

HERTSMERE REVISED CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION

Hearings Programme, Matters and Issues

Revised 30 April 2012

The Hearings Programme is regularly updated. Please ensure you check the latest position if you wish to attend a particular hearing by contacting the Programme Officer or viewing it on the website at www.hertsmere.gov.uk/planning/hertsmere-local-development-framework/CSEiP.jsp

Please remind yourself of the guidance concerning the format of hearings at this Examination, contained in the Inspector's Preliminary Advice Note.

Contact details for the Programme Officer

Carmel Edwards
Programme.officer@hertsmere.gov.uk
07969 631930

REVISED CORE STRATEGY (RCS) EXAMINATION **Hearings Programme, Matters and Issues**

Note 1: It is implicit that in answering the following questions, if respondents identify a deficiency in the RCS, they should make clear how it should be resolved.

Note 2: Policy references in brackets are to the principal policies but other sections of the RCS may also be relevant.

Note 3: Where representations have been made on a number of linked topics or issues in the DPD, in the interests of efficiency participants at the hearings are encouraged to attend the session that is most relevant to their concerns; this will not prejudice opportunities for these concerns to be considered as a whole.

Tuesday 1 May (10am)

Matter 1 – Overall Strategy and Housing Provision (RCS generally, Policies CS1, CS3, CS22)

Issues

- 1.1 Is the RCS consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the East of England Plan (while it remains part of the development plan)? Has the evidence base for the East of England Plan been appropriately taken into account in preparation of the RCS?
- 1.2 In general, is the RCS based on a sound assessment of the socio-economic and environmental characteristics of the borough and its relationship with adjacent areas? Does it take proper account of the strategies and plans for those areas? Has the duty to co-operate been satisfied?
- 1.3 Is there a sound basis for the overall housing target? In particular, is it based on robust assessments of local need and demand, the implications for affordable housing supply, economic growth and other relevant factors? Is it clear how the target figure in the RCS has been selected? In summary, is the RCS consistent with national policy for housing provision?
- 1.4 Is the overall housing target deliverable? Is there adequate justification for the supply that is expected from existing commitments and identified sites in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment? Is the assumed windfalls contribution soundly based? Is there sufficient evidence that the supply expectations are consistent with the need to protect employment land expressed in the RCS?
- 1.5 Is the reliance on the Elstree Way Corridor for housing supply in the plan period justified? Has it been given appropriate priority in the RCS and is the policy area clearly identified? What is the current timescale for adoption of the AAP? Does the reference in Policy CS22 to the Elstree Way Supplementary Planning Guidance give reasonably clear guidance for development in the interim period? What is the status of the Feasibility Study (2011)?

- 1.6 Is the proposed phasing of housing supply (Policy CS3) justified and likely to be effective?

Participants

Hertsmere Borough Council [x 2]
Drummond Robson (4029)
Drivers Jonas Deloitte *for* Cemex UK Ltd (4312)
Rolfe Judd Planning *for* Zog Investments Ltd (4504)
Herts CC – Environmental & Commercial Services (4553)
Stevenage Borough Council (4593)
Woolf Bond Planning *for* Gilston Investments Ltd (4634)
Bidwells *for* Barratt North London (4675)
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners *for* Commercial Estates Group/ Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course (4683)

Wednesday 2 May morning (9.30am)

Matter 2 – Distribution of Housing and Approach to the Green Belt (Policies CS2, CS12, CS14)

Issues

- 2.1 Is the proposed distribution of new housing based on sound assessment of the most sustainable options? Are the broad levels of growth at particular settlements appropriate?
- 2.2 Is the proposed replacement of Policy H4 of the Hertsmere Local Plan, which provides safeguarded land for housing, justified and clearly explained? Is it consistent with the approach to safeguarding land for employment?
- 2.3 Are the proposals for insets for Elstree (the part within the Green Belt), Shenley and South Mimms justified?
- 2.4 Are there sufficient reasons to conclude that there is no need for the RCS to provide for limited release of sites for housing in the Green Belt?
- 2.5 Overall, are the proposals for housing provision and its distribution reasonably flexible? Is there adequate regard to uncertainties and risks and are there sufficient measures for contingencies?
- 2.6 Taking account of Policies CS12, CS14 and the various references in the supporting text to the Green Belt, does the RCS provide a coherent, justified approach to the Green Belt and is it consistent with national policy?

2.7 Why is it necessary to designate Strategic Gaps in the Borough?

Participants

Hertsmere Borough Council [x 2]

Mr C R Hawkins (2593)

Drummond Robson (4029)

Drivers Jonas Deloitte *for* Cemex UK Ltd (4312)

Rolfe Judd Planning *for* Zog Investments Ltd (4504)

Planning Works Ltd *for* Rachel Charitable Trust (4549)

Woolf Bond Planning *for* Gilston Investments Ltd (4634)

Bidwells *for* Barratt North London (4675)

Mr D Jay (4678)

Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners *for* Commercial Estates Group/ Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course (4683)

Wednesday 2 May afternoon (2pm)

Matter 3 – Other Housing Matters; Sustainable Buildings (Policies CS4, CS5, CS6, CS7, CS15 and CS16, SP1; CS18, CS21)

Issues

- 3.1 Is there a sound basis for the targets and thresholds for affordable housing in the RCS, including in terms of economic viability? Is the RCS sufficiently ambitious in this regard?
- 3.2 Is the provision for gypsy and traveller accommodation justified and deliverable? Are the criteria in Policy CS6 appropriate and on what basis would planning applications be assessed?
- 3.3 In all other respects, are there reasonable prospects that an appropriate range of housing by size and type, including that necessary to meet the needs of an ageing population, will be delivered through the implementation of the RCS? How will the need for sheltered housing accommodation be provided? Is the constraint imposed by Policy CS18 in relation to healthcare and elderly care facilities justified? Should Policy CS7 (ii) not also apply to large windfalls?
- 3.4 Is there adequate justification for the approach to provision of Lifetime Homes and financial contributions in lieu? (paragraph 3.48 and Policy CS21)
- 3.5 Are Policies SP1, CS15 and CS16 and the supporting text clear, locally justified and reasonably flexible in regard to sustainable construction targets for residential and non-residential buildings?

Participants

Hertsmere Borough Council [x 2]

Woolf Bond Planning *for* Gilston Investments Ltd (4634)

Matter 4 - Town Centres (Policies CS26, CS27, Table 16, paragraph 8.5)

Issues

- 4.1 Is the RCS based on a systematic, coherent analysis of the needs of the borough's town centres for protection and enhancement, especially in terms of their retail function? Does the RCS set out a positive vision for the centres?
- 4.2 Is there a clearly defined town centre hierarchy (Policy CS26 and Table 16)? Does paragraph 8.5 seek to impose a needs test? Is it justified not to require a sequential assessment for retail development up to 2,500sq metres outside a town centre? Is it clear in what circumstances an impact assessment will be required?

Participants

Hertsmere Borough Council [x 2]

Thursday 3 May (9.30am)

Matter 5 – Economic Development (Policies CS8-CS10)

Issues

- 5.1 Does the RCS make adequate provision for economic development? To the extent that there is reliance on proposals in neighbouring districts, is this justified?
- 5.2 Is there clarity about the areas of land to which Policies CS8 – CS10 apply? What are the implications for the Proposals Map if Local Plan Policy B1 is to be replaced?
- 5.3 Is the proposal for safeguarding land adjoining the Elstree Way employment area justified and consistent with national policy? Does Policy CS8 provide adequate guidance about the extent of the area to be safeguarded and the basis on which it or the Cranborne Road safeguarded area would be released for development?

Participants

Hertsmere Borough Council [x 2]
CPRE (1491)
Boyer Planning for Lowerland (2004) Ltd (4652)
David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP (4673)

**Matter 6 – Open Space and Recreation Provision (Policies CS14 and CS18);
Protection of the Natural Environment (Policy CS12); Other Infrastructure
(Policies CS15, CS17, CS23, CS25)**

Issues

- 6.1 Is the RCS based on adequate analysis of the need for recreational open space and leisure provision?
- 6.2 Is there adequate geographical definition of the areas that are to be protected for their nature conservation interest?
- 6.3 With regard to key infrastructure, does the RCS give adequate guidance about what is required to underpin delivery of the spatial strategy and how, when and by whom it will be provided? Are the phasing and other implications of the required improvements to waste water treatment works properly considered and acknowledged?
- 6.4 Is there sufficient clarity about the roles and definitions of Transport Development Areas and Transport Corridors in terms of development and accessibility to services and employment (Policy CS23)? What is the justification for the different thresholds for dwelling numbers that are specified in the policy, and are they consistent with the adopted supplementary planning document on parking standards?

- 6.5 Should Policy CS25 do more to make clear where and when additional Greenway developments will take place and where they will be defined? Does paragraph 7.28 seek to secure financial contributions through planning conditions?

Participants

Hertsmere Borough Council [x 2]

Rolfe Judd Planning for Zog Investments Ltd (4504)

Herts CC – Environmental & Commercial Services (4553)

Matter 7 – Monitoring and Delivery (Table 17, Appendix 5)

Issues

- 7.1 Is the monitoring framework adequately developed, including justified, measurable indicators and targets, and is it clear what would trigger contingency action?
- 7.2 Concerning local plan policies that are to be replaced/are complimented by the RCS, how are the inconsistencies in Appendix 5 to be resolved?

Participants

Hertsmere Borough Council [x 2]
