

## **Dacorum Site Allocations Development Plan Document**

### **Supplementary Issues and Options Paper, November 2008**

#### **Comments by CPRE – The Hertfordshire Society**

We wish to comment as follows on these sites:

H/h48a	Gadebridge North
H/h62a	Pouchen End
H/h62b	Pouchen End Farm
H/h62c	Chaulden Lane
H/h62d	West of Hemel Hempstead
H/h67a	Fields End Farm
H/h84	Fields End Lane

We strongly oppose any proposal that any of the above sites should become residential. They lie in the Green Belt and their Green Belt status fulfils a vital role in preventing coalescence between Hemel Hempstead and Potten End. Development of the sites would be ill-served by public transport. Employment opportunities would be very limited. We consider that these sites should not progress to the next stage.

#### **H/h71a Friend at Hand, London Road**

We consider this site is 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.

#### **H/h77 Link Road, Gadebridge**

We consider that development on this isolated site in the Green Belt would be quite inappropriate, threatening the separation of Piccotts End from Hemel Hempstead and adversely impacting on the setting of Gadebridge Park. We agree that the site should not progress to the next stage.

#### **H/h89 Red Lion Nash Mills Lane**

Development of this site would lead to coalescence with Kings Langley and is inappropriate both as development in the Green Belt and within the flood plain.

#### **H/h93 Holtsmere End**

We oppose development on this Green belt site, which would threaten the coalescence of Woodhall Farm and Redbourn. The site is also very distant from any railway station. We consider that it should not progress to the next stage.

<b>Be/h2a</b>	<b>Upper Hall Park</b>
<b>Be/h2b</b>	<b>Ashlyns Park and Ashlyns Hall</b>
<b>Be/h2c</b>	<b>Ashlyns Lodge</b>
<b>Be/h2d</b>	<b>Chesham Road</b>
<b>Be/h2e</b>	<b>Kingshill Way</b>

We strongly oppose any proposal that any of the above sites should become residential, for all of the reasons given in the Schedule of Site Appraisals under 'Key land use issues raised' i.e. Green Belt, conspicuous intrusion, inconsistency with the East of England Plan,

inappropriate expansion of built up area and isolation. The sites lie outside the town boundary and, with the exception of Be/h2a, are separated from it. We consider the sites should not progress to the next stage.

**Be/h10 Hanburys, Shootersway**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site, for the same reasons as given above.

**Be/h14 British Film Institute, Kingshill Way**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site. We note that the development proposed for the site would be enabling development supporting improvements of existing facilities. However, we do not consider that this is an adequate reason for allowing intrusion into the open countryside, contrary to the East of England Plan.

**Be/h15 Darfield, Shootersway**

**Be/h17 Shootersway**

We oppose development on these Green Belt sites lying in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although there is existing scattered housing nearby, the sites are isolated from the main development of Berkhamstead and we consider that further development in the area would be inappropriate, damaging to the AONB and contrary to the principles of the Green belt.

**Be/L3 Upper Hall Park and Swing Gate Lane**

We do not consider that the proposed sports facilities and a football stadium are acceptable uses for this Green Belt site. We would oppose its designation as a Leisure site. Any significant built facilities would represent an undesirable intrusion into open countryside.

**T/h15 Icknield Way**

We strongly oppose any development on this Green Belt site. Not only would development be contrary to the East of England Plan, it would have a major effect on the setting of Tring and would constitute serious urban sprawl into open countryside. Employment opportunities in the neighbourhood are very limited.

**T/h16 London Lodge**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site, isolated in open countryside and distant from facilities other than the main A41. Development would be contrary to the East of England Plan and could encourage ribbon development out from Tring.

**T/h17 West Leith Woodlands**

We regard this site as totally unsuitable for development for numerous reasons: topography, effect on an SSSI, Green belt, effect on AONB, conflict with the East of English Plan, and effect on rural setting of Tring. We oppose development on it.

**T/L5 Waterside Way**

We oppose the removal of this site from the Green Belt. Construction of a marina here, outside the clear boundary of Tring, would encourage further development into the countryside north-west of Icknield Way.

**Bov/h2a Green Lane & Austin Mead**

**Bov/c2**

We oppose development on this Green belt site, which would be contrary to the East of England Plan and increase pressures on facilities. As with all the Bovingdon sites, there are sustainability concerns.

**Bov/h5a Shantock Lane**

We oppose development on this Green belt site, which would be contrary to the East of England Plan. The site is isolated from Bovingdon and development would represent further urban sprawl into the countryside. As with all the Bovingdon sites, there are sustainability concerns.

**Bov/h8 Duck Hall Farm**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site, which would be contrary to the East of England Plan and create further urban sprawl along Hemel Hempstead Road. As with all the Bovingdon sites, there are sustainability concerns.

**Bov/h9 Green Lane**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site, which would be contrary to the East of England Plan and increase pressures on facilities. As with all the Bovingdon sites, there are sustainability concerns.

**Bov/h10 Bovingdon Airfield**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site, which would be contrary to the East of England Plan and increase pressures on facilities. As with all the Bovingdon sites, there are sustainability concerns.

**KL/h8 NE of A41**

**KL/h9 SW of A41**

We strongly oppose development on these Green Belt sites. Development upon either would have a major effect on Kings Langley and represent a major loss of open countryside, as well as being contrary to the East of England Plan.

**KL/h10 Watford Road**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site, which would be contrary to the East of England Plan and would create urban sprawl outside Kings Langley along Watford Road.

**M/h2a Markyate GEA**

While we accept that the location of this site has attractions for conversion to housing, provided that the problem of periodic and not infrequent flooding can be overcome, we consider that it is important that Markyate retains a general employment area. We therefore oppose the suggested change to Residential/Mixed. We suggest that, in the medium term, the planning authority considers the relocation of the GEA to part of site WA51, after which further consideration could be given to the conversion of M/h2a to Residential/Mixed. WA51, as a GEA, has good access, which could be further improved, to the A5, would have little effect on neighbouring residences and is still close enough to Markyate to allow employees to walk or bicycle to it.

**Bov 74 Chaulden View, London Road.**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site.

**O/h 10 Chequers Hill, Flamstead**

This Green Belt development is contrary to the East of England Plan and would lead to inappropriate expansion of the settlement. Consequently we oppose it.

**O/h11 Little Heath Farm, Potten End**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site, which would be contrary to the East of England Plan. Development here would represent further ribbon development along Little Heath Lane and would adversely affect the neighbouring AONB.

**O/h 15 Lukes Lane, Gubblecote**

While we consider replacement of the existing commercial use may be appropriate, replacement with housing would not, introducing an isolated residential area within the Green Belt.

**O/h 16 Astrope Lane Long Marston**

This would lead to inappropriate extension of the village into the open countryside and encourage ribbon development. Consequently we oppose it.

**O/h21 Woodcroft Farm, Potten End**

**O/h22 Potten End Hill**

We strongly oppose development on both these Green Belt sites. The sites are fairly isolated and separated from Potten End village. Development would have a major impact on Potten End and would come close to creating coalescence with Water End. Any proposal would suffer from serious sustainability concerns as well as being contrary to the East of England Plan.

**O/h23 South of A41, Wigginton**

**O/h24 North of Wigginton**

We oppose development on both these Green Belt sites. Development would have a major impact on Wigginton and would increase the likelihood of coalescence with Tring. Any proposal would suffer from serious sustainability concerns as well as being contrary to the East of England Plan.

**O/h30 The Willows, Water End**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site. The site is fairly isolated. Development would be a serious incursion into open countryside. Any proposal would suffer from serious sustainability concerns as well as being contrary to the East of England Plan.

**O/h25 James Farm, Wilstone**

**O/h26 Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone**

**O/h27 Lower Icknield Way, Wilstone**

**O/h28 Tringford Farm, Wilstone**

All these sites lie in the AONB and are some distance from Wilstone, from which they are separated by open countryside. We strongly oppose development on any of the sites, all of which suffer from serious sustainability concerns.

**O/h29 The Green, Little Gaddesden**

We are frankly astounded that the County Council has put forward this site as a potential housing site, for which it is totally unsuitable. We would strongly oppose any development for all the reasons given in the Schedule of Site Appraisals.

**APS34 The Manor Estate**

This site is designated for leisure and open space. That use should not be compromised by additional housing.

**APS54 Shendish Manor**

We oppose development on this Green Belt site. It is important to avoid any development in order to avoid coalescence of Apsley with the Rucklers Way settlement. Development would also have a serious impact on the landscape of the Gade valley.

**GH59 Grovehill Park**

We oppose development on this site. Grovehill is at present not visible from Piccotts End; development on GH59 would come over the crestline and be visible from Piccotts End and elsewhere in the Gade valley. We recommend that the site is not considered further.

**HHC45 Hemel Hempstead General Hospital**

We consider that it is important that this site is reserved for health uses.

**BW30 Little Kingshill, Berkhamsted**

See our comments on Be/h2c, Be/h2d and Be/h2e above, which are equally applicable to this site. The site should not be progressed to the next stage.

**KL48 Red Lion PH, Kings Langley**

We consider this site inappropriate for development because of the high flood risk and the danger of coalescence with Kings Langley and Rucklers Lane. We consider that it should not be progressed to the next stage.

**WA51 London Road, Markyate**

See our comments on M/h2a above. This site is not suitable for housing; it lies in the flood plain and it is a long distance from the village centre and its facilities and its school.

**STA1 Holtsmere End Road**

**STA2 East of Hemel Hempstead**

We note from page 6 of the document that these sites lie within the area of St Albans City & District Council and in due course will be the subject of detailed assessment through the Hemel Hempstead Town Gateway Area Action Plan. We wish to reserve our comments on these sites until that time.