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This report has been prepared by Capita Symonds (CS) on behalf of the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and provides evidence to support the identification of land to the north of Chesham Road, Bovingdon, for up to 60 new homes and open space – as set out in Proposal LA7 of the Dacorum Core Strategy Draft for Consultation. The report supplements representations made to Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) by the MoJ in December 2010.

This report has been prepared solely to support the inclusion of this site within the core strategy and should not be used for any other purpose or copied/used by third parties.

The MoJ is one of the largest government departments, employing around 95,000 people in 900 locations across the United Kingdom. The MoJ works to protect the public and reduce reoffending, and to provide a more effective, transparent and responsive criminal justice system for victims and the public. The MoJ has responsibility for different parts of the justice system – the courts, prisons, probation services and attendance centres.

The land to the north of Chesham Road (hereafter referred to as “the site”), along with Her Majesty’s Prison (“The Mount”) to the north, fall within the ownership of the MoJ. Comprising unused grassland, the site provides an opportunity to deliver a compact urban extension to Bovingdon and will make a modest contribution to the Borough’s overall housing needs.

Specialist expert advice is provided throughout this report in the form of site specific impact assessment and where necessary, mitigation strategies. Expertise on planning, landscape and urban design is provided by CS, while specialist input on ecological matters is provided by Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust and that on utilities by Groundwise Searches. This report provides a greater level of information and detailed assessment of the site than any other prepared to date. Accordingly the report should be afforded notable weight by DBC and other decision makers.

Section 2 describes the site, its surroundings and the extent of the Green Belt. Section 3 of this brochure sets out both the current and emerging planning policy relevant to the Borough. Section 4 considers possible ecological impacts and appropriate mitigation measures. Section 5 addresses the requirements of utility services. Section 6 impact on the operations of the prison. Section 7 brings together the matters considered in the report and sets out details, including an illustrative layout, for a compact urban extension to west Bovingdon.
The Bovingdon Area

The village of Bovingdon is located to the northwest of Greater London, within the county of Hertfordshire, towards its western border with Buckinghamshire. Positioned along the A4105 corridor, Bovingdon is approximately equidistant (3 miles) from Hemel Hempstead to the northeast and Chesham to the west. Mainline rail services are available from Hemel Hempstead railway station, which along with the nearby A41, provide access to London and the north/west of England. Tube services are available from Chesham tube station, providing access to London via the Metropolitan line.

As a settlement Bovingdon is medieval in origin and is believed to have developed as a small hamlet between various farmsteads. Records for the village date back to the 13th Century. The village expanded significantly in the second half of the 20th Century and now has a population of approximately 5,000, many of whom commute to London and other surrounding employment centres. The historic parts of the village are mostly located around the High Street and the Green. The impressive St Lawrence Church, off Church Street, dates from the mid 19th Century and is thought to have the second largest churchyard in Hertfordshire. Arguably Bovingdon’s best known landmark is the Ryder Memorial (the well), built in 1881 and located towards the east of the village.

There are no indoor leisure facilities in the village and an overall shortage of outdoor leisure space. However, there are a football club and tennis club to the southeast of Green Lane and a bowling green to the north of the High Street, adjacent to the village hall.

Bovingdon is known also to lack public open space – particularly with regard to allotments, green corridors, parks and gardens and open space for children and young people. The village does not have any local nature reserves or wildlife sites. That said, small parcels of grassland and woodland to the south, east and north of the village, containing old hedgerow, do provide wildlife habitat.

Located along the High Street, the vibrant village centre includes shops, services, pubs and restaurants, a library, two GP surgeries and the village nursery and primary school. There are no designated employment sites in Bovingdon, although the Brickworks site, to the south of the village, has been producing bricks at Bovingdon since 1920. This is the last remaining brickworks in Hertfordshire.

Bovingdon Airfield, immediately northwest of the village, was built in 1942 and used for 30 years by the RAF and USAAF, until it was shut down in 1972. In 1987 HMP The Mount opened on part of the former airfield. Other parts of the airfield are now used to accommodate Bovingdon market on Saturdays and bank holiday Mondays. Figure 2 shows The Mount Prison with the Village to the south east with the site under consideration identified by the redline.

A total of ten bus routes serve Bovingdon, the most regular of which (52 and T5) provide an hourly service Monday to Friday and a less regular service on Saturdays and Sundays to destinations such as High Wycombe, Amersham, Hemel Hempstead and Hatfield.

Landscape

Dacorum’s Landscape Character Assessment (May 2004), prepared by The Landscape Partnership, recognises that Bovingdon lies within the Bovingdon and Chipperfield Plateau, comprising mainly farmland and some areas of semi natural woodland. According to the assessment, the plateau is characterised by gently undulating land, networks of diverse old hedgerows and narrow country lanes, which engender a private and secluded feel.

Beyond the defined Village Development Boundary, Bovingdon is surrounded on all sides by Metropolitan Green Belt.

Figure 2: Aerial Location
Feasibility Report

The Site

The land to the north of Chesham Road, i.e. the site, delineated by the red line extends to approximately 2.6 hectares (ha) in size including the surface water drainage pond (0.6ha of land). The site is located towards the western fringe of the village, surrounded by existing housing, The Mount prison and part of the former RAF/USAAF airfield.

The site currently comprises unused grass/scrub land and a significant number of trees are found towards almost all boundaries of the site. Such is the extent of existing boundary planting that new development at the site, of a moderate density, would not have any material visual impact on the housing areas to the south (Ashridge Close and Dinmore) and east (Hyde Lane), the prison to the north or the former airfield to the west. The only visually sensitive boundary is likely to be to the northeast, where existing houses off Mitchell Close back onto the site. Here carefully planned boundary treatments and urban design would help to mitigate any visual impact.

Overall the site is very well contained and its shape and positioning relative to existing housing and the prison provide an opportunity to round off development of this part of the village and create a clearly defined built edge. Molyneaux Avenue, immediately to the west, offers a clear barrier to future development and guards against urban sprawl. Such is the nature and positioning of surrounding built form that the site makes limited contribution to the openness of the Green Belt and its visual amenities. With extensive existing boundary planting, Molyneaux Avenue and the former airfield beyond, new development at the site would have very little impact on the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it.

In relation to any potential flooding constraints the Environment Agency’s on-line flood maps have been checked and the site falls within Flood Zone 1 – i.e. where there is a less than one in one thousand year chance of flooding from fluvial sources. As such there is no objection to the principle from a flooding perspective of developing this land for housing.

There are no designated heritage assets at or in close proximity to the site. The nearest listed building is the Grade II listed White Hart Cottage, a timber framed building with red brick, dating from the early 18th Century. However this building is situated 400 metres to the southwest of the site, separated by part of the former airfield and extensive boundary planting. The Bovingdon Conservation Area covers the southern end of the High Street, the Church and its grounds, part of Bury Farm and part of Vicarage Lane. The Conservation Area is over 600 metres to the east of the site, separated by a number of residential streets.

The site is within reasonable walking distance of both the village centre (including its shops, services, pubs and restaurants, library, GP surgeries, nursery and primary school) to the east and the football and tennis clubs to the south.

Pedestrian access to the site is currently available from Chesham Road and Molyneaux Avenue - the latter also serving as the primary access for the prison. Future vehicle access options are considered in Section 7 of this brochure. Existing bus routes serve Chesham Road, with some stopping immediately in front of the site.
National Guidance

Published in January 2005, Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1 sets out the overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system. PPS1 identifies that national policies and regional and local development plans provide the framework for planning for sustainable development and for that development to be managed effectively. This plan led system and the certainty and predictability that it aims to provide is accepted as being central to planning. PPS1 highlights six key principles which should be applied to ensure that development plans and decisions on planning applications contribute to the delivery of sustainable development, including: (i) pursuing sustainable development in an integrated manner; (ii) addressing the causes and potential impacts of climate change; (iii) a spatial planning approach; (iv) high quality inclusive design; (v) comprehensive and inclusive access, and; (vi) community involvement.

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 2, published in January 1995, outlines the history and extent of Green Belts and explains their purposes. PPG2 identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. Green Belts can shape patterns of urban development at sub-regional and regional scale, and help to ensure that development occurs in locations allocated in development plans. PPG2 notes that Green Belts, including their extent, are established through development plans. Up-to-date approved Green Belt boundaries are essential to provide certainty as to where Green Belt policies do and do not apply and to enable the proper consideration of future development options.

Originally prepared in response to the Barker Review of Housing Supply, PPS3 sets out the national planning policy framework for delivering the Government’s housing objectives. Published in November 2006 and updated in June 2010, PPS3 seeks to promote a step-change in housing delivery, through a new, more responsive approach to land supply at the local level. PPS3 sets specific outcomes that the planning system should deliver, including: (a) high quality, well designed and built housing; (b) a mix of both market and affordable housing; (c) a sufficient quantity of housing to meet need and demand; (d) housing in suitable locations, which offer a good range of facilities, employment, services and infrastructure, and; (e) a flexible and responsive supply of land.

PPS3 maintains the priority that development should be located on previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings. However, the policy statement also acknowledges that where demand is high, it will be necessary to identify and explore a range of options for distributing housing, including the role of growth areas, new free standing settlements and urban extensions. Key to PPS3 is that local planning authorities (LPAs) are required to plan for housing for at least 15 years. LPAs need to identify a rolling supply of sufficient specific, developable and deliverable sites for housing for five years. These need to be available, suitable and achievable. LPAs should also identify a further supply of specific developable sites for years 6-10 and where possible, for years 11-15.

Published in April 2001 and updated in January 2011, PPG13 emphasises the key role that land use planning has in delivering the Government’s integrated transport strategy. The key objectives of PPG13 are to integrate planning and transport at the national, regional, strategic and local levels to: (i) promote more sustainable transport choices for both people and freight; (ii) promote accessibility to jobs, shops, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, and; (iii) reduce the need to travel, especially by car.

Open spaces, sport and recreation are recognised as all underpinning people’s quality of life. Revised and reissued in July 2002, PPG17 sets out that well designed and implemented planning policies for open space, sport and recreation are fundamental to delivering broader Government objectives. PPG17 directs LPAs to seek opportunities to improve the local open space network and to incorporate open space within new development – in particular housing.
Regional Policy

The East of England Plan (EEP) was approved in May 2008, revoked by the Government in July 2010 and subsequently reinstated by a High Court legal challenge in November 2010. Notwithstanding the Government’s plans to formally abolish the EEP through provisions in the Localism Bill, at the time of writing the EEP remained part of the statutory development plan.

Elements of the EEP were successfully challenged by Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council. This led to the previous housing figures being quashed in 2009 and since this date Dacorum Borough Council has not had a housing target.

Policy H2 requires development plan documents to set appropriate targets for affordable housing, taking into account: the objectives of the EEP; local assessments of need; the desirability of separate targets for social rent and intermediate housing; evidence of affordability pressures, and; the regional housing strategy. At the regional level, delivery should be monitored against a target for 35% of housing coming forward through planning permissions to be affordable.

Local Policy

Once adopted, the principle document in the emerging Dacorum Local Development Framework (LDF) will be the Core Strategy.

DBC’s emerging Core Strategy was published in June 2009 for public consultation, with part dedicated to a spatial strategy for the village of Bovingdon.

Paragraph 1.11 notes that Bovingdon Airfield, located on the northwest edge of the village was built in 1942 and was used as a RAF/USAAF airfield until 1972. In 1987 HMP The Mount, a Category C prison for up to 720 inmates, opened on part of the former airfield. According to the Core Strategy, the key issues for the village include: a need for more affordable housing and a greater range of housing; capacity and threshold issues at Bovingdon Primary School; traffic congestion and parking shortages along the High Street; a need to include the frequency and routing of bus services; a lack of open space, wildlife sites and outdoor/indoor leisure and sport; retention of the village character; support for local businesses to maintain the vitality and vibrancy of the local centre, and; limited pedestrian and cycle access around the village.

Paragraph 3.5 considers that additional housing development is important to maintain a vibrant village. However, paragraph 3.6 recognises that a key constraint to housing growth in Bovingdon is the capacity of existing infrastructure and in particular, that of the primary school. On this basis, paragraph 3.7 suggests that the village should accommodate only modest levels of new housing – around 150 new dwellings between 2006 and 2031. The corresponding plan presented four options for this new growth: (i) Duckhall Farm, to the north of Bovingdon, (ii) rear of Green Lane, to the southeast; (iii) Grange Farm, to the southwest, and; (iv) north of Chesham Road, to the west of Bovingdon – partly within the ownership of the MoJ.

The subsequent draft of DBC’s Core Strategy was published in November 2010 and included two options for growth. Option 1, optimise the use of land within defined settlements. Option 2 (in addition to Option 1) to include local allocations which would be modest extensions to existing settlements. In Bovingdon this equated to 90 dwellings under Option 1 or 150 dwellings under Option 2. Other objectives for Bovingdon includes provision of new open space as part of any greenfield site development, safeguard the unique employment uses, such as Bovingdon Brickworks and HMP The Mount, as well as resolving any parking issues along the High Street.

The second option for 150 new dwellings includes a local allocation for up to 60 dwellings at north of Chesham Road, to the west of Bovingdon (Proposal LA7). Development at this location is expected to provide an element of affordable housing and an area of public open space. Other housing within the village is to be expected to contribute towards the local objectives.

Figure 4: Core Strategy Extract
The details for the local allocation (Proposal LA7) comprise:

Site Location - Land to the north of Chesham Road

Proposals - Up to 60 new homes; open space.

Principles - A mix of two-storey housing including around 40% affordable homes; a contribution must be made towards educational and community facilities; the layout, design, density and landscaping must relate well to existing housing, create a soft edge with the adjoining countryside and secure a strong long term Green Belt boundary; the impact on the local road network will be mitigated through the promotion of sustainable travel options.

Delivery - The proposal will be delivered as an allocation in the Site Allocations DPD where detailed planning requirements will be established.

In addition to these requirements, Policy CS19 expects that 75% of the affordable housing should be for social rent and therefore by implication 25% for intermediate housing. However, the level and mix of affordable housing will have regard to the overall viability of the scheme and any abnormal costs.

No up-to-date version of the Site Allocations DPD has been prepared since the Core Strategy was released for consultation in 2010. Until such time that the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs are finalised, technically the site will remain within the Metropolitan Green Belt and outside of the Bovingdon Development Boundary – from a planning policy perspective.

The Mount, Bovingdon Planning Policy Background

LDF Evidence Base

DBC’s evidence base includes the Assessment of Local Allocations and Strategic Sites (2010) and the Open Space Study (2008).

The Assessment of Local Allocations and Strategic Sites (pages 146-150) consider the site against various deliverability criteria. The assessment concludes that the site is an attractive development option for a number of reasons:

- the impact of development of this site on the Green Belt is relatively low;
- a significant proportion of the [adjoining airfield] site is previously developed land;
- development of the site would not lead to the loss of agricultural land, or an area of high quality countryside, and
- the site has good access.

However, the assessment also identifies some drawbacks:

- landowner interest for the site is unknown;
- the presence of a small reservoir [balancing pond] may have serious implications on viability;
- the proximity to the prison, and in particular the fact that the prison entrance runs through the site, which may have implications for the operation of the prison.

With respect to Bovingdon, the Open Space Study found that despite a mix of different types of open space, total provision is relatively low. Existing facilities include playing fields to the northeast and a football club, cricket club and amenity green to the south. The central part of the village has amenity greens and a facility for children and young people. Nevertheless, the village is thought to be deficient of 6.6 hectares (ha) of leisure space and there are no allotments or parks and gardens. Furthermore, the provision of facilities for children and young people is below minimum standards. The study concludes that new provision should be considered when opportunities arise.

Planning Contributions

The Council’s Planning Obligations Draft Final Version SPD was released in February 2011 and sets the parameters as to when planning contributions will be sought from developments. The main subject areas cover affordable housing, education, open space, police, libraries and sustainable transport. The potential planning contributions at Borough Council level are identified at Figure 5.

In relation to affordable housing the current site is classified by the Council as a green field site and 40% provision is therefore required. At present Table 3a on page 21 of the SPD confirms that there is no net additional demand for primary school provision in Bovingdon up to 2021 or 2031. A planning contribution would not therefore be sought. The County Council would obviously monitor this situation and it could change in the future depending on the demographics of the area. In relation to other potential planning contributions the table below summarises the potential requirements.
The Borough Council is also likely to seek a monitoring fee that would be 6% of the total value of the contributions up to a maximum of £10,000.

In addition to the local requirements there are further planning contributions that may be required by the County Council which are detailed in “Planning obligations guidance – toolkit for Hertfordshire, January 2008”, (HCC, Toolkit). The County Council state clearly that where local councils have adopted their own planning obligations document these will take precedence. However, there may be strategic matters that still apply.
Potential County Council Planning Contribution

On analysis of the County’s SPD it would appear that planning contributions may be required for sustainable transport and other community facilities that have not been referred to at the local level. In relation to sustainable transport the site specific contributions would be negotiated during the preparation of a detailed proposal but other county wide matters would be considered in accordance with the details contained in figure 6. The table below is a summary of the separate planning contributions that may be requested by the County Council having regard to the content of the HCC Toolkit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5+</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market &amp; other</td>
<td>£263.00</td>
<td>£802.00</td>
<td>£2,561.00</td>
<td>£4,423.00</td>
<td>£5,662.00</td>
<td>£47.00</td>
<td>£444.00</td>
<td>£1,677.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Education</td>
<td>£35.00</td>
<td>£175.00</td>
<td>£340.00</td>
<td>£459.00</td>
<td>£545.00</td>
<td>£32.00</td>
<td>£195.00</td>
<td>£270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>£14.00</td>
<td>£64.00</td>
<td>£138.00</td>
<td>£199.00</td>
<td>£244.00</td>
<td>£8.00</td>
<td>£57.00</td>
<td>£89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Facilities</td>
<td>£6.00</td>
<td>£16.00</td>
<td>£50.00</td>
<td>£82.00</td>
<td>£105.00</td>
<td>£3.00</td>
<td>£13.00</td>
<td>£41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transport</td>
<td>£625.00</td>
<td>£750.00</td>
<td>£1,125.00</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
<td>£1,500.00</td>
<td>£625.00</td>
<td>£750.00</td>
<td>£1,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>£943.00</td>
<td>£1,807.00</td>
<td>£4,214.00</td>
<td>£6,663.00</td>
<td>£8,056.00</td>
<td>£715.00</td>
<td>£1,459.00</td>
<td>£3,202.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **FLATS** |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |
| Market & other |   |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |
| Nursery Education | £35.00 | £175.00 | £340.00 | £459.00 | £545.00 | £32.00 | £195.00 | £270.00 |
| Childcare | £14.00 | £64.00 | £138.00 | £199.00 | £244.00 | £8.00 | £57.00 | £89.00 |
| Youth Facilities | £6.00 | £16.00 | £50.00 | £82.00 | £105.00 | £3.00 | £13.00 | £41.00 |
| Sustainable Transport | £625.00 | £750.00 | £1,125.00 | £1,500.00 | £1,500.00 | £625.00 | £750.00 | £1,125.00 |
| **TOTAL** | £940.00 | £1,782.00 | £3,495.00 | £4,949.00 | £5,192.00 | £653.00 | £1,298.00 | £2,656.00 |

*uses an assumed relationship between bedrooms and habitable rooms
When both the local and county requirements for planning contributions are added together the potential cost per dwelling is as shown on Figure 7.

### Figure 7: Potential District and County Council Planning Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms*</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOUSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FLATS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market &amp; other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Market &amp; other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>£1,107.00</td>
<td>£1,481.00</td>
<td>£1,922.00</td>
<td>£2,095.00</td>
<td>£2,249.00</td>
<td>£1,086.00</td>
<td>£1,463.00</td>
<td>£188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>£943.00</td>
<td>£1,087.00</td>
<td>£4,214.00</td>
<td>£6,663.00</td>
<td>£8,056.00</td>
<td>£715.00</td>
<td>£1,459.00</td>
<td>£3,202.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>£2,050.00</td>
<td>£2,568.00</td>
<td>£8,758.00</td>
<td>£10,305.00</td>
<td>£1,801.00</td>
<td>£2,922.00</td>
<td>£3,390.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|           | HOUSES |       |       |       |       | Flats Social Rent |   |       |
|           | Social Rent |   |       |       |       |                     |   |       |
| District  | £1,057.00 | £1,425.00 | £1,854.00 | £2,010.00 | £2,139.00 | £1,047.00 | £1,416.00 | £2,221.00 |
| County    | £940.00 | £1,782.00 | £3,495.00 | £4,949.00 | £5,192.00 | £653.00 | £1,298.00 | £2,656.00 |
| TOTAL     | £1,997.00 | £3,207.00 | £5,349.00 | £6,959.00 | £7,331.00 | £1,700.00 | £2,714.00 | £4,877.00 |

* uses an assumed relationship between bedrooms and habitable rooms

Note: For properties over 5 bedrooms an additional £130 will be sought regardless of tenure.

This information demonstrates that there is a wide range in terms of cost per dwelling for Section 106 contributions. They have been included with the site assessment to provide evidence and to demonstrate that the site can be delivered and is a viable option. The amounts are only indicative at this stage as the nature and mix of the development is likely to change if a formal planning application comes forward at a later stage. These matters would then be negotiated with the Council during pre-application discussions.

With the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy last year, Regulation 122 states that three legal tests must be met for each planning contribution that is sought. The three tests are:

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
(b) directly related to the development; and
(c) fairly and reasonable related in scale and kind to the development.

If all three tests are not met the Council is not justified in seeking that particular planning contribution.
Ecology

A separate Ecological Survey has been carried out by Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Consultancy on 4th April 2011. The survey covered the developable area of the site and the surface water drainage pond. In conclusion the site is considered to be of primarily grassland and no scarce or specifically protected species were found during the survey. Overall the site was considered to be of low to moderate ecological value and this would not prevent development of the site. For further details please refer to the Ecological Survey.

Utilities

A utilities survey has been carried out by Groundwise to establish whether there are any utilities which act as a constraint to the development of the site. Since the site lies on the edge of the built up area, a number of services run along the adjoining roads, which can then be ‘tapped in to’ at the appropriate time. There is however, a combined private foul and surface water pipe that crosses the site which is shown on the Thames Water research results. This is owned and maintained by the Ministry of Justice. It is necessary to plan for the easement of this pipe when designing the development. There is also a short section of gas pipeline which runs along the frontage of the site, 2 metres from the site boundary, parallel to Molyneaux Avenue. The utility searches that have been carried out do not reveal any other potential obstacles in relation to the location of equipment that could affect development of this site.

The presence of utilities on the site does not represent an insurmountable constraint but they need to be carefully considered and any easements incorporated into any future development proposals. Our illustrative masterplan has been designed to locate the foul and surface water pipeline along the internal road, thus ensuring buildings do not cover the easement. The development has also been set back from the Molyneaux Avenue frontage, thus avoiding the gas pipeline and retaining the existing landscape screen.
Impact on Operation of the Prison

The land the subject of this assessment is situated to the south of the prison and is separated from the prison itself by Molyneaux Avenue and Lancaster Drive. The land has never formed part of the prison itself and is not required for any future expansion and is surplus to MoJ’s requirements. Whilst the access, Molyneaux Avenue, is in the ownership of the MoJ this is purely an historic situation and there would be no objection in the future if all or part of the road was adopted by the Highway Authority. Molyneaux Avenue links to Lancaster Drive and already serves a number of private dwellings. There is no objection from the prison if further residential dwellings were serviced from Molyneaux Avenue. In summary the site is available for immediate disposal and there would be no adverse implications for the operation of the prison itself.

Viability of the site

A separate Viability Report has been prepared by Capita Symonds Real Estate based on the illustrative layouts at pages 12 and 13 of this report. This assessment demonstrates that it is viable to develop this site for up to 60 residential dwellings taking into account the current known constraints identified within this report.
In the Council’s initial assessment on the deliverability of this site for up to 60 residential dwellings there was concern as to whether this number of units could be accommodated on the site having regard to potential physical constraints, in particular the surface water drainage pond. A comprehensive report was commissioned by Groundwise to investigate the presence of other utilities on this site which could adversely affect the development potential of the site. As confirmed in Section 5 of this Report, apart from the combined sewer system identified by Thames Water which runs across the site, the only other identified services run along the boundary to Molyneaux Avenue.

Another key issue is the potential point of access to the site. Whilst there appear to be two minor existing accesses to the site from Chesham Road, the current County Council requirements state that on a secondary distributor road a separation distance between junctions should be 66m. This would not be achievable on Chesham Road and therefore the layout proposes the main site access from Molyneaux Avenue. However, subject to detailed discussions with the County Highway Authority it may be possible in the future for a small number of dwellings to be accessed direct from Chesham Road.

The site has been considered in two parts, firstly the main developable area which is shown within the red line which comprises 2 ha of land and secondly the area surrounding the drainage pond which comprises 0.6ha. The illustrative layout has taken into account the identified constraints and the open space requirements and demonstrates that 60 units can be accommodated on the site with a mix of two, three and four bedroom dwellings. Open space is provided in a central location on the site in accordance with the current Local Plan Policy 76 which requires approximately 1700 square metres of space for the proposed 60 units. Figure 9 shows five broad parcels of land with the main constraints identified. The accompanying schedule at Figure 10 demonstrates the potential dwelling mix within each parcel of land.

---

**Figure 9: Evaluation Plan**

- **Key**:
  - **Developable Site Boundary**
  - **Public Open Space**
  - **Existing Landscaping**
  - **Utilities**
  - **Vehicular Access**
  - **Potential Pedestrian Link**

**Figure 10: Evaluation Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No</th>
<th>Size (msq)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Quantity of 2b</th>
<th>Ave. plot size of 2b (150msq)</th>
<th>Quantity of 3b</th>
<th>Ave. plot size of 3b (200msq)</th>
<th>Quantity of 4b</th>
<th>Ave. plot size of 4b (250msq)</th>
<th>Total Plot</th>
<th>Total Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>10180</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>3320</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>3350</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td><strong>10180</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>72%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Plot sizes based on building footprint, garden and parking (including access)  
Note 2: Building footprints based on average floorspace for each dwelling (see sheet 2)
Figure 11 provides an additional illustrative plan which takes the layout to the next stage which further demonstrates that the number of units and mix can be achieved on the site in a satisfactory manner including a usable area of public open space.

The developable area currently excludes the balancing pond and there is the potential subject to further investigations to incorporate the pond as an area of public open space which could potentially release additional land for further development.
The additional evidence submitted within this brochure clearly demonstrates that this land is a sensible and logical site to bring forward for development to meet the needs of Bovingdon. The landowner, Moj, does not require the land for the operations of the prison and it could effectively be disposed of to meet the first phase of housing requirements within the Core Strategy. The potential physical constraints in relation to utilities infrastructure have been investigated and these have been taken into account with the illustrative layouts that have been produced. The Ecological Report has confirmed there is nothing unusual or rare at the site and that the habitat is generally poor. The potential development of the site would lead to the opportunity of increasing the biodiversity at the site and subject to further investigations the drainage pond could make a positive contribution to open space requirements for the Village. Overall, it is considered that the evidence within this brochure has overcome the previous potential drawbacks identified by the Council in relation to the development of this site. It has been demonstrated that up to 60 units can be accommodated on the site in a manner that would form a strong edge to the Green Belt and is commercially viable having regard to the accompanying viability report prepared by Capita Real Estate. To this end the details within this brochure should be given notable by the Council and other decision makers.