

Three Rivers District Council

Three Rivers Site Allocations Local
Development Document

Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum
June 2013

Halcrow Group Limited, a CH2MHill Company,
in association with
Centre for Sustainability at TRL Limited

This page is intentionally blank

Three Rivers District Council

Three Rivers Site Allocations Local Development Document

**Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum
June 2013**

**Halcrow Group Limited, a CH2MHill Company,
in association with
Centre for Sustainability at TRL Limited**

Halcrow Group Limited, a CH2MHill Company

Elms House 43 Brook Green London W6 7EF
Tel +44 (0)20 3479 8000
www.halcrow.com

Halcrow Group Limited has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions of their client, Three Rivers District Council, for their sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

© Halcrow Group Limited 2013

Three Rivers District Council
Three Rivers Site Allocations LDD
Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum
June 2013

Contents Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

Issue	Revision	Description	Date	Signed	Verified
01	00	Site Allocations LDD SA Report Addendum	19 th June 2013	KD	RG

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1 Background	2
1.2 SEA/SA Stages	2
1.3 Habitat Regulations Assessment	5
2. Proposed Changes to the LDD	6
3. Methodology	7
3.1 Introduction	7
3.2 Screening methodology	7
3.3 Assessment methodology	7
4. Assessment Findings	8
4.1 Screening	8
4.2 Minor Implications	8
4.3 Links to Core Strategy and Development Management Policies LDD	10
4.4 Habitats Regulations Assessment	11
5. Conclusion	12

Appendices

Appendix 1 Screening of Proposed Changes

Appendix 2 Revised Baseline to the Proposed Changes Sites

1. Introduction

1.1

Background

Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) has already produced a Core Strategy, which was adopted in October 2011. Additional Local Development Documents (LDD), such as the Site Allocations LDD (SA LDD) and the Development Management Policies LDD will support the Core Strategy and form a material consideration to inform decisions on future planning applications. Once fully adopted, these documents will replace the existing Three Rivers Local Plan 1996-2011.

The Site Allocations LDD identifies sites throughout the District for development up to 2026 to support the delivery of the Core Strategy and the Community Strategy. Although the sites identified in the document must go through the planning application process, the document provides principles that a suitable form of development can be located on a particular site. Reference must be made to the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies documents, as appropriate to get a holistic picture on what policies apply at each of the site identified within this LDD.

Consultation on the Proposed Submission version of the Site Allocations LDD was carried out over a six week period between 9th November and 21st December 2012. The Council have now had the opportunity to consider the representations received and are proposing a series of changes that will be submitted to the Secretary of State along with the Submission version of the Site Allocations LDD.

1.1.1

Purpose of this Sustainability Report Addendum

A sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.

This report has been prepared to report on the implications on the sustainability appraisal arising from the Proposed Changes to the LDD. It does not repeat information provided in the Proposed Submission Version SA Report (November 2012) and should therefore be read alongside that earlier report. Both this addendum and the Publication SA Report will form part of the LDD Submission documents.

1.2

SEA/SA Stages

The key stages of the SA/SEA process are broadly presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Stages in the SA/SEA and Three Rivers Site Allocations LDD

Three Rivers Site Allocations LDD	SA/SEA Stages	Dates
Begin Document Preparation	<p>Stage A: Setting the context, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A1: identify other relevant policies, plans and document programmes , and sustainability objectives. • A2: collecting baseline information. • A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems. • A4: Developing the SA framework. • A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA (Scoping Report). 	<p>Core Strategy SA Scoping Report (wholly applicable to the Site allocations LDD SA), prepared February 2006</p> <p>Consultation on Scoping Report February 2006</p>
<p>Preparation of Issues and Options (I&O) paper and consultation</p> <p>Preparation of preferred options, including consultation on possible preferred option</p>	<p>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing of effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1: Testing the LDD objectives against the SA framework. • B2: Developing the LDD options. • B3: Predicting the effects of the LDD. • B4: Evaluating the effects of the LDD. • B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects preferred and maximising beneficial effects. • B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the LDDs. 	<p>Consultation on Core Strategy Issues & Options (I&O) paper (which contained the Site allocations principles), June 2006</p> <p>As part of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation, consulted on the Addendum to the Preferred Options SA, November 2009. This document appraised the Strategic and Non-strategic housing sites.</p> <p>Branching out from the Core Strategy, a Site allocations Issues & Options SA Working Note, was produced in November 2010. This document included sites put forward for Education, Retail, Open space and Recreation use.</p>
Public consultation on Preferred options	<p>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C1 Preparing the SA Report. <p>Stage D: Consulting on the preferred options of the LDD and SA Report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D1: Public participation on the preferred options of the LDD and the SA Report. • D2 (i) Appraising significant changes. • D2 (ii) Appraising significant changes resulting from representations. • D3: Making decisions and providing Information. 	<p>Preparation of the Core Strategy Preferred Options (which included the housing sites) and the SA Report, February 2009; the Core Strategy Preferred Options Addendum (further housing sites consulted), November 2010</p> <p>Formal consultation on The Core Strategy Preferred Options (which included the housing sites) and the SA Report, February 2009; and consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred</p>

Three Rivers Site Allocations LDD	SA/SEA Stages	Dates
		<p>Options Addendum (further housing sites consulted), November 2010 and the accompanying SA Report.</p> <p>Preparation of the Site Allocations Issues & Options LDD and preparation of the Site Allocations Issues and Options SA Working Note, November 2010.</p> <p>Formal consultation on the Site Allocations Issues & Options LDD and preparation of the Site Allocations Issues and Options SA Working Note, November 2010.</p> <p>Formal consultation on the Site Allocation LDD and the SA Report, Pre-Submission Version, January 2012.</p> <p>Formal consultation on the Site Allocations LDD Additional Sites and the relevant SA Report, Pre-Submission (Preferred Options) Version, July 2012 (conducted by TRDC)</p>
Submission of LDD to Secretary of State	<p>Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the LDD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring. • E2: Responding to adverse effects. • Preparing the SEA Statement.² 	<p>Publication of the Proposed Submission Site Allocations LDD and SA Report, November 2012</p> <p><i>Submission of the SA LDD: June 2013 (this SA Report addendum)</i>, along with the Proposed Submission Site Allocations LDD SA Report, November 2012)</p> <p>Final adoption of the Site Allocations LDD is scheduled for December 2013. An SA Statement will be produced at this stage.</p>

¹This output is not required by the SEA Regulations but was produced to assist in selecting the preferred options.

²The SEA Statement is required by the SEA Regulations.

³ This Addendum forms part of the SA Report at the Submission stage.

1.3

Habitat Regulations Assessment¹

A Habitat Regulations Assessment was conducted as an independent study alongside the SA/SEA for TRDC, sharing information with the SA/SEA where applicable. In November 2007, a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report was prepared to comply with the UK's Habitats Regulations². Screening is required where a plan, alone or 'in combination' with other plans, could affect Natura 2000 Sites (Special Protection Areas for birds – SPAs, Special Areas of Conservation for habitats - SACs) following Article 6(3) of the European Habitats Directive.

The HRA screening report, in agreement with Natural England, concluded that Three Rivers Core Strategy would not result in any significant effects on any Natura 2000 sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and programmes. It was therefore considered, in consultation with Natural England, the statutory consultee, that a full Appropriate Assessment was not necessary. This conclusion stands in relation to the Submission version of the Site Allocations LDD.

¹ Reproduced from the Core Strategy SA Report.

² These regulations have since been updated and are now termed the *Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (SI490)*.

2. Proposed Changes to the LDD

Following an assessment of the representations received through the pre-submission consultation process, changes to some sites policies within the Site Allocations LDD have been proposed. The Proposed Changes have mainly resulted from the availability of additional baseline at a few sites provided through the consultation. This assessment of the proposed changes will be considered at the independent examination of the Site Allocations LDD. The Proposed Changes are detailed in Appendix 1.

3. Methodology

3.1

Introduction

The aim of this post-publication stage of the SA/SEA process is to determine whether there are likely to be any significant sustainability effects arising from the Proposed Changes to the Site Allocations LDD.

In order to do this it is necessary to identify whether any of the Proposed Changes to the LDD could result in changes to the original findings of the SA, as documented in the SA Report (November 2012), either through new significant sustainability effects being identified, or through originally identified significant effects no longer being considered likely.

The implications of the Proposed Changes on the findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment also need to be considered at this stage.

3.2

Screening methodology

Given that the the Proposed Changes are minor in nature, it is not proportionate to undertake a full assessment of all of the proposed modifications against the SA Framework. Therefore, a screening process has been undertaken which considers the nature of each of the Proposed Changes and determines whether it would be likely to result in a significant sustainability effect that would require an additional stage of sustainability appraisal to be undertaken.

The screening uses three levels of categorisation for the potential implications of each of the proposed modifications on the original sustainability appraisal as follows:

- No implications for the original findings of the SA (or HRA) and therefore no further consideration required;
- Implications (either positive or negative) for SA objectives but no update to SA findings required; or
- Modification requires an additional SA (or HRA) assessment.

3.3

Assessment methodology

Where the screening process identifies that a Proposed Changes requires an additional assessment this needs to be undertaken against the SA Objectives using the methodology utilised for all previous rounds of Sustainability Appraisal. Details of this methodology are provided in Section 6.1 of the Proposed Submission SA Report (November 2012). Where additional assessment is required, consideration should to be given to the wider implications that the changes will have on the findings of the previous sustainability appraisal.

4. Assessment Findings

4.1 Screening

The results of the screening process are detailed in Appendix 1 and are summarised as follows:

- 20 of the 24 Proposed Changes were judged as having potential implications for one or more of the sustainability appraisal objectives, but did not warrant a full assessment to be undertaken; and
- The remaining four Proposed Changes have no implications for the original findings of the SA.

4.2 Minor Implications

The screening process identified 20 Proposed Changes that are likely to help progress the achievement of certain SA Objectives but which did not warrant any further detailed assessment as no new significant adverse effects are likely to result from the changes. The SA Objectives that were identified to benefit from the Proposed Changes are as follows:

- SA1: Biodiversity;
- SA2: Water Resources;
- SA3: Flood risk; and
- SA4: Soil

A detailed note on the reason behind revision of the assessment rating since the Submission Version (November 2012) is provided in Appendix 1. It is to note that the assessment discussed in this report relates only to the Proposed Changes, and this addendum must be read in conjunction with the Submission Version Assessment (November 2012).

A summary of the revised ratings allocated to the sites where Proposed Changes apply is provided in Table 4.1.

Based on the revised policy wording, rating under four sites under the SA4 Soils objective has been upgraded to significant positive. The Proposed Changes at these sites require contamination risk assessment (and further remediation, if required) to be conducted; this requirement combined with the Development Management Policy 9: Contamination and Pollution will have a cumulative significant positive impact on improving the soil conditions at these sites with contamination potential from previous land-use.

The Proposed Changes were also found to support the Water objective (SA2) through stating measures that will help protect and enhance ground water quality. Minor positive rating has been allocated to 12 housing sites and 2 employment sites (where the previous round of assessment had allocated neutral or uncertain rating). Similarly the Proposed Changes will also support the Biodiversity

objective (SA 1) at eight housing sites and two employment sites. For this reason the rating under SA1 at these sites has been revised to minor positive (from either neutral or uncertain rating).

Table 4.1: Proposed Changes Assessment Summary Table

THEME	ENVIRONMENTAL							SOCIAL					ECONOMIC		
SEA Objective (abridged)	SA1- Biodiversity	SA 2&3- Water	SA4- Soils	SA 5&6- Climate change	SA7- Air Quality	SA8&9- Resource efficiency	SA10- Cultural Heritage	SA11- Landscape & Townscape	SA12- Health	SA13- Sustainable locations	SA14,15&16- Good quality Housing	SA17- Crime	SA18- Economic Growth	SA19- Fairer access to services	SA20- Revitalise Town centre
Policy/ Site name															
SA1: Housing Allocations	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	+
Kings Langley Employment Area H(3)	+	+	+	0	-	+	?	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+
Furtherfield Depot, Abbots Langley H(7)	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	+	0	-	+	0
Hill Farm Industrial Estate H(9)	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0
33 Baldwins Lane, Croxley Green H(12)	?	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	-	+	0
Killingdown Farm Buildings, Croxley Green H(13)	?	+	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	0	?	+	0
50-52, New Road, Croxley Green H(14)	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	-	+	0
Croxley Station Car park and Timber Yard H(16)	0	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	?	+
Garages rear of Drillyard, Rickmansworth H(19)	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0
Langwood House, Rickmansworth H(23)	?	?	+	0	0	0	?	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0
Gas works, Salter's Close H(24)	+	+	+	?	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	-	+	0
Bridge Motors, Rickmansworth H(25)	+	?	+	?	0	+	?	0	0	+	+	0	-	+	0
Depot, Harefield Road. Rickmansworth H(26)	+	+	+	?	0	+	?	0	0	+	+	0	-	+	0
Depot, Stockers Farm Road, Rickmansworth H(27)	+	+	+	?	-	+	?	0	0	-	?	0	-	-	0
Land south of Tolpits Lane H(28)	+	0	-	0	-	-	?	-	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Little Furze School H(33)	+	0	+	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	?	0
Grapevine Public House (H36)	+	0	+	0	0	+	?	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0
Land Rear of Foxgrove Path/ Heysham Drive (H37)	+	0	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	+	+	0	0	-	0
Site at Croxley Business Park E(a)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
Site at Tolpits Lane E(b)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0
Carpenders Park West/Delta Gain E(c)	-	+	+	0	?	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0
Maple Cross/Maple Lodge E(d)	+	+	+	0	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0

THEME	ENVIRONMENTAL							SOCIAL				ECONOMIC			
SEA Objective (abridged)	SA1- Biodiversity	SA 2&3- Water	SA4- Soils	SA 5&6- Climate change	SA7- Air Quality	SA8&9- Resource efficiency	SA10- Cultural Heritage	SA11- Landscape & Townscape	SA12- Health	SA13- Sustainable locations	SA14,15&16- Good quality Housing	SA17- Crime	SA18- Economic Growth	SA19- Fairer access to services	SA20- Revitalise Town centre
Policy/ Site name															
Kings Langley E (e)	+	+	+	0	?	+	?	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0
Mill End/Maple Cross/ Froghall Farm S(b)	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	++	0
South Oxhey R(b)	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	0

4.3 Links to Core Strategy and Development Management Policies LDD

To strengthen links with other LDD documents and to advance sustainability in practice, the assessment recommends cross-reference to specific Development Management Policies that need to be adhered to at each site, in addition to making a reference to the Core Strategy Policies and Development Management Policies (Paragraph 3.4 of Site Allocations LDD). The cross-reference suggested in the Table 4. 2 below may be included as a paragraph within Chapter 4: Housing Site Allocations.

Table 4.2: Recommended policy links to the Development Management DPD

DM Policy	Sites Allocation Reference
DM1: Residential Design and Layout	All Housing sites listed under Policy SA 1 and South Oxhey SA(6)
DM2: Green Belt	School site S(a) Mill End/Maple Cross – Land and SA(8) Maple Lodge Water Works east of A405/north of A412
DM3: The Historic Built Environment	All Housing sites listed under Policy SA 1, except H(9);SA(6) and Retail sites R (a) Rickmansworth
DM4: Carbon Dioxide Emissions and On site Renewable Energy	All allocated sites
DM6: Biodiversity, Trees, Woodland and Landscaping	All allocated sites
Attention to DM6(a)	H(12), H(16), H(28), E(a), E(b), E(d), E(e),S(d),S(b) and S(a); SA (7) Langleybury and The Grove
Attention to DM6(f)	H(11), S(b) and S(a)
DM7: Landscape Character	H(11), S(b), S(a) and S(d)
DM8: Flood Risk and Water Resources	All allocated sites
DM9: Contamination and Pollution Control	H(3), H(7), H(9), H(12), H(13), H(14), H(16), H(19), H(23), H(24), H(25), H(26), H(2), E(a), E(b), E(d), E(e), S(b) and S(d); SA(6)

DM Policy	Sites Allocation Reference
	and SA(8)
DM10: Waste Management	All allocated sites
DM11: Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities and Children's Play Space	H(37), H(36), H(31), H(20), S(b) and S(d); all Open Space Allocation sites; SA(6)
DM12: Community, Leisure and Cultural Facilities	H(10), H(15), H(21), H(33), H(34); SA(6)
DM13: Parking	All allocated sites

4.4 Habitats Regulations Assessment

The screening did not identify any Proposed Changes that would have implications for the original findings of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.

A slight revision to the distance from the Three Rivers Boundary to Burnham Beeches is to be noted as 7.8km as opposed to 9.5km as indicated in the Submission Version SA Report (November 2012).

The SA considers reference to Habitat Regulation 2010 (SI 490) and to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 should be explicitly stated in the introductory chapter or in the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development chapter of the Site Allocations LDD. This is to ensure that additional protection for European sites is provided within documents lower to the Core Strategy level.

5. Conclusion

None of the Proposed Changes to the Site Allocations LDD significantly alter the original findings of the SA Report (November 2012). However, as identified in Section 4, there are some of proposed minor modifications **Error! Reference source not found.** that will help progress towards the achievement of several of the SA Objectives. No proposed minor modifications were identified which if implemented would result in a movement away from achieving one or more SA objectives.

Additional baseline information that have now become available at sites where the changes are proposed are included in Appendix 2.

In addition there are no implications for the original conclusions of the HRA screening process.

To strengthen links with other LDD documents and to advance sustainability in practice, the assessment has suggested making explicit policy links between this LDD, the Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies LDD.

Appendix 1
Screening of Proposed Changes

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL's CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
All policies	<p>The following alterations are proposed:</p> <p>Amend Site H(3) Comments to 'Part of the site (north of Masters Yard) is identified as a wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey '.</p> <p>Amend Site H(24) Comments to 'Site near to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey '.</p> <p>Amend Site H(26) Comments to 'Site near to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey '.</p> <p>Amend Site H(27) Comments to 'Site near to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey '.</p> <p>Amend Site H(33) Comments to 'Site adjacent to wildlife site.</p>	<p>At Sites H(3), H(24), H(26), H(27), H(33), H(36) and H(37) the previous rating have been revised to minor positive under the SA1 Biodiversity SA Objective, on the basis that the policy now explicitly requires developers to consider biodiversity enhancement which may help reduce any negative impact on the wildlife site in the vicinity.</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
	<p>Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p> <p>Amend Site H(36) Comments to 'Site adjacent to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p> <p>Amend Site H(37) Comments to 'Site adjacent to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p> <p>Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy states that all development should take into the account the need to minimise flood risk through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p>	

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
<p>Site H(3) Kings Langley Employment Area</p>	<p>The following alterations to the Comments section are proposed:</p> <p>Deletion of '<u>Part of site is within floodzone. Flood Risk assessment would be required to support planning applications on the site</u>'.</p> <p>Inclusion of '<u>A number of waste sites are located to the north of the site. Parts of the site are in Source Protection Zones 1 and 2. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.</u>'</p> <p>Amendment to 'Part of the site (north of Masters Yard) is identified as a wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey '.</p>	<p>Further to updated baseline becoming available in November 2012, the site is no longer considered to be within flood zones therefore risk of flooding at the site is neutral.</p> <p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive' and the 'minor positive' rating allocated against SA4 Soils Objective remains unaltered, however it is acknowledged that this policy amendment will help maintain or enhance the soil quality at site. .</p> <p>Policy wording will help achieve the biodiversity objective SA1, therefore revision of current 'uncertain' impact rating</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
		to 'minor positive' effect is made.
Site H(7) Furtherfield Depot, Furtherfield, Abbots Langley	The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: <u>'The site lies within Source Protection Zone 2. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u>	The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'. The site redevelopment will present an opportunity to improve the soil condition on

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
		<p>this potentially contaminated site (due to history of depot landuse). The policy revision will provide further support towards achieving the SA4 Soil objective. For this reason a significant positive rating is allocated.</p>
<p>Site H(9) Hill Farm Industrial Estate, Hill Farm Avenue, Leavesden</p>	<p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: <u>'The site lies within Source Protection Zone 3. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u></p>	<p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>A significant positive rating has already allocated been allocated to SA4 Soil Objective in the previous round of the assessment, therefore no revision has been made in this report.</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
<p>Site H(12) 33 Baldwins Lane, Croxley Green</p>	<p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: <u>'The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u></p>	<p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>The 'minor positive' rating allocated against SA4 Soils Objective remains unaltered, however it is acknowledged that this policy amendment will help maintain or enhance the soil quality at site</p>
<p>Site H(13) Killingdown Farm Buildings, Croxley Green</p>	<p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: <u>'The site lies within Source Protection Zone 2. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u></p>	<p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>Although the policy word revision will help</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
		contamination remediation, if any exists, the assessment retains the 'significant negative' rating' as the proposal will result in loss of Grade2 Agricultural soil.
Site H(14) 50-52 New Road, Croxley Green	The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: <u>'The whole site is located above a principal aquifer (chalk), which is highly sensitive to contamination. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u>	<p>The policy change takes a precautionary approach to prevent contamination of the ground water sources (within the Chalk), thus supporting the SA2 Water Objective. For this reason, the rating has been revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>Rating under SA4 Soils objective remains unaltered at 'minor positive', however it is acknowledged that the policy amendment will provide stronger support to achieve the objective.</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
Site H(16) Croxley Station Car Park and Timber Yard	The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: ' <u>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.</u> '	<p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk (from previous use of mechanics and fuel use) which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA4 Soils Objective is revised from 'minor positive' to 'significant positive' rating.</p> <p>Rating under SA2 & 3 column should be split to acknowledge the 'minor positive' effect the policy revision will have on the water quality, but uncertainty relating to flood risk remains and can be addressed at the detailed design stage when results of the Flood Risk Assessment will become available.</p>
Site H(19) Garages Rear of Drillyard, West Way, Rickmansworth	The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: ' <u>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 3. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning</u>	The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
	<p><u>applications on the site.'</u></p>	<p>revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>Rating under SA4 Soils objective remains unaltered at 'minor positive' however it is acknowledged that the policy amendment will provide stronger support to achieve the objective.</p>
<p>Site H(23) Langwood House, High Street, Rickmansworth</p>	<p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: '<u>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u></p> <p>The Comments section states that a: 'Flood risk assessment would be required to support planning applications on the site.' No further detail is considered necessary.</p>	<p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources.</p> <p>Rating under SA2 & 3 column should be split to acknowledge the 'minor positive' effect the policy revision will have on the water quality, but uncertainty relating to flood risk remains and can be addressed at the detailed design stage when results of the Flood Risk Assessment will become</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
		<p>available.</p> <p>Rating under SA4 Soils objective remains unaltered at 'minor positive', however it is acknowledged that the policy amendment will provide stronger support to achieve the objective.</p>
<p>Gas works, Salter's Close H(24)</p>	<p>Amend Site H(24) Comments to 'Site includes area of wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p> <p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence:</p> <p><u>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on</u></p>	<p>Policy word change will help protect and enhance biodiversity features within and around the site, thus supporting SA1 Biodiversity Objective. The assessment rating is therefore revised from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
	<p>the site</p>	<p>revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>A 'significant positive' rating under SA4 Soils objective has already been allocated for this site policy, therefore no change has been proposed.</p>
<p>Bridge Motors, Rickmansworth H(25)</p>	<p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence:</p> <p>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.</p>	<p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive'. The assessment is indicated as split as the uncertainty relating to risk of flooding can be addressed only with the detailed design information at a later stage.</p> <p>Rating under SA4 Soils objective remains unaltered at 'minor positive', however it is acknowledged that the policy amendment</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
		will provide stronger support to achieve the objective.
Site H(26) Depot, Harefield Road, Rickmansworth	<p>Amend Site H(26) Comments to 'Site includes area of wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p> <p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence:</p> <p><u>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.</u></p>	<p>Policy word change will help protect and enhance biodiversity features within and around the site, thus supporting SA1 Biodiversity Objective. The assessment rating is therefore revised from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk (at a site with history of potential contamination from depot use) which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive' and the rating under SA4 Soils Objective is revised from 'minor positive' to 'significant positive' rating.</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
<p>Site H(27) Depot, Stockers Farm Road, Rickmansworth</p>	<p>Amend Site H(27) Comments to 'Site includes area of wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p> <p>Amend the comments section of site H(27) to read 'Part of site within a wildlife site' and add comment to enhance biodiversity features at the site.</p> <p>The Comments section to be amended to include the following sentence: <u>'The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u></p>	<p>Policy word change will help protect and enhance biodiversity features within and around the site, thus supporting SA1 Biodiversity Objective. The assessment rating is therefore revised from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>The policy change places emphasis on identifying and addressing contamination risk (at a site with history of potential contamination from depot use) which is likely to benefit both soils and ground water resources. For this reason, the rating under SA2 Water Objective is revised from 'neutral' to 'minor positive' and the rating under SA4 Soils Objective is revised from 'minor positive' to 'significant positive'</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
		rating.
Site H(28) Land South of Tolpits Lane	<p>Site boundary amended to exclude Little Tolpits Cottage.</p> <p>Amend Site H(28) Comments to 'Site includes area of wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p>	<p>Revision to the rating under SA1 Biodiversity objective from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive' effect as the policy wording now will require developers to protect and enhance biodiversity within and around the wildlife site (within the site boundary).</p> <p>No other change to the assessment rating is proposed.</p>
Little Furze School H(33)	<p>Amend Site H(33) Comments to 'Site adjacent to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.</p>	<p>Revision to the rating under SA1 Biodiversity objective from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive' effect as the policy wording now will require developers to protect and enhance biodiversity within and around the wildlife site (within the site boundary).</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
Grapevine Public House (H36)	Amend Site H(36) Comments to 'Site adjacent to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.	Revision to the rating under SA1 Biodiversity objective from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive' effect as the policy wording now will require developers to protect and enhance biodiversity within and around the wildlife site (within the site boundary).
Land Rear of Foxgrove Path/ Heysham Drive (H37)	Amend Site H(37) Comments to 'Site adjacent to wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts <u>and enhance biodiversity</u> will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey'.	Revision to the rating under SA1 Biodiversity objective from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive' effect as the policy wording now will require developers to protect and enhance biodiversity within and around the wildlife site (within the site boundary).

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
<p>Site E(a) Croxley Business Park</p>	<p>Added the following comments:</p> <p><u>Part of zone is within a floodzone. Flood Risk assessment would be required to support planning applications on the site.</u></p> <p><u>Adjacent to a SSSI and a Local Nature Reserve. Measures to avoid adverse impacts and to enhance biodiversity will need to be provided by developers, applications would need to be supported by an adequate ecological survey.</u></p> <p><u>Minimum of 8m buffer must be provided to ditch on site.</u></p> <p><u>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.</u></p> <p>'Allocation for employment' to be removed from the Comments section.</p>	<p>The site has already been developed but allocated for employment use through the document. The assessment considers against most environmental receptors the impact remains neutral. For this reason no revision to the current allocated assessment rating.</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
Site E(b) Tolpits Lane	<p>Allocation for employment' to be removed from the Comments section.</p> <p>Included the following new comments:</p> <p><u>Adjacent to a SSSI and Local Nature Reserve. Measures to avoid adverse impacts and to enhance biodiversity will need to be provided by developers; applications would need to be supported by an adequate ecological survey.</u></p> <p><u>Groundwater protection zone.</u></p>	<p>The site has already been developed but allocated for employment use through the document. The assessment considers against most environmental receptors the impact remains neutral. For this reason no revision to the current allocated assessment rating.</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
Site E(c) Carpenders Park West/Delta Gain	<p>The Comments section to be updated to include: <u>'Part of site is within a floodzone. Flood risk assessment would be required to support planning applications on the site.'</u></p> <p><u>Minimum 8m buffer must be provided to river on site.'</u></p> <p>'Allocation for employment' to be removed from the Comments section.</p>	<p>The site has already been developed but allocated for employment use through the document. However taking into account future proposals at the site, the policy revision will support SA3 Flood Risk objective. For this reason the current rating under SA3 is revised from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive'.</p>
Site E(d) Maple Cross/Maple Lodge	<p>Allocation for employment' to be removed from the Comments section.</p> <p>New comments included:</p> <p><u>Part of site is within a floodzone. Flood risk assessment would be required to support planning applications on the site.</u></p>	<p>The site has already been developed but allocated for employment use through the document. However taking into account future proposals at the site, rating under SA1 Biodiversity objective revised from 'minor negative' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>Rating under SA2 Water and SA3 Flood</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
	<p><u>Minimum 8m buffer must be provided to ditch on site.</u></p> <p><u>Part of the site is adjacent to a wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts and to enhance biodiversity will need to be provided by developers; applications would need to be supported by an adequate ecological survey.</u></p> <p><u>The site lies within Source Protection Zone 1. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site.</u></p>	<p>Risk objective revised from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive' as the policy wording revision addresses issues relating to ground water pollution and flood risk management.</p>
<p>Site E (e) Kings Langley Employment Area</p>	<p>Following comments have been added:</p> <p><u>Individual employment sites within the broad area have not been specifically identified.</u></p> <p><u>Minimum 8m buffer must be provided to River Gade.</u></p> <p><u>Part of the site (north of Masters Yard) is identified as a wildlife site. Measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance biodiversity will need to be provided by developers, supported by adequate ecological survey.</u></p>	<p>Rating under SA1 Biodiversity objective revised from 'minor negative' to 'minor positive'.</p> <p>Rating under SA2 Water and SA3 Flood Risk objective revised from 'uncertain' to 'minor positive' as the policy wording revision addresses issues relating to ground water pollution and flood risk</p>

POLICY REFERENCE	COUNCIL'S CHANGES TO POLICY WORDINGS AS A RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION COMMENTS	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMMENTARY (JUNE 2013)
	<p><u>A number of waste sites are located to the north of the site. Parts of the site are in Source Protection Zones 1 and 2. A preliminary risk assessment to determine whether there is contamination of the site and whether further remediation works will need to be undertaken would be required to support planning applications on the site</u></p> <p>Allocation for mixed use' to be removed from the Comments section.</p>	<p>management.</p> <p>Rating under SA4 Soils objective remains unaltered at 'minor positive', however it is acknowledged that the policy amendment will provide stronger support to achieve the objective.</p>
<p>Site S(b) Mill End/Maple Cross – Frogghall Farm and adjoining land</p>	<p>Included following comment:</p> <p><u>Minimum of 8m buffer must be provided to watercourses on site.</u></p>	<p>The requirement to include a buffer will help reduce the risk of flooding, however the policies already include measures to address potential risk from flooding. For this reason, no change to the allocated rating has been proposed.</p>
<p>Site R(b) South Oxhey</p>	<p>Amend land use plan legend on page 66 to "Mixed Use: Community, retail, <u>supporting services</u> and offices with residential above" and "key active frontages for retail, <u>supporting services</u> and community uses".</p>	<p>No change to the allocated rating.</p>

Appendix 2

Proposed Changes Sites: Revised Baseline

(replaces specific sites information included in Appendix 2a of Submission Version SA, November 2012.

Amendment is indicated in red font)

Residential Allocations

Kings Langley Employment Area- H3

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Conservation area within 500m but dense development between
Listed buildings	Some listed buildings within identified site boundary, but not for redevelopment
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	None
AQMA	AQMA on M25 within 200m of south of site, but not on site
Wildlife site	Part of site (north of Master's Yard) is identified as a wildlife site.
SSSI/SAC/LNR	None
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within site boundary
Primary school within 600m	Not within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Yes
Convenience retail-proximity	Within walking distance

Town Centre within 2000m	Kings Langley village centre within walking distance
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Yes
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, play space, and community facilities e.g. Hall and library within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	Railway to east and canal to west, bridges to connect to Kings Langley and Bedmond
Proximity to community facilities	Within walking distance
Proximity to health facilities	Within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Railway so possible vibration and noise issues. Some problems of lorries using existing roads to access current industrial uses
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Residential, employment and mixed uses
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good access to rail network and bus service, and good connection to road network. Parts of site have access to amenities in Kings Langley
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	No
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Possible contamination from industrial uses. Site is located adjacent to a historic landfill site and lies within Source Protection Zone 2, therefore the risk of contaminating ground water cannot be ruled out from future construction at this site. A Preliminary Risk Assessment to the water resources may be required.
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Furtherfield Depot, Abbots Langley-H7

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Within 500m but dense development between
Listed buildings	Within 500m but dense development between
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	None
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within walking distance
SSSI/SAC/LNR	None
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within 1800m
Primary school within 600m	Within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Yes
Convenience retail-proximity	Within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Village centre within walking distance
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Not within 1000m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, schools, church and halls within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	None

Proximity to community facilities	Within walking distance
Proximity to health facilities	Within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	None
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Adjacent to residential
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Access to primary school and some local facilities. Good connection to road network and bus service
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	Yes
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Possible contamination from previous use as a depot; site located in SPZ 2
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	None
Listed buildings	None
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	No
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	No
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within walking distance
SSSI/SAC/LNR	None, but close to Greenbelt
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Adjacent to Leavesden Park
Primary school within 600m	Within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Yes
Convenience retail-proximity	Not within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Village centre within 2000m; proximity better to Watford Town centre
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Not within 1000m
Amenity space-proximity	Not within walking distance in Three Rivers, but may be in Watford (eastern side of the site)
Greenspace- proximity	within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	None
Proximity to community facilities	Not within walking distance

Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Not a congestion hotspot
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Close to mixed use
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good road links, closer to greenspaces; but not many amenities/facilities. Perhaps good for employment, with some improvements (amenities) good for residential
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	Part of the site is within the greenbelt
Allotments	No
Public open space	Greenspaces, but no public open space
Contaminated land	Possible; site located within SPZ3
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	None
Listed buildings	Within 400m
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	None
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within walking distance
SSSI/SAC/LNR	SSSI and LNR within 800m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within 500m
Primary school within 600m	Within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Yes
Convenience retail-proximity	Local shops within 100m
Town Centre within 2000m	Not within 2000m
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Within 1000m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, children's play, church and halls and primary school within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	Railway to north east but viaduct
Proximity to community facilities	Not within walking distance

Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Adjacent to A 412 identified as a congestion hotspot; noise and vibration issue possible
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Residential, retail
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Well connected to road and rail; good bus service and retail facilities. Primary school severed by the railway line and no health facility within walking distance
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	No
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Unknown, but site within SPZ 1
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens -proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Part of site within conservation area
Listed buildings	Listed buildings on site
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	None
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	On site
SSSI/SAC/LNR	SSSI within 1000m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within 2000m
Primary school within 600m	Within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Within 1500m
Convenience retail-proximity	Local shops within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Not within 2000m
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Not within 1000m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, children's play, school, within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Adjacent
Major access constraints-severance etc	None
Proximity to community facilities	None within walking distance

Proximity to health facilities	Within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Local congestion, but no noise issues
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Edge of residential development, but area not recorded for crime occurrence
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good road links and bus service; good access to education facilities; access to health facilities. Part of the site within conservation area, however the rest is viable for residential development. Site put forward for development
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	Greenfield
Green Belt	Yes
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Unknown; site within SPZ2
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Within 400m
Listed buildings	Within 400m
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	None
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within walking distance
SSSI/SAC/LNR	LNR within 400m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within 1800m
Primary school within 600m	Within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Within 1600m
Convenience retail-proximity	Local centre within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Yes
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Within 900m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, play space, schools and community halls within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Adjacent
Major access constraints-severance etc	None
Proximity to community facilities	Within walking distance

Proximity to health facilities	Within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Not a congestion hotspot, no noise issue
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Within residential development
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good transport links and access to community facilities/ amenities
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	No
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Unknown; within SPZ3
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Site in conservation area
Listed buildings	Within 100m but development between
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	Less than 10% in Zone 2
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within walking distance
SSSI/SAC/LNR	SSSI within 1200m, LNR within 500m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within 1800m
Primary school within 600m	Within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Within walking distance
Convenience retail-proximity	Within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Within walking distance
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Within 500m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, primary school, library and community facilities within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	None
Proximity to community facilities	Within walking distance

Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	No congestion/ noise issues
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	On a High Street, adjacent residential
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Proximity to public transport and good transport links- within Town Centre, therefore viable
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	No
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Unknown; within SPZ1
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Within 200m, development between
Listed buildings	Within 200m, development between
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	Within flood zone 2 and adjacent to zone 3b
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within 100m
SSSI/SAC/LNR	SSSI within 900m, LNR within 700m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within 1500m
Primary school within 600m	Within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Within 300m
Convenience retail-proximity	Within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Within walking distance
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Within 700m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, schools and community facilities within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Adjacent
Major access constraints-severance etc	None
Proximity to community facilities	Within walking distance

Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Local congestion
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Adjacent to residential but not recorded for crime
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good access and amenities, community facilities
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	No
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Possible contamination from use as Gas Station; within SPZ1
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Bridge Motors, Church Street, Rickmansworth- H25

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens -proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Site in conservation area
Listed buildings	Adjacent
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	About 50% of the site is within flood zone 3a and some parts within zone 2 and rest in zone 1 for surface flooding and high risk for ground water flooding
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within walking distance
SSSI/SAC/LNR	LNR within 400m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within 1800m
Primary school within 600m	Not within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Within walking distance
Convenience retail-proximity	Within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Within walking distance
Bus route	Within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Within 600m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, play space church and hall within walking distance
Greenspace- proximity	Within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	None

Proximity to community facilities	Within walking distance
Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	No congestion/ noise issues
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Within residential area
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good transport links; proximity to the town centre and amenities
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	No
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Possible contamination as a result of petrol station use; within SPZ1
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Depot, Harfield Road- H26

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens-proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Within 200m
Listed buildings	Adjacent
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	Within flood zone 2
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Within walking distance
SSSI/SAC/LNR	LNR within 100m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Yes
Primary school within 600m	Not within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Within 800m
Convenience retail-proximity	Adjacent
Town Centre within 2000m	Yes
Bus route	Not within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	Yes
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace, but no other community facilities
Greenspace- proximity	Adjacent
Major access constraints-severance etc	Grand Union canal and River Gade to north , but no severance from Rickmansworth

Proximity to community facilities	Not within walking distance
Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	No congestion/ noise issues
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Good proximity to residential and retail
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good links to amenities, public transport(rail); limited community facilities
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	PDL
Green Belt	No
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Possible contamination from use as a depot; within SPZ 1
Topographical constraints	None perceived

Depot, Stockers Farm Road- H27

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic parks and gardens -proximity	None
Local preservation/ conservation area	Within 300m
Listed buildings	Within 300m
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	Partly within Zone 2
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Some within site boundary
SSSI/SAC/LNR	LNR within 200m
Ancient woodland	None
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Not within 2000m
Primary school within 600m	Not within walking distance
Secondary school within 2000m	Within 1200m
Convenience retail-proximity	Within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	Yes
Bus route	Not within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	At 1000m
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace and primary school within walking distance, other community facilities limited
Greenspace- proximity	Within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	Canal and river to north, bridges to access Rickmansworth

Proximity to community facilities	Not within walking distance
Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	No congestion or noise issue
Other social aspects	No reports of social issues
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Adjacent to residential, no record of social deprivation or crime incidence
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Good transport and amenities; close to Rickmansworth Town Centre. Limited public transport
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	Part PDL, part greenfield
Green Belt	Yes
Allotments	No
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space
Contaminated land	Unknown; within SPZ1
Topographical constraints	None perceived

ISSUE: EMPLOYMENT SITES

Site E(a) Croxley Business Park

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	Adjacent to SSSI and river valley.
Scheduled Ancient Monument	None
Historic Parks & Gardens-proximity	Moor Park Registered Park adjacent to the site
Local preservation/ conservation area	Moor Park Conservation area adjacent to the site.
Listed buildings	None
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	Flood zones 2 and 3(part)
AQMA	No
Wildlife site	None
SSSI/SAC/LNR	SSSI/ LNR immediately to the west of the site
Ancient woodland	Ancient woodland within 1000m to west of site.
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Designated employment area; Tolpits Lane to the north
Bus route	Not within walking distance
Rail station within 1000m	No
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace within walking distance, but no community facilities
Greenspace- proximity	Greenspace within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	Disused railway track to the south west of the site
Proximity to community facilities	Not within walking distance
Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	No congestion hotspot

Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Demand for employment floorspace exists, therefore considered viable, but may be improved with access to public transport
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	Brownfield
Green Belt- proximity	Surrounded by Green Belt
Allotments	None
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space.
Contaminated land	Unknown, employment uses on site; within SPZ1
Topographical constraints?	None perceived.

Site E(b) Tolpits Lane

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	Adjacent to SSSI and river valley.
Scheduled Ancient Monument	SAM 300m to south of site.
Historic Parks & Gardens-proximity	Moor Park Registered Park 700m to south of site
Local preservation/ conservation area	Moor Park Conservation area 600m to south of site.
Listed buildings	Listed buildings on south side of Tolpits Lane.
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	None.
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	Flood zone adjacent to north and south but not on site.
AQMA	None
Wildlife site	Wildlife sites to south and west of site.
SSSI/SAC/LNR	SSSI/ LNR immediately to the north of the site.
Ancient woodland	Ancient woodland within 1000m to north west of site.
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Designated employment area. Croxley Business Park 200m to north.
Bus route	Not within walking distance.
Rail station within 1000m	No.
Amenity space-proximity	Greenspace within walking distance, but no community facilities
Greenspace- proximity	Greenspace within walking distance
Major access constraints-severance etc	Railway to west and river to south.
Proximity to community facilities	Not within walking distance.
Proximity to health facilities	Not within walking distance.
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Not an identified congestion area, but roads used by lorries etc for industrial purposes, and access constraint likely due to severance from railway line and

	water bodies
Economic aspects	
Viability- proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Already in viable use as employment land.
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	Brownfield.
Green Belt- proximity	Surrounded by Green Belt.
Allotments	None.
Public open space	Close to publicly accessed greenspaces; no civic space.
Contaminated land	Unknown, but previous employment uses on site; <i>within SPZ</i>
Topographical constraints	None perceived.

Site E(e) Maple Cross

Environmental factors	
Effect on important views	None
SAM	None
Historic Parks & Gardens-proximity	None within 1000m
Local preservation/ conservation area	None adjacent or in the immediate vicinity
Listed buildings	Close to the site
Landscape classification (AGLV/ AONB)	No designation
Flood Zone-2, 3a or 3b	Zone 2
AQMA	No
Wildlife site	Yes, near the site
SSSI/SAC/LNR	No
Ancient woodland	No
Accessibility/ key services	
Employment area within 2000m	Within walking distance
Primary school within 600m	None within 1000m
Secondary school within 2000m	None within 1000m
Convenience retail-proximity	None within walking distance
Town Centre within 2000m	None within walking distance
Bus route	Within walking distance- max 30min waiting time
Rail station within 1000m	Not within walking distance
Amenity space-proximity	Play spaces within walking distance, but no community facilities within 1000m
Greenspace- proximity	Play space available
Major access constraints-severance	Adjacent to A road, potentially causing severance to the west; eastern side wooded/greenspace -no major

	development
Proximity to community facilities	Not within 1000m
Proximity to health facilities	Not within 1000m
Congestion/ pollution (noise, air) possibility	Next to 'A' road, congestion hotspot on slip road leading to M25
Other social aspects	Maple Cross and Mill End Ward- socially deprived areas
Proximity to other built development (crime)	Few residential sites adjacent, however severed by A road and close to employment sites
Economic aspects	
Viability - proximity to transport links; proximity to facilities and community amenities	Proximity to a major road and served by bus route is a positive in terms of connectivity, therefore saleable
Land uses	
Greenfield/Brownfield site	Greenfield/ brownfield
Green Belt	Yes
Allotments	Not an allotment
Public open space	Yes- recreation ground adjacent
Contaminated land	Likely from previous use; within SPZ1
Topographical constraints	None known

