

8. CHAPTER 8: LANDSCAPE, BIODIVERSITY AND HISTORIC HERITAGE

8.1 Landscape

Three quarters of all respondents, (75.3%), reported that they agreed with the Council's suggested approach for Landscape Character Assessment Areas. Only 6 people, (2.4%), disagreed and 22.4% did not express an opinion. One respondent did not give a reason for disagreement, but the reasons given by other respondents who disagreed are shown below.

- **Question 66: Landscape Character Assessment Areas**
- *Avoid building estates at all cost*
- *If the areas are of sufficient nature to amount. Also designation then the guidance should be of primary not supplementary importance.*
- *Just leave it alone*
- *Stop wasting money and time changing what we have, utilise what we already have and improve our area/services*
- *Too easy to overlook if taken do supplementary*

13.7% of respondents said that there were parts of the Borough that they would wish the Council to consider for local landscape conservation designation.

- **Question 67: Landscape Conservation Designation**
- *All existing green belt land!*
- *Allotment areas*
- *Apsley*
- *Area alongside canal from H.H to Berkhamsted, wonderful nature conservation area and needs to be protected*
- *Ashlyns school grounds, especially the perimeter- to include TPO's on all trees*
- *Blumers Park*
- *Boxmoor, around the canal*
- *Boxmoor, Gade Valley, Bulbourne river flood plan to prevent development*
- *Business Park, Nature reserves, Huts and Wildlife Trust*
- *Chiltern Area of outstanding natural beauty*
- *Conserve our current landscape and no more building upon it*
- *Either side of A41 bypass to depth of 300 meter*
- *Felden, chalk landscape, harebells, bluebell woods, orchids*
- *Is Frithsden- vineyard and woods included in the plan?*
- *Kingsfield, Roughton common, Box Lane golf course*
- *Land west of Durrants and Bell Lane, they give pleasure to local walkers*
- *Maintain all path areas Gadebridge, Grovehill, Coronation Fields, Warners End Valley.*
- *Marchant fields, Grove Hill Park. To retain the open character of the area and limit the spread of residential housing*
- *Site by site by local management team*
- *St Marys behind Herbert Street*
- *The Convent, Woodland Avenue*
- *The Farms area south of Kings Langley Bunkers Lane area, open fields & canal areas south of Kings Langley*
- *The fields/wood either side - show the separation of Bovington from Hemel very well*
- *The land off Cupid Green Lane, and fields bridge paths - badger sets, wild life deer.*
- *The woods on Gravel Lane, Warners End Road*
- *Tring Park*
- *Tring. It has had enough infill land used recently, cramming residential sites in anywhere no green belt land should be used around Tring.*
- *Water gardens + into town river area need to be more up market*

Other sites that the Council should consider as regionally important geological or geomorphic sites are shown below.

- **Question 68: Important Geological and Geomorphic Sites**
- All green belt land
- Don't forget the puddingstone that was built over at St Johns Church when the road was improved
- Feldon and Roughdown Featherfield Lane chalk downland rare habitats.
- Land west of Durrants and Bell Lane, they give pleasure to local walkers
- Littleheath & Rockheath wood
- Pudding Stones at water end between red lion pub and river bridge
- Roughdown common was important but that has gone does the Council listen?
- The Langleys Area, Chippon Field, Water End and all rural parts of borough, keep their priority outlook and heritage as they are
- Trust land

8.2 Biodiversity

The large majority of respondents, (80.8%), agreed with the Council's proposed approach to Wildlife Sites, (by identifying them on the Proposals Map). Only six people, (2.4%), said that they disagreed with this and 16.9% did not respond to the question.

12.5% of respondents, (32 people) said that there were other areas of Ancient Woodland that they would wish the Council to consider protecting.

- **Question 70: Other areas of Ancient Woodland**
- All woodlands should be protected x 7
- Any designated by the woodland trust that are not on the boroughs current list
- Ashbridge
- Blue Bell Woods, war memorial, trees need maintaining
- Bluebell House, Ivanhoe
- Bunkers Lane
- Bury Wood
- Chipperfield Common
- Chipperfield Common, Kings Langley Common, Boxmoor
- Frithsden woodland on 'Roman Road'. Former convent of St Mary Woodland Ave
- Grove Hill woods (Between Hunting Gate and Marlborough Rise)
- Hunting gate - please clear this area of rubbish
- If only many are currently covered- All should be.
- Long Green Berkhamsted + land adjacent to A41
- Rant Meadow woods in Hemel Hempstead
- Scrub Hill common
- The bluebell woods on Galley Hill, Gadebridge
- The Convent, Woodlands Avenue
- The majority of the existing
- The nicky line and Holtmere End, Dodds Lane
- The verges along Shooters Way bordering the A41
- The wood area of North Church Common above new road
- Tring Park
- Up Galley Hill on the right
- Woodlands adjacent to Hockbridge Bottom from A41 Bypass down to county boundary
- Woods near Swallowdale roundabout

8.3 Historic Heritage Designations

Ten respondents suggested other sites that they would wish to put forward for consideration as areas of Archaeological Significance. These are shown below.

- **Question 70: Areas of Archaeological Significance**
- *Fenced off area top of Queensway by roundabout what is it?*
- *Gadebridge path, walled garden*
- *Marlin Chapel on Rossway*
- *Randall Park*
- *Roman Villa - Gadebridge*
- *The land off Cupid Green Lane, Holtsmere, March nut farm and fields*
- *The old Palace area and surrounding fields in King Langley should remain as is, no building/alterations to this area. Due to its heritage, age and condition they are all important*
- *The Sappi Nash Mills site is original paper mill in the valley which was the cradle of mechanised paper making in the world, linked to Markets Hill school.*
- *Too late, two of the finest building have been demolished, Sunley and Mcalpine*
- *Would the new sites found on widening of M1 2006/2007 be included?*

Very few respondents noted any of the listed parks and gardens for NOT being identified on the Proposals Map for their importance to the landscape and local history.

		Cases	Col Response %
Q72 Which should NOT be identified on the Proposals Map?	Beechwood House, near Markyate	10	3.9%
	Chipperfield Manor	9	3.5%
	Cheverells, Markyate	8	3.1%
	Rossway, south of Berkhamsted	8	3.1%
	Gaddesden Place	7	2.7%
	Abbotts Hill, Kings Langley	9	3.5%
	Westbrook Hay, near Hemel Hempstead	8	3.1%
	Shendish Manor, near Hemel Hempstead	10	3.9%
	Gadebridge Park	8	3.1%
	Champneys, near Wigginton	13	5.1%
	Amersfort, Potten End	1	.4%
	The Golden Parsonage, Bridens Camp near HH	1	.4%
	Haresfoot, south of Berkhamsted	3	1.2%
	(not given)	223	87.5%

Only one in the list, Champneys near Wigginton, was mentioned by more than 5% of respondents, (5.1%).

Although ten respondents felt that there were other parks and gardens of importance they would like the Council to consider for inclusion within the

policy only seven respondents itemised specific parks or areas. Those nominated are shown below.

- **Question 73: Other Parks and Gardens**
- *College lake nature reserve Tring*
- *Markyate*
- *Rudolf Steiner Grounds*
- *The watergardens designed by famous garden designer who made it possible for humans and wildlife to co-exist. A town centre, a first.*
- *Tring Park*
- *Tring Park, St Marys church yard, St John Boxmoor churchyard and gardens, Leverstock green parish, Little Gaddesden village houses*
- *Water Gardens, Hemel Hempstead*

8.4 The Grand Union Canal

Over a third of all respondents, (35.7%), said that there were specific sites or facilities that they would wish the Council to consider safeguarding. 37.6% said that there were not and 26.7% failed to answer the question. (Respondents were not invited on the questionnaire to identify these sites).

9. CHAPTER 9: DESIGN

Finally, the majority of respondents (62%) agreed that the Council should design areas in towns and large villages as recommended in the Urban Design Assessment. Only 7.5% disagreed and 30.6% failed to answer the question.

Those respondents who agreed this were asked if there were any changes they would like the Council to consider to the boundaries of the urban design areas that are recommended in the Urban Design Assessment. The responses to this question are shown below.

Question 76: Changes to boundaries of urban design areas

- *Avoid Green Belt if possible*
- *Infrastructure capability, traffic flow/parking, localised mix com/ residents, fit with plan strategies*
- *Remove BE/H2, BE/H8, BE/H9, BE/T2*
- *Site by site appraisal*
- *Where necessary*