and the prison. • Wild space boundaries should be protected and enhance.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bov/c2: Land rear of Green Lane and Austin Mead 	Much needed recreation space alongside existing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be protected (release of green belt is contrary to the EoE Plan). • Sustainability concerns: the infrastructure cannot support further development. • Impact on already congested roads and parking problems in the village, particularly with market traffic and prison facilities. • The village community will be ruined. • Can the utilities, power and drainage, support more development? • Object to loss of wildspace. The open space provides an important resource to the existing residents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bov/o1: Old Dean 	Land well used by the community and provides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure cannot support more

	facilities for young people's recreation.	<p>development. Bovingdon is already over populated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The village is already too congested particularly along the High Street and as a result of the market traffic and prison facilities. • Housing is too dense in this area.
• Bov/o2: Lancaster Drive	Facilities for young people's recreation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure cannot support more development. Bovingdon is already over populated. • The village is already too congested particularly along the High Street and as a result of the market traffic and prison facilities. • Housing is too dense in this area.
THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED		
BOV 03: R/O 10-22 (even numbers only) Church Street	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrequired backland development. • Density too high for this semi rural location, not in keeping with the surrounding area and conservation area. • Poor access – Church Lane is very narrow which is already congested with cars and not suitable for increased traffic. • Building on back gardens will increase water runoff and flooding. • Protect / enhance adjacent Wildspace.
BOV 74: Land adjoining Chaulden View, London Road	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Wildspace. • Green Belt
All sites in Bovingdon	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population increase hasn't been matched by increased infrastructure. This has to improve first • Development would destroy the village. Bovingdon already has a prison which causes increased traffic problems and noise. • It will ruin the countryside and rural beauty. • The East of England Plan does not support the release of green belt land around

		Bovingdon
--	--	-----------

KINGS LANGLEY		
Site	Reasons for supporting sites (Q1)	Reasons for excluding sites (Q2)
SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/h8: Land north-east of A41 Bypass 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area would be suitable with little disruption to residents. • Herts Property could make available for development but only on part of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covers a huge area in the green belt (contrary to the EoE plan). Development of this scale would impact on the character of the village, the conservation area, AONB, local wildlife habitat and rural setting of the village. • Contains 4 working farms which should be protected. • Would lead to urban sprawl and coalescence with Watford. • Remote location with poor access to local services and public transport. • Contains well used public footpaths, cycle paths and bridal ways • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. Would increase the burden of commuter travel. • Significant infrastructure investment would be needed and therefore it is an unsustainable site for development and contrary to national and regional planning guidance. • Development would destroy the existing community. • There are other opportunities for development within the village boundary or alternative brownfield sites. • Development at the scale proposed would have a significant impact on the operational capacity of J20 of the M25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/h9: Land south-west of A41 Bypass 	Area would be suitable with little disruption to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who

	residents.	<p>does not wish to promote the site for development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covers a huge area in the green belt (contrary to the EoE plan). Development of this scale would impact on the character of the village, the conservation area, AONB, local wildlife habitat and rural setting of the village. • Contains 4 working farms which should be protected and adjacent to ancient woodland. • Would lead to urban sprawl and coalescence with Watford. • Remote location with poor access to local services and public transport. • Contains well used public footpaths, cycle paths and bridal ways • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. Would increase the burden of commuter travel. • Significant infrastructure investment would be needed and therefore it is an unsustainable site for development and contrary to national and regional planning guidance. • Development would destroy the existing community. • There are other opportunities for development within the village boundary or alternative brownfield sites. • Development at the scale proposed would have a major impact on the operational capacity of J20 of the M26. • On a wildlife and eco site and adjacent to wildlife sites.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/h10: Land east of Watford Road 	Area would be suitable with little disruption to residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE

		<p>plan), site of a Scheduled Ancient Monument and floodplain. Will impact on local wildlife, the rural setting, character of the village and quality of life.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coalescence of Kings Langley with Hunton Bridge/Watford should be avoided. • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. • Loss of farmland and woodland which contribute to the rural character of the village. • There are other opportunities for development within the village boundary. • Adjacent to a wildlife site. • Historic links to the site of a thirteenth century royal palace – historic landscape and impact assessment required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/h11: Land adjacent 119 Hempstead Road 	None given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt, against the principle of green belt release. • Would extend the village envelope joining Kings Langley to Nash Mills/Hemel. Would impact on the character of the village and its rural setting. • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. • There are other opportunities for development within the village boundary. • Object to development on a wildlife site. • Loss of natural and agricultural habitat corridors, within the floodplain and contains a public right of way.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/h12: Land at Rucklers Lane 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt, against the principle of green belt release. • Loss of woodland and biodiversity and a wildlife sites. • Would lead to coalescence and change the character of Rucklers Lane.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. • Narrow lane which cannot support more traffic. • There are other opportunities for development within the village boundary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/h6: Garages rear of Waterside 	Unightly area of old buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. • There are already parking problems in the area which new houses would worsen. • Would lead to loss of privacy for adjoining properties.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/h7: Scout Hall, rear of Great park 	Brownfield site. Will improve what is on the site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. • Scout hut is a valuable resource for local children. • Sports facilities should not be used for housing. • Owned by Herts County Council who do not wish to promote the site for development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KL/c2: Rectory Farm, Rectory Lane 	None given	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covers a huge area in the green belt which would extend the village envelope joining Kings Langley to Nash Mills. Would impact on the character of the village and its rural setting. • Village not able to sustain more growth. Existing infrastructure and road network already congested and inefficient. • Site is located within a flood plain and need to protect wildlife along the canal. Adjacent to a wildlife site. • Would set a precedent for large scale housing development. The Police should not move out of Hemel Town Centre. • Site contains a working farm and listed buildings.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An important local amenity and public right of way which should be retained for local use or for the football club.
THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED		
KL15: R/O Jubilee Walk, Watford Road	Site suitable for development and within the urban area which does not impinge on the Green Belt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Green Belt, farmland and woodland that contributes to the rural character of the village. Transport network and infrastructure cannot support more development. Visual impacts and public right of way. Floodplain. Loss of Wildspace and damage to local Wildlife habitats. Need to protect the Green Belt to avoid the village merging with surrounding settlements.
KL 48: Land Behind Nash Mills Depot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good use of redundant, run down industrial site however an EIA should be undertaken to determine the effect on local infrastructure, particularly in view of the Manor Estate development. Will not impinge on the Green Belt. Style of buildings however must fit in with local character and provide sufficient green space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coalescence of Hemel and Rucklers Lane/Kings Langley. Land covered by an Article 4 direction. Flood risk. Adjacent to a Wildlife Site and Wildspace.

MARKYATE		
Site	Reasons for supporting sites (Q1)	Reasons for excluding sites (Q2)
SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M/h2a: Markyate General Employment Area, Hicks Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Derelict, run down Brownfield site which seams surplus to requirements. Important gateway which should be improved. Area would be very suitable with little disruption to residents. Consider it is important to deliver long-term regeneration of the site that will generate significant benefits for the wider Markyate area. Preference expressed for a mixed use scheme comprising of employment and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development on the scale proposed would have a direct and significant impact on the A5. Public transport facilities would need to be improved first. Flooding issues. Local employment should be retained. Housing not suitable within an industrial area.

	housing, with the opportunity to improve pedestrian links and to de-culvert the River Ver.	
THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED		
WA 19: Corner of Hicks Road and High Street	None	None
WA 36: R/O 50 & 52 High Street	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site within Conservation Area. High Street at narrowest point, with narrow footway.
WA 51: London Road	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lies in floodplain • Long distance from village centre, facilities and school. • Site is within close proximity to the Chilterns AONB and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of AONB. • Sewerage farm very close making it inappropriate for houses. Some commercial could possibly be provided.

OTHER LCOATIONS		
Site	Reasons for supporting sites (Q1)	Reasons for excluding sites (Q2)
SCHEDULE OF SITES CONSIDERED		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h10: Land opposite Bowling Cottage, Chequers Hill, Flamstead 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated site within the green belt (contrary to the East of England Plan). • Object to loss of wildspace. • Inappropriate location for more houses and traffic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h11: Land at The Orchard, Little Heath Farm, Little Heath Lane, Potten End 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt (contrary to the East of England Plan) and AONB. Would represent ribbon development. • Would impact on the character of the village and open countryside. Should avoid coalescence with Hemel Hempstead.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsustainable location with a lack of local facilities. • Poor transport links and limited capacity to accommodate more traffic. • Adjacent to a wildlife site and object to loss of wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h13: Land in Bourne End village, Bourne End 	Site could meet local housing need.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt and AONB. • There are already enough houses and traffic. • Object to loss of wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h20: Land off Bourne End Lane, Bourne End 	Could meet local housing need.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the green belt and AONB. • There are already enough houses and traffic. • Object to loss of wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h21: Land west of Woodcroft Farm, Water End Road, Potten End 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan), adjacent to the AONB, wildlife site and close to an ancient woodland. • Isolated site with poor transport links and insufficient local amenities. Would lead to increase in car travel impacting on already congested roads. • Will impact on the character of the village and open countryside. Lead to coalescence with Hemel Hempstead and Water End. Need to protect the village from urban sprawl. • Would affect views and setting on Gaddesden Place and its Parkland. • Need to protect and enhance the Wildspace boundary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h22: Land off Potten End Hill, Potten End 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB. Sprawl beyond the defined boundary of the village should be resisted. • Isolated site with poor transport links and insufficient local amenities. Would lead to increase in car travel impacting on already

		<p>congested roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on this scale would be inappropriate. Will impact on the character of the village and open countryside. Lead to coalescence with Hemel Hempstead and Water End. • Would affect views and setting on Gaddesden Place and its Parkland. • Need to protect and enhance the Wildspace boundary and on key biodiversity area (Upper Gade Valley).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h23: Land south of the A41 Bypass, Wigginton 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB. Sprawl beyond the defined boundary of the village should be resisted and would neither conserve nor enhance the AONB. • Erosion of natural habitat, agriculture and woodland and would affect the amenity of the area. • Infrastructure not able to support further development. • Would increase Coalescence of Wigginton and Tring. • On an SSSI and Key Biodiversity Area (Tring Park/high scrubs).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h24: Land north of Wigginton 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who do not wish to promote the site for development. • Within the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB. Sprawl beyond the defined boundary of the village should be resisted and would neither conserve nor enhance the AONB. • Erosion of natural habitat, agriculture and woodland and would affect the amenity of the area. • Infrastructure not able to support further

		<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase Coalescence of Wiggington and Tring which would have a significant impact on the village. • On a Wildlife, Key Biodiversity Area (Tring Park/high scrubs) and adjacent to an SSSI.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h30: Land adjacent The Willows, Potten End Hill, Water End 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and adjacent to the AONB. Should resist sprawling development beyond the defined village boundary. • Isolated site with poor transport links and insufficient local amenities. Would lead to increase in car travel impacting on already congested roads. • Will impact on the character of the village and open countryside. Lead to coalescence with Hemel Hempstead and Water End. • Would affect views and setting on Gaddesden Place and its Parkland. The site is very close to Gordon Benningfield's old home which features in many of his pieces. • On a Key Biodiversity Area (Upper Gade Valley) and need to protect and enhance the Wildspace boundary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h12: Land at Rosebarn Lane, Wilstone 	Available to meet long term housing needs. The SA and SEA identified that the site is free of environmental designations and recommended that the site is carried forward to the next stage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at O/h4 already being developed to meet local affordable housing need. • Insufficient local facilities to support more development. Would overwhelm the village. • Would encroach into the green belt, countryside and AONB. • Object to loss of wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h16: Land at Astrope Lane, Long Marston 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension of village into the countryside. Would represent ribbon development. • Object to loss of wildlife site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h17: Land at Marston Place, Chapel Lane, Long 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detrimental to rural character of the village and conservation area. • Would need to re-route two footpaths. • On a wildlife site and object to loss of Wildspace.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h19: Land south west of Wilstone 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at O/h4 already being developed to meet local affordable housing need. • Insufficient local facilities to support more development. Would overwhelm the village. • Would encroach into the green belt, countryside and AONB. • Object to loss of wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h25: Land at James Farm, Wilstone 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within an isolated location in the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB. • Remote location which bears no relation to existing settlements, away from local amenities and transport links relying on the car. Large site would require substantial new infrastructure. • Character and visual aspects of the landscape and its small historical settlements would be significantly changed and destroy the character of the country lanes. • Lies adjacent to Tring Reservoir SSSI and would need to protect and enhance Wildspace features.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h26: Land north of Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within an isolated location in the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB. • Remote location which bears no relation to existing settlements, away from local amenities and transport links relying on the car. Large site would require substantial new infrastructure. • Character and visual aspects of the landscape and its small historical settlements would be significantly changed and destroy the character of the country lanes. • Lies adjacent to Tring Reservoir SSSI and

		would need to protect and enhance Wildspace features.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h27: Land south of Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within an isolated location in the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB. • Remote location which bears no relation to existing settlements, away from local amenities and transport links relying on the car. Large site would require substantial new infrastructure. • Character and visual aspects of the landscape and its small historical settlements would be significantly changed and destroy the character of the country lanes. • Lies adjacent to Tring Reservoir SSSI, on an Eco Site, would detract from the Wendover Arm and would need to protect and enhance Wildspace features.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h28: Land south of Tringford Farm, Wilstone 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within an isolated location in the Green Belt (contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB. • Remote location which bears no relation to existing settlements, away from local amenities and transport links relying on the car. Large site would require substantial new infrastructure. • Character and visual aspects of the landscape and its small historical settlements would be significantly changed and destroy the character of the country lanes. • Lies adjacent to Tring Reservoir SSSI.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h29: Land at The Green, Little Gaddesden 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site owned by Herts County Council who does not wish to promote the site for development. • Within an isolated location in the Green Belt

		<p>(contrary to the EoE plan) and AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of character with the settlement. • Unsuitable site for development. Support conclusions set out in the Schedule of Site Appraisal. • Object to loss of Wildlife site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h15: Egg Packing Facility, Lukes Lane, Gubblecote 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site however narrow roads and lack of services and infrastructure will only support a small number. • Mix of residential/employment may be more sustainable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated development in the Green Belt. • Conversion from industrial to residential is not sustainable. Could result in loss of employment for local residents. • Need to protect and enhance boundary Wildspace.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/h18: Garage Block, Nunfield, Chipperfield (DBC submission) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield site • Design and layout should be sympathetic to the surrounding area. 	None
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/smlvb1: Garden Scene Nursery, Chipperfield 	None	No need to extend the boundary. Views expressed in the Schedule of Site Appraisals strongly endorsed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O/smlvb2: Vicarage Road, Potten End 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is enclosed on all sides by built development. • it is clearly perceived as part of the village and does not make a strongly positive contribution to the openness of the green belt • it is located in a sustainable location very close to the community facilities of the village 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need to extend the boundary. Should protect development that destroys the character of the village. • Will set a precedent for further infill development eroding the rural natural of the village. • Poor access and area already suffers from congestion.
THE SCHEDULE OF SHLAA SITES CONSIDERED		
ALD 16: Land at Tom's Hill	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within AONB boundary. Would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. Likely adverse impacts of development should be carefully considered. • On and SSSI, Wildlife site and wildspace. Loss of, or impact on, SSSI not acceptable.
ASH 4: Garage at Hudnall Corner	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within AONB boundary. Would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. Likely adverse impacts of development should be carefully considered. • Adjacent to a Wildlife Site.
TW 25: Marston Court	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On and adjacent to a number of Wildlife sites.

WA 55: Bradden Meadow, Jockey End, Gaddesden Row	None	<p>Protect and enhance wildspace boundaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is within the Chilterns AONB and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. • Protect and enhance wildspace boundary to the west.
--	------	--

BROAD LOCATIONS		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Green Belt 	None	Should not be considered.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sites in Bovington 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the infrastructure is at breaking point; • the Prison located within the village already has an impact on the rural nature of the settlement through increased noise and traffic; • the market and stock car racing on Bovington Airfield brings a lot of extra traffic into the village causing traffic congestion and parking problem; • there is no public transport system;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sites in Hemel Hempstead 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hemel Hempstead has sufficient Infrastructure to support new development. • It has more Brownfield sites than the villages. 	None
Be/c3, H/h17a, H/h60a, H/h76, Hr5, H/tcb1, H/h77, H/h83, H/h89, H/L7, KL/c2, KL/h10, M/h2a, O/h15, O/h16, O/h17, APS41, BC12, BW7, KL48, NM13, TW25, WA51.	None	Not supported by the Environment Agency on Flood risk grounds.

Annex 2: QUESTION 3

Are there any other sites the Council should consider?

112 suggestions were received.

sites suggested

Site	Number of times site is suggested	Action
Sites taken into account in 2006 Site Allocations Issues and Options consultation No action arising		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frogmore Road Units 1 -18 	2	Site Ref: H/h17, H/h18, H/h19
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas Board Site 	1	Site Ref: H/h34
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Ivy House Lane 	2	Site Ref: Be/h1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Adj to BC2 between Bank Mill & Bulbeggars Lane, Berkshated 	1	Site Ref: Be/H8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Farm, Pea Lane, Northchurch 	1	Site Ref: Be/h4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lane at Grange Farm, Green Lane, Bovingdon 	2	Site Ref: Bov/h6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Long Lane, Ex M.O.D. sites, Bovingdon 	1	Site Ref: Bov/h7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Former Chilterns Garage site, Chesham Road, Bovingdon 	2	Site Ref: BOV46)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Cow Lane, Dunsley Farm, Tring 	5	Site Ref: T/h10, T/L1, T/L2, T/e3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South of Icknield Way, Tring 	4	Site Ref: T/h4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Station Road, Tring 	1	Site Ref: T/h6, T/e2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field North of Grove Road, Tring 	2	Site Ref: T/h5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourne End Industrial area 	1	Site Ref: O/h1, O/h3, H/t3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garages to the rear of Cornerwood, Park Close, Markyate 	1	Site Ref: WA16
Sites taken into account in 2008 Site Allocations Supplementary Issues and Options Consultation No action arising		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bovingdon Airfield 	8	Site Ref: Bov/h10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area between Mayland and the M1 	4	Site Ref: STA2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of Land Adj. The Willows, Potten End Hill, Water End 	1	Site Ref: O/h30

Other sites

Hemel Hempstead

- Education support centre, Tenzing Road
- Marchmont – Land to the north of A4147 between Marchmont Farm and Grove Hill
- Feldon area
-
- Cupid Green Extension

- B&Q site, Two Waters Road

- Include Former Hewden Plant Hire site in with site H/h83

- Vacant land in Maylands / Buncefield / the old Lucas Sites

Berkhamsted

- Land South of Grand Union Canal, Billet Lane

- Latimer House, Gravel Path

- Field Adjacent to Garden Field Lane

- Community Boat yard and sites at the north end of Bridge Street

- Re-designate the British Film Institute as a Major Developed site within the Green Belt.
- Allocation site D6 for Affordable housing

1

2

1

1

1

1

8

1

2

1

1

1

1

Site Ref. H/h78.

Site Ref. H/h1.

Too general a location. No action required.

Consider through the East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan

Safeguard for bulky retailing. No action required.

Site has been in previous commercial use. Consider separately from H/h83 through Site Allocations DPD.

Consider through the East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan and Maylands Gateway project.

Residential likely to be inappropriate use in employment area. Considered through the SHLAA (site BW16) and accepted as a viable site. However, consultants were unsure of likely timing for development. Also consider merits of location against outcome of employment space study.

Small site that could reasonably be pursued through the Development Management process. No action required.

Site in Green Belt. Consider need in context of overall housing requirements in Core Strategy.

Small site that could reasonably be pursued through the Development Management process. No action required.

Consider through Core Strategy DPD.

Site in Green Belt. Allocation only being considered for a Gypsy and Traveller site. No action required.

<i>Tring</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Tring School 	2	Site protected for Open Land. No action required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land between Duckmore Lane, Aylesbury Road and Fox Lane 	1	Sensitive location in Green Belt and CAONB. No action required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former household waste site and land opposite 	1	Sensitive location in Green Belt and CAONB. No action required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grove Road just past the school 	3	Green Belt location (see response to T/h5). No further action required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former Grove garage 	1	Small site that could be pursued through the Development Management process. No action required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic Parkland behind Tesco 	1	Significant protection already in place as site lies within Green Belt and CAONB and forms part of Tring Park. No action required.
<i>Bovingdon</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Adj. to Church Lane House, Vicarage Lane 	1	Sensitive site in Green Belt and Conservation area. No action required.
<i>Kings Langley</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area between Site APS54 and Love Lane School. 	1	Green Belt location. Consider need in context of overall housing requirements in Core Strategy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Royal Mail Sorting Office 	1	Small site that could reasonably be pursued through the Development Management process. No action required.
<i>Wiggington</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the rear of 2 -8 Fieldway 	1	No evidence all rear gardens are available. No action required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land south of Wiggington 	1	Sensitive location in Green Belt and CAONB. No action required.

<p><i>Long Marston</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Glebe Field, next to the Church 	<p>1</p>	<p>Consider further the need for the proposed use, relative priority and its suitability against alternative sites. Progress in part dependent on Government advice in PPG3: Housing – current advice is that “rural exception sites” for affordable housing can be shown in the development plan.</p>
<p>Non-site specific suggestions</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Brownfield sites Land should be set aside for a new arts venue. All schools in the Green Belt should be either removed completely from these sites or the Major Development Site designation should be recast to allow redevelopment, to assist with the Building for Schools programme. 	<p>7</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>Not specific enough. The Council will generally seek to prioritise brownfield development opportunities. No action required.</p> <p>Consider through the Hemel Hempstead place strategy in the Core Strategy and Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Master Plan.</p> <p>Consider what policy support can be provided towards educational facilities in the Green Belt through the Core Strategy DPD.</p>

Annex 3: QUESTION 7

Which of the following suggested new Open Land designations do you support?

186 responses received

	No. of Respondents	Actions
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD		
H/o3: Warners End Wood	79	Already in the Green Belt. New designation inappropriate. Do not progress.
H/o1: Hunting Gate Wood	68	Progress to next stage. Hunting Gate Wood would link to existing open land at Grove Hill Park.
H/o9: Martindale School	67	Awaiting decisions on the future use of the school site. New designation would be inappropriate until resolved. Do not progress.
H/o10: Woodland belt Maylands Avenue	65	Progress to next stage. Forms a continuous tree belt separating the commercial area from adjoining housing.
H/o2: Woodland between Hawthorn Lane and Martindale Road	64	Small wooded belt. Do not progress.
H/o7: Longdeans School and Woodfield School	63	Majority of land dominated by parking and school buildings. Do not progress.
H/o5: Brickmakers Lane Allotments	63	Small area of open space. Strong local demand for allotment use should ensure its future protection. Do not progress.
H/o4: Trouvere Park	61	Small amenity space within residential estate. Do not progress further.
H/o11: Woodland belt off Tewin Road	61	Small wooded belt within a residential neighbourhood. Do not progress.
H/o8: Hobletts Manor School	60	Progress to next stage. Hobletts School includes significant open land within its grounds.
H/o6: Dell at The Crofts	56	Small amenity space within residential estate. Do not progress further.
H/o13: Datchet Close	50	Small amenity space within residential estate. Do not progress further.
H/o14: Adjoining Howe Grove	50	Small amenity space within residential estate. Do not progress further.
H/o12: Berkeley Square/Cuffley Court, Bayford Close	48	Progress to next stage. Large area of open space within a residential neighbourhood.
BERKHAMSTED		
Be/o6: Swing Gate Junior School	90	School grounds too small to justify designation. Do not progress.
Be/o1: St Mary's Church grounds	87	Protection of grounds already in place. Churches are listed and fall with a Conservation Area.
Be/o4: St Peter's Church grounds	85	
Be/o2: Bridle Way	79	While just under 1Ha in area, the land

		forms a continuous wooded belt that links the edge of the town to open countryside. It represents an important local landscape feature in the neighbourhood. Progress to next stage.
Be/o5: Edgeworth House, High Street	79	Progress to next stage.
Be/o3: Victoria Junior School	76	School grounds too small to justify designation. Do not progress.
TRING		
T/o1: Frances de la Salle School	55	Much of the land is covered by buildings. Do not progress.
BOVINGDON		
Bov/o1: Old Dean	75	Small amenity space within residential estate. Do not progress further.
Bov/o2: Lancaster Drive	74	

Annex 4: QUESTION 8

Are there any additional areas of land (within our urban areas) that you would like us to consider designating as Open Land?

201 responses received

Yes - 127 responses

No - 74 responses

Sites suggested

Site	Number of responses	Actions
All proposed development land	2	Inappropriate as not all land warrants this level of protection and it would unreasonably frustrate development opportunities. No action arising.
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD		
Site APS 34 (Manor Estate)	5	Open Land proposed as part of the Planning Application. No action arising.
Site NM13 (Sappi site)	1	Inappropriate as site is urban in character and currently subject to a planning application for housing.
Warners End valley and the land adjacent to Polehanger Lane between Knights Orchard and Halsey Drive/ Galley Hill.	2	Already designated Open Land. No action arising.
Buncefield/Mayland Business Area/Redbourn Area	3	Inappropriate as no significant areas of open space. No action arising, but see also response to H/o10.
BERKHAMSTED		
Butts Meadow, off Kings Road	1	Already designated Open Land. No action arising.
The Moor	1	
Canal Fields, Lower Kings Road	2	
East Meadow (on Shrubland road, nr Sportspace)	4	
Site Be/h13 (Football club)	2	
Berkhamsted Colleigate Sports Ground	1	Site in Green Belt. Open Land designation is inappropriate. No action arising.
Green Space in Lombardy Drive (south of the main road)	2	Open space is too small to justify a new designation. No action arising.
All allotments (including either side of Ivy House Lane)	3	Already designated Open Land or Green Belt /AONB. No action arising.
Open Space in Dell Field and Castle Hill Estates	1	Open space near Dellfield Avenue is too small to warrant a new designation. The major open space in the Castle Hill estate is within the Green Belt. No action arising.
Park adjacent to Victoria school	1	Land to the south of the school is already designated as Open Land. No action arising.
Sites Be/c4, Be/L2 & Be/h12 (land at Durrants	1	Large area of Open Land already

Lane)		designated as part of this site. No action arising.
Lime Walk between Castle Hill Avenue /Castle Hill / Castle Hill Wood	1	Open space too small to warrant new designation. No action arising.
All school ground	1	Most school sites are already designated as Open Land. No action arising.
Scrub land between the canal and the railway between New Road and Dudswell.	1	All of this land which is within the urban area and is already designated Open Land. No action arising.
TRING		
Land around Marshcroft Lane which is not in the Green Belt	1	Plots are too small and scattered to justify a new designation. No action arising.
BOVINGDON		
Rear of school playing fields / Playing area behind the Memorial Hall to the NW of Church Lane	2	Land is already allocated as Open Land. No action arising.
Around the Moody Estate and in the surroundings of the main road.	1	Plots are too small and scattered to justify a new designation. No action arising.
Suggested sites outside the urban area:		
All Green Belt land	1	All sites sufficiently protected as currently within the Green Belt. No action arising.
Bovingdon Airfield	10	
Land behind Green Lane and Austin Mead, Bovingdon	1	
Shantock Lane Area, Bovingdon (Bov H/h5a)	3	
Land behind Bovingdon Brickworks	1	
Shendish Land, especially towards the Manor Estate (APS 54)	10	
All Green Belt land	4	
Sites D1 and D2 & H/h86 and land around Featherbed Lane	40	
All Kings Langley Green Belt sites	4	
Land between the Station and Bovingdon	1	
Site STA 2	1	
Land opposite the top of Cross Oak Road, Berkhamsted	1	
Velvet Lawn (adj to Thomas Coram School)	1	
Berkhamsted Castle	1	
Berkhamsted Cricket Ground	1	
Common Land/farmland around A41 Bypass/Swing Gate Lane/Upper Hall Park (Berkhamsted).	6	
Sites D3, D4 & D5	1	
Site Be/h2a and Be/h2b	2	
Sites Be/h12, Be/h10	1	
Land presently farmed between St Michael's Croft and Shootersway and the field between Woodcock Hill and Westfield Road, Berkhamsted	1	
Land behind Oakeley Lane/South of Icknield Way, Tring	2	
Site KL 48	1	

Land between Potten End and Hemel Hempstead	1	
The woods at the foot of Boxted Farm.	1	
Land north of H/o3	1	
Land/Woodland Belt surround Woodhall Farm	2	
Sites H/h62a, b, c & d	1	
Warners End Wood	2	
The 'wildspace' designation of the Upper Allotment site in New Road to be extended to include the adjacent wood which lies to the north lying in Green Belt, as a wildlife preservation and animal migration corridor particularly as it falls between allotments and common road.	1	
Rectory Farm to the Red Lion and beyond	2	
Trout Lakes, Kings Langley	1	

Annex 5: QUESTION 9

Are there any additional comments you would like to make on any other site(s) in the schedule of Site Appraisals (ref Appendix A)?

A total of 217 responses were received

Yes - 146 responses

No - 71 responses

Response	Actions
<p>The majority of respondents used this opportunity to re-emphasise their previous points regarding releasing Green Belt for development, preventing coalescence of settlements and the detrimental impact of more development on the existing infrastructure and road network. The importance of giving proper consideration to existing residents was stressed and some questioned the sustainability of sites identified.</p> <p>A number of key organisations also commented raising a number of issues. These are incorporated in the summary tables below.</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>Additional comments made on specific sites are summarised below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be/h12, Be/L2, Be/c5, H/h62a, b, c, d, H/h67a, H/h84, T/L5, Bov/h10, O/h12, O/h19 <p>Careful consideration needs to be given to the impact of the development on the CAONB, which is in close proximity to these sites. It will need careful boundary treatments with the highest standard of design and use of materials. Development should face the AONB rather than turn its back to it.</p>	<p>No action required. Points noted and will be taken into account if sites are progressed further through the Core Strategy DPD and Site Allocations DPD.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H/h91 <p>Residual Land from the Highfield House development and is appropriate for the relocation of the existing Doctor's surgery from Jupiter Drive. If not the site would be suitable for a small scale residential or for use as parking or amenity space for the adjoining Jupiter Drive</p>	<p>No action required. Sensitive site sitting within existing Open Land and affected by a Tree Preservation order.</p>

	School.	
• T/h15	The County Council will make the land available for development should DBC consider there is a need for it.	No action required.
• KL/c2, KL/h10, KL/h11, KL/h12, KL/h6, KL/h7	The impact on the operational capacity of J20 of the M25 would be minimal	
• Bov/o2	Consider use of this space for allotments.	No action required. The site already provides important local amenity space within a residential area.
• Be/o3, Be/o6	HCC question whether these would actually make a major contribution to the character of the settlement.	No action required. Be/o3 and Be/o6 are both small areas of open land and do not justify being progressed further.
• H/o7, H/o8 and H/o9.	HCC object to these sites. Martindale School should not be considered as open land until a decision is made on the use of the site. This designation could hamper other uses coming forward on the site.	No action required. H/o7 and H/o9 are not being progressed further. H/o8 is reasonable to progress given Hobbletts School sits in significant open land.
• APS34, APS54, D1 and D2	Should be allocated as a multifunctional network of greenspace and a biodiversity buffer zone. These sites are important for wildlife and biodiversity (see UNCS Map1) and could be used to link up corridors with Phasel, the SSSI Roughdown Common and Boxmoor/Two Waters Commons	Explore broad issues raised through future work within the Core Strategy on green infrastructure and the Green Space Strategy. However, Open Land is planned within APS34 and APS54.
Additional comments made on broad locations:		
All woodlands, wildlife sites/corridors SSSI and conservation areas - areas for biodiversity should be protected.		No action required. Such sites are already sufficiently protected.
Phasing of development - Land should be developed in the following order of priority: 1) Brownfield, 2) Windfall, 3) Greenfield, 4) greenbelt.		No action required. The Council supports a broad prioritising of sites. However, it is important that there is a mix of types of sites in order to ensure an adequate housing supply in different locations and over time to meet its housing target. The Council is also required to ensure it has a 5 and 15-year supply of

	housing land.
--	---------------

