



# Draft SA/SEA of North Hertfordshire Local Plan Preferred Options

Report to North Hertfordshire District Council

November 2014

<p><b>Option (e) Use smaller greenfield sites in the villages</b></p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option implies that there would be a number of greenfield developments adjacent to villages, which is likely to have a significant impact on access to green space, biodiversity and landscape. Green space could be provided within the development, but the ability to be in contact with wildlife and wild places will be significantly reduced.</li> <li>• The exact impacts would depend on location, but the BAP indicates that these areas include “areas high in biodiversity”, key areas for farming wildlife and key grassland habitats. Taken together, the developments are likely to have a significant impact on landscape. Some of the areas around villages are in or close to the AONB.</li> <li>• Locating developments adjacent to villages is likely to increase the need to travel, as there are currently few services and jobs in the villages, and it is unclear whether the new developments would be large enough to provide the new services and jobs needed. However, it is possible that the development could result in the size of the village increasing to a scale where it can support additional services and public transport provision</li> <li>• This option should have a positive impact on the provision of services in rural areas.</li> <li>• New housing will significantly increase water use in the District, and put significant pressure on water infrastructure. Based on an average use of water by customers of Anglian, which covers most of the District of around 127 litres per person per day for metered properties, this would be an increased use of 1.838 billion litres per annum. Environment Agency water strategy for the Anglian Region says that increases in abstraction from the aquifer are not acceptable, so additional water would need to be provided from regional reservoirs. The SEA of the RSS for the East of England Plan notes the pressure on water infrastructure in the region as a result of proposed new housing provision and the impacts of climate change. Since the District has amongst the lowest rainfall (125mm/y) in the UK, the new developments will reduce the District’s ability to respond to climate change.</li> <li>• The provision of large amounts of new housing is likely to have a positive impact on affordability, particularly if it includes significant amounts of affordable housing, and if some of this is aimed at particular groups in need such as young people, disabled people and key workers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations for changes to this option and need for additional data:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake detailed research to determine the impacts on landscape, biodiversity, travel and groundwater in specific locations.</li> <li>• No changes are recommended, within the parameters of the requirement to provide extra housing</li> </ul>
<p><b>NHDC response 2007</b> This option has not been pursued.</p>
<p><b>NHDC response 2014</b> This option has once again not been pursued specifically; however there is more development in the district’s villages based on the amount of sites that have been submitted in these locations and the site’s suitability based on the services that exist. This provides an overlap with the villages spatial option below.</p>

**2. How to identify which villages within the rural area might be able to accommodate development**

<p><b>Option (a) Identify villages which may take further development based on the level of facilities in the village.</b></p>
<p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option would have a positive impact on the key sustainability issues of minimising development on greenfield land and protecting landscapes.</li> <li>• It would have an adverse impact in terms of generating more and longer car journeys</li> </ul>

and therefore add to greenhouse gas emissions. This would work against the North Herts targets to: reduce the distance travelled per person by 5% by 2021; reduce the car use modal share from 72.07% to 65.5% by 2021.

- But there is uncertainty about the extent to which this option would generate new journeys. This would require more information on: the type of facilities that would be considered; the proposed levels of development and in which villages; and modelling to predict the likely journey generation.
- It is likely that this option would prevent the development of affordable housing in some villages where there is a demand for more affordable housing, but to be certain this would require further analysis of the Housing Needs data.

**Recommendations for changes to this option and new data needs**

- Clarify what types of facilities would be considered and therefore which villages would be expected to accommodate development. The choice of facilities should include public transport links and other facilities which studies have shown generate longer and the most frequent journeys.
- Clarify if certain types of development, e.g. tourism, affordable housing, or housing to meet local needs, would be favoured in the villages.
- Based on the above information model the likely impact on journeys and modal share. Use the Housing Needs study database to analyse which (if any) villages with a significant demand for more affordable housing would be prevented from accommodating more affordable housing under this option.

**NHDC Response 2007**

This is the preferred option. The Preferred Options Paper defines a list of villages based on those which have schools: Ashwell, Barkway, Barley, Graveley, Hexton, Ickleford, Kimpton, Breachwood Green, Great Offley, Oaklands/Mardley Heath (part), Pirton, Preston, Reed, Sandon, St Ippolyts/Gosmore, Whitwell, Therfield, Weston and Little Wymondley.

New development is not anticipated to be in significant numbers. In essence, these villages will have a boundary drawn around their existing built up areas within which infill development is acceptable. Where this is inadequate to meet local needs, land will be released outside that village boundary. The North Hertfordshire villages tend to be more expensive than the towns and are therefore finding it harder to retain young families, which is leading to a skewed age population.

On the need to travel, modelling to show modal share arising from new development in these villages would give an incomplete answer. One justification for allowing additional development in these villages is in order to safeguard existing facilities. Using the schools as an example, villages without schools export all their children every day to other villages or towns for schooling. If the schools in any of these villages closed, there would be a significant increase in journeys to and from these villages. A small amount of additional development as infill or for local needs (which would by definition be for people who already live or work in the area) will therefore give a small increase in travel, but may prevent the even larger increase in travel that would arise if the schools closed.

On social and economic aspects of sustainability, village schools act as a focus point for the villages and ensure that villages continue to attract and retain young families, which prevents them stagnating as dormitories for older families and retirees. Schools also provide local employment.

**NHDC response 2014**

This is still the preferred option. The preferred options local plan in HDS2 Settlement Hierarchy lists the villages where general development will be allowed, based on those which have schools: Category A villages are: Ashwell, Barkway, Barley, Breachwood Green, Cockernhoe, Codicote, Graveley, Hexton, Ickleford, Kimpton, Knebworth, Little Wymondley, Oaklands, Offley, Pirton, Preston, Reed, Sandon, St Ippolyts, Therfield, Weston and Whitwell.

HDS2 Settlement Hierarchy also allows infilling in the built core of the village in category B, based on facilities within the villages which are Balckmore end, Clothall, Great Wymondley,

Hinxworth, Holwell, Kelshall, Lilley, Newnham, Old Knebwoth, Peters Green, Radwell, Rushden, Wallington; and Willian.  
HDS2 Settlement Hierarchy also allows only affordable housing in category C villages where there is a proven need in Bygrave, Caldecote, Langley and Nuthampstead.

**Option (b)** Identify villages which may take further development based on the population of the village.

**Conclusions**

- This option would have a very similar impact to option (a) if there is a significant correlation between villages with larger populations and villages with more services and facilities.
- If there are a number of villages with higher populations but relatively poor access to services and facilities, then this option is likely to have a more severe impact on the key sustainability issue of trip generation than option (a). However, if the villages with higher populations are also those with better public transport links, then this option could have a less severe impact on trip generation than option (a).
- It is likely that this option would prevent the development of affordable housing in some villages where there is a demand for more affordable housing, but to be certain this would require further analysis of the Housing Needs data.

**Recommendations for changes to this option and new data needed**

- Clarify which villages, on the basis of population size would be expected to accommodate development and how much housing they could accommodate without damaging character. (This information could probably be derived from the Housing Capacity Study.)
- Investigate the availability of facilities and public transport links in these villages.
- Clarify if certain types of development, e.g. tourism, affordable housing, or housing to meet local needs, would be favoured in the villages.
- Based on the above information model the likely impact on journeys and modal share.
- Use the Housing Needs study database to analyse which (if any) villages with a significant demand for more affordable housing would be prevented from accommodating more affordable housing under this option.

**NHDC response 2007**

This option has not been pursued.

**NHDC response 2014**

This option has once again not been pursue, based on the potential allocation of sites in locations without the appropriate services and facilities, this would not constitute sustainable development.

**Option (c)** Identify villages which may take further development based on the desires of the parish council and the residents of the village.

*Note: This option reflects the approach taken in the current plan, i.e. it is the “business as usual” option.*

**Conclusions**

- It is very difficult to predict the impact of this option because it would depend on the decisions of parish councils and residents. There is no guarantee that their decisions would be based on the need for housing, rural diversification, services or facilities.
- This option could have an adverse impact on the objective of “sharing access to services and the benefits of prosperity fairly” if the parish council and residents did not consider the needs of the more deprived members of their community.

**Recommendations for changes to this option and new data needed**

- Include an explanation of how parish councils and residents would be expected to reach

decisions, e.g. if there decisions should be backed up by evidence of need, availability of facilities, and how they would involve and consider the needs of the more deprived members of their community, as well as the needs to protect biodiversity and local character.

**NHDC response 2007**

This option has not been pursued.

**NHDC response 2014**

This option has not been explicitly pursued, although through neighbourhood plans, there is the opportunity for parishes to bring forward development as long as the neighbourhood plan is in accordance with the local plan.

**Option (d) Do not identify specific villages and allow some development in all villages.**

**Conclusions**

- This option would have a positive impact on the key sustainability issues of minimising development on greenfield land and protecting landscapes. The extent of this impact would depend on the amount of development allowed in the villages.
- It would have an adverse impact in terms of generating more and longer car journeys and therefore add to greenhouse gas emissions, especially as this option would allow development in villages with poor public transport and facilities. This would work against the North Herts targets to: reduce the distance travelled per person by 5% by 2021; reduce the car use modal share from 72.07% to 65.5% by 2021.
- It could also increase the number of households with poor access to services and facilities.
- It is not clear if this option would support the key sustainability issues of providing more affordable housing. This would depend on the kind of development that was permitted or encouraged under this option.
- There is uncertainty about how much this option would generate new journeys. This would require more information on: the amount of development allowed in each village; modelling to predict the likely journey generation.

**Recommendations for changes to this option and new data needed**

- Clarify how much new development would be allowed in each village under this option, and what proportion of the development would be for affordable housing.
- Based on the above information model the likely impact on village character, journeys and modal share.

**NHDC response 2007**

This option has not been pursued.

**NHDC response 2014**

This option has once again not been pursued based on the potential allocation of sites in locations without the appropriate services and facilities, this would not constitute sustainable development.

**Option (e) Do not allow any development in any village.**

**Conclusions**

- This option is likely to have a very negative impact on the key sustainability issues of promoting rural tourism, protecting greenfield land and landscapes, providing affordable housing, and improving access to facilities in rural areas, including health and educational facilities.
- It would have a positive impact on the key sustainability issues of minimising new trip generation and greenhouse gas emissions.
- It may also have a negative impact on community cohesion.

**Recommendations for changes to this option and new data needs**

- This option is adapted to allow the development of small scale community services, facilities and meeting places, including schools and health facilities, designed to serve

# Contents

Appraisal Framework	4
Significance criteria	7
Preferred sites: overview and document history	14
Site summaries	16
Ashwell	16
Baldock	17
Barkway	21
Codicote	22
Cockernhoe and east of Luton	23
Great Ashby and North East Stevenage	25
Graveley	27
Hitchin	27
Ickleford	31
Kimpton	32
Kings Walden	33
Knebworth	33
Letchworth Garden City	34
North Stevenage	37
Offley	38
Preston	39
Pirton	39
Reed	40
Royston	41
St Ipployts	43
St Paul's Walden	44
Therfield	44
Weston	45
West Stevenage	45
Wymondley	46
Site matrices	47
Ashwell	47
Baldock	50
Barkway	83
Codicote	88
Cockernhoe and east of Luton	95

Great Ashby and north east Stevenage	106
Graveley	115
Hitchin	119
Ickleford	143
Kimpton	148
Kings Walden	155
Knebworth	158
Letchworth Garden City	164
North Stevenage	197
Offley	203
Preston	205
Pirton	208
Reed	215
Royston	220
St Ipployts	246
St Paul's Walden	252
Therfield	254
Weston	259
West Stevenage	262
Wymondley	268

Site/location/ type	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Preston</b>	Village has some facilities, including school and bus service (less frequent than hourly). It is a category A village in settlement hierarchy.	<p>The following issues relate to development in Preston:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No shops, post office or doctor's surgery.</li> <li>• There are known capacity issues in relation to secondary schools within Hitchin.</li> <li>• Whitwell and Hitchin surgeries have capacity to accommodate additional places. However, this will depend on the extent of growth in other locations that serve these surgeries.</li> <li>• Development is likely to result in the increased use of private cars for work and to access services</li> </ul>
PR1 –formerly site 215 - Land east of Butchers Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site will provide 23 dwellings, which are likely to include affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a greenfield site on agricultural Grade 3 land</li> <li>• Site adjacent to conservation area and designated archaeological area</li> <li>• The landscape capacity for developments is considered to be low.</li> <li>• Public rights of way run through the site, development will reduce existing residents' access to open countryside to the west of the village</li> </ul>
<b>Pirton</b>	Village has a range of facilities, including school and bus service (less frequent than hourly). It is a category A village in settlement hierarchy.	<p>The following issues relate to development in Priton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No shops or doctor's surgery.</li> <li>• There are known capacity issues in relation to secondary schools within Hitchin.</li> <li>• Hitchin surgeries have capacity to accommodate additional places. However, this will depend on the extent of growth in other locations that serve these surgeries.</li> <li>• Development is likely to result in the increased use of private cars for work and to access services</li> </ul>
PT1 –formerly site 64 Land East of Priors Hill, Pirton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will provide 88 dwellings, including affordable housing.</li> <li>• Site likely to support local services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site, classified as grade 3 agricultural land.</li> <li>• Constraints on the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.</li> <li>• Site borders an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</li> </ul>

Site/location/ type	Strengths	Weaknesses
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is within a designated area of archaeological interest.</li> <li>• Site is close to an Ancient Monument.</li> <li>• Site is located near to listed buildings.</li> <li>• Site borders a conservation area.</li> <li>• Potential surface water flooding issues onsite</li> </ul>
PT2 – formerly site 214 - Holwell Turn, West Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will provide 47 dwellings, including affordable housing</li> <li>• Site likely to support rural services</li> <li>• Close to public rights of way leading to green space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site on grade 2 and 3 agricultural land</li> <li>• Close to conservation area</li> <li>• Close to edge of AONB</li> <li>• Constraints on the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.</li> </ul>
<b>Reed</b>	Village has some facilities, including school and bus service (less frequent than hourly). It is a category A village in settlement hierarchy.	<p>The following issues relate to development in Preston:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No shops, post office or doctor’s surgery</li> <li>• Development is likely to result in the increased use of private cars for work and to access services</li> </ul>
RD1 –formerly RD/r1 Land at Blacksmiths Lane Reed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New housing may support local services</li> <li>• Would provide 21 dwellings, including affordable housing</li> <li>• Within walking distance of school and green space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site, grade 2 agricultural land</li> <li>• The site is located adjacent to an area of archaeological interest</li> <li>• The site is located near to a conservation area</li> </ul>
RD2 –formerly site 73 Land North of Blacksmiths Lane, Reed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New housing may support local services</li> <li>• Would provide 10 dwellings, including affordable housing</li> <li>• Within walking distance of school and green space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site, classified as grade 2 agricultural land.</li> </ul>

6. Use natural resources efficiently; reuse, use recycled where possible	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No identified constraints in this village</li> </ul>
<i>Town centres</i>		
7. Promote sustainable urban living?	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is a long distance from employment</li> <li>There are no food shops within Preston</li> <li>Residents likely to use private transport to commute into the nearest large town for work and food</li> </ul>

Key positive effects	Key negative effects	Potential mitigation
<p>No designated wildlife sites</p> <p>Site is not located in Source Protection Zone</p> <p>No evidence of land contamination</p> <p>Site not in a flood risk area</p>	<p>This is a greenfield site on agricultural Grade 3</p> <p>The site is a rural isolated site and is poor in terms of access to local services</p> <p>Site contains archaeological area</p> <p>Development could impact on landscape</p>	<p>Ecological survey and retention of existing vegetation</p> <p>Encourage sustainable transport measures</p> <p>Landscape assessment and sensitive design</p> <p>Sensitive design taking into account historic environment</p> <p>Improve public transport provision</p> <p>Contribution to Green Infrastructure Projects</p>

## Pirton

<b>Type of Site and Number: PT1 –formerly site 64 Residential</b>		
<b>Site Reference and Location: 07/0463/1 Land East of Priors Hill, Pirton</b>		
	<b>What is the predicted effect on</b>	<b>Justification for assessment and any mitigation measures</b>

SA Objectives	each SA objective?			
	Short term	Med term	Long term	
<b>ECONOMIC ACTIVITY</b>				
1 Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth	x/√	x/√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is situated in a rural area</li> <li>There are not many facilities or services nearby</li> <li>There are no food shops, shops as well as no doctors surgery</li> <li>The site has the potential to support the rural economy; number of proposed dwellings on the site is high - 146</li> <li>In the long term demand for services and facilities will increase within the area and bring in new business</li> </ul>
<b>LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS</b>				
2(a) Minimise the development of Greenfield land and other land with high environmental and amenity value?	x	x	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development is located on a greenfield site</li> <li>The site is located upon agricultural land grade 3</li> </ul>
2(b) Provide access to green spaces	√	√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green space is within 400m</li> <li>Public rights of way are near this site</li> </ul>
2 (c) Deliver more sustainable location patterns and reduce the use of motor vehicles	x	x	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The nearest large town to Pirton is Hitchin which is 3 miles away</li> <li>There is a regular bus service</li> <li>There is no train station within 800m</li> <li>The site location is likely to lead to increased use of private cars</li> <li>Mitigation – Encourage sustainable transport initiatives</li> <li>Mitigation – Improve public transport services</li> </ul>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</b>				
3(a) Protect and enhance biodiversity	?/√	?/√	?/√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site does not fall within or near a designated wildlife site</li> <li>Trees are present around the perimeter of the site</li> <li>Mitigation – retain existing trees where possible</li> </ul>
3(b) Protect and enhance landscapes	x	x	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This village is located within the Pirton Lowlands landscape character area.</li> <li>The site borders the Chilterns AONB</li> <li>Mitigation – ensure the development and its densities are in keeping with the surrounding areas</li> </ul>

3(c) Conserve and where appropriate, enhance the historic environment	<b>Xx</b>	<b>Xx</b>	<b>Xx</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site contains an area of archaeological interest</li> <li>Site borders a conservation area</li> <li>Site is opposite an Ancient monument</li> <li>Site is located near listed buildings</li> <li>Mitigation – archaeological survey</li> <li>Mitigation – Ensure future development is sensitive to local buildings and development and incorporates the local character including size, materials, design etc</li> </ul>
3(d) Reduce pollution from any source	√	√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is not within a source protection zone</li> <li>Site does not border a water course</li> <li>There is no evidence of contamination upon the site</li> </ul>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE</b>				
4(a) Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and Improve the District's ability to adapt to climate change	?/√	?/√	?/√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site does not border a flood risk zone</li> <li>The site is not viable for SuDS</li> <li>The site is large enough to consider CHP</li> </ul>
<b>A JUST SOCIETY</b>				
5(a) Share benefits of prosperity fairly	X/√	X/√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This area is not identified as deprived</li> <li>Local services need improving</li> <li>There are no shops, food shops as well as no doctors surgery in Pirton</li> </ul>
5(b) Increase access to decent and affordable housing	√	√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site and dwelling quantity is large enough to provide affordable housing</li> </ul>
5(c) Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce health inequalities	x/√	x/√	x/√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development is relatively large and the construction phase would be disruptive for surrounding local residential areas</li> <li>No evidence of noise constraints identified.</li> <li>Provision and access to affordable housing improves health inequalities</li> </ul>
<b>RESOURCE USE AND WASTE</b>				
6(a) Use natural resources efficiently; reuse, use recycled where possible	?	?	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information on constraints</li> </ul>
<b>TOWN CENTRES</b>				
7 Promote sustainable urban living	x	x	x	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of the site will increase the use of private transport</li> <li>Residents are likely to commute into the nearest large town for work, and other trips</li> </ul>
<b>Summary</b>				

<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Potential mitigation</b>
<p>The site does not border a watercourse</p> <p>No evidence of land contamination</p> <p>Site does not border a flood risk zone</p> <p>Affordable housing</p> <p>Site provides access to green space</p> <p>Site does not contain a wildlife site</p> <p>Site is not located within a source protection zone</p> <p>The site has the potential to support the rural economy; number of proposed dwellings on the site is high</p> <p>Site is large enough to consider CHP</p>	<p>This is a greenfield site</p> <p>Agricultural land grade 3</p> <p>Pirton is in a rural location, the nearest large town is Royston</p> <p>Not many facilities and services located nearby</p> <p>The sites location is likely to promote commuting</p> <p>No information on resource constraints</p> <p>SuDS are not viable</p> <p>Site borders an AONB</p> <p>Site is within an area of archaeological interest</p> <p>Site is opposite an Ancient Monument</p> <p>Site is located near to listed buildings</p> <p>Site borders a conservation area</p>	<p>Retain as many trees on the site as possible</p> <p>Improve public transport</p> <p>Improve facilities and services</p> <p>Encourage and improve alternative transport</p> <p>Undertake an archaeological survey</p> <p>Ensure development is sensitive to local buildings and development and incorporates the local character including size, materials, design etc</p> <p>Ensure the development and its densities are in keeping with the surrounding areas</p> <p>Site is large enough to consider CHP</p>

**PT2 – formerly Site 214 – Holwell Turn, West Lane**

SA Objective: Will the site...	Score	Justification for assessment including short medium and long term issues and recommendations for mitigation / improvement
<i>Economic Activity</i>		
1. Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth?	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is situated in a rural area</li> <li>• There are not many facilities or services nearby</li> <li>• The site has the potential to support the rural economy; number of proposed dwellings on the site is high</li> <li>• In the long term demand for services and facilities will increase within the area and bring in new business</li> </ul>
<i>Land use and development patterns</i>		
2a. Minimise the development of greenfield land and other land with high environmental and amenity value?	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is greenfield</li> <li>• Site is located upon grade 2 and 3 agricultural land</li> </ul>
2b. Provide access to green spaces?	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green space is within 400m</li> <li>• Public rights of way are near this site</li> </ul>
2c. Deliver more sustainable location patterns and reduce the use of motor vehicles?	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus stop within 400m, there is a regular bus service</li> <li>• There is no train station within 800m</li> <li>• There are no food shops and no doctors surgery, the nearest large town to Pirton is Hitchin which is 3 miles away</li> <li>• The site location is likely to lead to increased use of private cars</li> <li>• Mitigation – Encourage sustainable transport initiatives</li> <li>• Mitigation – Improve public transport services</li> </ul>
<i>Environmental protection</i>		

3a. Protect and enhance biodiversity?	? / ✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site does not conflict with any designated areas of ecological interest, however, development of a greenfield site is unlikely to enhance biodiversity unless development includes green features within design.</li> <li>• Vegetation present in the form of hedgerows and grass areas</li> <li>• Mitigation – ecological survey and seek to maintain existing trees and hedgerows and sensitive design to create net gain for biodiversity</li> </ul>
3b. Protect and enhance landscapes?	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This village is located within the Pirton Lowlands landscape character area, which has moderate to low sensitivity</li> <li>• Landscape capacity for small scale incremental development is considered to be moderate</li> <li>• Mitigation – ensure the development and its densities are in keeping with the surrounding areas, use and enhancing of existing hedgerows in screening of site.</li> </ul>
3c. Conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the historic environment?	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site does not contain an area of archaeological interest, listed building or conservation area</li> <li>• Site borders a conservation area</li> <li>• Mitigation – Ensure future development is sensitive to local buildings and development and incorporates the local character including size, materials, design etc</li> </ul>
3d. Reduce pollution from any source?	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not within a source protection zone</li> <li>• Site does not border a water course</li> <li>• There is no evidence of contamination upon the site</li> </ul>
<i>Climate change</i>		
4a. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and Improve the Districts ability to adapt to climate change	? / ✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not in a flood risk zone</li> <li>• The site is not viable for SUDs as identified in the SuDS viability Plan</li> </ul>
<i>A just society</i>		
5a. Share benefits of prosperity fairly?	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area is not identified as deprived</li> <li>• Local services need improving</li> </ul>
5b. Increase access to decent and affordable housing?	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site and dwelling quantity is large enough to provide affordable housing</li> </ul>

5c. Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce health inequalities?	X / 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development is relatively large and the construction phase would be disruptive for surrounding local residential areas</li> <li>No evidence of noise constraints identified.</li> <li>Provision and access to affordable housing improves health inequalities</li> </ul>
<i>Resource use and waste</i>		
6. Use natural resources efficiently; reuse, use recycled where possible	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information on constraints</li> </ul>
<i>Town centres</i>		
7. Promote sustainable urban living?	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no shops, food shops as well as no doctors surgery in Pirton</li> <li>The location of the site will increase the use of private transport</li> <li>Residents are likely to commute into the nearest large town for work, and other trips</li> </ul>

Key positive effects	Key negative effects	Potential mitigation
Site will support rural services	Greenfield site	Encourage sustainable transport initiatives
Site will provide affordable housing	Located upon grade 2 and 3 agricultural land	Improve public transport services
Site not in a flood risk area	Out of town location means commuting will occur	Sensitive design for setting of adjacent conservation area
No evidence of contamination		Design and densities in keeping with existing development
Low landscape sensitivity		
No designated wildlife site		

# **Sustainability Appraisal and SEA of North Hertfordshire Local Plan Preferred Options**

## **Appendix 8: Appraisal of sites not taken forward – significance criteria, summaries and matrices**

November 2014

## Contents

Appraisal Framework	5
Significance criteria	8
Sites not taken forward: overview	15
Site summaries	17
<b>Sites appraised in 2008</b>	<b>18</b>
Baldock	18
Barkway	18
Barley	19
Hitchin	19
Ickleford	22
Kimpton	22
Knebworth	23
Letchworth Garden City	23
Royston	26
Sandon	29
Therfield	29
St Paul's Walden	29
<b>Sites appraised in 2009 and 2013 (<i>site numbers = digits only</i>)</b>	<b>30</b>
Ashwell	30
Baldock	31
Barkway	32
Barley	34
Clothall	35
Cockernhoe and east of Luton	36
Codicote	37
Graveley	38
Great Ashby and north east Stevenage	39
Hitchin	39
Kimpton	41
King's Walden	42
Knebworth	43
Lilley	44
Nuthampstead	45
Offley	45
Pirton	46
Preston	46
Reed	47
Royston	47
Sandon	48

St Ippolyts	49
St.Paul's Walden	50
Therfield	51
Wymondley	51
<b>Strategic site options appraised in 2013</b>	<b>54</b>

## Matrices 57

<b>Sites appraised 2008</b>	<b>57</b>
Baldock	57
Barkway	60
Barley	62
Hitchin	67
Ickleford	101
Kimpton	107
Knebworth	109
Letchworth	112
Royston	144
Sandon	169
Therfield	172
St Paul's Walden	177
<b>Sites appraised 2009 and 2013 (<i>site numbers = digits only</i>)</b>	<b>179</b>
Ashwell	179
Baldock	191
Barkway	206
Barley	224
Clothall	233
Cockernhoe and east of Luton	236
Codicote	241
Graveley	246
Hitchin	252
Site 209 – Reduced Version of SW Hitchin	260
Kimpton	264
Kings Walden	274
Knebworth	280
Lilley	294
Nuthampstead	297
Offley	300
Pirton	302
Preston	305
Reed	314
Royston	320
Sandon	322
St Ippolyts	330
St Pauls Walden	352
Therfield	355
Wymondley	357
<b>Strategic site options appraised in 2013</b>	<b>382</b>

# Matrices

The assessment is based on the current situation and trends for each objective, including where there are particular problems. This information is contained in appendix 2 (baseline data and key sustainability issues), and has been referred to throughout the process of compiling the matrices.

These matrices were produced over a period from 2008 to 2013. They should be read in conjunction with the site summaries, which are included earlier in this document. The site summaries were reviewed fully in September 2014 to identify any changes required to reflect new information or changes in information, and to correct mistakes. The full matrices for strategic sites (sites considered as options in February 2013 plus BA1, considered as an option in July 2013) were also reviewed at that time in order to support the process of choosing the preferred strategic options. The matrices for sites appraised in 2008 and 2009 were the subject of a limited review in July 2012 to identify any changes resulting from new information arising at that time (for example information about the Royston Sewage Treatment Works capacity issues), or to take account of consultation comments.

## Sites appraised 2008

### Baldock

<b>Type of Site and Number:</b> Residential (Brownfield) B/r06				
<b>Site Reference and Location:</b> Adjacent 68 London Road, Baldock				
	<b>What is the predicted effect on each SA objective?</b>			<b>Justification for assessment and any mitigation measures</b>
<b>SA Objectives</b>	<b>Short term</b>	<b>Med term</b>	<b>Long term</b>	
<b>ECONOMIC ACTIVITY</b>				
1 Achieve sustainable levels of	0	0	0	

6. Use natural resources efficiently; reuse, use recycled where possible	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No constraints identified</li> </ul>
<i>Town centres</i>		
7. Promote sustainable urban living?	? / X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Offley's location makes the residents use of private transport likely to commute into the nearest large town for work and entertainment, few services in the village</li> </ul>

Key positive effects	Key negative effects	Potential mitigation
Site will support local services Site Within 400m of greenspace Does not include designated wildlife site Site will provide affordable housing Not in flood risk area	Greenfield site, grade 3 agricultural land Site not within 400m of bus stop Low capacity in landscape Site contains listed building and conservation area	Ecological survey Landscape assessment Sensitive design relating to historic built environment Improve public transport provision Noise and vibration should be considered in design

## Pirton

### Site 214 – Holwell Turn, West Lane

SA Objective: Will the site...	Score	<b>Justification for assessment including short medium and long term issues and recommendations for mitigation / improvement</b>
--------------------------------	-------	--

<i>Economic Activity</i>		
1. Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth?	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is situated in a rural area</li> <li>• There are not many facilities or services nearby</li> <li>• The site has the potential to support the rural economy; number of proposed dwellings on the site is high</li> <li>• In the long term demand for services and facilities will increase within the area and bring in new business</li> </ul>
<i>Land use and development patterns</i>		
2a. Minimise the development of greenfield land and other land with high environmental and amenity value?	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is greenfield</li> <li>• Site is located upon grade 2 and 3 agricultural land</li> </ul>
2b. Provide access to green spaces?	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green space is within 400m</li> <li>• Public rights of way are near this site</li> </ul>
2c. Deliver more sustainable location patterns and reduce the use of motor vehicles?	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus stop within 400m, there is a regular bus service</li> <li>• There is no train station within 800m</li> <li>• There are no food shops and no doctors surgery, the nearest large town to Pirton is Hitchin which is 3 miles away</li> <li>• The site location is likely to lead to increased use of private cars</li> <li>• Mitigation – Encourage sustainable transport initiatives</li> <li>• Mitigation – Improve public transport services</li> </ul>
<i>Environmental protection</i>		
3a. Protect and enhance biodiversity?	? / √	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site does not conflict with any designated areas of ecological interest, however, development of a greenfield site is unlikely to enhance biodiversity unless development includes green features within design.</li> <li>• Vegetation present in the form of hedgerows and grass areas</li> <li>• Mitigation – ecological survey and seek to maintain existing trees and hedgerows and sensitive design to create net gain for biodiversity</li> </ul>

3b. Protect and enhance landscapes?	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This village is located within the Pirton Lowlands landscape character area, which has moderate to low sensitivity</li> <li>• Landscape capacity for small scale incremental development is considered to be moderate</li> <li>• Mitigation – ensure the development and its densities are in keeping with the surrounding areas, use and enhancing of existing hedgerows in screening of site.</li> </ul>
3c. Conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the historic environment?	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site does not contain an area of archaeological interest, listed building or conservation area</li> <li>• Site borders a conservation area</li> <li>• Mitigation – Ensure future development is sensitive to local buildings and development and incorporates the local character including size, materials, design etc</li> </ul>
3d. Reduce pollution from any source?	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not within a source protection zone</li> <li>• Site does not border a water course</li> <li>• There is no evidence of contamination upon the site</li> </ul>
<i>Climate change</i>		
4a. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and Improve the Districts ability to adapt to climate change	? / √	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not in a flood risk zone</li> <li>• The site is not viable for SUDs as identified in the SuDS viability Plan</li> </ul>
<i>A just society</i>		
5a. Share benefits of prosperity fairly?	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This area is not identified as deprived</li> <li>• Local services need improving</li> </ul>
5b. Increase access to decent and affordable housing?	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site and dwelling quantity is large enough to provide affordable housing</li> </ul>
5c. Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce health inequalities?	X / 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development is relatively large and the construction phase would be disruptive for surrounding local residential areas</li> <li>• No evidence of noise constraints identified.</li> <li>• Provision and access to affordable housing improves health inequalities</li> </ul>

<i>Resource use and waste</i>		
6. Use natural resources efficiently; reuse, use recycled where possible	?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information on constraints</li> </ul>
<i>Town centres</i>		
7. Promote sustainable urban living?	X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no shops, food shops as well as no doctors surgery in Pirton</li> <li>The location of the site will increase the use of private transport</li> <li>Residents are likely to commute into the nearest large town for work, and other trips</li> </ul>

Key positive effects	Key negative effects	Potential mitigation
Site will support rural services	Greenfield site	Encourage sustainable transport initiatives
Site will provide affordable housing	Located upon grade 2 and 3 agricultural land	Improve public transport services
Site not in a flood risk area	Out of town location means commuting will occur	Sensitive design for setting of adjacent conservation area
No evidence of contamination		Design and densities in keeping with existing development
Low landscape sensitivity		
No designated wildlife site		

## Preston

**Type of Site and Number: 65 Residential**  
**Site Reference and Location: 07/0961/1 Land West of Back Lane, Preston**