

**Revised Appendix E**

**Summary of representations made in Regulation 27 stage**



Rep Number Name: Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust  
RCS/R27//1296/1/C Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust

Section  
Whole Document

On behalf of  
Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 HMWT is generally supportive of the draft Core Strategy. A few revisions and additions are required to bring the Strategy in line with recent changes in policy and strategy pertaining to nature conservation. It would also be beneficial to build in flexibility to some of the wording, to ensure that the Core Strategy remains relevant and useable going forward. These revisions are necessary to make the Core Strategy consistent with national policy, effective and generally 'sound'. HBC has already demonstrated a commitment to local biodiversity and an appreciation of the need for detailed guidance for planners, developers and communities through publication of its Biodiversity and Trees SPD (adopted December 2010). Reference to the Hertfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan (HBAP) is supported, the RCS would be more sound and effective if it reflected other, more recent policy changes, strategies and frameworks including: Nature Improvement Areas; Local BAP; Natural Environment White Paper 2011; Ecological Restoration Zones; Local Nature Partnership (LNP); Living Landscapes Strategy; Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services 2011; SHIP; and Green Infrastructure Plan. Local Plan documents need to properly integrate and interact with newer policy documents to ensure that they are 'sound'. Plans and strategies need to link up with those in neighbouring areas. We strongly endorse the balanced approach to development encompassed in the Core Strategy, and the emphasis placed on protection of the natural and built environment and environmentally responsible development. This overarching theme needs to be supported by strong, evidence-based policies, integrated decision-making and practical, effective support by HBC for community groups and others working towards these shared objectives
- Q.7 Include references as stated above; it is recommend that greater attention is given to ecological linking features, buffer areas and also any landscape-scale conservation areas, as may be defined or endorsed by the Hertfordshire Local Nature Partnership (see details in above section); it is requested that theres commitment to support the development and implementation of initiatives in Herts such as Nature Improvement Areas and other outcomes of the Local Nature Partnership.
- Q.8 No
- Q.9

Rep Number Name: The Coal Authority  
*RCS/R27//4547/1/C The Coal Authority*

Section  
*Whole Document*

On behalf of

The Coal Authority

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 Advise that Hertsmere is entirely out of the current defined coalfield. It is therefore not necessary to specifically consult the Coal Authority on emerging planning document despite being a 'specific' consultation body. .

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/8/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*Whole Document*

On behalf of

**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 The Core Strategy would benefit from a number of minor amendments that would improve consistency with the local highway authority:  
All references to 'public transport' should read 'passenger transport'; All references to Hertfordshire Highways should read Hertfordshire County Council  
(Hertfordshire Highways is part of HCC and may change once contracts are renewed); 'Existing highways network' should read 'existing highway network'; 'highways  
authority' should read 'highway authority' Para 7.23 would be clarified from changing 'a equestrian road crossing' to ' a traffic-light controlled road crossing for  
horse-riders'.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Mrs Young  
*RCS/R27//4682/1/C Mrs Young*

Section  
*Whole Document*

On behalf of  
Mrs Young

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Revised Core Strategy is a very through document and my comments are just thoughts on how to hopefully improve it. The main thoughts I have are on housing, population growth, traffic growth, Cowley Hill Ward, planting of trees, sustainability, local economy, CIL charge and health. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).

Q.7 I have also included suggestions. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Boyer Planning  
RCS/R27//4652/1/O Boyer Planning

Section  
Whole Document

On behalf of  
Lowerland (2004) Ltd

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 A statement has been submitted by the organisation, the key issues relate to the following: 1) Policy CS12 and SP1 should link to paragraph 2.37 to allow for amendments to the Green Belt. A mechanism for Green Belt releases for employment, as with housing. 2) no mechanism for review of employment land especially if sites in adjoining boroughs are not brought forward. Lack of a leisure or hotel policy.
- Q.7 Policy changes sought 1) Acknowledge the need and potential for small green belt boundary review in line with paragraph 2.37. 2) Apply a proactive approach to London Arc Employment Study. 3) To include policies relating to non-B Class employment uses and other forms of commercial development such as leisure and hotels within context of PPS4. 4) To identify land adjoining the Key Employment Site at Centennial Park, and Local Significant Employment Site at Lismarrane Industrial Park as a Strategic Development Location where small scale changes would accord with the principles of PPG2.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The issues raised relate to a key policy issue.

Rep Number Name: Aldenham Parish Council  
*RCS/R27//1192/1/S Aldenham Parish Council*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Whole Document*

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 APC agrees with policies CS1 - CS17 and CS19 - CS29.

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre  
*RCS/R27//1286/1/S Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre*

Section  
*Whole Document*

On behalf of

**Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Yes Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 In relation to Objectove 13 on biodiversity, CS12 and CS15 - 'we agree with and support these policies'

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Woodland Trust  
RCS/R27//4526/1/S Woodland Trust

Section  
Whole Document

On behalf of  
Woodland Trust

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Yes Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Woodland Trust supports Chapter 5: Open Land and the Environment and is particularly pleased to see the following:  
a) protection and enhancement of ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees,  
b) endorsement and support for the Hertfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan and particularly the chapter on Woodland,  
c) "continued presumption against any development, which will have an adverse effect on any natural assets ..." (page 58, paragraph 5.14),  
d) Policy CS12 "All development proposals must conserve and enhance the natural environment of the borough, including biodiversity, protected trees ... Proposals should provide opportunities for habitat creation and enhancement ..." (page 59),  
e) use of the Woodland Trust Access Standard as a measurement of accessible woodland, and  
f) recognition that "Woodland ... can also play an important role in preventing flooding caused by rainfall ..." (page 62, paragraph 5.32)

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Watford and District Talking Newspaper for The Blind  
*RCS/R27//1001/1/C Watford and District Talking Newspaper for*  
On behalf of

Section  
*1.1 Purpose and status of this Document*

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: PGA Design Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4674/2/O PGA Design Consulting*

Section  
*1.1 Purpose and status of this Document*

On behalf of  
PGA Design Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is not considered that there is sufficient evidence to support the spatial vision, and it is not considered that the aims could be met. It is not clear if there is sufficient, inadequate, or over provision of sports or leisure facilities. It is also considered that the plan fails to set ou the approach to derelict land.

Q.7 None suggested

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)  
*RCS/R27/4676/2/O Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr*

Section  
*1.11 What is the Core Strategy?*

On behalf of

**Philips Planning (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The draft core strategy is not based on a comprehensive and up-to-date SHMA of the overall housing requirements, and to the extent that some information is available there is no connection between the policies proposed and requirements. The Council's assessment of the requirement for affordable housing (para. 3.23) on its own significantly exceeds the provision proposed in policy CS1. The Core Strategy is inconsistent with existing national planning policy as set out in PPS1 and PPS3 and the draft NPPF.
- Q.7 An up-to-date SHMA that assesses overall housing requirements is required against which land use implications of alternative strategic options can be considered, a clear exposition given as to how the two are related and the implications if housing market requirements are not to be met.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The issues raised are fundamental to the Core Strategy and have been consistently made by the representor without the substance of the representation being taken into account by the Borough Council.

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/2/O Shire Consulting*  
On behalf of

Section  
*1.12 National policy, East of England Plan and  
other external influences*

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England or the East of England Plan (EEP) still remains a fundamental part of the 'Development Plan' and it is a material consideration at this submission stage of the Core Strategy. It is the most up-to-date element of the existing Development Plan and its housing requirement figures are based upon evidence of household formation and population projection. The Council provides no convincing evidence to depart for the figures in the EEP and it is disingenuous to suggest at paragraph 1.12 that the Core Strategy is in "general" conformity with the housing figures in the EEP.

The Council makes reference to the evolution of the previous version of the Core Strategy but attempts to gloss-over the fundamental criticisms of the Planning Inspector who made it clear that the Strategy would be found unsound. The current document still does not properly address the reasons why the Inspector was so critical and as a result, this Submission document also risks being found unsound. Given the embarrassing debacle of having to withdraw the Core Strategy, the Council should have taken on board all of the Inspector's comments, not just "a number" of them (para. 1.26)

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council - Property  
*RCS/R27//4520/1/C Hertfordshire County Council - Property*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Table 2 Spatial implications of other plans,  
strategies and programmes*

### HCC Property

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The acknowledgment of the importance of other external influences and the plans and strategies of others set out at Table 2 is welcomed. However the HCC Supporting People Strategy has been updated to 2007-12. The Supporting People Commissioning Body endorsed a new five year strategy in July 2007, and this has been formally adopted by each partner organisation on the Commissioning Body. The implementation of the strategy is reviewed annually.
- Q.7 Delete the reference to Hertfordshire County Council supporting people strategy: 2005 - 2010:  
Insert: Hertfordshire County Council Supporting People Strategy 2007 - 2012  
and amend the bullet points in columns 2 and 3 accordingly
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 HCC property wish to be represented at the EIP in order to discuss this and other matters

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council - Property  
*RCS/R27/4520/2/C Hertfordshire County Council - Property*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Table 2 Spatial implications of other plans,  
strategies and programmes*

### HCC Property

- | Do you Consider the DPD is: | (1) Legally Compliant   | (1) Core Strategy Support | Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not: |           |           |                                  |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|
|                             | (2) Sound   | No                        | (2) In Part  | Justified | Effective | Consistent with National policy: |
| Q.6                         | (Row 3) The current Children and Young People's Plan is dated 2011/12 The Hertfordshire Children's Trust Partnership was disbanded in Summer 2011 and it was agreed that the CYPP would be extended for one final year until 3/12. This was to bridge the gap in strategic planning until the new Health and Wellbeing Board (and within those arrangements, the Children's Strategic Commissioning Groups) came on stream. |                           |  |           |           |                                  |
| Q.7                         | Delete the reference to Hertfordshire County Council Children and Young People's Plan 2006 - 2009:<br>Insert: Hertfordshire County Council Children and Young People's Plan 2011-12 and amend the bullet points in columns 2 and 3 accordingly  |                           |  |           |           |                                  |
| Q.8                         | Yes   |                           |  |           |           |                                  |
| Q.9                         | HCC property wish to be represented at the EiP in order to discuss this and other matters   |                           |  |           |           |                                  |



Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council - Property  
RCS/R27/4520/4/C Hertfordshire County Council - Property  
On behalf of

Section  
Table 2 Spatial implications of other plans,  
strategies and programmes

### HCC Property

- | Do you Consider the DPD is: | (1) Legally Compliant  | Yes | (1) Core Strategy Support | Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not: |           |                                  |
|-----------------------------|--|-----|---------------------------|--|-----------|----------------------------------|
|                             | (2) Sound  | No  | (2) In Part               | Justified  | Effective | Consistent with National policy: |
| Q.6                         | The acknowledgment of the importance of other external influences and the plans and strategies of others set out at Table 2 is welcomed. HCC has a challenging duty to ensure that there is always sufficient and suitable education provision for all of its children and young people which was encapsulated in the document School Organisation Plan (2003 - 2008). Hertfordshire CC has a good record meeting this challenge actively planning school places and changing the supply in line with forecast demand. The planning cycle the process of forecasting, review and change - is a continual one. In line with national trends, Hertfordshire experienced a period of falling demand for primary school places between 2000 and 2007. The national and local situation has now changed: demand for places has increased and will increase further. In Table 2 the reference to Hertfordshire County Council School Organisation Plan (2003 - 2008) is now therefore out of date. Hertfordshire County Council's strategy to meet the rising demand for school places is set out in the 'Meeting the rising demand for school places' document. |     |                           |  |           |                                  |
| Q.7                         | Delete the reference to Hertfordshire County Council School Organisation Plan (2003 - 2008); Replace with text referring to the current 'Meeting the rising demand for school places' document 2011<br><a href="http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/edlearn/aboutstatesch/risingdemand/">http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/edlearn/aboutstatesch/risingdemand/</a> ; The bullet points in columns 2 and 3 need to be adjusted accordingly.   |     |                           |  |           |                                  |
| Q.8                         | Yes  |     |                           |  |           |                                  |
| Q.9                         | HCC Property wish to be represented at the EIP to discuss the relevant issues  |     |                           |  |           |                                  |

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27//4658/1/C Shire Consulting*

Section  
*1.26 Community and stakeholder participation*

On behalf of  
**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We have read the Council's "Statement of Community" including the Appendix 5 responses to the representations that we made to the Draft Revised Core Strategy document in February 2011 but as most of those representations have been ignored, many of the points that we raised remain as objections to the Submission version of the Core Strategy. Indeed it is difficult to believe the Council is doing anything more than just going through the motions of a consultation exercise as many of the representation made by others (apart from those in support) have been ignored. In some instances, even where the Council acknowledges in its Reponses that a change should be made, that change has not been made (see the example of Green Belt wording below).

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/3/C Shire Consulting*

Section  
*1.26 Community and stakeholder participation*

On behalf of  
**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Council makes reference to the evolution of the previous version of the Core Strategy but attempts to gloss-over the fundamental criticisms of the Planning Inspector who made it clear that the Strategy would be found unsound. The current document still does not properly address the reasons why the Inspector was so critical and as a result, this Submission document also risks being found unsound. Given the embarrassing debacle of having to withdraw the Core Strategy, the Council should have taken on board all of the Inspector's comments, not just "a number" of them (para. 1.26)

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Natural England (Consultations)  
*RCS/R27/4014/1/O Natural England (Consultations)*

Section  
*2.0 Spatial Vision and Development Strategy*

On behalf of

**Natural England**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 As we have mentioned in our previous comments the Core Strategy should seek to protect and enhance green infrastructure, and linkages to the wider strategic network, within built-up areas as well as in the wider countryside. Sufficient, well-designed green infrastructure is recognised as being highly beneficial to the health and well-being of people and the communities they live in. Well designed multi-functional GI can also provide significant benefits for biodiversity, landscape, amenity, drainage and local food production. It is disappointing that the provision of GI is not a key objective of the Core Strategy and that there is no reference in the Core Strategy to levels of GI deprivation or Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace standards (ANGSt). See further comments below in relation to SP1 and CS14. We welcome the inclusion of an objective to promote sustainable access to the wider countryside, with reference to the Watling Chase Greenways Strategy. However, the Core Strategy makes no reference to the Hertsmere GI Plan or the Hertfordshire GI Plan the objectives and aspirations of these plans should form part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. Protection and enhancement of GI, including the strategically important Watling Chase Community Forest, needs greater emphasis within the Core Strategy.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Robson Planning Consultancy  
RCS/R27//4029/1/O Robson Planning Consultancy

Section  
2.0 Spatial Vision and Development Strategy

On behalf of

Own submission

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Submission Revised Core Strategy is not a balanced, coherent or positive strategy for the next 15 years in Hertsmere. It lacks any proper vision for the future of the District but is rather an unsuccessful patchwork of constraints and restrictions aimed at compliance with regulation as a tool of development management rather than the proper and creative strategy planning of 10,000 hectares of Britain. It appears to have learned very little from representations on its two failed predecessors. It is not legally compliant in failing to offer encouragement to the development and use of land under the 2004 regulations and provides little that is effective. It does not follow PPS12 para. 4.1. The reasoned justifications offered rely on an uneven evidence base and are not based on successful experience. It has not been the subject of recent meaningful consultation with its citizens. For these reasons an alternative approach seeking a more balanced approach to both Town and Country is offered.

Q.7 (The representor also submitted wider documents to support the submission)

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 The proposed distribution of development in Hertsmere is unbalanced and unsustainable. The SRCS lacks vision. The Local Development Framework should be positive and creative to provide statements of the development and use of land which the local planning authority wish to encourage, not restrict, protect and defend unsoundly as past experience has shown. Based on a long career in Town and Country Planning involved predominantly in creating and realising major projects in Britain, as well as local practitioner experience in Hertsmere over a number of years, including five advising Hertsmere's largest private landowner until last year, supported by a professional team, I wish to offer constructive and impartial professional material to assist better local plan and placemaking in the District on firmer foundations. I believe this now needs the forum of the Oral Examination for this dialogue to take place.

Rep Number Name: Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)  
RCS/R27/4686/1/O Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)

Section  
2.0 Spatial Vision and Development Strategy

On behalf of  
Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Core Strategy's (CS) recognition that the Borough is influenced by strong links with nearby settlements such as Watford in neighbouring Local Authorities is generally supported. This is particularly important when examining need and demand for additional commercial, leisure and community land uses which benefit from the Borough's strategic location close to the M25 and M1 with good links to London and the rest of the country (as acknowledged at paragraph 2.3).  
Section 2 of the CS sets out demographic and economic trends at high level but social infrastructure is not examined and there is no evidence base examining the need for leisure and community facilities. It acknowledges that leisure centres (such as Bushey) are particularly popular and attract many visitors from outside the Borough (paragraph 2.9) which suggests potential demand for additional facilities. However, in the absence of a Social Infrastructure Study or Community Needs Assessment (common practice for a number of Local Authorities), the CS is not considered robust and is therefore not justified or effective as it does not assist in the delivery of these land uses (particularly in the context of supporting significant population growth over the CS plan period).  
Core Strategy Objective 3 in Table 4 identifies the focus of development on brownfield sites within the principal towns, to accommodate expected development needs. However, Table 4 takes no account of previously developed sites outside of towns which have the potential to play an important role in terms of accommodating non-residential uses to support future housing growth and the local economy. There are also a number of areas located in poor quality Green Belt land which should be considered to meet the development needs and demands of the Borough particularly in terms of additional hotel and leisure facilities and / or commercial development. Table 4 is therefore not considered to be effective as it is not sufficiently flexible.

Q.7 Reference in Section 2 to undertaking a social infrastructure study to examine the demand and need for additional leisure, community and other social infrastructure uses in the borough.  
Objective 3 in Table 4 to read: To maintain an adequate supply of suitable land, focussed on brownfield sites within the principal towns to accommodate expected development needs and supporting community infrastructure. In exceptional circumstances appropriately located Green Belt land should also be considered for some form of new development where a specific need and demand is met and where no detrimental harm to the Green Belt can be demonstrated at that location.

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27//4553/1/S Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*2.0 Spatial Vision and Development Strategy*

On behalf of

**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The County Council continues to support the policy approach taken by the Borough Council with regard to waste issues to promote the minimisation of waste and encourage re-use and recycling. It is encouraging to see that the sustainable management of waste with regards to reuse and recycling is covered in both policies SP1, CS15 and the supporting text. Suggestions made in previous representations in relation to the 'construction phase and following occupation' have been included and this is welcomed. In relation to the site management of waste and waste generation, there is specific mention of commercial and industrial waste.

Q.7 It should be recognised that construction and demolition waste is not the only waste stream that needs to be managed and every household has a part to play in the management of waste across the county in accordance with the emerging Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies vision and objectives.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire Gardens Trust  
*RCS/R27//4009/1/C Hertfordshire Gardens Trust*

Section  
*2.19 Spatial Portrait*

On behalf of  
**Hertfordshire Gardens Trust**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 'It is not complete. The Listed Building assets do not include historic gardens, local and those on the English Heritage Register, not does it include the settings of heritage assets. A list of historic gardens in Hertsmere is available from HGT'

Q.7 Inclusion of omissions as above

Q.8 No

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/8/O Shire Consulting*

Section  
*2.23 LDF Core Strategy Objectives*

On behalf of

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Paragraph 2.23 refers to the "limits of the built up area to accommodate development" which seems to be the basis for the "objectives" which follow. It is evident from the Core Strategy that the principle "limit" is that imposed by the Council's refusal to consider adjustments to the Green Belt, which is of course simply a planning land use designation.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Environment Agency  
*RCS/R27//4493/1/S Environment Agency*

Section  
*2.23 LDF Core Strategy Objectives*

On behalf of

Environment Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 We still feel you should amend this point to include a commitment to address climate change adaptation as well as mitigation. Adapting to unavoidable impacts of climate change is as important as adapting to reduce the effects of climate change through mitigation.

Climate change will lead to an increase in rainfall and more intense rain storms. This will lead to more frequent flooding in all forms. Green roofs are one way that we can help stem this problem. Green roofs are an important example of design that can help us adapt to and mitigate climate change. They reduce surface water runoff, as well as enhancing biodiversity and keeping buildings cool in summer and warm in winter.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: London Travel Watch  
*RCS/R27//1069/1/S London Travel Watch*

Section  
*Table 4 LDF Core Strategy Objectives*

On behalf of  
London Travel Watch

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Yes  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Welcomed objectives on promoting accessibility

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council - Property  
*RCS/R27/4520/3/C Hertfordshire County Council - Property*

Section  
*2.24 LDF Core Strategy Objectives*

On behalf of  
HCC Property

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 During previous consultations HCC Property has supplied detailed information to HBC regarding the likely need for new educational facilities proportionate to the amount of housing growth. Due to the level of housing proposed in Borehamwood a 2FE Primary School site is required. The county council is concerned that, as drafted, no reference has been made to this spatial need which could amount to a site of some 2.5 hectares (see detailed representations). Whilst this could be addressed within/by future LDF documents such as Site Allocations, future SPDs or Area Action Plans it is considered that the Core Strategy should be amended to ensure that there is an overarching CS commitment to make future provision.
- Q.7 Table 5 Page 2 Borehamwood - Insert an additional bullet point - To provide a new 2.5 hectare primary school site
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 HCC property wish to be represented at the EIP in order to discuss this and other matters

Rep Number Name: London Travel Watch  
*RCS/R27/1069/2/C London Travel Watch*

Section  
*Table 5 Spatial objectives by settlement*

On behalf of  
London Travel Watch

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Support for the spatial objectives. Concern over the lack of specific proposals to improve congestion, and high parking standards. There is concern that more supporting text is given to Greenways than public transport. It is noted in para 7.20 that the Council will ' continue o lobb for, support and fund improvements to services and facilities' although no evidence of this is cited. Para 7.23 mention accessibility zones, although it is noted that they are not including in the Core Strategy. There is also support for policy CS25, but have concerns that there are no specific proposals to further the principle aims.

Q.7 Correction should be made regarding para 8.14 and the frequency of bus routes through Shenley

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham Parish Council  
*RCS/R27/1192/2/C Aldenham Parish Council*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Table 5 Spatial objectives by settlement*

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6
- Q.7 APC would request that on page 24 - 'Spatial Objectives by Settlement-- Radlett' - the seventh bullet point be amended to show Neighbourhood Plan rather than Parish Plan.
- Q.8
- Q.9

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
RCS/R27//4504/1/O Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Section  
Table 5 Spatial objectives by settlement

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 While we broadly support the overarching spatial objectives for Bushey, in our view a greater emphasis needs to be places on the acute need to provide more parks/gardens and outdoor sports facilities in this part of the Borough.

The Hertsmere Open Space Study (October 2011) notes that Bushey currently experiences deficiencies in the quantity and accessibility to a variety of types of open spaces (based on the Council's own PPG17 assessment). Policy should therefore place a greater emphasis on the provision of new and improved parks/gardens, outdoor sports facilities and playspace/ facilities within Bushey.

Q.7 On this basis, bullet point 4 (relating to Bushey) should be amended as follows:

"Improve and enhance the quality, quality and access to parks and gardens, outdoor sports facilitates and play areas/facilities in Bushey".

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4658/9/O Shire Consulting

Section  
Table 5 Spatial objectives by settlement

On behalf of

Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Table 5 lists "Spatial Objectives by Settlement", in most cases starting with an intention to "Manage housing availability and affordability". In reality, the Council does not have the ability to "manage" either of these. Restricting land availability through planning policy will certainly reduce the availability of housing but that will inevitably exacerbate the existing problems of affordability. As a direct result of the Council's approach the "impact on the Borough" (paragraph 2.27) will be higher house prices and less affordability. That could be construed as mis-management. In paragraph 2.30 the Council debates the matter of zero net migration but, as we have previously emphasised, the Council has no control over who can afford to choose to live in the Borough. Ignoring the drivers of household growth will simply exacerbate the problem of sons and daughters of current residents being unable to afford to live in the Borough.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP  
RCS/R27/4673/3/O David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP

Section  
Table 5 Spatial objectives by settlement

On behalf of  
RRHE LLP

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 Table 5 sets out the Spatial Objectives for each of the principal settlements in the Borough. Para 2.26 recognizes that "Borehamwood and Potters Bar will remain the two largest centres of employment in the Borough where many homes, jobs and services are located". Table 6 identifies Borehamwood as lying at the top of the settlement hierarchy of the Borough and 'an important economic centre for South Hertfordshire'. Paragraph 4.17 states that one of the key roles of the LDF is 'to maximize economic development opportunities in the Borough' and adds that 'this is set out in the LDF Spatial Vision and Key Objective 11'. In our submission it is not however translated into the Spatial objectives for Borehamwood.
- Q.7 The fourth bullet point of the Spatial Objectives for Borehamwood (page 23, Table 5) should be amended to read: "#protect employment and industry in the town and maximize economic development opportunities"
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The representation relates to Policy CS8 which is a fundamental issue of strategic policy.

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/4/O Shire Consulting*

Section  
*2.25 Distribution and level of development*

On behalf of  
**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 PPS3 and PPS12 both stress the importance of the evidence base in relation to policy-making. This particularly includes the adoption of housing requirements, locally based affordable housing thresholds and identifying the availability of a land supply for housing. Reading the "Distribution and Level of Development" section of the Submission Core Strategy gives the impression that the Council has decided on what level and distribution it wants and has adjusted the evidence to fit that decision. That is unsound.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
*RCS/R27/4504/2/O Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning*

Section  
*2.26 Distribution and level of development*

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 We note that paragraph 2.26 states that the SHLAA has identified “sufficient” land across the Borough to accommodate 3,550 homes without developing on greenfield land within the Green Belt. However, there is no comment/analysis clarifying whether these identified sites represent suitable, deliverable or viable development prospects. Without this information it is difficult to assess whether the Council’s assertion that future housing targets can be met within existing urban areas is a reasonable/realistic assumption.  
We also note that the Council refers to the Core Strategy being in conformity with the East of England Plan. However, the East of England Plan targeted the provision of 5,000 homes between 2001 and 2021 (at an annual rate of 260 dwellings per annum). Notwithstanding this, the Revised Core Strategy targets the provision of 3,550 over the plan period at a rate of 237 homes per annum - and again does not provide explicit evidence to explain why a higher target has not been adopted.
- Q.7 As per our comments above.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)  
*RCS/R27/4676/3/O Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr*

Section  
*2.29 Distribution and level of development*

On behalf of

**Philips Planning (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 No evidence has been produced to justify the statement that, "The existing infrastructure of the Borough would not be able to support any additional housing development...". In that the statement is being used to limited future housing development to less than requirements it is inconsistent with national policy and ineffective.
- Q.7 If such evidence exists it needs to be adduced, if not either the statement should be deleted or the research should be carried out so that the option of additional housing development over and above that proposed in para 2.26 can be evaluated.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The issues raised are fundamental to the Core Strategy and have been consistently made by the representor without the substance of the representation being taken into account by the Borough Council.

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4658/11/O Shire Consulting

Section  
2.31 Distribution and level of development

On behalf of

Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The soundness of the Core Strategy is called into question by paragraph 2.31. It states: "However, should the identified sites not come forward for development, including those in the Elstree Way Corridor, the Council will review the level of its local housing ambition or alternatively consider whether land elsewhere needs to be realised for new housing. The role of the local Green Belt will be a key issue in any such consideration". What does the phrase "review the level of its local housing ambition" mean? Does this imply a revision of the housing requirement downwards? If so it undermines the claim that the Core Strategy is sound. Also, given the Council's steadfast refusal through the whole drawn out process to seriously consider changing GB boundaries, mentioning the alternative of releasing GB land suggest that the Council itself has serious doubts about the ability to deliver its alleged land supply.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
*RCS/R27/4504/3/S Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning*

Section  
*2.33 Distribution and level of development*

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

We support the identification of Bushey as a Strategic Housing Location where new housing growth/development will be directed. This appropriately recognises the good range of facilities/services provided locally, the proximity to Watford town centre and the associated transport links.

Q.7

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: Taylor Wimpey North Thames  
RCS/R27/4679/4/S Taylor Wimpey North Thames

Section  
2.33 Distribution and level of development

On behalf of  
Taylor Wimpey North Thames

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 TWNT welcome and support the recognition and identification of the Elstree Way Corridor as an appropriate location for significant new housing development over the plan period. While the Corridor has been identified for redevelopment/regeneration now for some 10 years via the adopted Elstree Way Corridor SPG, progress realising these aspirations has been slow with many sites identified for development not having come forward as anticipated. Where development has taken place this has generally been for housing illustrating the attraction to the market of new housing in this location. Accordingly, if the comprehensive regeneration of the corridor is to occur then it is right and proper that it is housing led. Given the delays that have been experienced to date in bringing sites forward and the significant proportion of the housing target that is to be met within the Corridor the Council will need to show flexibility and seize opportunities as they arise either within or adjacent to it as a means of levering in additional investment and interest and securing the continued regeneration of the area.

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP  
RCS/R27//4673/1/O David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP

Section  
2.36 Distribution and level of development

On behalf of  
RRHE LLP

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 This paragraph is inconsistent with the proposal in Policy CS8 to safeguard land for additional employment between the A1 and Rowley Way at Borehamwood. Specifically, the second sentence of the paragraph is unchanged from the previous Core Strategy which did not include that proposal.
- Q.7 The second sentence of para 2.36 should be amended to read: " The existing safeguard land adjoining Cranborne Road Employment Area will be retained and a new area of land between the A1 and Rowley Lane, adjoining the Elstree Way Employment Area, is safeguarded for additional employment-related development. Otherwise, it is not proposed to allocate new areas of land for employment purposes and the Council will seek to direct significant new industrial and warehousing development to designated brownfield locations in Borehamwood, Potters Bar and Bushey.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The representation relates to Policy CS8 which is a fundamental issue of strategic policy.



Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
*RCS/R27/4504/9/O Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning*

Section  
*2.37 Distribution and level of development*

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We agree with the Council that opportunities exist to make minor, small scale changes to Green Belt boundaries to enable a more appropriate, defensible boundary to be established. This will in our view, provide the opportunity to successfully regenerate / redevelop redundant/underused sites on the edge of the existing urban settlements (particularly around Bushey).

The former West Herts College Annex site in Bushey is an example where new development can bring a redundant site back into use and create a more defensive boundary for the Green Belt. The site currently contains a number of semi derelict education buildings (the majority of which have not been in use for sometime). The removal of these buildings and replacement with a more contained form of residential development will provide the opportunity to reduce the current sprawl of buildings and would better relate to the neighbouring residential land-uses.

Furthermore, the redevelopment of the site provides the opportunity to provide the majority of the site as new, publically accessible, open space (incorporating new children's play space) and an extension to the neighbouring nature reserve – thereby addressing a key deficiency in Bushey and creating a strong defensible boundary to the Green Belt.

Q.7 As per out comments above

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4658/5/ Shire Consulting

Section  
Table 6 The Settlement Hierarchy

On behalf of  
Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Manipulation of evidence is evident in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy. Table 6 notes that Radlett has "good rail links to London and a popular district centre serving both the local population and an increasing number of visitors from further afield". Given it is such a sustainable location with a popular district centre, the plan should be promoting it as an areas where increased development should be taking place. The "limited scope and capacity for significant further growth" is entirely because the Council chooses that this should be so. Many facilities and infrastructure listed as excuses for not accepting development are often provided by developers.

Q.7 As noted in our comments on Settlement Hierarchy, there is no sound justification for Potters Bar to provide less housing than Bushy particularly as Potters Bar is such a sustainable location. Policy CS2 should be rewritten to allow for a much greater percentage of new housing to be provided in Potters Bar.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)  
*RCS/R27/4634/5/C Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston*

Section  
*Table 6 The Settlement Hierarchy*

On behalf of

Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 Borehamwood and Potters Bar are appropriate locations for growth. However, for reasons identified elsewhere in the representations, there should be a review of the Green Belt around these two settlements. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 The Key Diagram should identify sustainable urban extensions to the north east of Borehamwood and the south of Potters Bar, following a review of the Green Belt. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To expand upon our representations and to take account of the most up to date and publically available information.

Rep Number Name: Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX  
*RCS/R27//4312/1/S Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX*

Section  
*Table 6 The Settlement Hierarchy*

On behalf of  
Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Support the identification of Radlett in the Borough's Settlement Hierarchy as shown in Table 6, agree that Radlett is appropriately ranked as a third level settlement in the hierarchy.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association  
*RCS/R27//4240/1/C The Radlett Society and Green Belt*

Section  
*2.39 Distribution and level of development*

On behalf of

**The radlett Society and Green Belt Association**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is considered that this paragraph could be stronger, in order to protect the Green Belt. I is considered that Burrells Yard off Watling Street would be ideal for sheltered or affordable housing.

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4658/6/O Shire Consulting

Section  
2.45 Alternative Options

On behalf of  
Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Under 'Alternative Options' paragraph 2.45 suggest that the Green Belt is a "key environmental constraint". It is not, it is a land use policy designation and in Appendix 5 of its "Statement of Consultation" the Council accepts that "The terminology to Green Belt will be reviewed and amended within the Core Strategy (pages 64 and 163). Despite this, the misuse of such terminology still persists in the Submission document. Furthermore, by using the excuse that there would be relatively little local support for urban extensions the Council is abrogating its responsibility to plan properly for development the result will be a worsening of affordability in the housing market, contracting the alleged wish to seek solution to the problem. This is unsound. Furthermore the argument that "the greatest concentration of services (and scope to expand them) can be found" in Borehamwood, ignores Potters Bar which Table 6 states is "a key local town in the east of the Borough with a number of major employers, two distinct shopping areas, thriving industrial areas and rail and bus links to London and towns to the north". As such Potters Bar is a sustainable location for development but the Council has chosen to ignore that by limiting the potential housing land supply there to about 10% of the Borough total.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/13/C Shire Consulting*

Section  
*2.49 Delivering the spatial vision*

On behalf of

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The plan then states that "Accommodating the housing needs of existing residents will remain a priority throughout the period of the Core Strategy, including the needs of concealed households - those individuals and young families unable to move out of a family home and afford their own accommodation", apparently without any sense of the irony of that statement. Paragraph 2.49 further adds to the irony as the provision of affordable housing on the back of market housing simply increases the lack of affordability in the latter, thus compounding the problem.

Q.7 Policy CS1 should use as a minimum the EEP pro-rata requirement of 3750 additional dwellings over the 16 year period (250 dwellings per year) and should review the list of 'constraints' in the light of these representations.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
*RCS/R27/4504/8/O Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning*

Section  
*2.55 Delivering the spatial vision*

On behalf of

**Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 While we recognise the Council's objectives to safeguard and enhance the openness of the Borough, in our view a greater emphasis needs to be places on the acute need to provide more parks/gardens and outdoor sports facilities in this part of the Borough.

The Hertsmere Open Space Study (October 2011) notes that Bushey currently experiences deficiencies in the quantity and accessibility to a variety of types of open spaces (based on the Council's own PPG17 assessment). Future policy should therefore place a greater emphasis on the provision of new and improved parks/gardens, outdoor sports facilities and playspace/facilities within Bushey.

Q.7 As per out comments above

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.



Rep Number Name: Natural England (Consultations)  
*RCS/R27/4014/4/C Natural England (Consultations)*

Section  
*Policy SP1 Creating Sustainable Development*

On behalf of

**Natural England**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We believe the protection and enhancement of GI through development, including seeking to address any deficiencies, should be at the heart of this policy. We recommend that additional wording is included in this policy to reflect our comments above and below in relation to GI.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
RCS/R27/4553/9/C Hertfordshire County Council

Section  
Policy SP1 Creating Sustainable Development

On behalf of

HCC Spatial and Land use Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 It is understood that an IDP is currently being prepared and that the assessment of infrastructure requirements over the Plan period is an ongoing and iterative process; the lack of an IDP means that as it stands the pre-submission document may not be sound as it is neither effective as required by PPS12 (Para 4.52) nor positively prepared as required by the draft NPPF (Para 48).  
The RCS is focused on development along the EWC, and the development proposals underpin the wider objectives of Core Strategy. Given the importance of the Elstree Way, it is necessary to identify the necessary infrastructure requirements and ensure that they are deliverable in a timely fashion. Concerns that the 'masterplan' (feasibility study?) contains no information on how the proposals are to be funded or delivered. Noted that that Elstree and Borehamwood Urban Transport Plan is to be reviewed shortly.
- Q.7 "The Core Strategy needs to be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan that sets out the infrastructure required to support the growth set out within the Plan, indicative costs, delivery agencies, phasing etc in line with the sound infrastructure planning principles in PPS12."
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To discuss the relevant infrastructure issues

Rep Number Name: Indigo Planning  
*RCS/R27//4496/1/O Indigo Planning*

Section  
*Policy SP1 Creating Sustainable Development*

On behalf of

Indigo Planning for Sainsbury's Supermarkets

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Draft Policy SP1 states that all non-residential development should as a minimum standard, achieve the required levels for BREEAM Excellent or Outstanding. This is overly prescriptive and lack flexibility. This has the potential to make schemes unviable. As such, the policies should be amended accordingly.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4688/1/O Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting

Section  
Policy SP1 Creating Sustainable Development

On behalf of  
Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 SP1 - The School is pleased to note the intention set out within Policy SP1 that the Council intends working with key local stakeholders in order to create sustainable development. Furthermore the School is also encouraged that the draft Core Strategy recognises the role of education provision in the promotion of sustainable communities (see also for instance "LDF Core Strategy Objective 10") and that new improved educational facilities are to be supported.

However, this position is not wholly reflected in the rest of Policy SP1, which seeks to focus development opportunities within the existing built up area. The document does not recognise that not all educational establishments are with urban areas. Making improvements to the existing educational provision at the Aldenham Campus necessitates consolidation and further development within the site. The relocation of the entire operation, or the establishment of additional new facilities within town centres would not itself be a sustainable option it would result in redundancy of historic buildings or splitting a school's operations. The action of splitting the operations not only could create additional traffic impacts in the new location, it would also complicate the day to day running of the educational establishment. Draft policies, such as CS23 should also recognise this.

Policy SP1 unnecessarily duplicates Government Policy in PPG12 (point vii); makes statements that it is not in a position to deliver (such as point x regarding "efficient and affordable transport"); and also contains a number of requirements (say those relating to compliance with BREMM standards) that are best left to Building Control as PPS12 advises. Overall, this policy requires considerable editing in order to make it compliant with PPS12 and therefore 'sound'.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G) c/o Jones Lang LaSalle  
*RCS/R27/4689/1/O Legal and General Life Fund Partnership*

Section  
*Policy SP1 Creating Sustainable Development*

On behalf of

**Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Legal and General Life Fund Limited Partnership (L&G) own the freehold of two sites in the borough at Rowley Lane and Elstree Way respectively - site plans included as appendices to submission. Has requested that previously made submissions to the Revised Draft Core Strategy in February 2001 be taken into consideration.

Policy CS1 - Concerns expressed over proposed housing provision and specifically 'significant reduction' to the East of England Plan target over the same period, and lack of justification as to why alternative methodology for calculating the number of dwellings were not chosen. Suggest that a lower housing target has been selected to reduce pressure to deliver more housing including on green belt sites.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd  
*RCS/R27/4647/5/O Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd*

Section  
*Key Diagram*

On behalf of

**Mr J Onona**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is not considered that an adequate supply of housing is deliverable in urban locations. It is thought that the release of Green Belt should in incorporated into the plan and diagram. Representations relate to site S163 in Borehamwood at the rail tunnel and north of Barnet Lane. The site is in the Green Belt.

Q.7 None

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 'For these reasons, the RCS is unsound and therefore we wish to participate at the oral examination'

Rep Number Name: Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)  
*RCS/R27/4675/5/O Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)*

Section  
*Key Diagram*

On behalf of  
**Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The spatial strategy illustrated by the Key Diagram is considered to be unsound. The Key Diagram does not reflect that there would be a need to identify housing land in the Green Belt. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).

Q.7 If the housing target set by Policy CS1 is increased, as is suggested in our representations (see Policy CS1 representations), the Key Diagram should be altered in order to identify SHLAA Site S2 (Land North of Barnet Lane) as an allocated housing location. Should the housing target proposed by Policy CS1 remain unchanged, the Key Diagram should be altered in order to identify SHLAA Site S2 (Land North of Barnet Lane) as a safeguarded site.

Q.8

Q.9 For the reasons provided in our representations in respect of Policy CS1, CS2 and CS3 the Key Diagram is considered to be unsound. Accordingly it is crucial that the content of the Key Diagram is explored thoroughly at the oral examination, so as to ensure that it is properly tested.

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/2/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*3. Housing*

On behalf of

**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 In order to meet the housing target set out in Policy CS6, there is a significant reliance upon urban sites identified in the SHLAA. There does not appear to have been any discounting exercise to cater for the probability that not all SHLAA sites are likely to come forward.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Gill & David Jay  
RCS/R27//4678/1/C Gill & David Jay

Section  
3. Housing

On behalf of  
Gill & David Jay

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Finds it difficult to reconcile the many tables showing the sources of new housing. With reference to the location of new homes in Potters Bar finds it difficult to identify how the town will deliver in excess of 350 homes (10% of the total new homes under CS2) without the use of Green Belt sites which would be contrary to paragraph 3.10 that states 'there is anticipated to be sufficient land without a new to release land in the Green Belt for development'. Grammatical error in the sentence 'if the sites in the SHLAA do not come forward at the anticipated rate [?] be a need to review the focus on housing growth within existing built up area'. Paragraph 3.11 seems to give advance warning that the Council may choose to designate Green Belt land for development.

An ability to default to Green Belt land significantly weakens the status of that land and residents' confidence in its protection because:

There is no statement of policy regarding how the Council views the relative merits of different Green Belt sites i.e. which are the Green Belt sites with the weakest case for retention or the strongest case for development

There is no clear statement as to where the Council would revise the contribution of each town towards the total under CS2 if by doing so the development of Green Belt land could be avoided.

The Core Strategy should provide residents with confidence that the Green Belt really does have the highest possible protection through specific, unambiguous policy statement

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/7/O Shire Consulting*

Section  
*3. Housing*

On behalf of

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Core Strategy has now acknowledged the concerns expressed by ourselves and others that the artificial reduction of the RSS housing requirement was unsound but there is still no apparent justification for using an annual figure below that recommended by the Panel and set out in the RSS. Table 3 refers to "meeting the housing needs of the local population" but this ignores the fact that Hertsmere Council can have no control whatsoever over in-migration to the district, a point effectively acknowledged in the recognition of "the high degree of mobility and levels of in and out-commuting".

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/10/O Shire Consulting*

Section  
*3.3 Housing Land Availability*

On behalf of  
**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The section of the Core Strategy entitled "Housing Land Availability" has evidently been written in an attempt to address some of the serious criticisms made by the previous Inspector but it does not provide a clear explanation of the alleged supply figures or the housing trajectory. For example the text, table 8 and Figure 2 confuse "allocations" and "commitments" and the Gross/Net Yield figures make paltry allowances for slippage. The Council has been forced to accept changes in its approach but the document still gives the impression that evidence has been tailored to suit the reduction requirement that the Council has chosen. The RSS requirement for a 15 year period would be 3750. Table 8 alleges a net 15 year supply of 3740, a figure which seems to have been designed to just exceed the Council's reduction requirement. In Appendix 5 of the "Statement of Consultation" the Council takes issue with our previous comments on housing land supply on the basis that we were involved in the workshop of the SHLAA process, but involvement does not imply endorsement of the results. Indeed we expressed our reservation on a number of occasions during that process.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham Parish Council  
*RCS/R27/1192/3/C Aldenham Parish Council*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Table 8 Projected Housing Supply in Hertsmere  
2012 to 2027*

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 APC would request that the table is amended so that Aldenham is shown separately, instead of as part of Bushey. Aldenham is in the Parish of Aldenham with Radlett - Bushey is separate. This will allow APC to see how many settlements are proposed for its parish.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Mr Hawkins  
*RCS/R27//2593/1/C Mr Hawkins*

Section  
*3.10 Green Belt*

On behalf of

Mr Hawkins

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Finds it difficult to reconcile the many tables showing the sources of new housing. With reference to the location of new homes in Potters Bar finds it difficult to identify how the town will deliver in excess of 350 homes (10% of the total new homes under CS2) without the use of Green Belt sites which would be contrary to paragraph 3.10 that states 'there is anticipated to be sufficient land without a new to release land in the Green Belt for development'. Grammatical error in the sentence 'if the sites in the SHLAA do not come forward at the anticipated rate [?] be a need to review the focus on housing growth within existing built up area'. Paragraph 3.11 seems to give advance warning that the Council may choose to designate Green Belt land for development.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
RCS/R27/4504/7/O Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Section  
3.10 Green Belt

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 As per our comments to paragraph 2.26, we are aware that in the Council's view the SHLAA has identified "sufficient" land across the Borough to accommodate 3,550 homes without developing on greenfield land within the Green Belt. However, there is no comment/analysis to clarify whether these identified sites represent suitable, deliverable or viable development prospects. Without this information it is difficult to assess whether the Council's assertion that future housing targets can reasonably be met within existing urban areas is realistic/robust.

On this basis, it continues to be our view that the Council should not preclude the redevelopment of redundant/vacant brownfield sites with the Green Belt (in accordance with paragraph 2.37). Particularly, such development can address existing local deficiencies (particularly in terms of access to open space) and can provide an improved defensible boundary to the Green Belt.

Q.7 As per our comments above

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4658/12/O Shire Consulting

Section  
3.10 Green Belt

On behalf of

Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Despite the starting point for the Council's approach to development (an immutable Green Belt), paragraph 3.10 and 3.11 also seems to suggest that if the SHLAA sites do not come forward, there will be a need to review GB boundaries. If that is the case it should be made explicit. Furthermore it begs the question, if the Council is uncertain, why is it so adamant that Green Belt boundaries do not need to be looked at now? If the Council is relying upon subsequent DPDs in case it needs to consider changes to the Green Belt, that matter should be addressed first in the Core Strategy. If not, it is hard to see how a subsequent DPD can be in conformity with the Core Strategy. Furthermore, given the length of time that it is taking to attempt to achieve a sound Core Strategy, we are not optimistic about the likely timescales for the Council producing further DPDs. Such blatant manipulation of the housing figures to suit a political agenda is the antithesis of planning and further adds to the unsoundness of the Core Strategy.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)  
*RCS/R27/4676/4/O Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr*

Section  
*3.10 Green Belt*

On behalf of

**Philips Planning (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The housing trajectory indicates that future housing delivery, even should contingent sites become truly available will be less than past performance and annualised RBS/RCS development rate. This is not justified. It is unlikely to be effective in meeting future housing requirements and their delivery given the level of contingencies on which it is dependent and is inconsistent with national policy as contained in both PPS1, PPS3, PPS12 and the draft NPPF to meet housing requirements and increase housing supply and the availability of housing land. (This comment also relates to para. 3.11 and fig. 2).
- Q.7 The trajectory and para. 3.10 need to be made consistent with increased housing provision based upon an up-to-date SHMA which assesses overall housing requirements. (See related representations on other parts of the draft core strategy.)
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The issues raised are fundamental to the Core Strategy and have been consistently made by the representor without the substance of the representation being taken into account by the Borough Council.



Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
RCS/R27/4553/10/C Hertfordshire County Council

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of

HCC Spatial and Land use Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Whilst some 300 dwellings short of the housing growth requirement for the Borough identified within the East of England Plan, paragraph 2.26 states that the housing growth level proposed within the Core Strategy still remains in general conformity with the Plan. The scale of underprovision compared to East of England Plan requirements is not too dissimilar from that proposed within the Broxbourne Core Strategy which has recently been subject to examination. It would be helpful for supporting documentation/evidence be presented to articulate a more detailed explanation of the reasoning behind the shortfall. PPS3 (Para 10) and the NPPF (Para 28) make it clear that future housing targets should take into account housing need and demand, household and population projections, and housing need. LPAs should meet the full requirements for market and affordable housing in their housing market area, with a duty to cooperate.

Q.7 With the East of England Plan in force there should be greater clarity on the justification for not meeting the full housing requirement for the Borough identified in the East of England Plan.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/16/C Shire Consulting*

Section  
*Policy CS1 The supply of new homes*

On behalf of  
**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 In Policy CS1 point (vii) is totally unnecessary as it duplicates matters covered by Government Policy in PPG2.
- Q.7 It should be deleted. Point (x) should also be deleted as it is not within the control of either the Council or developers to provide this for "all development across the Borough".
- Q.8
- Q.9

Rep Number Name: Thames Water Property Services  
RCS/R27/1055/2/O Thames Water Property Services

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of  
Thames Water

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS1 sets out that the Council will take account of local infrastructure capacity when identifying locations for new development in the Site Allocations DPD.

It is not clear whether this reference to local infrastructure capacity includes sewerage infrastructure. Notwithstanding this sewerage infrastructure is complex with sewerage networks serving multiple local authority districts and development occurring within one district can impact on the capacity available elsewhere in the network. Development Plan allocations provide the clearest picture of growth to allow for upgrades to water and wastewater infrastructure to be planned. However, the proposed revocation of the regional spatial strategies results in less certainty over the location and scale of development in order to help plan for strategic upgrades. Individual development sites can impact on the sewerage network and the scale of the impact depends on various factors including the scale of the development and the point of connection to the sewerage network. As a result it is difficult to identify whether upgrades to the sewerage networks are required to support development until there is more certainty over the location, scale and phasing of development.

It is essential that any necessary upgrades to sewerage networks and infrastructure are provided ahead of the occupation of development in order to avoid adverse impacts such as sewer flooding or pollution of watercourses. In order to ensure that capacity exists or can be provided ahead of the occupation of development.

With regard to sewage treatment capacity, most of the sewage from Hertsmere flows to Maple Lodge Sewage Treatment Works (STW) in Three Rivers District Council with the remainder being treated at Blackbirds STW located within the Hertsmere. The Three Rivers Water Cycle Study Scoping Report highlights that upgrades will be required either at Maple Lodge or Blackbirds STWs to support growth within the study area. As the flows from Hertsmere go to these sewage treatment works it is considered that the scoping report should form part of the evidence base for the Core Strategy. This is acknowledged in the response to our comments from January 2011 set out in the Statement of Consultation however, no reference to the potential upgrades to Maple Lodge or Blackbirds STW or the Three Rivers Water Cycle Study Scoping Report are made within the Core Strategy. As such the Core Strategy is not considered to be justified or effective. We are working with local authorities to ensure that upgrades required at Maple Lodge and Blackbirds together with strategic upgrades to the sewerage network are delivered to support growth and would be keen to work with Hertsmere to understand the location, scale and phasing of growth to help inform strategic infrastructure investment.

Q.7 Supporting text should be provided for Policy CS1 to highlight that Hertsmere will work with Thames Water in order to ensure that strategic wastewater infrastructure required to support growth will be delivered.

With regard to localised network upgrades, we have recommended revisions to Policy CS15 and the supporting text to ensure that any necessary upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: CPRE Hertfordshire  
RCS/R27//1491/1/O CPRE Hertfordshire

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of  
CPRE Hertfordshire

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 As currently worded, clause (vii) of Policy CS1 misleadingly implies that only 'inappropriate development' that is harmful to the openness and appearance of the Green Belt should be avoided, whereas all development that is inappropriate in the Green Belt should be avoided, because it is contrary to national policy, as currently set out in PPG2. The misleading implication is a result of a comma being omitted after 'inappropriate development'. The policy is therefore inconsistent with the text of the Revised Core Strategy and with Policy CS12, as well as national policy.
- Q.7 The unsoundness of the wording of Policy CS1 (vii) could be conveniently corrected by the inclusion of a comma after the words 'inappropriate development', but for greater clarity the following text could be inserted at this point:- 'in the Green Belt, particularly such development'
- Q.8 No
- Q.9

Rep Number Name: Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX  
RCS/R27/4312/2/O Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of

Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Object to the Revised Core Strategy's claim in paragraph 2.26 that the proposed quantum and distribution of development would be in 'general conformity' with the East of Eland Plan 2001-2021 (EEP), rolled forward to the end of the Revised Core Strategy plan period (2027). The EEP housing target for Hertsmere is 5,000 units over twenty years, or 250 units per annum. Applying the EEP figures over 15 years, the housing target for Hertsmere would be 3,750 based on the EEP figures, a target 200 units in total greater than that proposed by the Revised Core Strategy. No justification has been provided to demonstrate why this 200 unit difference has not been considered by the Revised Core Strategy.

Similarly, the HBC Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Update (November 2011) acknowledges that the housing target of 3,550 is in conformity with the EEP which is incorrect. The SHLAA update identifies that there is sufficient land supply for 3,716 dwellings over a 15 year period, or 3,559, when the lapse rate is applied. This is broadly equivalent to the Revised Core Strategy housing target of 3,550 and CEMEX suggest that the housing target has been applied on the basis that this accords with where land is available in preferred locations (previously developed site and urban locations) to avoid Green Belt release, rather than assessing housing need in the Borough. CEMEX consider that housing land availability does not reflect housing need. The London Commuter Belt (West) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2008 covering the period 2007-2021 demonstrates a housing need which exceeds the Revised Core Strategy Housing Target. The SHMA identifies a need for 3,600 new dwellings in Hertsmere during 2007-2021. On an annual basis, this amounts to 257 dwellings per annum, a figure greater than the EEP housing target. Applied to the fifteen year Revised Core Strategy plan period, this annual requirement amounts to a total housing need of 3,857, demonstrating that housing need exceeds even the EEP housing target and further emphasises the necessity of some selective Green Belt release during the plan period.

To emphasise this further CEMEX highlight the findings of demographic data released following the adoption of the EEP and preparation of the SHMA and noted in CEMZ's previous representations (March 2011) which indicates that housing need is likely to escalate.

Q.7 Suggest that Policy CS1 is amended to accommodate the requirement for these further dwellings, and believe that a good proportion of the additional dwellings could be provided following consideration of Green Belt boundaries adjacent to existing residential development - such as the Kemprow Farm site.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
*RCS/R27/4504/5/O Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning*

Section  
*Policy CS1 The supply of new homes*

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We note that Policy CS1 is targeting the provision of 3,550 over the plan period at a rate of 237 homes per annum. However, this target is below the East of England Plan's housing targets for Hertsmere, which seek the provision of 5,000 homes between 2001 and 2021, at an annual rate of 260 dwellings per annum. In our view, the Council needs to provide clear evidence to support/explain why the East of England Plan targets have not been adopted in this particular case.

Whilst we broadly support the criterion which will be taken into account when providing new homes, Policy CS1 should also recognise that there may be suitable opportunities to undertake development on redundant/vacant brownfield sites with the Green Belt (in accordance with paragraph 2.37). Particularly, where such development can address existing local deficiencies (particularly in terms of access to open space).

Q.7 As per out comments above

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: Stevenage Borough Council  
RCS/R27//4593/1/O Stevenage Borough Council

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of  
Stevenage Borough Council

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The Courts have made plain that, for so long as Regional Strategies subsist, any Core Strategy submitted for examination must be in conformity with it. Looking ahead, the Localism Act contains provisions for the Secretary of State to revoke any Regional Strategy in part or in whole by Order. If and when these are given effect, decisions about the appropriate level of homes to be built in the future will become a matter for individual authorities. This will be subject to the tests of soundness and successfully discharging the duty to co-operate. Historically, there has been a strategy of redistribution among districts in Hertfordshire to ensure that the development needs of the County are at least broadly met (c.f. Hertfordshire Structure Plan Review 1991-2011 [adopted 1998] and the East of England Plan [2008]). This strategy has effectively allowed some authorities to underprovide housing when measured against their projected needs on the basis that it is offset by overprovision elsewhere. However, it is clear (c.f. Stevenage's Draft Core Strategy) that it will not be possible to simply rely on this approach continuing in the future. Current Government guidance on setting housing targets is set in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3). PPS3 requires, inter alia, that targets be informed by assessments of need and demand using the findings of the SHMA and Government household projections. The draft National Planning Policy Framework meanwhile suggests that authorities should plan to meet the full requirements for market and affordable housing in their housing market area. There is currently no framework for co-operation and / or the redistribution of targets amongst authorities or housing market areas in Hertfordshire (or beyond) to meet these requirements in the event that the East of England Plan is revoked. Until such time as a framework exists, it is considered unlikely that any individual authority proposing housing targets which are lower than locally-assessed need would be able to demonstrate that the duty-to-cooperate has been discharged and that the tests of soundness have been met. Notwithstanding these points, even while the East of England Plan subsists, the rejection of Stevenage's Draft Core Strategy critically undermines the basis on which the housing targets in Policy H1 for the other districts in Hertfordshire were arrived at.
- Q.7 Reasoned justification for any underprovision of housing against identified needs including mechanisms for ensuring that any shortage is provided for elsewhere within the housing market area or beyond. Demonstration that the duty to co-operate has been successfully discharged including, but not limited to, consideration of the above.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To ensure that these matters are fully considered.

Rep Number Name: Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)  
RCS/R27/4634/3/O Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston)

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of

Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The RCS fails to plan for a review of the Green Belt and is therefore not flexible in accordance with the requirements of PPS12. The application of the urban intensification approach within the RCS is not based upon a robust assessment of likely delivery and is in conflict with PPS3 and PPS12. The LPA wishes to prevent development in the Green Belt at the cost of delivering sufficient affordable homes and infrastructure and would therefore fail to deliver the objectives of the RCS, which are in conflict with one another. Indeed, the RCS relies on the delivery of housing in current employment areas, an approach that is not supported by its own evidence base, which demonstrates that there should be no reduction in employment land. As such, it is considered that the LPA is not able to demonstrate a developable supply of housing land to meet the requirement during the plan period to 2027 and it is felt that this necessitates the release of land from the Green Belt. (These comments also relate to Policy CS2). (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 A Green Belt review should be undertaken and the RCS should be amended to make reference to this study. Land exists to the north east of Borehamwood and south of Potters Bar (SHLAA refs. S52, S53, S54 & S56) that is suitable and available. The RCS should include a new policy in relation to the land north east of Borehamwood stating that 'Land to the north east of Borehamwood, as shown on the key diagram, is identified for a sustainable urban extension to provide for a mixed community of up to around 750 dwellings together with associated infrastructure. The detailed boundaries of the broad location together with the overall quantum of housing development, including the amount of necessary supporting infrastructure will be a matter to be determined through a development brief in consultation with the local community.' A similar worded policy for the two areas of land to the south of Potters Bar should be prepared, though it should specify that the sites would yield 150 dwellings each. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.8
- Q.9 To expand upon our representations and to take account of the most up to date and publically available information.



Rep Number Name: Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)  
RCS/R27/4634/4/O Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston)

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of

Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The RSS should be the starting point for any housing target. However, the Council should also have regard for PPS3 and the draft NPPF, which require that LPAs meet the full requirements for market and affordable housing, taking into account need and demand. Given that the SHMA indicates that there is a greater need for housing than set out in the RSS, the housing target should be higher. The target seems to be based on the SHLAA and available capacity within urban areas; it should be based on an assessment of need. Demographic data from the Chelmer model should not be used to assess need, as it is not the most up-to-date assessment of need. Furthermore, the SHLAA demonstrates that the Council's strategy as set out in the RCS would fail to provide a sufficient level of housing and would be inflexible and uncertain, due to a heavy reliance upon the Elstree Way Corridor, Broad Locations and the BBC Elstree site. (These comments also relate to paragraphs 3.1-3.14). (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 A Green Belt review should be undertaken and the RCS should be amended to make reference to this study. Land exists to the north east of Borehamwood and south of Potters Bar (SHLAA refs. S52, S53, S54 & S56) that is suitable and available. The RCS should include a new policy in relation to the land north east of Borehamwood stating that 'Land to the north east of Borehamwood, as shown on the key diagram, is identified for a sustainable urban extension to provide for a mixed community of up to around 750 dwellings together with associated infrastructure. The detailed boundaries of the broad location together with the overall quantum of housing development, including the amount of necessary supporting infrastructure will be a matter to be determined through a development brief in consultation with the local community.' A similar worded policy for the two areas of land to the south of Potters Bar should be prepared, though it should specify that the sites would yield 150 dwellings each. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To expand upon our representations and to take account of the most up to date and publically available information.

Rep Number Name: Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd  
*RCS/R27//4647/1/O Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd*

Section  
*Policy CS1 The supply of new homes*

On behalf of

Mr J Onona

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is considered that the 10% reduction in the RSS housing target is 'significant'. It is not considered that a wide range of data sources has been used to determine the figure, and therefore unreasonable and unsound. It is considered that population projections, household growth and affordable housing targets have not been taken into account. It is thought that there is an over reliance on windfall sites and that projected housing densities in the SHLAA are unrealistic. It is not thought that the Council have taken into account housing trends to date, or the possibility of Green Belt review.

Q.7 None

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 'For these reasons, the RCS is unsound and therefore we wish to participate at the oral examination'

Rep Number Name: Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)  
RCS/R27//4675/1/O Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of

Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The approach adopted by the Council thus far in order to determine the extent of housing targets is considered to be flawed and moreover is inconsistent with the clear guidance given by PPS3. The RCS does not provide any genuine evidence to substantiate the target set by Policy CS1, indeed the Council's own data would seem to suggest that the targets are far too modest to satisfy projected housing need. At paragraph 2.27 the RCS states that the target set by Policy CS1 takes account of infrastructure constraints but there is no indication within the RCS or any other document as to what these might be. It would appear from the Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan 2011-203123 that there are no strategic transport deficiencies which would constrain development in the Borough (refer to Policy CS3 representations for further details). The housing target set by Policy CS1 of the RCS is therefore inconsistent with the guidance of PPS3 and is not justified by a robust and credible evidence base as required by PPS12.  
Policy CS1 also requires housing development to be focussed within existing urban areas. it is our view however that there are insufficient deliverable urban sites to satisfy the targets set by Policy CS1, let alone any increase which may be required to these targets. It is therefore highly likely that there will be a need for some Green Belt release in order to supplement urban land supply. At this stage, the Council have not undertaken any technical work to consider the implications of Green Belt release and as such the RCS provides no indication of where development in the Green Belt should be located if urban land fails to deliver a sufficient number of dwellings. It is not sufficiently robust to simply state that strategic issues of this nature will be considered at a later date.  
We would therefore urge the Inspector to postpone Examination of the RCS in order to allow the Council to undertake a full and proper review of existing Green Belt boundaries. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 On the basis that both the wording and content of Policy CS1 is considered to be unsound, it would not be appropriate to suggest changes to the policy, given that any changes would fundamentally alter the overall strategy for growth in the Borough, thus requiring further technical work and public consultation. Nonetheless, at the very least, the RCS should seek to make up the previous shortfall in supply, when calculated against the EEP target. Policy CS1 should also make it very clear that housing targets are the minimum development required and should not be seen as a ceiling to development.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The brief assessment provided demonstrates that the terms of Policy CS1 are both illegal and unsound. Accordingly it is crucial that these issues are explored thoroughly at the oral examination, so as to ensure that the policy is properly tested.

Rep Number Name: Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)  
*RCS/R27//4676/1/O Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr*

Section  
*Policy CS1 The supply of new homes*

On behalf of

**Philips Planning (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The policy relates only to the assessed supply of housing sites and even in this respect is dependent on a number of contingent sites possibly coming forward. It does not relate to any overall assessment of the requirements and is deficient in meeting even the Council's own assessment of the requirement for affordable housing. The proposed policy is inconsistent with national policy as contained in PPS1, PPS3 and the emerging NPPF. No justification is given as to how it relates to housing requirements, nor is it likely to be effective in either meeting those requirements or maintaining an increased supply and choice and housing. (This comment also relates to paras. 3.12 and 3.13).

Q.7 (No comments submitted).

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 The issues raised are fundamental to the Core Strategy and have been consistently made by the representor without the substance of the representation being taken into account by the Borough Council.

Rep Number Name: Taylor Wimpey North Thames  
RCS/R27/4679/1/O Taylor Wimpey North Thames

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of

Taylor Wimpey North Thames

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 While TWNT welcome the proposed increase in the housing target from 3,200 to 3,550 dwellings, the revised figure still falls short of the RSS target and is not fully reflective of local identified need and will limit the potential of the Revised Core Strategy (RCS). It is evident that the Council have undertaken further work to identify additional sources of housing land and that the updated SHLAA work now indicates that just over 3,550 dwellings could potentially be delivered over the next 15 years. The Council have again therefore used the SHLAA and the identified potential supply of urban land outside the Green Belt to set the target rather than identifying an adequate supply of land to meet the results of an objective assessment of need as both current (paragraph 33, PPS3) and emerging (paragraphs 14 & 15, NPPF) guidance at the national level require. Furthermore, so far as the SHLAA identifies a supply of land only marginally above the revised target the Council's approach assumes that all sites identified will come forward. The reality is that they will not and the approach being adopted in the RCS does not therefore provide for a flexible, rolling programme of housing land that PPS3 or the emerging NPPF require. If the Council is to maximise the use of urban land for housing and to avoid the need to utilise Green Belt land then every opportunity will need to be sought to increase the yield of dwellings from urban sites within the main settlements.

Q.7 It must be demonstrated that the housing target is based upon an objective and robust assessment of need and not just available capacity in urban land in line with national guidance (paragraph 33, PPS3 and further supplemented by paragraphs 14 & 15 of emerging NPPF). The supply of housing land identified over the plan period must be sufficient enough to ensure a continuous supply of available, suitable and deliverable land remains in the event that identified sites do not come forward as anticipated (paragraphs 52 & 53, PPS3 and paragraph 109, emerging NPPF).

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust  
RCS/R27//4680/1/O Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of

Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Paragraphs 3.3- 3.14 of the Core Strategy provide background to justify the policy wording for policy CS1. This clearly sets out that Hertsmere Borough Council does not intend to allocate or safeguard any land within the greenbelt over the plan period. This is a change to the 2008 Core Strategy submission, which made provision for a number of 'areas of search' which were considered potential sustainable locations should greenbelt land by required to meet regional housing targets.

From reviewing the Core Strategy and other supporting documents, it appears that the change in strategy towards greenbelt land release is based on two factors:

1. The results of the SHLAA (2010), which identified a potential supply of 3,740 dwellings from brownfield/sites within the development boundary.
2. The abolition of the East of England Plan (2008), which gives Councils the flexibility to set their own housing targets

The ability of Hertsmere to set their own housing targets is not in question, however prior to the adoption of the plan the Council needs to justify that the number of dwellings identified within the town/village development boundaries are fully deliverable and achievable over the plan period. Although 3,740 dwellings have been identified as suitable within the SHLAA, there is evidence to suggest that several of the sites will not be deliverable or achievable within the plan period. For this reason it is not considered that policy CS1 fully meets the test of 'soundness'.

Q.7 It is suggested that the wording of bullet point 6 be amended as set out below and that an additional bullet point be added.

- vi) the need to focus the majority development within the boundaries of existing built- up areas
- vii) the need to allow for a limited release of greenbelt land, adjacent to the main settlements. This will include land at Little Bushey Lane, Bushey and .(for Council to insert other sites as appropriate).

Or the alternative wording to the additional paragraph, should the Council not wish to commit to greenbelt land release at this stage.

vii) the need to safeguard a limited amount of greenbelt land, adjacent to the main settlements. The safeguarded greenbelt sites include land at Little Bushey Lane, Bushey (for Council to insert other sites as appropriate). The 2010/2011 annual monitoring report (AMR) confirmed that only 156 dwellings were built in the monitoring year of 2010/2011. This is significantly below the previous target of 250 units per annum and the proposed Core Strategy target of 237 units per annum. Given that the SHLAA identifies that 968 dwellings are expected to come forward from development that already has planning permission or allocated sites this low completion level suggests significant question mark over the deliverability of these sites. The sharp fall in completions in 2010/2011 as predicted suggests substantial issues with regard to the deliverability of brownfield land/other land within development boundaries. In addition from reviewing the SHLAA (2010) it is apparent that the submission of most of the sites that have been put forward for development are not substantiated by a robust evidence base. There is a high probability that many of the 'deliverable' sites identified will suffer from issues relating to transport/access, foul water/surface water drainage problems and contaminated land issues, all common problems in the deliverability of brownfield land. Once the appropriate surveys have been undertaken it is likely to render a number of the sites either unviable or not suitable for development.

To address this fundamental problem the Council needs to give additional flexibility towards the release of greenbelt land. This will ensure that an adequate supply of deliverable housing exists to meet the required housing numbers. The best method of achieving this would be to allow for the release of well- positioned greenbelt land.

The site at Little Bushey Lane, Bushey (see attached plan) has a very strong relationship with the existing town development boundary for Bushey. It also benefits

Q.8

Yes

Q.9

Attendance in public is required to put forward a robust case to support the comments provided in this statement. In particular we would like to provide evidence with regard to the 5- year land supply and viability; with reference to the available sites set out in the SHLAA, and to address the issue of delivery of affordable housing over the plan period.

Rep Number Name: Knight Frank  
*RCS/R27/4681/1/O Knight Frank*

Section  
*Policy CS1 The supply of new homes*

On behalf of  
Knight Frank (on behalf of Enfield BC)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The housing target identified is not based on a robust and credible evidence base, which should include migration data and demographic changes. It is therefore inconsistent with PPS12 and the emerging NPPF. Based on ONS Government Projections the Council should plan for 810 new homes per annum over the plan period. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).

Q.7 The housing target should be brought more in line with the ONS Government Projections. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A



Rep Number Name: NLP for CEG and Owners of Potters Bar Golf Club  
RCS/R27/4683/1/O NLP for CEG and Owners of Potters Bar Golf

Section  
Policy CS1 The supply of new homes

On behalf of  
CEG and Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Revised Core Strategy as it currently stands is unsound because it does not adequately justify the scale and distribution of development for the Borough, in the context of the evidence on objectively assessed development needs.

The distribution and level of development proposed through the Revised Core Strategy does not accord with, or deliver the aims and objectives of, national policy, specifically homes and jobs to meet needs nor the stated aims and objectives of the Revised Core Strategy itself.

Q.7 Due to the above, in order to make the Core Strategy sound, there needs to be an amendment to Policies CS1 and CS2 and the supporting text to require a higher dwelling target. This should be set at a minimum of 350 dwellings per annum, equivalent to 5,250 dwellings over the period 2012-2027.

Policies CS1 and CS2 will therefore need to be changed to include a recognition that Green Belt release is likely to be necessary to accommodate the higher dwelling target and that the suitable sites to deliver this will be identified through the forthcoming Site Allocations Document which will amend Green Belt boundaries accordingly. This will similarly need to be reflected in CS12 where it should be identified that whilst the presumption against inappropriate development, which causes harm to the openness and appearance of the Green Belt, will remain, suitable sites for amendments to the Green Belt will be considered through the Site Allocations DPD where it can be demonstrated they are appropriate and will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt. This will include assessing those Green Belt sites already deemed deliverable through the SHLAA. A 'Strategic Assessment of the Need for Housing in Hertsmere' is also attached to the representation.

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 CEG and the Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course consider the Revised Core Strategy is not a sound and robust basis for the future planning of Hertsmere and wish to reserve the right to appear at the oral examination on the basis of the representations set out.

Rep Number Name: Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX  
*RCS/R27/4312/3/O Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX*

Section  
*Policy CS2 The location of new homes*

On behalf of

Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Object to the way the housing target total has been allocated to the settlements in the hierarchy, in particular for Radlett. Suggest that the distribution of housing land to Radlett is insufficient for a settlement identified on the third level of the settlement hierarchy.

Suggests contradiction between paragraph 2.39 setting out the reasons why Radlett has been attributed at least 5% of new housing, justified by limited scope and capacity for growth, with the profile of the settlement provided in Table 6 which identifies Radlett as a district centre "servicing local residents and visitors from further afield. Also, does not recognise that new development can deliver improvements to local infrastructure to overcome shortfalls. CEMEX finds this policy unsound as it is inconsistent and unjustified due to flaws in the evidence base.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd  
*RCS/R27/4647/2/O Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd*

Section  
*Policy CS2 The location of new homes*

On behalf of

Mr J Onona

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is considered that there should be a review of Green Belt land with a view to delivering housing in the long term. It is not thought that the policy is based on 'credible evidence'. Representation relates to site S163 in Borehamwood, within the Green Belt but with good access to the town centre. It is considered that this site should be released as part of the Core Strategy in a phased approach over the course of the plan.

Q.7 None

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 'For these reasons, the RCS is unsound and therefore we wish to participate at the oral examination'

Rep Number Name: Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)  
RCS/R27/4675/2/O Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)

Section  
Policy CS2 The location of new homes

On behalf of

Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 Policy CS2 fails to provide a 'Plan B' in order to ensure that housing growth is directed to appropriate Green Belt locations, should urban land not yield a sufficient number of dwellings to satisfy targets. In accordance with paragraph 2.12 of PPG2 the Council should safeguard appropriate sites to supplement housing land supply now, rather than seeking to review the Green Belt boundary at the end of the plan period. The approach adopted by Policy CS2 is therefore considered to be ineffective and in the absence of a strategic Green Belt review, it is not justified by a robust and credible evidence base in accordance with the requirements of PPS12. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 If the housing target set by Policy CS1 is increased, as is suggested in our representations, the wording of Policy CS2 should be altered to allow for the release and allocation of SHLAA Site S2 in accordance with the Council's phased approach.  
Should the housing target proposed by Policy CS1 remain unchanged, it is considered that the wording of Policy CS2 can be altered as follows to make it sound.  
Policy CS2 Location of New Homes  
Priority will be given to locating the majority of residential development within the main settlements of Borehamwood, Potters Bar and Bushey. Between 2012-2027, up to 60% of new housing will be sought in Borehamwood, at least 10% in Potters Bar, up to 25% in Bushey and at least 5% in Radlett and other suitable locations. Land to the North of Barnet Lane in Borehamwood (shown on the Proposals Map) will also be removed from the Green Belt and safeguarded to meet the development needs of the Borough. Residential development on the site for up to 150 dwellings will be supported if the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year rolling supply of housing land at any time between 2012 - 2027.  
Windfall developments will be supported on appropriate sites in all towns, subject to local environmental constraints, the relationship with the surrounding pattern of development and the requirements of Policies SP1, CS12, CS15, CS16 and other relevant planning policies.  
Within rural locations and in particular, Shenley, Elstree and South Mimms limited, small scale infilling on suitable sites will be supported.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The assessment provided demonstrates that Policy CS2 is unsound. Accordingly it is crucial that the issues raised are explored thoroughly at the oral examination, so as to ensure that the policy is properly tested.

Rep Number Name: Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)  
RCS/R27/4676/5/O Philips Planning Services Ltd (on behalf of Mr

Section  
Policy CS2 The location of new homes

On behalf of

Philips Planning (on behalf of Mr Mark Homan)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The list of core strategy policies to be submitted states that draft policy CS2 replaces saved local plan policy H4 dealing with 'Green Belt safeguarded land for housing'. No reference, justification or explanation relating to this however is contained in the text of the draft core strategy. The 'safeguarded' land does not lie within the approved green belt and adjoins the main settlements of the Borough. Yet reference is only made within the draft text and policies to land 'within' the main settlements and no reference is made to land on the edge of settlements and previously safeguarded for housing under policy H4. The availability of the safeguarded land for housing needs to be made explicit because of the identification of safeguarded sites within the SHLAA as part of the future housing land supply referred to in the draft Core Strategy and its specific reservation for housing development. (This comment also relates to para. 3.12).
- Q.7 Para 3.12 and policy CS2 should be modified to refer to locating the majority of residential development within the main settlements and on land excluded from the green belt and reserved for housing.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The issues raised are fundamental to the Core Strategy and have been consistently made by the representor without the substance of the representation being taken into account by the Borough Council.

Rep Number Name: Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust  
RCS/R27/4680//O Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS2 The location of new homes

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:  
Q.6 The proposal to locate the majority of residential development at the main settlements of Borehamwood, Potters Bar and Bushey is fully supported and is consistent with national policy. The provision of 25% of housing to be located at Bushey is appropriate given its size and that it has the suitable infrastructure to accommodate additional growth.

As discussed in paragraph 2.6, the SHLAA (2011) contains an overview of all of the bdevelopment sites that have been put forward in Bushey, along with a clarification of the number of dwellings likely to come forward from existing allocations and permissions. This sets out that there is a total figure of 612 dwellings expected to come forward from existing allocations and permissions within Bushey and the surrounding area, with a further 148 dwellings allocated as being deliverable on sites within the town development boundary. This gives a total provision over the plan period of 760 units for Bushey. The Council have identified the need to provide 3,550 dwellings over the plan period. Therefore the provision of 760 units falls 128 units short of policy CS2's requirement that 25% of dwellings Borough- wide will be delivered in Bushey. The Council have stated that the shortfall will be made up of windfall housing between 2011-2016. However, this alone cannot be relied upon to meet the demand as there is no certainty regarding windfall sites. Additionally it is assumed that all of the existing allocations, permissions and allocated SHLAA sites will come forward for development. As explained in section 2of this report there is a high probability that the town centre sites identified will not all come forward for development. On this basis within Bushey there is a shortfall of identified sites within the town development boundary and on these grounds the plan is unsound.

As part of the SHLAA review, the Council only identified one suitable greenbelt site around Bushey that is of an adequate capacity to meet the shortfall of housing required to meet the 128 unit shortfall identified in paragraph 4.2. This is site reference S42 at Little Bushey Lane. All of the other identified suitable sites would require the release of a number of greenbelt sites as they do not have the capacity to meet the 128 dwelling shortfall alone. Releasing one larger site has the benefit of being able to provide a significant number of affordable units of a mix and type to meet the demand in the area and reduces the risk of deliverability.

Q.7 The wording for this policy is appropriate; however the Council need to clearly justify their position with regard to the deliverability of the identified sites within the settlement boundary of Bushey to meet the 25% of housing allocated.

Q.8

Q.9 Attendance in public is required to put forward a robust case to support the comments provided in this statement. In particular we would like to provide evidence with regard to the 5- year land supply and viability; with reference to the available sites set out in the SHLAA, and to address the issue of delivery of affordable housing over the plan period.

Rep Number Name: Knight Frank  
*RCS/R27/4681/2/O Knight Frank*

Section  
*Policy CS2 The location of new homes*

On behalf of  
Knight Frank (on behalf of Enfield BC)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 ONS Government Projections show that the housing target should be significantly higher. To reduce the pressure on the infrastructure of the main towns that would arise as a result of this, it is thought that new housing should be distributed more evenly across the Borough. To accommodate the level of growth required new areas outside of the main settlements may also have to be identified. Moreover, many of the sites identified in the SHLAA may not be developed at all, may not come forward at the densities projected, or may not be suitable for families as they would be flats. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 There should be the consideration of the potential of Green Belt sites, some of which could be safeguarded for housing. Specifically, SHLAA site S162 could contribute towards housing supply. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.8 No
- Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: NLP for CEG and Owners of Potters Bar Golf Club  
*RCS/R27/4683/2/O NLP for CEG and Owners of Potters Bar Golf*

Section  
*Policy CS2 The location of new homes*

On behalf of

**CEG and the Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Revised Core Strategy as it currently stands is unsound because it does not adequately justify the scale and distribution of development for the Borough, in the context of the evidence on objectively assessed development needs.

The distribution and level of development proposed through the Revised Core Strategy does not accord with, or deliver the aims and objectives of, national policy, specifically homes and jobs to meet needs nor the stated aims and objectives of the Revised Core Strategy itself.

Q.7 Due to the above, in order to make the Core Strategy sound, there needs to be an amendment to Policies CS1 and CS2 and the supporting text to require a higher dwelling target. This should be set at a minimum of 350 dwellings per annum, equivalent to 5,250 dwellings over the period 2012-2027.

Policies CS1 and CS2 will therefore need to be changed to include a recognition that Green Belt release is likely to be necessary to accommodate the higher dwelling target and that the suitable sites to deliver this will be identified through the forthcoming Site Allocations Document which will amend Green Belt boundaries accordingly. This will similarly need to be reflected in CS12 where it should be identified that whilst the "presumption against inappropriate development, which causes harm to the openness and appearance of the Green Belt", will remain, suitable sites for amendments to the Green Belt will be considered through the Site Allocations DPD where it can be demonstrated they are appropriate and will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt. This will include assessing those Green Belt sites already deemed deliverable through the SHLAA. A greater proportion of any dwelling requirement across the Borough should be delivered in Potters Bar to respond to the local need. Policy CS2 should be amended to state that up to 20% of new housing will be sought in Potters Bar, with the level of growth sought in other areas amended accordingly.

Green Belt release in Potters Bar will be necessary to achieve this with sites and green belt boundaries should be confirmed through the Site Allocations Document. As above, policy CS12 should be amended to reflect this, with the supporting text to CS2 and CS12 specifically identifying Green Belt amendments around Potters Bar as a priority over any Green Belt amendments in other areas of the District in order to address the imbalance in the current distribution of planned development.

Hertsmere Borough has a significant level of housing need and demand, as reflected in its existing evidence base including the Chelmer Demographic projections and the SHMA (notwithstanding the shortcomings of that evidence base). This is also evidenced by NLP's 'Strategic Assessment of the Need for Housing in Hertsmere' which provides a more robust and up-to-date assessment of housing need. Over a long period, population in the Borough has grown, through a combination of natural change, and, in most recent years, net immigration.

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 CEG and the Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course consider the Revised Core Strategy is not a sound and robust basis for the future planning of Hertsmere (see attached representations) and wish to reserve the right to appear at the oral examination on the basis of the representations set out.



Rep Number Name: PPML Consulting Ltd (on behalf of Annington Developments Ltd)  
RCS/R27/4687/3/O PPML Consulting Ltd (on behalf of Annington

Section  
3.15 Infilling

On behalf of

PPML (on behalf of Annington Developments)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Paragraph 3.15 - the definition of infilling is too restrictive. There is no specific guidance on this matter in national policy guidance PPG 2 that would support limiting infilling to one or two dwellings. The quantum of development subject of infilling should be determined on a site by site basis. Bushey should be added to the list of locations where a development boundary should be proposed allowing appropriate infilling.

Q.7 Remove reference to 'one or two dwellings'. The quantum should be determined on a site by site basis. The village of Bushy should be added to the list where a development boundary is proposed.

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX  
RCS/R27/4312/4/O Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX

Section  
Policy CS3 Phasing of Development

On behalf of  
Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 CEMEX consider the housing targets are insufficient and anticipate a shortfall will occur and consider the policy unsound as it is not in accordance with adopted or emerging national policy

Highlights that to future proof the Core Strategy it must be in general conformity with the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) specifically a requirement for Local Planning Authorities to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites, plus an additional allowance of 20%. Without the Core Strategy taking the NPPF into consideration there is uncertainty over the delivery of housing sites in the Borough to meet the targets and a review of the Core Strategy will be inevitable.

CEMEX reference Policy H1 - Regional Housing Provision 2001-2021 of the EEP highlighting that district housing allocations are to be regards as minimum targets to be achieved, rather than ceilings which should not be exceeded.

Q.7 A further review of the evidence base and the SHLAA to demonstrate how this further 20% could be accommodated is required.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd  
*RCS/R27/4647/3/O Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd*

Section  
*Policy CS3 Phasing of Development*

On behalf of

Mr J Onona

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is not considered that the Core Strategy is in line with PPS3 on delivering housing, and therefore no justification for the phasing of development in the manner suggested in the document. It is considered that the policy should allow for the release of 'safeguarded Green Belt land' - specifically site S163

Q.7

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 'For these reasons, the RCS is unsound and therefore we wish to participate at the oral examination'

Rep Number Name: Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)  
*RCS/R27/4675/3/O Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)*

Section  
*Policy CS3 Phasing of Development*

On behalf of

**Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 For the reasons provided above, Policy CS3 would fail to effectively control the delivery of development across the plan period. It is the responsibility of the Council to increase the supply of housing in accordance with Government guidance. The nominal threshold imposed by Policy CS3 will simply place an unjustified moratorium on the delivery of housing in Hertsmere. This is an unnecessarily restrictive policy position that has no foundation in either the current suite of national planning policy documents or the emerging NPPF.  
Policy CS3 also fails to provide sufficient clarity as to the mechanism and process which will be entered into by the Council in order to review the phasing of housing delivery in the event that there is a shortfall in supply. To simply state that a review will be undertaken does not go far enough. The policy must include wording which clearly sets out the Council's intended approach. This approach should include the identification of safeguarded Green Belts sites. In absence of a strategic Green Belt review, it is considered that SHLAA Site S2 (Land North of Barnet Lane) should fall into this category (please refer to Policy CS2 representations for further details of SHLAA Site S2 and the reasons for releasing the site from the Green Belt).  
Policy CS3 is therefore considered to be unsound, insofar as it is not justified, effective or consistent with national planning policy. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 If the housing target set by Policy CS1 is increased, as is suggested in our representations (see Policy CS1 representations). The wording of Policy CS3 should be altered to allow for the release and allocation of SHLAA Site S2 in accordance with the Council's phased approach.  
We are unclear as to the process which will be undertaken by the Council to review the phasing of sites (as suggested by policy CS3) and therefore it is not possible to provide an alternative wording which would make Policy CS3 sound. It is however suggested that, should the housing target proposed by Policy CS1 remain unchanged, the second paragraph of Policy CS3 be deleted entirely and that reference is made to SHLAA Site S2, which should be safeguarded for development in order to address any shortfall in supply.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The assessment provided above demonstrates that Policy CS3 is unsound. Accordingly it is crucial that the issues raised are explored thoroughly at the oral examination, so as to ensure that the policy is properly tested.

Rep Number Name: Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust  
RCS/R27/4680/3/O Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust

Section  
Policy CS3 Phasing of Development

On behalf of  
Strutt and Parker LLP

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The principle of this policy is supported, however there needs to be additional flexibility to ensure that development comes forward quickly if housing levels fall below the target development rate. Support is given to the recognition that if the delivery of housing falls below 20% of the development rate over 3 consecutive years, consideration will be given to the release of land from the greenbelt. However, there is a statutory requirement for the Council to maintain a 5 year supply of land. Currently policy CS3 requires the Council to undertake a review of the Core Strategy prior to allocation new sites. This is likely to be a lengthy process, involving several rounds of consultation and will not allow development to come forward at a rate, which will maintain the 5 year supply of land. To introduce increased flexibility and to allow development to come forward quickly, in the event that housing levels fall below the target of 237 dwellings per calendar year for three years running, a limited number of greenbelt sites should designated as 'safeguarded.' These safeguarded sites would be available to come straight forward for housing without the Council needing to undertake a detailed and potentially time consuming review as currently required by policy CS3.
- Q.7 It is recommended that paragraph 3 of policy CS3 be amended as follows, to ensure that the Core Strategy is consistent with national policy: 'Where the housing delivery is projected to fall below the proportion sought in each phase by at least 20% over three years, the safeguarded greenbelt sites will be released as sites available for housing allocation.'
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 Attendance in public is required to put forward a robust case to support the comments provided in this statement. In particular we would like to provide evidence with regard to the 5- year land supply and viability; with reference to the available sites set out in the SHLAA, and to address the issue of delivery of affordable housing over the plan period.

Rep Number Name: Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G) c/o Jones Lang LaSalle  
*RCS/R27/4689/2/O Legal and General Life Fund Partnership*

Section  
*Policy CS3 Phasing of Development*

On behalf of

**Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Legal and General Life Fund Limited Partnership (L&G) own the freehold of two sites in the borough at Rowley Lane and Elstree Way respectively - site plans included as appendices to submission. Has requested that previously made submissions to the Revised Draft Core Strategy in February 2001 be taken into consideration.

Policy CS3 - Phasing can create missed opportunities for Borough and Developers - Example: If sites in Phase 3 are not allowed in Phase 1, market conditions may later change resulting in the sites allocated for phase 3 no longer being viable or available.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
*RCS/R27/4504/6/O Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning*

Section  
*3.24 Housing Need*

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is noted that the London Commuter Belt (West) Sub-Region Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2008 (SHMA) identifies a significant need for affordable housing within Hertsmere - with an anticipated requirement for 89% of new housing to be provided as affordable (up to 2021). In our view, this highlights the important need to increase housing delivery (and housing targets), maximise achievable development densities (within new schemes) and provide positive support for residential development opportunities throughout the Borough.

Given the acute need for affordable housing it is vital that the Council is able to produce robust evidence to demonstrate why higher housing targets (as identified in the East of England Plan) have not adopted.

Q.7 As per out comments above

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)  
*RCS/R27/4634/2/O Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston)*

Section  
*Policy CS4 Affordable Housing*

On behalf of

**Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Even though the reduction in the threshold for the provision of affordable housing is supported, it is not considered that the RCS will be able to deliver enough housing overall to meet the need for affordable housing as identified in the SHMA. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).

Q.7 The release of land from the Green Belt could help to deliver sustainable, mixed communities, including a material amount of affordable housing provision at 35% of the total to be provided. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 To expand upon our representations and to take account of the most up to date and publically available information.



Rep Number Name: Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd  
*RCS/R27/4647/4/O Daniel Rinsler & Co Ltd*

Section  
*Policy CS4 Affordable Housing*

On behalf of

Mr J Onona

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is considered that the policy 'lacks flexibility that is necessary to confirm that 35% affordable housing should be a target, not a uniform requirement across all new housing schemes'. It is considered 'reasonable to assume that this will create an unnecessary burden on developers and cause shortfalls in housing delivery'. The overall national economic situation is considered to be 'so severe. . . that not only will this adversely affect the short to medium term supply, it may also have ramifications far beyond the medium term'.

Q.7 'Policy should therefore be changed such that the 35% affordable housing figure is a maximum target.'

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 'For these reasons, the RCS is unsound and therefore we wish to participate at the oral examination'

Rep Number Name: Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)  
*RCS/R27/4675/4/O Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)*

Section  
*Policy CS4 Affordable Housing*

On behalf of

**Bidwells (on behalf of Barratt North London)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 In light of the above, it is clear that for Policy CS4 to be effective and in doing so increase the supply of affordable housing in Hertsmere, it will be necessary to raise the overall housing target set by Policy CS1. The fact that Policy CS4 sets a target of 995 affordable homes across the plan period (2012 - 2027) merely highlights the limited weight that the Council attach to affordable housing delivery. The Council's decision to discount the evidence presented by their SHMA would suggest that the document is either inadequate (from the Council's perspective) or simply does not fit with the Council's aspirations. The policy also fails to acknowledge the significant constraint that the provision of affordable housing places on the viability of individual development schemes. A flat 35% requirement across all developments, with no allowances made for viability, will place an unnecessary burden on the delivery of housing and therefore should be avoided.
- Q.7 It is recommended that the second paragraph of Policy CS4 be amended as follows:  
A target of 35% of the housing units on qualifying sites should be affordable, equating to an Affordable Housing target of 995 homes from 2012 to 2027. The Council will seek the maximum viable level of Affordable Housing on site. A lower level of provision will not be acceptable unless the Council agrees that its Affordable Housing objectives are being met.  
No other changes are proposed to the wording of Policy CS4, however, for the RCS to provide a robust strategy which makes a meaningful contribution to meeting identified affordable housing needs, the housing target set in Policy CS1 should be increased (please refer to Policy CS1 representations for further details).
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 (No comments).

Rep Number Name: Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust  
RCS/R27/4680/4/O Strutt and Parker LLP for Royal Masonic Trust

Section  
Policy CS4 Affordable Housing

On behalf of  
Strutt and Parker LLP

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The delivery of affordable housing has correctly been identified as a key Core Strategy objective. Paragraph 3.51 of the Core Strategy stipulates that the Council have identified that there is a shortfall of affordable housing, equating to an annual shortfall of 351 homes per year. The Core Strategy also identifies that there is a lack of large housing sites in the Borough and that this has created a problem with the deliverability of affordable housing, with many developments falling below the current 25 dwelling threshold for affordable housing provision. Policy CS4 will require all developments above 10 units or a site area of 0.3 hectares to deliver affordable housing, which is supported. However it needs to be recognised that a number of the smaller sites within the development boundaries still fall below this threshold.

To use the example of Bushey, of the 148 dwellings within the town development boundary that have been identified as being suitable for development in the SHLAA, 44 are on small sites of less than 10 dwellings where there will be no requirement for affordable housing provision. This is a significant amount of the overall supply in Bushey, which already suffers from a shortfall and a high demand for affordable housing. Additionally many of the smaller sites within the town centre have a number of constraints, which may cause issues regarding viability and ultimately affect the provision of affordable housing that can be delivered.

The only large site (above 100 units) identified within the SHLAA as being suitable for housing in Bushey was the RMTGB site at Little Bushey Lane, Bushey. This has an identified capacity of 162 units and would have the potential to make a significant affordable housing contribution. Being greenbelt land the site is relatively unconstrained and has the ability to deliver a high number of affordable units to meet the shortfall, with no issues surrounding viability.

Q.7 It is not recommended that policy CS4 is specifically amended, however the Council should provide a robust evidence base to demonstrate how the shortfall of affordable housing will be addressed Borough wide, but specifically in Bushey. This additional evidence is required to demonstrate that the Core Strategy is both justified and consistent with national policy.

Q.8

Q.9 Attendance in public is required to put forward a robust case to support the comments provided in this statement. In particular we would like to provide evidence with regard to the 5- year land supply and viability; with reference to the available sites set out in the SHLAA, and to address the issue of delivery of affordable housing over the plan period.

Rep Number Name: PPML Consulting Ltd (on behalf of Annington Developments Ltd)  
*RCS/R27/4687/2/O PPML Consulting Ltd (on behalf of Annington*

Section  
*Policy CS4 Affordable Housing*

On behalf of

**PPML (on behalf of Annington Developments)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The provision of affordable housing should be subject to viability test which would consistant with advice in PPS3.

Q.7 add - 'subject to site viability' at the end of the first paragraph.

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G) c/o Jones Lang LaSalle  
*RCS/R27/4689/3/O Legal and General Life Fund Partnership*

Section  
*Policy CS4 Affordable Housing*

On behalf of

**Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Legal and General Life Fund Limited Partnership (L&G) own the freehold of two sites in the borough at Rowley Lane and Elstree Way respectively - site plans included as appendices to submission. Has requested that previously made submissions to the Revised Draft Core Strategy in February 2001 be taken into consideration.

Policy CS4 - Affordable Housing clause (35%) must be flexible to account for financial viability of Housing projects.

Ask that consideration be given to a clause making allowances for development schemes where a 35% provision of affordable housing is not viable for financial or other reasons.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham Parish Council  
*RCS/R27/1192/4/C Aldenham Parish Council*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS5 Affordable Housing in rural areas on  
"Exception" sites*

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 APC would like to register land it owns in Pegmire Lane next to the cottages, which it would like to see developed as affordable housing.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Three Rivers District Council  
*RCS/R27//1110/1/C Three Rivers District Council*

Section  
*Policy CS6 Gypsy and Travellers sites*

On behalf of  
**Three Rivers District Council**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Paragraph 3.4 refers to the East of England Plan Single Issue Review and the Gypsy and Traveller site need. The policy states that fewer pitches are required. It was considered that the evidence base is unclear. Local Authorities are to work together to meet the need for transit sites, although it is not understood why these sites have not been identified. Particular concerns were raised in relation to the South Mimms G/T site. It is thought that the site could accommodate additional permanent pitches, but to the loss to some transit pitches. There is a concern that this would have to be accommodated elsewhere in south west Hertfordshire.

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Traveller Law Reform Project & Friends, Families and Travellers  
RCS/R27//4677/1/NC Traveller Law Reform Project & Friends,  
On behalf of  
TLRP &FFT

Section  
Policy CS6 Gypsy and Travellers sites

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The policy sets out needs accurately to 2011. Policy H4 stated that Hertsmere should provide 18 new pitches to 2011. However it also required councils to make provision beyond 2011 using a 3% annual compound increase. This would entail provision for a further 29 pitches to 2027. The policy only talks of seeking to make provision to 2017 of a further 10 pitches. It should also state explicitly that the policy will be used to judge windfall applications.  
We also have concerns about the use of the word 'seek' in relation to future provision. Policy CS1 states that The Council will make provision for 3550 additional dwellings within the District between 2012 and 2027, a development rate of 237 dwellings per year. Policy CS6 fails to deal with provision for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the same positive fashion, give an annualised target or lay out the needed provision to 2027, the period for which the core strategy plans. This opens up an element of uncertainty about future provision and only plans for the next five years. If there is uncertainty about future provision it should state how and when future needs will be assessed and how these needs will be incorporated in future planning. It fails to do this and the core strategy is internally inconsistent.  
We welcome the inclusion of a criteria based policy against which to judge allocations but are concerned about both the number of the criteria and also the content of some of them. Circular 1/2006, which still stands until replaced, gives advice on criteria and does state on p 21, para 3 that lists of criteria should not be overlong. In our view the list of 12 criteria is excessive and hence is more likely to lead to refusal of planning permission than a shorter list.  
We are pleased that the policy does only require the criteria to be taken into consideration. However, we have concerns about some of the individual criteria which we believe are too tightly drawn and not realistic. C 1/2006 makes the point that all criteria need not necessarily have to be met to gain planning permission. These are criterion iii, iv, v and viii. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 Replace introductory paragraph in policy CS 6 with:  
'The Council will provide for the further needs of Gypsies and Travellers on the basis of identified need within south and west Hertfordshire. The Council will make provision for 9 additional pitches within the District to meet the East of England Plan requirements to 2011 and a further 29 pitches by 2027. In providing for the new pitches in the Site Allocations DPD, the Council will take account of.'  
This will ensure conformity with the approach taken in CS1 and will ensure that needs will be planned for into the future. It provides for more certainty about pitch provision than the existing text.  
Criteria should be reduced in number and the following detailed changes made:  
Criterion iii- remove reference to major road network. This will ensure that the widest possible range of sites can be considered and reflect the reality of traffic generated by what will be by any standards small residential sites.  
Criterion iv - delete as unnecessary and potentially prejudicial.  
Criterion v - delete as unnecessary and potentially prejudicial.  
Criterion vii - delete as these issues are best dealt with by means of planning conditions.
- Q.8 No
- Q.9 Not applicable.



Rep Number Name: National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Group  
RCS/R27//4671/1/O National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Group

Section  
Policy CS6 Gypsy and Travellers sites

On behalf of

National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS6 and Paragraph 3.41 set out the number of pitches proposed to be delivered in Hertsmere to 2021. However there is no justification for a reduced number of pitches post 2011 compared with the East of England Regional Plan. Since the post 2011 figures do not reflect the most robust evidence, then they are not consistent with national policy and the policy will fail to be effective at delivering pitches to meet identified need.

Should the East of England Plan figures be rejected, then if there are 56 existing pitches in the Borough, plus 3 recently approved, plus 9 additional to be delivered to 2011, that leaves a baseline figure of 68 pitches in the district at 2011. Using the 3% compound growth rate, then there is a need for 13 additional pitches from 2011-2017:  $((1.03)^6 \times 68) - 68 = 13.1$

The figures must also be minimum figures to allow for appropriate development through the development control (planning application) process. This would be consistent with the policy for mainstream housing and would allow for some flexibility in provision. On this issue, the draft policy CS6 does not appear to relate to the consideration of planning applications (contrary to the provisions of Circular 01/2006) and only refers to "identifying any required potential sites".

Not all the criteria listed are appropriate to the planning application process (for example the sequential approach to site selection is sensible for site allocations but not workable for the development control process, given that the main drivers are land affordability and availability). The criteria are also over-restrictive, which means the policy is neither justified (against current and emerging national policy) or likely to be effective (at meeting need).

Criteria i and ii relate only to the site allocation process, not to the development control process.

Criterion v is unreasonable if it expects sites to be distributed equally across the Borough, just as it would not be appropriate for housing to be distributed uniformly across the Borough. It is also not appropriate to place this restriction on applicants and could prevent acceptable sites from coming forward.

Criterion viii does not appear to be justified in that it restricts sites to those with 'local connections'.

Criterion xi, where it reads 'any other adverse effects on the built environment and natural environment are avoided' effectively prevents ANY site coming forward, since all development can be said to have some level of effect. Reference to the additional core strategy policies is not appropriate, given that no policy should be read in isolation.

Suggested amendments follow in response to question 8.

Q.7 The policy should be amended so that the pitch figures reflect the evidence base and are minimum.

The wording of the criteria should be amended as follows:

'Site allocations and applications for planning permission will be supported where the following criteria are met:

1. The site has safe and convenient vehicular access to the public highway
2. The site does not have an unacceptable impact on the landscape or existing residential amenity.
3. There must be safe and acceptable environmental conditions on the site including the need to avoid air and noise pollution and significantly contaminated land. Sites must not be at high risk of flooding and must provide an acceptable standard of residential amenity for the proposed residents

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Environment Agency  
*RCS/R27/4493/2/S Environment Agency*

Section  
*Policy CS6 Gypsy and Travellers sites*

On behalf of

Environment Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 The policy does take account of the potential flood risk and the ability to mitigate it when allocating Gypsy and Traveller sites. It also makes reference to Policy CS15 which adopts the sequential approach to development.

Q.8 No

Q.9

4. The site is able to receive essential services including water, sewerage, drainage and water disposal.
5. The site is located within reasonable proximity to key local services.
6. The site can be adequately landscaped where necessary

For site allocations, a sequential approach will be followed with an emphasis on previously developed land. The potential of existing sites to accommodate additional pitches will be considered to meet need arising on those sites.'

Rep Number Name: The Planning Bureau Limited for McCarthy and Stone  
RCS/R27//4651/1/O The Planning Bureau Limited for McCarthy

Section  
3.49 The mix of new housing

On behalf of  
McCarthy and Stone

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 In broad overall terms McCarthy and Stone set out that as part of the Plans priorities and objectives more specific reference should be made to the needs of the ageing population and particular emphasis made to the housing of this proportionately rising section of society. Ideally there is justification to support a specific policy that promotes the delivery of specialist accommodation for the older population. With the absence of such a policy the specialist provision is swept up in more general residential planning policies that do not necessarily reflect the specific characteristics of such specialist provision along with its development characteristics and sales patterns. Specialist retirement housing meets a number of Core Strategy aims and yet is given little weight in the overall document. A retirement and care development such as that developed by McCarthy and Stone is an important contributor to the housing mix in a particular area. By its very nature it is a single entity with communal space and facilities and could not provide a mix of house types and tenure within the same block. If minimum floorspace standards are to be used these must be guided by industry wide standards for the likes of specialist housing. A catch all general standard would be inappropriate. Levels of car parking amenity space and internal communal space as well as communal areas are integral to making a retirement scheme deliverable and viable.

Para 3.48 of the revised Core Strategy refers to the Council's Housing Needs Survey and the need for sheltered housing units. Para 3.49 provides encouragement for the development of "sheltered or very sheltered (extra care) housing" which is encouraging. Assessment of the need or demand for owner occupier retirement housing / close care is not explored in any real detail in this survey and as such is not fully reflected in emerging policy. The complex needs, expectations, provision of care and support will vary considerably within this age group and there will be a need to provide a holistic approach to different types of housing and care provision from the public and private sector, and across all types of tenure.

The Hertsmeres Borough area, although diverse in part, is essentially an affluent area with a high proportion of owner occupiers. With the ageing population forecast there will be a significant number of people later in life who are looking to downsize and/or seek a different form of development that more closely suits their particular needs in terms of size, security, companionship and actual housing need. There is an extremely limited choice of specialist retirement housing for this sector of the population within the Borough such that this can contribute to the stagnation of the housing market and adversely affect the housing objectives of the Council.

The draft National Planning Policy Framework reiterates the economic messages in the Government's Plan for Growth, published with the Budget in March 2011, including the need to free up planning to help drive the economy.

- o Clause 29 states: "To enable a plan to be deliverable, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, local standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and on-site mitigation, provide acceptable returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable."
- o The NPPF also sets out how the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development will work. The Presumption offers a real opportunity to set the broad parameters for encouraging good, high quality and sustainable housing while delivering economic growth. Clauses 28 and 111 make reference to the need for local authorities to plan for new homes and prepare Strategic Housing Needs Assessments. Clause 28 makes specific reference to the need for councils to identify the housing needs of older people across the range of tenures. Clause 111 also states that they should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required, including for the elderly.

The Council has not provided justification as to the requirement for treating Class C2 uses as residential for the purposes of providing affordable housing. Extra Care developments in their own right provide a specialised and much needed form of accommodation and their particular development characteristics such as communal facilities, service charges, longer sales and marketing periods and need to ensure a completed development mean that there is a tight viability threshold in which to make a scheme deliverable. Limited viability work has been provided by the Council to demonstrate how such a policy can be absorbed without seriously delaying, if not creating unmovable obstacles to the provision of such specialist accommodation. National planning policy guidance contained in PPS3 also has regard to the ageing of the population and the implications it will have on housing needs. Paragraph 21 of PPS3 identifies that authorities should have particular regard to "the current and future demographic trends" and also "older and disabled people". Paragraph 69 of PPS3 also advises that in determining applications for residential development,

Q.7 It is clear from local and national statistical data that the demographics of Hertsmere and the UK as a whole is ageing. The Council recognise the current and future increase in the older people in the district and in older person households which will have significant implications on the overall housing market in a district with many physical constraints on residential development. It is clear that a significant proportion of older person only households in the district are owner occupiers who are unlikely to be eligible for public sector forms of specialised accommodation. The evidence suggests that there is a current and growing need for specialised forms of accommodation. Local Planning Authorities should have regard to achieving a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, older people. private sector accommodation for older persons such as retirement housing and assisted living extra care and policy should be more pro-active towards this.

The Core Strategy fails to draw out sufficient policy weight and as such is unsound on this issue. Furthermore it seeks to add further unjustified "burden" by seeking to include Class C2 developments within the affordable housing criteria. As such it is considered that the Core Strategy is unsound on this issue having not been justified.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Gerald Eve  
*RCS/R27//1246/1/O Gerald Eve*

Section  
*Policy CS7 Housing Mix*

On behalf of  
**Peter Dines**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Not justified: The strategy identified the needs of an ageing population "including residential and care home spaces" and "encourages" the development of residential care homes. However, policy CS7 provides no encouragement. The Strategy is therefore unsound on this point. The policy seeks to apply affordable housing policy to class C2 development. This is not in accordance with National Policy PPS3 etc. This does not "encourage" development of accomodation for older people.

Q.7 CS7 add iii) There is a presumption in favour of development which seeks to provide additional accomodation for older people. Paragraph 3.49 Delete "Whilst..SPD"

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)  
*RCS/R27//4634/1/O Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston)*

Section  
*Policy CS7 Housing Mix*

On behalf of

**Woolf Bond Planning (for Gilston Developments)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 Reliance on urban intensification will result in much housing coming forward as flatted developments, comprising smaller one and two bedroom units. This will, thus, fail to ensure the provision of an appropriate mix of housing types and tenures. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.7 The release of greenfield sites can provide the quantum of development to help deliver a more varied mix of housing types and tenures. (Please see additional information submitted for further comments).
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To expand upon our representations and to take account of the most up to date and publically available information.

Rep Number Name: The Planning Bureau Limited for McCarthy and Stone  
RCS/R27/4651/2/O The Planning Bureau Limited for McCarthy

Section  
Policy CS7 Housing Mix

On behalf of  
McCarthy and Stone

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 In broad overall terms McCarthy and Stone set out that as part of the Plans priorities and objectives more specific reference should be made to the needs of the ageing population and particular emphasis made to the housing of this proportionately rising section of society. Ideally there is justification to support a specific policy that promotes the delivery of specialist accommodation for the older population. With the absence of such a policy the specialist provision is swept up in more general residential planning policies that do not necessarily reflect the specific characteristics of such specialist provision along with its development characteristics and sales patterns. Specialist retirement housing meets a number of Core Strategy aims and yet is given little weight in the overall document. A retirement and care development such as that developed by McCarthy and Stone is an important contributor to the housing mix in a particular area. By its very nature it is a single entity with communal space and facilities and could not provide a mix of house types and tenure within the same block. If minimum floorspace standards are to be used these must be guided by industry wide standards for the likes of specialist housing. A catch all general standard would be inappropriate. Levels of car parking amenity space and internal communal space as well as communal areas are integral to making a retirement scheme deliverable and viable.

Para 3.48 of the revised Core Strategy refers to the Council's Housing Needs Survey and the need for sheltered housing units. Para 3.49 provides encouragement for the development of "sheltered or very sheltered (extra care) housing" which is encouraging. Assessment of the need or demand for owner occupier retirement housing / close care is not explored in any real detail in this survey and as such is not fully reflected in emerging policy. The complex needs, expectations, provision of care and support will vary considerably within this age group and there will be a need to provide a holistic approach to different types of housing and care provision from the public and private sector, and across all types of tenure.

The Hertsmerer Borough area, although diverse in part, is essentially an affluent area with a high proportion of owner occupiers. With the ageing population forecast there will be a significant number of people later in life who are looking to downsize and/or seek a different form of development that more closely suits their particular needs in terms of size, security, companionship and actual housing need. There is an extremely limited choice of specialist retirement housing for this sector of the population within the Borough such that this can contribute to the stagnation of the housing market and adversely affect the housing objectives of the Council.

The draft National Planning Policy Framework reiterates the economic messages in the Government's Plan for Growth, published with the Budget in March 2011, including the need to free up planning to help drive the economy.

- o Clause 29 states: "To enable a plan to be deliverable, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, local standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and on-site mitigation, provide acceptable returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable."
- o The NPPF also sets out how the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development will work. The Presumption offers a real opportunity to set the broad parameters for encouraging good, high quality and sustainable housing while delivering economic growth. Clauses 28 and 111 make reference to the need for local authorities to plan for new homes and prepare Strategic Housing Needs Assessments. Clause 28 makes specific reference to the need for councils to identify the housing needs of older people across the range of tenures. Clause 111 also states that they should identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required, including for the elderly.

The Council has not provided justification as to the requirement for treating Class C2 uses as residential for the purposes of providing affordable housing. Extra Care developments in their own right provide a specialised and much needed form of accommodation and their particular development characteristics such as communal facilities, service charges, longer sales and marketing periods and need to ensure a completed development mean that there is a tight viability threshold in which to make a scheme deliverable. Limited viability work has been provided by the Council to demonstrate how such a policy can be absorbed without seriously delaying, if not creating unmovable obstacles to the provision of such specialist accommodation. National planning policy guidance contained in PPS3 also has regard to the ageing of the population and the implications it will have on housing needs. Paragraph 21 of PPS3 identifies that authorities should have particular regard to "the current and future demographic trends" and also "older and disabled people". Paragraph 69 of PPS3 also advises that in determining applications for residential development,

Q.7 It is clear from local and national statistical data that the demographics of Hertsmere and the UK as a whole is ageing. The Council recognise the current and future increase in the older people in the district and in older person households which will have significant implications on the overall housing market in a district with many physical constraints on residential development. It is clear that a significant proportion of older person only households in the district are owner occupiers who are unlikely to be eligible for public sector forms of specialised accommodation. The evidence suggests that there is a current and growing need for specialised forms of accommodation. Local Planning Authorities should have regard to achieving a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, older people. private sector accommodation for older persons such as retirement housing and assisted living extra care and policy should be more pro-active towards this.

Q.8 No

Q.9



Rep Number Name: RPS on behalf of Willows farm  
RCS/R27//4552/1/O RPS on behalf of Willows farm

Section  
4.1 Employment and the Economy

On behalf of  
Bowmans Leisure (Willows Farm)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We are objecting to this employment and economic section of the Revised Core Strategy (RCS) on the grounds that it is not currently consistent with the Good Practice Guide on Tourism (DCLG May 2006).

This guidance sets out in paragraph 3.13 how Local Authorities should deal with issues in their Local Development Frameworks. In those locations where the future development of tourism is a key issue for the local authority, it will be appropriate for the core strategy to cover tourism issues together with any objectives relevant to tourism. In other local authorities it may be that the plan's broad approach to economic growth and regeneration sets the framework for the future development of tourism. In these cases this relationship should be acknowledged and taken into account in the development of the core strategy. If the future development of tourism is accepted as being a key issue the RCS is unsound because it does not cover tourism issues together with any relevant to tourism. Notwithstanding the degree of importance that might be afforded to tourism as a key issue, the RCS is unsound since it does not acknowledge the relationship between tourism and economic growth and regeneration, in accordance with the latter part of 3.13 of the good practice guide. The RCS makes no direct reference to tourism. The borough hosts the UK's largest farm park.

Q.7 We consider the following additional supporting text (which would become Paragraph 4.29 if no other additional paragraphs are to be inserted and proposed Policy CS12 should be inserted at the end of Chapter 4:-

"Tourism Development

The Council recognises that tourism is a fast changing industry, and is keen to support tourism initiatives, particularly where the provision of facilities may help to provide all-year round facilities for residents and visitors. The Council will support proposals for the extension, upgrade and improvement of existing tourist attractions. Applications for new tourist attractions will require careful consideration given the need to balance potential benefits to the local economy from increased employment and visitor numbers against the need to protect the high quality landscape within which they are located. Policy CS12 Promoting Tourism in Hertsmere, The Council will support proposals for the extension, upgrade and improvement of existing tourist attractions and sites. Any proposals for tourism development will be required to satisfactorily meet access, parking and environmental conditions and other relevant DPD/Local Plan policies. This change would make it sound.

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 To ensure that tourism development is afforded the importance in the RCS that it is due.

Rep Number Name: Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)  
RCS/R27/4686/3/O Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)

Section  
4.1 Employment and the Economy

On behalf of  
Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 It is considered that Section 4 should make reference to the importance of supporting the tourism industry. The latest Nomis Labour Market Profile for the Borough identifies that a greater proportion of the Borough's workforce (10.1%) is employed in tourism related industries than Hertfordshire (7.3%), East of England Region (7.7%) and in Great Britain (8.2%).  
As recognised in draft paragraph 2.20 of the CS, the Borough has a number of visitor attractions, however the CS does nothing to acknowledge the industry's importance to the local economy or facilitate its growth. Due to this significant omission, the CS is not considered to be effective, justified or consistent with national planning policy.  
Proposals for new tourist attractions in addition to the extension, upgrade and improvement of existing tourist attractions and hotels should be actively supported based on the potentially significant socio-economic benefits. In relation to the latter, this could for example be the form of additional bedspace accommodation or complementary land uses at existing hotels (as part of the exceptional circumstances case) to encourage new inward investment from beyond the borough whilst meeting tourist demand. This could generate new jobs and increase spending power more generally within the borough as a result of enhanced tourist trade.  
As set out the response to Policy CS8, Green Belt land characterised by low quality landscape with a number of surrounding established land uses is also considered to have the potential to accommodate employment generating uses, particularly given the socio-economic benefits of the tourism industry on the local economy.
- Q.7 Section 4 should contain text that acknowledges the importance of the tourism industry to the Borough's economy and identify an aspiration to support tourism initiatives to include the expansion and upgrade of hotels. Section 4 should acknowledge that more detailed policies on tourism should be considered as part of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD.
- Q.8 No
- Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/14/C Shire Consulting*  
On behalf of

Section  
*4.15 Hertfordshire London Arc Jobs Growth and  
Employment Land Study*

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 An assumption is made that there will be two new business parks in other districts (paragraph 4.15). We previously pointed out that this is seriously undermined by the decision of St. Albans' Council to abandon their earlier Core Strategy proposal for a new business park but the Submission document does not address the matter. The implementation of Policy CS22 relies heavily on the production of a future DPD but given the length of time that it is taking to attempt to achieve a sound Core Strategy, we are not optimistic about the likely timescale for the Council producing further DPDs. This calls into question whether this policy can be effective.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: CPRE Hertfordshire  
RCS/R27/1491/2/O CPRE Hertfordshire  
On behalf of

Section  
4.21 The location, scale and type of new  
employment development

CPRE The Hertfordshire Society

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 (See also our representation on Policy CS8). Policy CS8 proposes the allocation and safeguarding of an undefined area of Green Belt land for employment development between Borehamwood and the A1, and this is shown diagrammatically on the Key Diagram. No recognition of the Green Belt status of this land is included in the Policy, or in the relevant text in paragraph 4.21, no indication is given of the size of the area proposed for development, and no explanation is given of the Council's justification for developing this Green Belt land contrary to national, and the Council's own, Green Belt policy. The statement that the Council considers that this is 'the most appropriate location for the provision of additional employment land' does not meet the national policy requirement for justification of the release of Green Belt for development. The inclusion of this specific proposal is therefore considered to be unsound by virtue of being unjustified and inconsistent with national planning policy.
- Q.7 Without a reasoned justification for allocation of land in the Green Belt for development in a development plan document, as required by national guidance, the only recourse to achieve soundness of the Core Strategy would be to delete the proposed allocation and safeguarding of land for the extension of the Elstree Way Employment Area from the document, including from Policy CS8, the Key Diagram, and from paragraph 4.21.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To ensure that CPRE Hertfordshire's concerns about the issues relating to the principle of the allocation of Green Belt land for development through the Hertsmere development plan process are fully considered in the Examination of the Core Strategy.

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/3/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*4.25 Alternative options for employment*

On behalf of

**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 With regard to the location of new waste management facilities, it is encouraging to see that Para 4.25 states that whilst there is a focus for designated employment areas to remain B-Class development, waste management facilities are identified as being one of the limited range of other uses that forms that will be considered. However, it should be clarified that this also applies to the safeguarded employment areas adjoining both the Elstree Way and Cranbourne Road employment areas.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Highways Agency  
*RCS/R27//1568/1/C Highways Agency*

Section  
*Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment*

On behalf of  
**Highways Agency**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Highways Agency does not object to Policy CS8, however it is considered some additional text is required to increase the effectiveness of the policy and its consistency with related policies CS21, CS22, CS23 and CS25.

Q.7 The Highways Agency recommends the following text, highlighted in green italics, is added to Policy CS8 to increase its effectiveness:

Any development should form of a comprehensive, integrated package of measures to improve their respective adjoining Employment Areas and associated access, with consideration of Polices CS21, CS23 and CS25.

The boundaries of the area adjoining the Elstree Way Employment Area and parameters for development for the land adjoining Cranborne Road and Elstree Way will be clarified in the Site Allocations DPD. The Elstree Way Employment Area and the proposed safeguarded land will be covered by the Elstree Way Corridor AAP, as specified in Policy CS22.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Highways Agency  
RCS/R27/1568/2/C Highways Agency

Section  
Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment

On behalf of  
Highways Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Highways Agency recognises that at this stage in developing the LDF it is less likely that details regarding the exact scale and location of development will be known or, if they are, details may be subject to significant change over time. It may not therefore be appropriate to incorporate excessive detail in the Core Strategy, to provide flexibility and help to ensure the document stays relevant. The Highways Agency recognises that more detail should be provided in the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD and the Elstree Way Corridor AAP.

The Highways Agency does however require some indication of the potential scale of employment development proposed at the safeguarded land adjacent to the Elstree Way employment area. Paragraph 4.24\* of the Core Strategy indicates that proposals exceeding 2,500m<sup>2</sup> of office space is to be limited to "...locations in the Elstree Way Employment Area". The Highways Agency seeks clarification that this is also making reference to the proposed safeguarded land.

The Highways Agency notes in paragraph 2.32 of the Core Strategy that 2,700 new office jobs and 240 new warehouse jobs are expected to be generated during the plan period. Paragraph 4.28 \* of the Core Strategy indicates that extensions to the Elstree Way and Cranborne Road employment areas are more favourable than the other identified employment areas, a broad proposal for which the Highways Agency does not object to at this stage, however for clarity and to provide some initial impression of the possible highway impact that could potentially arise, it is requested that an indication of the proportion of new jobs that could be generated at the Elstree Way Employment Area and the adjacent safeguarded land is provided.

\* It is noted that paragraph numbers are repeated in Chapter 4 of the Core Strategy. The above comments are making reference to the second paragraph numbered 4.24 on page 53 of the Core Strategy, and the first paragraph numbered 4.28 on page 51 of the Core Strategy.

Q.7 The Highways Agency requests clarification on several items as described above. It is recommended, given Policy CS8 deals with the scale and location of development, that as far as possible at this stage it is indicated what proportion of the total planned additional jobs is anticipated to be located at the Elstree Way employment area and adjacent safeguarded land.

Also, the Highways Agency recommends the following text, highlighted in green italics, is added to paragraph 4.24\* in order to increase its effectiveness:

"...Consequently, proposals in Employment Areas for more than 2,500 sq m (net) of new office floorspace (including ancillary office accommodation) will be limited to locations in the Elstree Way Employment Area, including development on the adjacent proposed safeguarded land."

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/12/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment*

On behalf of

**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The approach towards safeguarding land adjacent to existing employment areas in order to provide a flexible supply of employment land seems appropriate and the wording of Policy CS8 is generally supported. It is unclear as to when or how the safeguarded allocations are likely to come forward over the Plan period. It is likely that any development will result in potentially significant traffic generation which has not yet been assessed.
- Q.7 It is requested that additional wording is included within Policy CS8 that will only allow development to come forward on the safeguarded employment sites where it can be demonstrated that the cumulative impact on transport infrastructure can be adequately mitigated.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To discuss the relevant infrastructure issues.



Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/17/C Shire Consulting*

Section  
*Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment*

On behalf of  
**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS8 "The Council will support development proposals in appropriate locations, which attract commercial investment". This ambivalent statement should be deleted.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: CPRE Hertfordshire  
*RCS/R27/1491/4/O CPRE Hertfordshire*

Section  
*Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment*

On behalf of

**CPRE The Hertfordshire Society**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 Policy CS8 proposes the allocation and safeguarding of an undefined area of Green Belt land for employment development between Borehamwood and the A1, and this is shown diagrammatically on the Key Diagram. No recognition of the Green Belt status of this land is included in the Policy, or in the relevant text in paragraph 4.21, no indication is given of the size of the area proposed for development, and no explanation is given of the Council's justification for developing this Green Belt land contrary to national, and the Council's own, Green Belt policy. The inclusion of this specific proposal is therefore considered to be unsound by virtue of being unjustified and inconsistent with national planning policy.
- Q.7 Without a reasoned justification for allocation of land in the Green Belt for development in a development plan document, as required by national guidance, the only recourse to achieve soundness of the Core Strategy would be to delete the proposed allocation and safeguarding of land for the extension of the Elstree Way Employment Area from the document, including from the Key Diagram and paragraph 4.21.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To ensure that CPRE Hertfordshire's concerns about the issues relating to the principle of the allocation of Green Belt land for development through the Hertsmere development plan process are fully considered in the Examination of the Core Strategy.

Rep Number Name: David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP  
RCS/R27/4673/4/O David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP

Section  
Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment

On behalf of  
RRHE LLP

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We support the intention to identify additional employment potential by safeguarding land north of the Holiday Inn hotel between the AI and Rowley Lane at Borehamwood. It is important that the Core Strategy makes provision for such additional development consistent with the role, stated in para. 4.17, "to maximize economic development and employment opportunities in the Borough". The suitability of this land is emphasized by:  
# its co-location with existing strategic employment land in the Elstree Way Corridor;  
# its location at Borehamwood, the principal settlement in the Borough in terms of the settlement hierarchy (Table 6);  
# its strategic location adjacent to the AI;  
# the fact that the land fulfil little Green Belt purposes at present having regard to the substantial areas of hardstanding and generally poor environmental quality.

Current and emerging national policy (PPS4 and Draft NPPF) emphasizes the importance of stimulating economic growth through stronger support for business and employment development. In a Borough like Hertsmere, with tightly defined urban boundaries, it is especially important that the Core Strategy takes a positive approach to identifying additional development opportunities, including facilitating necessary changes to the Green Belt boundary (see Representation relating to para 5.7).

This is reflected in para 5.6 of the Core Strategy which refers to the importance of facilitating "business churn" in the Green Belt. Para. 4.46 of PPS12 states that a Core Strategy is "unlikely to be effective if it cannot deal with changing circumstances". The identification of the land between the AI and Rowley Lane in Policy CS8 is consistent with this guidance,

Q.7 None in this respect

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)  
RCS/R27/4686/2/O Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)

Section  
Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment

On behalf of  
Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The CS' emphasis on maintaining a competitive economy, in a way which supports local business and workforce requirements which can endure economic downturns (paragraph 4.2) is supported. However, it is considered that the CS does not provide a sufficient mechanism to achieve this. The CS relies on the CHELR (2005) and the London Arc Study (2009) however these only represent a snapshot and the volatile nature of the commercial market in addition to the current economic downturn means that flexibility must be incorporated into this employment section and its policies.

It is acknowledged that Hertsmere is located in a wider employment market, however, the employment targets are reliant on new business parks in neighbouring local authorities which raises questions regarding deliverability particularly in the absence of an up-to-date assessment of local demand and need.

Draft Policy CS8 does not acknowledge that there might be appropriate locations outside of Employment Areas and Employment Sites for employment generating development. Government guidance contained in the recent NPPF indicates that the sequential approach (i.e. considering town centre and edge of centre sites first before out of centre) will now not apply to new office development - in order to relax controls and encourage commercial investment.

For example, land outside of Bushey close to the M1 benefits from the strategic road network, and contains suitable sites which could potentially accommodate commercial uses to include for example research and development facilities (subject to market demand). This is particularly relevant in the context of a Borough with a number of knowledge based sectors but which is a net exporter of labour.

In addition, draft paragraph 5.6 of the CS acknowledges that 'there is not considered to be any scope to review the range of uses permissible in the Green Belt although the Council recognises the need for a realistic approach to accommodating land use within the urban fringe close to London. There are a significant number of established businesses, institutions and sports clubs with sites in the Green Belt, many of them pre-dating the establishment of Green Belt. Business churn is a reality in the Green Belt and the control and use of associated land and buildings will continue to form part of the proper planning of the area.'

Therefore, where legitimate opportunities on Green Belt land arise, they should be considered positively. The quality of land falling within the Green Belt and its contribution to its purpose should be kept under review and where circumstances dictate, such as need, land should be released for that purpose. Green Belt land characterised by low quality landscape with a number of surrounding established developed uses have the potential to accommodate employment generating uses and should be considered. A flexible approach in this context is required.

Draft Policy CS8 is not considered to be effective as it is not sufficiently flexible. It is not justified because the evidence on which it is based is not considered robust or credible. It is not consistent with draft national policy identified in the draft NPPF.

Q.7 In order to be sound, draft Policy CS8 should be amended to read as follows:

'The Council will support development proposals in appropriate locations, which attract commercial investment, maintain economic competitiveness and provide employment opportunities for the local community. In order to encourage economic development and promote a competitive local economy, provision will be made for the supply of at least 110 ha of designated employment land for B-class development within the Borough up to 2027, primarily focused on the following locations and as indicated on the Key Diagram. Sites outside of Employment Areas, Employment Sites and settlement boundaries will be considered for employment generating uses on a site by site basis subject to market demand and appropriate design.'

The supporting text should acknowledge the need to undertake an updated employment needs study.

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A

*land*

Rep Number Name: Taylor Wimpey North Thames  
*RCS/R27/4679/3/S Taylor Wimpey North Thames*

Section  
*Policy CS8 Scale and distribution of employment*

On behalf of  
Taylor Wimpey North Thames

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Yes Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 TWNT welcome and support the proposed identification of a new safeguarded area adjacent to the Elstree Way Employment Area between the A1 and Rowley Lane for B class uses. In addition to increasing the supply of unfettered land suitable for employment use, it is understood that the purpose for safeguarding this land for employment development is as compensation for that which may be lost to housing development within the Employment Area beyond the Elstree Way Corridor. TWNT welcome the recognition by the Council that current guidance, reinforced by emerging guidance in the draft NPPF seeks to prevent the retention of sites that are no longer suitable for continued employment use or attractive to the market and that there exist sites within the Employment Area that may be better suited/utilised for housing. A significant proportion of new dwellings are to be provided within the Elstree Way Corridor if the housing target and development strategy is to be met and to date the pace of redevelopment in the currently defined corridor has been slow. If these aspirations are to be realised the Council will need to adopt a flexible approach towards releasing sites currently within the Employment Area but adjacent to the corridor that by reason of location and relationship to existing and proposed housing would be better redeveloped for housing and welcome the identification of the land safeguarded for the possible future expansion of the Employment Area to enable this.

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust  
*RCS/R27/1296/3/C Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust*

Section  
*5. Open Land and the Environment*

On behalf of  
Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 Para 5.4 - We are pleased to note the specific reference to Wildlife Sites and protected species sites (and para 5.9). It may be useful to insert the words 'natural and heritage assets' in place of simply 'assets' in the sentence preceding the bulleted list, to make it clear that the list relates to both paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4. I would also question whether 'Green Belt' should be included as a natural/heritage asset. Para 5.13, 5.14, 5.15, 5.26-28, 5.31 and 5.32-3 are supported. Policy CS12 - HMWT generally supports the content of this policy. It may be beneficial to make reference to the Green Infrastructure network and habitat linkages between important sites. The Core Strategy could be better aligned with Hertfordshire Green Infrastructure Plans.
- Q.7 Para 5.4 - For clarity, it may be useful to insert the words 'natural and heritage assets' in place of simply 'assets' in the sentence preceding the bulleted list, to make it clear that the list relates to both paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4.  
Give consideration to whether 'Green Belt' should be included as a natural/heritage asset.
- Q.8 No
- Q.9

On behalf of  
HCC Spatial and Land use Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Para 5.44 - In the March 2011 Budget Statement, the coalition Government announced changes to the definition of zero carbon. These changes now mean that by 2016, new residential development will be required to achieve a carbon reduction equivalent to their regulated emissions, not the total emissions as previously required under the definition. Subsequently, this would require all new development to meet the equivalent Code 5 of the CSH and not Code 6 as currently stated in Para 5.27 and Policy CS16. Should the council still have ambitions to achieve carbon reductions equivalent to Code Level 6 in 2016 then this will need to be supported by an appropriate evidence base. Para 5.46

The requirement for larger developments to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements on site is not the most appropriate approach. The Hertfordshire RLC Technical Study (Para 9.28) identifies that such an approach is not the most cost effective in achieving carbon savings and is more constraining on the development industry. This approach would support the remainder of the Paragraph that supports carbon reduction. Furthermore, any requirement for onsite requirements should be included within Policy CS16. Para 5.51 - Provided that utilising waste as an energy source to provide heat and power as part of a decentralised energy scheme is acknowledged, HCC is supportive of the promotion of all new development and major refurbishment to use energy efficiently, such as from decentralised and renewable or low carbon energy sources as stated in Policy CS16. Allowable Solutions - In order to meet the higher Code Levels as set out in Policy CS16, it is likely that not all carbon reductions can be achieved onsite and there will be a need for an allowable solution fund to help developers meet the Policy requirements. Consideration should be given to including within Policy CS16 wording that would allow developers to pay into a local allowable solutions fund. This approach would reflect that being undertaken by other local authorities in Hertfordshire.

Q.7 Para 5.27 outlines the modules that are included within the Hertfordshire Building Futures Guide. In addition to those modules currently set out in Para 5.27, there are a number omitted from the list which would be beneficial to include as they would help meet the objectives set out at the beginning of the chapter and the wider vision of the Core Strategy. For completeness, the following modules should be included in the list; Climate Change Adaptaton; Landscape and Biodiversity; Safety

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/11/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*5. Open Land and the Environment*

On behalf of

**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The references in the RCS are considered to be insufficient where they are not based upon the Hertsmere GI Plan or Hertfordshire SHIP. This work was commissioned by a joint planning group for Hertfordshire including Hertsmere and forms part of the evidence base for developing Local Plans. It is not clear how this has informed the preparation of the RCS. The RCS is not considered to be compliant with national policy, or demonstrate how the borough has applied its duty to co-operate. Reference made to RSS policy ENV1, Para 4.8 of PPS12 and Para 23; 31 and 154 of the NPPF.
- Q.7 Consideration should be given to a revised policy framework similar to that within the adopted Three Rivers Core Strategy that identifies the Green Infrastructure and investment priorities over the Plan period. Consequently, the production of an IDP to support the delivery of the Core Strategy should include the projects set out in the GI Plan.
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To discuss the relevant Green Infrastructure issues



Rep Number Name: PGA Design Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4674/1/C PGA Design Consulting*

Section  
*5. Open Land and the Environment*

On behalf of  
PGA Design Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Noted that no reference has been make to an assesment of need and demand for sports facilities in accordance wih PPG17. It is not considered that there is sufficeint evidence to understand if there are enough facilities or an overprovision. It is thought that the Core Strategy is unjustified, where is is not possible to develop 'the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternative'.

Q.7 None suggested

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4658/15/O Shire Consulting

Section  
5.5 Green Belt

On behalf of

Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS3 rightly considers the possibility of a review of Green Belt boundaries "Where housing deliver is project to fall below this proportion sought in each phase by at least 20% over the following three years". However, recognition of such a possibility suggest the Council's apparent confidence about its land supply figures is misplaced as it makes no realistic allowance for error in its aspirations. The Council's starting point throughout the whole sorry process of the evolving Core Strategy has been the fixed idea of no change to the Green Belt and it appears that the lessons from this short sighted approach have still not been learned. The essence of the forward planning process is to plan for future needs not to prevent them being provided for or, worse still, have to react in a hurry when there is a problem. Yet again this threatens to result in the Core Strategy being found unsound. Policy CS7 prudently safeguards land for employment use so the Strategy should similarly provide safeguarded sites now for future housing use, thus avoiding the likelihood of unplanned changes to the Green Belt.

Our earlier representations referred to the erroneous description of the Green Belt as a "Natural Asset", a "habitat", and an "environmental constraint", when in fact Green Belt is an entirely man-made land use policy designation that has no relationship to landscape quality, biodiversity, or environmental characteristics (PPG2, paragraph 1.7). The Council accepts in Appendix 5 of its "Statement of Consultation" that "The terminology to Green Belt will be reviewed and amended within the Core Strategy" (pages 64 & 163) but despite this, the misuse of such terminology still persists in the Submission document. The Council should therefore address this matter through pre-submission changes to be placed before the Inspector.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: DLA Town Planning (on behalf of St Margarets School)  
*RCS/R27//4685/1/S DLA Town Planning (on behalf of St*

Section  
*5.5 Green Belt*

On behalf of

**DLA on behalf of St Margarets**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The acknowledgement of the importance of Major Developed sites within the Green Belt and their continuing needs for development is welcomed. Similarly the recognition of the historic presence of many such companies and institutions with the Green Belt as users of large amounts of land and stewards of the countryside is welcomed. In order to support these uses and ensure their continued role, flexibility will be required in the application of Green Belt policy in order to accommodate development needs to ensure appropriate users can adapt, survive and remain viable in their use of the site. Flexibility is required in the application of Green Belt policy and also the definition of 'appropriate envelopes for infilling', particularly where the existing buildings are of historic or architectural interest, adjacent to which it may not be desirable to focus all new development. The flexibility in approach should be formally acknowledged in either the relevant MDS policies or the supporting text to those policies and within paragraphs 5.5 or 5.6 of this document. (These comments also relate to paragraph 5.6).

Q.7 N/A

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning  
RCS/R27/4504/4/S Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Section  
5.6 Green Belt

On behalf of

Zog Investments Ltd c/o Rolfe Judd Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We welcome the Council's intention to take a "realistic approach to accommodating land use within the urban fridge" and within the Green Belt. We also agree with the Council that there are a number of opportunities to make minor, small scale changes to Green Belt boundaries and/or take forward new development on previously development land within the Green Belt to enable a more appropriate, defensible boundary to be established. This will in our view, provide the opportunity to successfully regenerate / redevelop redundant/underused sites on the edge of the existing urban settlements (particularly around Bushey).

The former West Herts College Annex site in Bushey is an example where new development can bring a redundant site back into use and create a more defensive boundary for the Green Belt. The site currently contains a number of semi derelict education buildings (the majority of which have not been in use for sometime). The removal of these buildings and replacement with a more contained form of residential development will provide the opportunity to reduce the current sprawl of buildings and would better relate to the neighbouring residential land-uses.

Furthermore, the redevelopment of the site provides the opportunity to provide the majority of the site as new, publically accessible, open space (incorporating new children's play space) and an extension to the neighbouring nature reserve - thereby addressing a key deficiency in Bushey and creating a strong defensible boundary to the Green Belt.

Q.7 As per out comments above

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 Our client is currently progressing development proposals at the former West Herts College Annex site and is keen to participate in the formulation of new policy within the Borough.

Rep Number Name: David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP  
RCS/R27/4673/2/O David Lander Consultancy for RRHE LLP  
On behalf of  
RRHE LLP

Section  
5.7 Green Belt

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Para. 5.7 states that the Council will review the detailed Green Belt boundary in a subsequent Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. It also indicates particular locations where a change to the boundary is envisaged. We object to this on three grounds: the omission of any reference to the proposed safeguarded employment land between the A1 and Rowley Way (Policy CS8); the omission of any reference to the removal of the Holiday Inn Hotel at Borehamwood from the Green Belt; the absence of a policy to clarify Green Belt boundary proposals.

These points are addressed in turn. Safeguarded Employment Land between A1 and Rowley Way: it is inconsistent with the safeguarding of this land for future employment purposes that it should remain in the Green Belt. We highlight the guidance in para 2.12 of PPG2: "When local planning authorities prepare new or revised structure and local plan, any proposals affecting Green Belts should be related to a time-scale which is longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan. They should satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. In order to ensure protection of Green Belts within a longer time-scale, this will in some cases mean safeguarding land between the urban area and the Green Belt which may be required to meet longer-term development needs." (our underlining) The text underlined confirms that safeguarded land will not remain in the Green Belt. The correct policy response in this case therefore is that the land between A1 and Rowley Way (subject to the following matter regarding the Holiday Inn Hotel) is removed from the Green Belt and made subject to an appropriate policy for development control purposes. The detailed wording of that policy, and the specific new boundary, is agreed to be a matter for the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. It is however important that the principle of a Green Belt boundary change in this location is identified in the Core Strategy and not 'delegated' to the subsequent DPD.

Holiday inn Hotel : the hotel comprises a substantial parcel of intensively developed land at the junction of the A1 and Rowley Way. Its inclusion in the Green Belt represents an anomaly. It does not serve any Green Belt purposes (PPG2 para. 1.5), nor is it capable of fulfilling any of the intended uses of Green Belt land (PPG2 para. 1.6). In the intended review of the Green Belt boundary this land should be removed from the Green Belt and placed within the urban area. This is a separate matter to the proposed safeguarding of future employment land to the north of the hotel and is a change that should also be highlighted in the Core Strategy.

The Need for a Policy : PPS12 emphasizes the critical role of the Core Strategy in determining spatial priorities.

Para. 4.5 states:

"it is essential that the Core Strategy makes clear spatial choices about where developments should go in broad terms. This strong direction would mean that the work involved in the preparation of any subsequent DPDs is reduced. "

The Green Belt is a fundamental planning concept in relation to spatial strategy in Hertsmere and it is essential that, consistent with the guidance in PPS12, the Core Strategy identifies the scope for - and limitations on - changes to the Green Belt boundary, albeit the precise detail of those will be determined through the subsequent DPD.

As well as requiring amendments to para. 5.7 to address the matters described above, we submit that an additional policy (or an extension to Policy CS12) should be included in the Core Strategy to provide the clear direction necessary for this purpose.

Change Sought

1. The following additional words should be added to para. 5.7:

"The Green Belt boundary will also be redrawn to exclude the Holiday Inn hotel and the area safeguarded for strategic employment purposes between the A1 and Rowley Lane.

2. An additional policy be added, or an additional paragraph to Policy CS12, to state:

"The Green Belt will remain unchanged from that shown in the Hertsmere Local Plan except around Shenley where the boundary will be redrawn to reflect the recent redevelopment of Shenley Hospital, and at Borehamwood where it will be redrawn to include the curtilage of the Holiday Inn hotel within the defined urban area and to exclude the safeguarded employment land between the A1 and Rowley Way from the Green Belt. The new boundaries resulting from these changes, and any-minor changes to existing village envelopes, will be determined through the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. "

- Q.7 1.) The following additional words should be added to para. 5.7. "The Green Belt boundary will also be redrawn to exclude the Holiday Inn hotel and the area safeguarded for strategic employment purposes between the A1 and Rowley Lane". 2) An additional policy be added, or an additional paragraph to Policy CS12, to state: "The Green Belt will remain unchanged from that shown in the Hertsmere Local Plan except around Shenley where the boundary will be redrawn to reflect the recent redevelopment of Shenley Hospital, and at Borehamwood where it will be redrawn to include the curtilage of the Holiday Inn hotel within the defined urban area and to exclude the safeguarded employment land between the A1 and Rowley Way from the Green Belt. The new boundaries resulting from these changes, and any minor changes to existing village envelopes, will be determined through the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD."
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 The representation relates to Policy CS8 which is a fundamental issue of strategic policy.

Rep Number Name: Aldenham Parish Council  
*RCS/R27/1192/5/C Aldenham Parish Council*  
 On behalf of

Section  
*Table 9 New Wildlife Sites ratified since 2003*

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
 (2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6
- Q.7 APC would like to know the location of the paddock in Summerhouse Lane, Patchetts Green. APC would also point out that Scrubbitts Wood is in Radlet, not Radlett/Aldenham.
- Q.8
- Q.9

Rep Number Name: Environment Agency  
*RCS/R27/4493/3/S Environment Agency*

Section  
*5.13 Natural assets*

On behalf of

Environment Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 We support the approach in paragraph 5.13 page 58. However we would like to highlight the importance of protecting and enhancing your river corridors and maintaining a development free buffer strip next to watercourses. We would like to see a commitment within these policies to retaining and providing an eight metre wide undeveloped buffer zone for all ordinary watercourses and designated Main Rivers in Hertsmere. This will make space for water and help adapt to climate change. The Government's flood risk strategy 'Making Space for Water' (2005) highlights the importance of making room for water alongside watercourses as a measure of reducing flood risk, providing habitat benefit and an improved amenity resource as well as improving biodiversity and water quality.

River corridors also contribute to the green infrastructure network.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
RCS/R27/4688/2/ Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment

Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS12 is concerned with the Green Belt and attempts to rewrite PPG2 in its own terms. The second part of this policy adds noting to the long-established policy already within PPG2 and so in accordance with PPS12 should be deleted.

Through the document the Green Belt is referred to variously as a "Natural Asset" (paragraph 5.9), "natural environment" (the title of Policy CS12), as well as an "environmental constraint" (paragraph 5.51). This does not acknowledge that Green Belt is an entirely man-made land use policy designation that has no relationship to landscape quality, biodiversity, or environmental characteristics (PPG2, paragraph 1.7). Whilst on occasions, Green Belts may also contain protected landscapes or species habitats this is coincidental to their land use planning role. We recommend that these erroneous references also be removed from the draft.

Although the School's Campus is entirely within the Green Belt, much of the area of core activity, which is the most heavily built up, is screened from the open countryside by strong belts of planning. Thus the site can accommodate further development without compromise to Green Belt openness and there is scope to add further built form to the EAI/MDS without encroachment into the open countryside. There has been considerable correspondence between the Council and the School on the matter of defining a rational and sensible boundary for its EAI boundaries since before 2006 (see for instance the representations submitted to the Core Strategy Issues and Options). The School is pleased that the Council has accepted that in some cases the EAI boundaries need to be 'clarified' (paragraph 5.5) and reference is made (at paragraph 5.7) to the specific need to review the boundary at Henley Hospital. However, the School is disappointed that none of this work is to be undertaken until the realises of the Site Allocations DPD (a document which still has no timescale and may never even emerge bearing in mind that the LFD should have been in preparation for some 7 years already). The School's view is that this important matter should be dealt with now or, at the very least, a firm intention and timetable should be set down for undertaking this fundamental review.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: The Forestry Commission  
*RCS/R27//1529/1/C The Forestry Commission*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment*

**The Forestry Commission**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 It is not considered that the policy (together with SP1) goes far enough to support the increase in tree planting to meet a range of aims (drainage, habitats, recreation, urban heat sinks). It is also considered that the monitoring targets should be more positive by using targets to prevent the felling of trees.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/19/C Shire Consulting*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment*

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS12 starts with sloppy wording and it also duplicates what is set out in national policy (PPG2). The whole of the second paragraph should be deleted including the intention to designate "strategic gaps". Such designation is unnecessary if the area are already protected by Green Belt policies (the reference in paragraph 2.38 of the Core Strategy should also be deleted). Furthermore, the title of policy should be altered as it infers that protection of natural environment is synonymous with Green Belt protection.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: CPRE Hertfordshire  
*RCS/R27/1491/5/O CPRE Hertfordshire*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment*

**CPRE The Hertfordshire Society**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 In our representations on the Pre-submission Core Strategy we suggested that the reference to PPG2 be amended to refer to 'national planning policy' in view of the government intention to supersede existing individual guidance documents apart from PPS10. This is necessary to avoid a crossreference to an out of date document. To be effective, the second paragraph of the Policy should also appear first, to provide the proper strategic context for decision making on development in the Green Belt, that is, the presumption against inappropriate development, and as indicated in the Policy title. This change would in part overcome our concern expressed on the Pre-submission Core Strategy in 2011, about the need for specific Green Belt policy.

Q.7 The second paragraph of Policy CS12 should be moved to become this first paragraph, and slightly amended to read as follows in order to be both effective, and consistent with national policy:-  
'There will ['also' deleted] be a presumption against inappropriate development as defined in national policy [moved from end of sentence with 'national policy' replacing 'PPG2 (Green Belts)'], which causes harm to the openness and appearance of the Green Belt.'

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX  
*RCS/R27/4312/5/O Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment*

Drivers Jonas on behalf of CEMEX

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Suggests inconsistencies within Policy CS12 - paragraph 5.7 states that the boundaries of village envelopes will be considered and that the Shenley Hospital site will be removed for the Green Belt - CEMEX consider this as constituting a major amendment to the Green Belt and therefore contrary to statements elsewhere in the Core Strategy.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Planning Works Ltd for Rachel Trust  
*RCS/R27//4549/1/O Planning Works Ltd for Rachel Trust*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment*

**Rachel Charitable Trust**

- |                             |                       |     |                           |    |  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|----|--|
| Do you Consider the DPD is: | (1) Legally Compliant | Yes | (1) Core Strategy Support | No | Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:           |
|                             | (2) Sound             | No  | (2) In Part               |    | Justified      Effective      Consistent with National policy: |
- Q.6      Comments for CS12 and paragraph 5.8. Paragraph 1.5 of PPG2 outlines the five purposes of including land in Green Belt. The role of the proposed strategic gap appears to be exactly the role the Green Belt is already performing. The proposed strategic gap is therefore an unnecessary land designation, as new development proposed in the designated area would already be controlled by Green Belt Policy.
- Q.7      As PPG2 provides a clear national policy approach to the protection of the Green Belt there is no need for an additional designation which would, ineffect introduce a two tier Green Belt Policy in the Borough.
- Q.8      Yes
- Q.9      In order to fully and properly debate the proposed changes sought.

Rep Number Name: NLP for CEG and Owners of Potters Bar Golf Club  
*RCS/R27/4683/3/O NLP for CEG and Owners of Potters Bar Golf*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment*

### CEG and the Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Revised Core Strategy as it currently stands is unsound because it does not adequately justify the scale and distribution of development for the Borough, in the context of the evidence on objectively assessed development needs.

The distribution and level of development proposed through the Revised Core Strategy does not accord with, or deliver the aims and objectives of, national policy, specifically homes and jobs to meet needs nor the stated aims and objectives of the Revised Core Strategy itself.

Q.7 A greater proportion of any dwelling requirement across the Borough should be delivered in Potters Bar to respond to the local need. Policy CS2 should be amended to state that up to 20% of new housing will be sought in Potters Bar, with the level of growth sought in other areas amended accordingly.

Green Belt release in Potters Bar will be necessary to achieve this with sites and green belt boundaries should be confirmed through the Site Allocations Document. As above, policy CS12 should be amended to reflect this, with the supporting text to CS2 and CS12 specifically identifying Green Belt amendments around Potters Bar as a priority over any Green Belt amendments in other areas of the District in order to address the imbalance in the current distribution of planned development.

Hertsmere Borough has a significant level of housing need and demand, as reflected in its existing evidence base including the Chelmer Demographic projections and the SHMA (notwithstanding the shortcomings of that evidence base). This is also evidenced by NLP's 'Strategic Assessment of the Need for Housing in Hertsmere' which provides a more robust and up-to-date assessment of housing need. Over a long period, population in the Borough has grown, through a combination of natural change, and, in most recent years, net immigration. This submitted with the representations.

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 CEG and the Owners of Potters Bar Golf Course consider the Revised Core Strategy is not a sound and robust basis for the future planning of Hertsmere (see attached representations) and wish to reserve the right to appear at the oral examination on the basis of the representations set out.

Rep Number Name: PPML Consulting Ltd (on behalf of Annington Developments Ltd)  
RCS/R27//4687/1/O PPML Consulting Ltd (on behalf of Annington  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment

PPML (on behalf of Annington Developments Ltd)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS12 should reflect other paragraph in the Core Strategy notably paragraphs 2.37 and 3.15 where the Council is supporting changes to the GB boundary to allow infilling development.

Q.7 Make Policy CS12 explicit that inilling will be deemed acceptable in the GB.

Q.8 No

Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Natural England (Consultations)  
*RCS/R27/4014/S Natural England (Consultations)*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS12 The Green Belt and Protection and  
enhancement of the natural environment*

**Natural England**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Natural England supports this policy which requires that all development proposals must conserve and enhance the natural environment, including biodiversity, protected trees, landscape character, and sites of ecological and geological value and provide opportunities for habitat creation and enhancement throughout the life of a development.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/18/C Shire Consulting*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS13 Protection or enhancement of historic heritage assets*

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Much of Policy CS13 duplicates matters that are covered in national policy. Such duplication should be removed. Also, the wording is sloppy - how can "all development proposals" (a porch? / a change of use?) conserve or enhance the historic environment? This should be prefaced by "where is relevant".

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4688/3/O Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS13 Protection or enhancement of historic heritage assets*

**Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Policies such as CS13, CS15 and CS15 contain a number of statements relating to development in the historic and natural environment; or in areas of flood risk, that add nothing to the Government policy already in place on these topics. There is no need to repeat national policy within the LDF, and unless something specific to Hertsmere Borough alone can be shown on these matters, an Inspector could well judge these policies as being 'unsound' at the public examination. By removing the unnecessary policy statements the Core Strategy could be very much more concise.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4688/4/O Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS13 Protection or enhancement of historic  
heritage assets*

**Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 CS13 contains the meaningless phrase "the Council will take account of available historic environment characterisation work, ...when making decisions affecting heritage assets and their settings". Accompanying paragraph 5.20 looks to put all the Borough's archaeological sites on to the same level of protection as Scheduled Monuments with a 'presumption against development' A great many parts of the Borough might be thought to have a archaeological potential, but when investigations contain no such remains. The Government's policy to promoting economic development should be recalled, as should the default reaction to development being 'yes'.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: English Heritage (East of England Region)  
*RCS/R27//4548/1/S English Heritage (East of England Region)*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS13 Protection or enhancement of historic heritage assets*

**English Heritage**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Yes Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The approach taken to the integration of historic environment issues is welcomed, together with the recognition of characterisation work and Conservation Area Appraisals.

Q.7 It would be helpful for clarity to include the words 'or their setting' after scheduled monument' in line 5 of the policy.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: CPRE Hertfordshire  
*RCS/R27/1491/6/O CPRE Hertfordshire*

Section  
*5.22 Access to open spaces and the countryside*

On behalf of

**CPRE The Hertfordshire Society**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The final sentence of paragraph 5.22 notes that there is a 'wish to avoid a concentration of uses on the site (a farm) which might not be considered as conventional or appropriate activity in such a location' in part reflecting its Green Belt location. This wording fails to reflect that the starting point for consideration of proposals in Green Belt locations, should be whether both the 'uses' that might be considered acceptable, and the specific development proposals, are appropriate in Green Belt terms as defined in national planning policy. The current wording is not therefore likely to be effective, and is not consistent with national planning policy.

Q.7 In order to be made sound in terms of effectiveness and consistency with national policy, the words 'inappropriate development or' should be included after 'wish to avoid' in the second line of the final sentence of paragraph 5.22.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/13/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*5.23 Access to open spaces and the countryside*

On behalf of

**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The references to the Watling Chase Community Forest within the Core Strategy are currently considered to be insufficient in compliance with RSS policy ENV1. The Green Infrastructure Plan identifies the WCCF as an important existing GI initiative. Neighbouring authorities are expected to recognise WCCF as a strategic GI initiative within their Core Strategies. Policy CS14 is considered to be narrow in focussing on recreation as a benefit. Green Infrastructure is multi-functional and wider references are required.
- Q.7 Additional references similar to those contained within Policy C7 of the adopted Local Plan should be included within Chapter 5 to state; "As an example of a nationally, regionally and locally important Green Infrastructure initiative, The Watling Chase Community Forest Plan and any supplementary planning guidance to develop its themes will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the Forest area when the principal aims of the Forest Plan will be taken into account."
- Q.8 Yes
- Q.9 To discuss the relevant Green Infrastructure issues.

Rep Number Name: CPRE Hertfordshire  
*RCS/R27/1491/3/O CPRE Hertfordshire*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS14 Promoting recreational access to open spaces and the countryside*

**CPRE The Hertfordshire Society**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Clause 'v)' of Policy CS14 rightly refers to promotion of recreational uses which are appropriate in the Green Belt, but should also ensure that the development itself is appropriate, as defined in national policy, otherwise the policy implies that any development will be encouraged, whether 'appropriate' or 'inappropriate' in Green Belt terms. This would be contrary to national planning policy and the stated intentions of the Core Strategy.

Q.7 Clause 'v)' of Policy CS14 should be amended to read as follows in order to be both effective and consistent with national planning policy:- 'promotes development, including land uses, which can be considered as appropriate in The Green Belt; and'

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Natural England (Consultations)  
RCS/R27/4014/3/O Natural England (Consultations)  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS14 Promoting recreational access to open  
spaces and the countryside

### Natural England

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 As mentioned in our earlier responses Natural England wishes to see a net gain in green infrastructure and an approach which does not permit development that could compromise the integrity of the overall green infrastructure network. We have previously recommended that the following points are included in the policy wording:  
? Protection and enhancement of a multi-functional network of green space resulting in an overall net gain over the period of the Core Strategy.  
? All development should incorporate sufficient new green space in accordance with Natural England's ANGSt standards of achieving 2ha of natural greenspace within 300m of every home. In addition as many existing wildlife features as possible should be retained, and new features such as green roofs created.  
Further to the above, Natural England has commissioned a series of county-level reports to map the provision of ANGSt by local authority; the report for Hertfordshire (Analysis of Accessible Natural Greenspace Provision for Hertfordshire - [http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/HertsReport\\_tcm6-21928.pdf](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/HertsReport_tcm6-21928.pdf)) - identifies green infrastructure deficiencies for Hertsmere district at some or all of the ANGSt levels. The Core Strategy should make reference to this and seek to address these deficiencies through the relevant policies. We are pleased to note that CS20/ Table 11 includes reference to CIL contributions towards Watling Chase Community Forest and other GI.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Environment Agency  
*RCS/R27/4493/6/S Environment Agency*

Section  
*5.38 Contaminated Land*

On behalf of

Environment Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 We are please to see that you have made reference to Planning Policy Statement 23 and CLR 11 as part of this section.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4688/5/O Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting*

Section  
*5.46 Energy Consumption*

On behalf of  
**Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The reasoned justification (paragraph 5.46) to draft Policy CS15 requires measures to offset at least 10% of total carbon emissions through a combination of sustainable design and construction and on-site renewable generation on schemes of 10 new homes, or development of 1,000 sq m or above. PPS22 on "renewable Energy" warns that policies of this type must not "place an undue burden on developers" and not all sites will be suited to such measures. Furthermore, the technology in relation to many forms of renewable energy is not proven to produce sufficient energy to justify its costs. The draft policy should be deleted, as it is not 'sound'.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/20/C Shire Consulting*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS15 Environmental impact of new  
development*

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Elements of Policy CS15 duplicate matters covered by the Building regulation and other legislation so are contrary to Government policy and totally unnecessary.  
These should be deleted.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Thames Water Property Services  
RCS/R27//1055/1/O Thames Water Property Services  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS15 Environmental impact of new  
development

### Thames Water

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant No (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part No Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We support the requirement in Policy CS15 to improve water efficiency. However, it is also critical to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the sewerage network and sewage treatment works to support development as set out in our comments to the draft Revised Core Strategy in January 2011.

Within our comments to the consultation in January 2011 we set out that improvements to water and wastewater infrastructure cannot be requisitioned through Section 106 agreements and as such we rely on supportive planning policies to ensure that any new water or wastewater infrastructure required to support development is delivered ahead of the occupation of development. Failure to do this can result in adverse impacts such as sewer flooding or the pollution of watercourses.

There are existing problems of sewer flooding within Hertsmere as set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which forms part of the evidence base. However, no reference of sewer flooding is made within the Core Strategy. It is acknowledged that paragraph 5.32 makes reference to the need for investment in sewage discharge capacity and treatment, however, this text is within a section which relates to the risk of flooding caused by increased run-off and impence to the flow or storage of floodwater. Sewer flooding can occur due to overloading of sewer networks as a result of heavy rainfall run-off into sewers. However, in areas with separate surface water and foul water sewers such as Hertsmere sewer flooding could result from insufficient capacity within existing sewers to cater for peak flows arising from existing and additional proposed development potentially combined with rainwater getting into the foul sewer network via routes such as infiltration and missed connections. As such it is considered that the text in paragraph 5.32 is confused and should be revised with a separate paragraph being included making reference to wastewater infrastructure.

The Statement of Consultation summarises our previous comments and states that wastewater and water infrastructure will be considered in Policy CS15. However, Policy CS15, while making reference to improving water efficiency, makes no reference to wastewater infrastructure issues. It is therefore considered that the Core Strategy is not consistent with its evidence base and would not be effective or justified.

Q.7 In order to address the above concerns and ensure that the Core Strategy is justified and effective it is considered that the second sentence of paragraph 5.32 should be deleted and replaced by a further paragraph with the following suggested wording:

The Council recognises the problem of sewer flooding which can occur due to a lack of capacity within the existing sewer network. New development has the potential to cause sewer flooding by overloading the existing sewer network where there is insufficient capacity or could exacerbate existing sewer flooding problems. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users as set out in Policy CS15 (see proposed change below). In some circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by statutory undertaker, the Council will require the developer to fund appropriate improvements which must be completed prior to occupation of the development.

Policy CS15 should also be revised to include an additional bullet point stating:

- demonstrating that capacity exists within the existing sewerage network or that capacity will be provided ahead of the occupation of development.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Environment Agency  
*RCS/R27/4493/4/S Environment Agency*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS15 Environmental impact of new  
development*

Environment Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 We are pleased to see that you have included reference to your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment in CS15.

We are also pleased to see that point (i) now also refers to the Flood Risk Sequential Test and sequential approach to development.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Indigo Planning  
*RCS/R27/4496/2/O Indigo Planning*

Section  
*Policy CS16 Energy and CO2 Reductions*

On behalf of

**Indigo Planning on behalf of Sainsbury Supermarket**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Draft Policy CS16 states that all new non-domestic developments will be expected to achieve CO2 emission reductions in line with Building Regulations Part L and the following successive updates to Part L of the Building Regulations, as they become mandatory. The draft Policy also states the Council will encourage all new development or major refurbishments to incorporate energy from decentralized and renewable low carbon sources. All large scale development will also be required to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation. This is overly prescriptive and lack flexibility. This has the potential to make schemes unviable. As such, the policies should be amended accordingly.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4688/6/O Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting*

Section  
*Policy CS16 Energy and CO2 Reductions*

On behalf of  
**Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS16 also requires development to meet the terms of Part L of the Building Regulations by specified dates. Meeting the terms of such a policy may not be possible in relation to current technology and this is one reasons why PPS1 states that planning policy should not duplicates the terms of other legislation. The draft policy should be deleted, as it is not 'sound'.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G) c/o Jones Lang LaSalle  
*RCS/R27/4689/4/O Legal and General Life Fund Partnership*

Section  
*Policy CS16 Energy and CO2 Reductions*

On behalf of

**Legal and General Life Fund Partnership (L&G)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Legal and General Life Fund Limited Partnership (L&G) own the freehold of two sites in the borough at Rowley Lane and Elstree Way respectively – site plans included as appendices to submission. Has requested that previously made submissions to the Revised Draft Core Strategy in February 2001 be taken into consideration.

Policy CS16 - Sustainable Homes Levels - must also take into account financial viability of Housing Projects

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Environment Agency  
*RCS/R27/4493/5/S Environment Agency*

Section  
*Policy CS16 Energy and CO2 Reductions*

On behalf of

Environment Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 We support the aims for new residential development to achieve Code Level 3 by 2010, Code Level 4 by 2013 and Code Level 6 by 2016.

We think water efficiency targets should also be included here. We suggest a commitment to a water efficiency level of 105 litres per head per day. This is equivalent to level 3/4 for water in the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust  
*RCS/R27/1296/2/C Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust*

Section  
*6. Building Sustainable Communities*

On behalf of  
Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 Para 6.4 - I note that 'allotments and other urban open land including woodland and town or village greens' is listed as a 'key community facility'. Whilst I welcome that these are recognised, it would be preferable for this definition to be broadened to include 'other Green Infrastructure assets'.  
Para 6.12, Table 11 and Policy CS20 - HMWT strongly welcomes the Council's view that CIL charging for strategic and local infrastructure is an appropriate way forward to foster sustainable growth and address cumulative impacts of new developments. It is our view that habitat/GI creation and restoration should be included in the charging schedule.
- Q.7 Para 6.4 - We suggest that 'other Green Infrastructure assets' be included alongside allotments, urban open land etc., as a key community facility. We feel a specific reference to Green infrastructure is merited.
- Q.8 No
- Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/5/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*6. Building Sustainable Communities*

On behalf of  
**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Paragraph 6.11 does not accurately reflect the current state of play in terms of progressing CIL charging schedules. It seems highly unlikely there will a countywide CIL and the per dwelling costings produced by HHS now seem somewhat out-of-date and not particularly relevant given where the authorities now are in terms of progressing CIL. Although there has been a recent government consultation on whether or not affordable housing should be included within CIL, the outcome of this is not yet known and as such its inclusion within Table 11 is not compliant with the published CIL regulations 2011 (as amended).

Q.7 In addition to the Borough' standard charge already identified in Para 6.11, reference should also be made to the Planning Obligations Guidance - Toolkit for Hertfordshire, and also reflected in policy CS20. Affordable Housing should be removed from Table 11. Para 6.23 -The AAP should include provision for/recognition of public realm improvements, links to Shenley Road and Elstree Way as a key sustainable transport (bus) corridor.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)  
*RCS/R27/4686/4/O Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)*

Section  
*6. Building Sustainable Communities*

On behalf of  
**Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 The CS' commitment to promoting, providing or facilitating the provision of key community facilities with a clear presumption in favour of supporting such land uses (draft paragraph 6.5) is considered appropriate. However, in order to make the CS sound, an up-to-date Community Needs Assessment / Social Infrastructure Study should be undertaken so that the policy is based upon a sufficiently robust evidence base.  
The CS' acknowledgement that the provision of key community facilities will be considered in relation to the needs and demands of the local and wider growing population is supported.  
The above will ensure that the CS will facilitate the provision of an adequate supply of suitable land uses (listed at draft paragraph 6.4) to include leisure facilities and cemetery development to meet the needs of the borough's population over the plan period.
- Q.7 Reference in Section 6 to the importance of taking an up to date Community Needs Assessment / Social Infrastructure Study.
- Q.8 No
- Q.9 N/A

Rep Number Name: Edwards Covell  
*RCS/R27//4643/1/C Edwards Covell*

Section  
*Policy CS17 Access to services*

On behalf of

**On Behalf of KPWG**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Yes

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 Welcome the amendments made to Policies CS12 and CS17, however, request a specific new policy on cemeteries, like that of Stockport's and Cherwell's Core Strategies. Suggested wording: "The Core Strategy will encourage the provision of an adequate supply of suitable land in appropriate locations for cemetery and crematoria development and ancillary facilities to meet the needs of the borough's population through the plan period. This involves woodland burial, the expansion of existing cemeteries and / or the provision of a new cemetery / cemeteries. An assessment is submitted with representation which suggest a capacity for 5.1 years of burials.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Sport England (East Region)  
RCS/R27//1487/1/O Sport England (East Region)

Section  
Policy CS17 Access to services

On behalf of  
Sport England

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Sport England welcomes the spirit and broad content of this policy as it takes a positive approach to facilitating and promoting the building and land use requirements of local services which would include community sport. However, there is concern that the Council's evidence base on sport which would support the inclusion and implementation of this policy will not be sufficiently robust if challenged when the policy is implemented. For example, the policy seeks new provision of required key community facilities to be made as part of new development and the evidence base will inform what is sought through planning obligations. The evidence base for indoor and outdoor sport in its current form is not considered to accord with Government guidance in PPG17 in relation to planning policies being supported by robust assessments and audits of local need. The evidence base would not therefore meet the 'justified' and 'consistent with National Policy' tests of soundness. The Council's Open Space Study (October 2011) has been considered and the principal concerns are:

Indoor Facilities:

1. The assessment uses Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator which is not intended for undertaking sports facility needs assessments and only allows a crude analysis to be undertaken. The strategic planning tools that should be used for undertaking indoor sports facility needs assessments such as the Facilities Planning Model and Active Places Power have not been used.
2. The assessment does not account (and apply appropriate weighting) for factors such as the age/condition of facilities, their accessibility in terms of hours that they are open in the peak period, their accessibility by car, public transport and walking, import and export of demand between Hertsmere and surrounding areas, the level of utilised capacity of individual facilities etc. The above mentioned tools would allow these factors to be accounted for but the Sports Facility Calculator only allows estimated demand from within Hertsmere to be compared with existing supply without accounting for any of these considerations.
3. The assessment does not account for the sport/activity specific needs of facilities such as sports halls and swimming pools e.g. with respect to swimming pools, there is not an assessment of whether the facilities have the capacity and design to meet the different uses of the water space such as swimming club use, swimming lessons, aqua aerobics, diving, water polo etc. Consultation with user groups and facility operators would allow such an assessment to be made.
4. The consultation undertaken to inform the assessment is based on a Best Value general user survey from 2006/07. While this may give some generic views of residents, this does not account for the views of facility operators, sports clubs, sports governing bodies etc who are key stakeholders in the use of sports facilities and would be expected to be consulted in the first instance to provide feedback on issues such as the quantity, quality and accessibility of facilities;
5. There would only appear to be a limited assessment of the quality of existing facilities in the form of a survey of school facilities which is based on the views of each individual school which is unlikely to achieve consistency.

Outdoor Facilities:

1. The Council's Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy was based on 2006 supply and demand data which will be significantly out of date by the time the core strategy is adopted. While the document was updated in 2010, it is unclear to what extent the supply and demand data was updated and whether the stakeholder consultation element was updated. Sport England considers that any playing pitch assessment which is based on data more than 3 years old would be out-of-date and in need of review unless the supply/demand data was monitored and the assessment updated on an annual basis. As it is unclear whether this has been undertaken, it is not possible to confirm that the evidence base for outdoor sports facilities is sufficiently up-to-date.

An example of a potential concern in terms of implementing policy CS17 using the current evidence base is that the Open Space Study has concluded that there is an oversupply of swimming pools and sports halls. Consequently, if planning applications come forward involving the loss of such facilities, based on this evidence, the Council may find it difficult to prevent their loss even though it is possible that a more detailed analysis of needs as advocated would identify deficiencies. Similarly, even if there are sufficient facilities in quantitative terms for meeting needs, the existing facilities will require significant investment over time to maintain their quality to meet the community's expectations. The conclusion that there is an oversupply of some key community sports facilities is likely to make it more difficult to justify seeking new developments to make provision towards making qualitative improvements to existing facilities and is likely to be a low priority when decisions are made about the use of developer contributions. Addressing the issues identified above would provide the evidence base for securing such provision if justified.

Q.7 While supportive of this policy in broad terms, I would urge the Council to review the evidence base relating to sport which underpins it to avoid the implementation of the policy being challenged at a later date and to help inform and justify the policy when applied. In practice this would involve the following;

1. Undertake a revised quantitative assessment of indoor sports facility needs using the Facilities Planning Model and Active Places Power strategic planning tools in order to robustly analyse needs;
2. Undertaking a qualitative assessment of all indoor sports facilities using a consistent and robust methodology;
3. Undertaking consultation with key stakeholders that can provide a more detailed and robust perspective of indoor sports facility needs and issues.
4. Unless it can be demonstrated that the supply/demand data and consultation that informed the Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy has been substantially updated since the study was first prepared in 2006, a review of the strategy should be undertaken in accordance with Sport England's 'Towards a Level Playing Field' Playing Pitch Strategy methodology which is the industry standard methodology for preparing such assessments/strategies.

The outcome of this work could either support the current conclusions of the Open Space Study to make them more robust or if different conclusions are reached, could be used to update the findings of the study.

While reviewing the evidence base would be preferential before the strategy is examined, as Sport England would not wish to delay the preparation of the core strategy, I would be prepared to accept a commitment being made in the core strategy (in the supporting text to the policies in chapter 6: Building Sustainable Communities) which commits to a review of the evidence base to address Sport England's concerns within a defined timescale in order to support the implementation of the policy.

The review of the evidence base should be undertaken in consultation with Sport England and in the interim of a core strategy being adopted, discussions should take place between the Council and Sport England to discuss how the evidence base will be reviewed in practice. Sport England would be happy to provide advice to the Council on how to undertake assessments, access strategic planning tools, identify stakeholders etc

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4688/7/C Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting*

Section  
*Policy CS18 Key community facilities*

On behalf of  
**Aldenham School Charity c/o Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Draft policy CS18 supports "dual use of key community facilities, including educational, healthcare and recreational facilities". Whilst the School often allows use of its facilities by the wider community, for this to be done efficiently, the policy should recognise that additional parking provision is required.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Sport England (East Region)  
RCS/R27/1487/2/O Sport England (East Region)

Section  
Policy CS18 Key community facilities

On behalf of  
Sport England

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Sport England welcomes this policy as it supports the principle of new community facilities including sport and seeks to protect existing facilities. However, there is concern that the Council's evidence base on sport which would support the inclusion and implementation of this policy will not be sufficiently robust if challenged when the policy is implemented. For example, the policy resists the loss, reduction or displacement of facilities/sites unless it can be demonstrated that they are surplus to the needs of the community or no longer fit for purpose. The evidence base that supports the policy will inform whether facilities are surplus to needs and consequently it is essential that it is robust. The evidence base for indoor and outdoor sport in its current form is not considered to accord with Government guidance in PPG17 in relation to planning policies being supported by robust assessments and audits of local need. The evidence base would not therefore meet the 'justified' and 'consistent with National Policy' tests of soundness. The Council's Open Space Study (October 2011) has been considered and the principal concerns are:

Indoor Facilities:

1. The assessment uses Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator which is not intended for undertaking sports facility needs assessments and only allows a crude analysis to be undertaken. The strategic planning tools that should be used for undertaking indoor sports facility needs assessments such as the Facilities Planning Model and Active Places Power have not been used.
2. The assessment does not account (and apply appropriate weighting) for factors such as the age/condition of facilities, their accessibility in terms of hours that they are open in the peak period, their accessibility by car, public transport and walking, import and export of demand between Hertsmere and surrounding areas, the level of utilised capacity of individual facilities etc. The above mentioned tools would allow these factors to be accounted for but the Sports Facility Calculator only allows estimated demand from within Hertsmere to be compared with existing supply without accounting for any of these considerations.
3. The assessment does not account for the sport/activity specific needs of facilities such as sports halls and swimming pools e.g. with respect to swimming pools, there is not an assessment of whether the facilities have the capacity and design to meet the different uses of the water space such as swimming club use, swimming lessons, aqua aerobics, diving, water polo etc. Consultation with user groups and facility operators would allow such an assessment to be made.
4. The consultation undertaken to inform the assessment is based on a Best Value general user survey from 2006/07. While this may give some generic views of residents, this does not account for the views of facility operators, sports clubs, sports governing bodies etc who are key stakeholders in the use of sports facilities and would be expected to be consulted in the first instance to provide feedback on issues such as the quantity, quality and accessibility of facilities;
5. There would only appear to be a limited assessment of the quality of existing facilities in the form of a survey of school facilities which is based on the views of each individual school which is unlikely to achieve consistency.

Outdoor Facilities:

1. The Council's Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy was based on 2006 supply and demand data which will be significantly out of date by the time the core strategy is adopted. While the document was updated in 2010, it is unclear to what extent the supply and demand data was updated and whether the stakeholder consultation element was updated. Sport England considers that any playing pitch assessment which is based on data more than 3 years old would be out-of-date and in need of review unless the supply/demand data was monitored and the assessment updated on an annual basis. As it is unclear whether this has been undertaken, it is not possible to confirm that the evidence base for outdoor sports facilities is sufficiently up-to-date.

An example of a potential concern in terms of implementing policy CS18 using the current evidence base is that the Open Space Study has concluded that there is an oversupply of swimming pools and sports halls. Consequently, if planning applications come forward involving the loss of such facilities, based on this evidence, the Council may find it difficult to prevent their loss even though it is possible that a more detailed analysis of needs as advocated would identify deficiencies. Similarly, even if there are sufficient facilities in quantitative terms for meeting needs, the existing facilities will require significant investment over time to maintain their quality to meet the community's expectations. The conclusion that there is an oversupply of some key community sports facilities is likely to make it more difficult to justify seeking new developments to make provision towards making qualitative improvements to existing facilities and is likely to be a low priority when decisions are made about the use of developer contributions. Addressing the issues identified above would provide the evidence base for securing such provision if justified.

Q.7 While supportive of this policy in broad terms, I would urge the Council to review the evidence base relating to sport which underpins it to avoid the implementation of the policy being challenged at a later date and to help inform and justify the policy when applied. In practice this would involve the following;

1. Undertake a revised quantitative assessment of indoor sports facility needs using the Facilities Planning Model and Active Places Power strategic planning tools in order to robustly analyse needs;
2. Undertaking a qualitative assessment of all indoor sports facilities using a consistent and robust methodology;
3. Undertaking consultation with key stakeholders that can provide a more detailed and robust perspective of indoor sports facility needs and issues.
4. Unless it can be demonstrated that the supply/demand data and consultation that informed the Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy has been substantially updated since the study was first prepared in 2006, a review of the strategy should be undertaken in accordance with Sport England's 'Towards a Level Playing Field' Playing Pitch Strategy methodology which is the industry standard methodology for preparing such assessments/strategies.

The outcome of this work could either support the current conclusions of the Open Space Study to make them more robust or if different conclusions are reached, could be used to update the findings of the study.

While reviewing the evidence base would be preferential before the strategy is examined, as Sport England would not wish to delay the preparation of the core strategy, I would be prepared to accept a commitment being made in the core strategy (in the supporting text to the policies in chapter 6: Building Sustainable Communities) which commits to a review of the evidence base to address Sport England's concerns within a defined timescale in order to support the implementation of the policy.

The review of the evidence base should be undertaken in consultation with Sport England and in the interim of a core strategy being adopted, discussions should take place between the Council and Sport England to discuss how the evidence base will be reviewed in practice. Sport England would be happy to provide advice to the Council on how to undertake assessments, access strategic planning tools, identify stakeholders etc

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Aldenham Parish Council  
*RCS/R27/1192/6/S Aldenham Parish Council*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS18 Key community facilities*

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 APC welcome the comments made unde CS18, especially with reference to the Former Fire Station at Radlett.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: The Theatres Trust  
*RCS/R27//4670/1/S The Theatres Trust*

Section  
*Policy CS18 Key community facilities*

On behalf of  
**The Theatres Trust**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Yes Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 We support the document and find it to be sound, from our point of view, with regard to Policies CS17 Access to Services (includes cultural facilities in the accompanying text) and CS27 Strengthening Town Centres (supports arts, leisure and entertainment uses), but with some comments. Policy CS18 presumably does not include your cultural venues. This policy provides for the loss or displacement of community facilities which protection is not offered for leisure and cultural facilities. Hertsmere has a number of cultural facilities and these should also be given the same protection, maintenance and enhancement as your community facilities as they too would be difficult to replace. Your cultural facilities provide a quality of life to residents and make a valuable contribution to the character and function of your town centres, especially the evening economy. We suggest that para.8.17 includes theatres as another example of positive evening uses rather than casinos, and still find Policy CS29 (Safe and Attractive Evening Economy) to be depressing and negative.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Highways Agency  
*RCS/R27/1568/4/C Highways Agency*

Section  
*Policy CS19 Securing mixed use development*

On behalf of  
**Highways Agency**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Highways Agency considers the intention of Policy CS19 is good, however there is some concern regarding the reference made to 'local road capacity'. Whilst it is recognised that this may be referring, geographically, to all roads in the immediate 'local' area, it is felt that a minor amendment to the wording of the policy is necessary to clarify that assessment should not be limited to the local road network, i.e. that under the control of Hertfordshire County Council, but also encompass, where applicable, the Strategic Road Network which is under the control of the Highways Agency.

Q.7 The Highways Agency recommends the following text, highlighted in green italics, is inserted into Policy CS22, to increase its effectiveness from the Highways Agency's perspective:

"iii) public transport accessibility, and local and strategic road network capacity; and"

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: English Heritage (East of England Region)  
*RCS/R27/4548/2/C English Heritage (East of England Region)*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Table 11 Potential items to be incorporated into a  
future CIL charging schedule for Hertsmere*

**English Heritage**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 It may be suitable for the Council to include heritage assets as a potential area for CIL funding, e.g. if a scheme related to a heritage asset at risk.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Sport England (East Region)  
RCS/R27/1487/3/O Sport England (East Region)  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS20 Standard charges and other planning obligations

## Sport England

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 This policy is welcomed as it makes provision for new residential and non-residential developments to make provision for on-site or off-site community facilities (which may include sport) through standard charges or individual planning obligations. However, there is concern that the Council's evidence base on sport which would support the inclusion and implementation of this policy will not be sufficiently robust if challenged when the policy is implemented. As provision will only be justified for facilities/services for which a need is known to arise from new development, the Council's evidence base will be scrutinized by developers when assessing whether such needs exist in relation to sport. If the evidence base is not considered to be robust, developers are likely to challenge the need to make provision for sport which may result in provision not being made even though needs may exist.

The evidence base for indoor and outdoor sport in its current form is not considered to accord with Government guidance in PPG17 in relation to planning policies being supported by robust assessments and audits of local need. The evidence base would not therefore meet the 'justified' and 'consistent with National Policy' tests of soundness. The Council's Open Space Study (October 2011) has been considered and the principal concerns are:

### Indoor Facilities:

1. The assessment uses Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator which is not intended for undertaking sports facility needs assessments and only allows a crude analysis to be undertaken. The strategic planning tools that should be used for undertaking indoor sports facility needs assessments such as the Facilities Planning Model and Active Places Power have not been used.
2. The assessment does not account (and apply appropriate weighting) for factors such as the age/condition of facilities, their accessibility in terms of hours that they are open in the peak period, their accessibility by car, public transport and walking, import and export of demand between Hertsmere and surrounding areas, the level of utilised capacity of individual facilities etc. The above mentioned tools would allow these factors to be accounted for but the Sports Facility Calculator only allows estimated demand from within Hertsmere to be compared with existing supply without accounting for any of these considerations.
3. The assessment does not account for the sport/activity specific needs of facilities such as sports halls and swimming pools e.g. with respect to swimming pools, there is not an assessment of whether the facilities have the capacity and design to meet the different uses of the water space such as swimming club use, swimming lessons, aqua aerobics, diving, water polo etc. Consultation with user groups and facility operators would allow such an assessment to be made.
4. The consultation undertaken to inform the assessment is based on a Best Value general user survey from 2006/07. While this may give some generic views of residents, this does not account for the views of facility operators, sports clubs, sports governing bodies etc who are key stakeholders in the use of sports facilities and would be expected to be consulted in the first instance to provide feedback on issues such as the quantity, quality and accessibility of facilities;
5. There would only appear to be a limited assessment of the quality of existing facilities in the form of a survey of school facilities which is based on the views of each individual school which is unlikely to achieve consistency.

### Outdoor Facilities:

1. The Council's Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy was based on 2006 supply and demand data which will be significantly out of date by the time the core strategy is adopted. While the document was updated in 2010, it is unclear to what extent the supply and demand data was updated and whether the stakeholder consultation element was updated. Sport England considers that any playing pitch assessment which is based on data more than 3 years old would be out-of-date and in need of review unless the supply/demand data was monitored and the assessment updated on an annual basis. As it is unclear whether this has been undertaken, it is not possible to confirm that the evidence base for outdoor sports facilities is sufficiently up-to-date.

An example of a potential concern in terms of implementing policy CS20 using the current evidence base is that the Open Space Study has concluded that there is an oversupply of swimming pools and sports halls. Consequently, it would be difficult to justify seeking new developments to make provision towards such facilities. If the evidence base is not correct and there are deficiencies, new development would consequently not make provision for meeting such needs. Furthermore, even if there is an oversupply in quantitative terms for meeting needs, the existing facilities will require significant investment over time to maintain their quality to meet the community's expectations. Making qualitative improvements to existing facilities is likely to be a low priority when decisions are made about the use of developer contributions as the evidence bases has not assessed this in any detail.

Q.7 While supportive of this policy in broad terms, I would urge the Council to review the evidence base relating to sport which underpins it to avoid the implementation of the policy being challenged at a later date and to help inform and justify the policy when applied. In practice this would involve the following;

1. Undertake a revised quantitative assessment of indoor sports facility needs using the Facilities Planning Model and Active Places Power strategic planning tools in order to robustly analyse needs;
2. Undertaking a qualitative assessment of all indoor sports facilities using a consistent and robust methodology;
3. Undertaking consultation with key stakeholders that can provide a more detailed and robust perspective of indoor sports facility needs and issues.
4. Unless it can be demonstrated that the supply/demand data and consultation that informed the Playing Pitch Assessment and Strategy has been substantially updated since the study was first prepared in 2006, a review of the strategy should be undertaken in accordance with Sport England's 'Towards a Level Playing Field' Playing Pitch Strategy methodology which is the industry standard methodology for preparing such assessments/strategies.

The outcome of this work could either support the current conclusions of the Open Space Study to make them more robust or if different conclusions are reached, could be used to update the findings of the study.

While reviewing the evidence base would be preferential before the strategy is examined, as Sport England would not wish to delay the preparation of the core strategy, I would be prepared to accept a commitment being made in the core strategy (in the supporting text to the policies in chapter 6: Building Sustainable Communities) which commits to a review of the evidence base to address Sport England's concerns within a defined timescale in order to support the implementation of the policy.

The review of the evidence base should be undertaken in consultation with Sport England and in the interim of a core strategy being adopted, discussions should take place between the Council and Sport England to discuss how the evidence base will be reviewed in practice. Sport England would be happy to provide advice to the Council on how to undertake assessments, access strategic planning tools, identify stakeholders etc

Q.8 No

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)  
RCS/R27/4686/5/O Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS20 Standard charges and other planning obligations

**Savills (on behalf of Jupiter Hotels)**

- | Do you Consider the DPD is: |  | (1) Legally Compliant   | Yes | (1) Core Strategy Support | Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not: |           |           |                                  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-----|---------------------------|--|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|
|                             |  | (2) Sound   | No  | (2) In Part               | Yes  | Justified | Effective | Consistent with National policy: |
| Q.6                         |  | The use of individually negotiated Section 106 obligations on a site-by-site basis is generally supported. It is considered that the importance of viability and deliverability in plan making and the determination of applications should be emphasised in the policy wording. As identified in the draft NPPF, Local Plan aspirations must be deliverable and planning permissions must demonstrate that they can be delivered in the current market. The NPPF also acknowledges that CIL charging schedules should be prepared in conjunction with Local Plans. It is noted that the schedule for the Borough will be drawn up shortly and it is important that development is not prejudiced by a fixed CIL set at a level that threatens in any way its delivery. |     |                           |  |           |           |                                  |
| Q.7                         |  | In order to put greater emphasis on the need to consider viability in the negotiation of obligations, draft paragraph 6.11 should read 'on larger all development schemes will provide the Council will, however, retain the option of negotiating Section 106 agreements on a site-by-site basis having regard to amongst other planning factors, the scheme's viability for both residential and non-residential development whilst affording 106 provisions which mitigate impact.'  |     |                           |  |           |           |                                  |
| Q.8                         |  | No  |     |                           |  |           |           |                                  |
| Q.9                         |  | N/A   |     |                           |  |           |           |                                  |

Rep Number Name: English Heritage (East of England Region)  
*RCS/R27/4548/3/C English Heritage (East of England Region)*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Policy CS21 Securing a high quality and accessible environment*

**English Heritage**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

- Q.6 'We are pleased to see that reference is made to the historic environment in this policy.'
- Q.7 PPS5 emphasises that the historic environment can have a positive role to play in place-shaping, and would be appropriate to refer to this within the policy.
- Q.8 No
- Q.9

Rep Number Name: Highways Agency  
RCS/R27/1568/3/C Highways Agency

Section  
Policy CS22 Elstree Way Corridor

On behalf of  
Highways Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The Highways Agency supports the council's intention to produce an AAP for the Elstree Way corridor, and welcomes the inclusion of this proposal within Policy CS22. The Highways Agency acknowledges the council's proposal for potentially permitting development on safeguarded land between Rowley Lane and the A1, east of the Elstree Way employment area. The Highways Agency wishes to seek confirmation that development on the safeguarded land will be covered by the AAP, to increase the opportunity for bringing forward integrated and sustainable development, and reduce the risk of fragmented and piecemeal development.

The Highways Agency queries whether there is any existing transport evidence base which covers the Elstree Way employment area, incorporating planned development on the safeguarded land, and whether this includes the Strategic Road Network. The Highways Agency requires an understanding of the highway impact, if any, which may arise upon the Strategic Road Network, as a result of development growth in this area, and whether any form of mitigation is required.

The Highways Agency considers that through an AAP, there is opportunity for and a compelling need to compile a suitable evidence base and mitigation strategy which assesses and responds to any impact on the highway network, including the A1, if evidence demonstrates that this is the necessary action to take. The AAP may also present an opportunity to develop a tariff mechanism or CIL contribution which deals specifically with any impact arising at this junction and the Strategic Road Network arising from development in the area.

The Highways Agency considers that it would be beneficial for Policy CS22 to cross-reference Policy CS23 which sets out the need for appropriate transport assessment accompanying future development proposals.

Q.7 The Highways Agency recommends the following text, highlighted in green italics, is inserted into Policy CS22, to increase the effectiveness of this policy and its justification:

Any development should have regard to guidance set out in the Elstree Way Corridor Area Action Plan DPD and be brought forward in a coordinated manner. The AAP will incorporate the Elstree Way employment area and the proposed safeguarded land to the east, between Rowley Lane and the A1 Barnet Bypass

and should be in compliance with other policies in the Core Strategy, with particular reference to the requirements of policies CS21, CS23 and CS25. "The AAP will be supported by a suitable evidence base which considers, amongst other things, the potential cumulative traffic effects of planned development in the area on the surrounding transport network, including the Strategic Road Network. In consultation with relevant stakeholders, this evidence will be used to determine what mitigation and improvement works may be required to facilitate development coming forward and ensure the highway network can operate efficiently and safely in the future. As part of the AAP and in consultation with stakeholders, consideration will be given to a potential tariff mechanism or CIL contribution to secure funding for infrastructure, including highway mitigation, if based on evidence it is deemed necessary, and does not compromise the viability of development.

Transport assessment work prepared in support of development coming forward should take account of advice set out in DfT Circular 02/2007, the Highways Agency's Protocol for Dealing with Planning Applications, and local highway authority advice, including the need to ensure the Strategic Road Network is 'no worse off' than if the development did not take place.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Mr L Setyon  
*RCS/R27//2957/1/C Mr L Setyon*

Section  
*Policy CS22 Elstree Way Corridor*

On behalf of

**Lee Setyon**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Consultee made representations regarding parking in a CPZ in Radlett, these comments are outside of the remit of the Core Strategy.

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Taylor Wimpey North Thames  
*RCS/R27/4679/2/S Taylor Wimpey North Thames*

Section  
*Policy CS22 Elstree Way Corridor*

On behalf of

Taylor Wimpey North Thames

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support Yes Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound Yes (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS22 now confirms the Council's intention to prepare an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the Elstree Way Corridor. TWNT welcome the proposed preparation of the AAP as the current SPG is now nearly 10 years old and is now outdated having been overtaken by events. A number of sites have not come forward in the manner or at the pace anticipated and up-to-date commercially focussed guidance is required to ensure development does come forward and the Council's objectives especially for the accommodation of 800 new dwellings within the corridor are to be realised. As part of this serious consideration should also be given to altering and expanding the boundaries of the defined corridor so that the area it covers is not so arbitrary and that the area can be development comprehensively and viably. As a Company that is based, and has land interests, in the corridor TWNT very much wish to be part of the discussions on the APP going forward.

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
RCS/R27/4553/6/C Hertfordshire County Council

Section  
7. Transport and Parking

On behalf of

HCC Spatial and Land use Planning

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7

Following confirmation of DfT funding contribution to the construction of the Croxley Rail Link it might be prudent for the Core Strategy to consider potential implications of the scheme. Paragraphs 1.19, 1.22, 7.1, table 5 and policy CS14 are inconsistent in the degree to which congestion is to be managed/reduced. The position of the County Council is as set out in the LTP the growth in traffic and congestion will be reduced. No reference appears to be made to the Borehamwood and Elstree Urban Transport Plan or the Potters Bar Urban Transport Plan. Refers to diversion of traffic from the M25 in relation to Potters Bar and to improving the accessibility of Radlett railway station in relation to Radlett. Neither of these issues appear to be picked up in the Transport section. Reference to the 'associated Accessibility Strategy' should be removed. There are several associated documents with this strategy and they are likely to change over the period of the Plan. The 'strategy' is adequately covered by the inclusion of the Local Transport Plan. The Local Transport Plan is 2011 – 2031 is based on 5 key goals and not the 8 priorities listed in Para 1.18. In table 11 the transport section should be extended to include Intelligent Transport Systems as well as 'softer' measures such as Travelwise. Para 7.1 - The South Mimms Service Station is not recognised by the County Council as a source of congestion. This issue may merit a discussion between the authorities. Para 7.2 should be extended to acknowledge that the Borough Council can influence car usage through its car parking management and standards. This would support the Core Strategy Objectives and Policy CS24. Para 7.5 incorrectly states that 'A number of Urban Transport Plans for different parts of the Borough are also currently under preparation'. A number of Urban Transport Plans already exist, the Potters Bar UTP is at the final stages of consultation and a review of the Elstree and Borehamwood UTP is to be undertaken next. Para 7.7 - Roads in Hertfordshire has recently been updated and the 2011 rather than the 2001 version should be referenced. Policy CS23 - The wording of Policy CS23 could be strengthened by the inclusion of an additional bullet point that reads; 'the cumulative impact on the highway network can be adequately mitigated'. Policy CS24 - Reference should be made to the inclusion of electric vehicle charging points and consideration given to including this in Policy CS34 to support the objectives of the Core Strategy. Greenways - A useful addition to the section on Greenways would be on how they are likely to be delivered and this would help inform / be informed by the preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. For clarity and consistency it would also be helpful to reference 'Greenways' within Policy CS25.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Highways Agency  
RCS/R27/1568/5/O Highways Agency  
On behalf of

Section  
Policy CS23 Development and accessibility to  
services and employment

### Highways Agency

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Item (ii) under Policy CS23 states the need for a travel plan to accompany development proposals over 2,500sqm and 80 residential units prepared in accordance with guidance set out in the Parking Supplementary Planning Document.

The Highways Agency welcomes the inclusion of this requirement and recognises that the land-use quantum threshold for triggering the need for a Travel Plan is in accordance with the DfT's Guidance on Transport Assessment. To increase the effectiveness of the policy, the Highways Agency considers that this description should be enhanced to make reference to DfT best practice guidance on preparing travel plans.

Q.7 The Highways Agency recommends the following text, , is inserted into Policy CS23:

"ii) it is accompanied by a suitable Travel Plan (for developments over 2,500sqm or 80 residential units), prepared in accordance with guidance set out in the Parking Supplementary Planning Document and DfT guidance on preparing travel plans.

Reference should also be made to advice set out in DfT Circular 02/2007, the Highways Agency's Protocol for Dealing with Planning Applications, and local highway authority documentation, in terms of producing transport assessment in support of development proposals.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association  
*RCS/R27/4240/2/S The Radlett Society and Green Belt*

Section  
*Policy CS25 Promoting alternatives to the car*

On behalf of

**The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Support

Q.7 Syntax errors within text para 7.19

Q.8 No

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners  
RCS/R27//1248/1/C Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners

Section  
Policy CS26 Town centre strategy

On behalf of  
CS Harlequin Ltd

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 "Policy CS26 states that proposals to create in excess of 2,500 sq.m of new retail floor space that is outside of an existing town centre will be subject to the sequential test. This is inconsistent with PPS4 which states that a sequential assessment is required for all applications for main town centre uses (including retail) that are not in an existing centre and not in accordance with an up to date development plan (Policy EC14). No floor space threshold is set in relation to the sequential approach. The 2,500 sq.m threshold relates to impact assessments only. Small scale town centre uses should also be focused in designated areas. On the basis that policy CS26 is not consistent with PPS4 Policy EC14 the policy as it is currently worded is unsound."

Q.7 The relevant part of policy CS26 should be reworded to delete 'in excess of 2,500 sq.m'

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/21/C Shire Consulting*

Section  
*Policy CS26 Town centre strategy*

On behalf of

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 The "Town Centre Strategy" in Policy CS26 in effect just repeats PPS4. It should either be rewritten to address matters of particular relevance to Hertsmere or it should be deleted.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Indigo Planning  
*RCS/R27/4496//O Indigo Planning*

Section  
*Policy CS26 Town centre strategy*

On behalf of

Indigo Planning for Sainsbury's Supermarket

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Draft Policy CS26 states that development within the designated centres, including the town centre of Potters Bar, will be permitted provided that it maintains the primary retail function or wider role as an appropriate town centre use (as defined within PPS4). The Sainsbury's store on Darkes Lane should be included in the designated primary frontage to acknowledge the stores role as a shopping destination and an important anchor for the town centre. The store offers a wide range of goods and services, and serves as a main attractor to the town centre. It is easily accessible being located adjacent to the Potters Bar rail station and is well served by public transport.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association  
*RCS/R27/4240/3/C The Radlett Society and Green Belt*

Section  
*8.11 The health of individual centres – Radlett*

On behalf of

**The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 It is unclear why further retail development at Battlers Green is not supported, where it complements the main district centre well. Support is also given for the post office and sorting office as an essential facility.

Q.7 Spelling error in para 8.5 - 'Stirling Corner'

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: Shire Consulting  
*RCS/R27/4658/22/C Shire Consulting*

Section  
*Policy CS27 Strengthening town centres*

On behalf of

**Shire Consulting**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant  
(2) Sound

(1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Policy CS27 sets out the intention to designate primary and secondary frontage in Borehamwood, Potters Bar, Bushey and Radlett, although the plan provides no justification for doing so. It is stated that the designation of the frontages will take place in the "Site Allocations and Development Management DPD" but again, there appears to be no reasoned justification for either the designation or the intention to set out an "appropriate proportion" of each use that will be permitted. Rather than just repeating PPS4 , the Council would be wiser if it actually reads what PPS4 and other Government policy says.

Q.7

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: RPS on behalf of Willows farm  
RCS/R27/4552/2/O RPS on behalf of Willows farm

Section  
Policy CS27 Strengthening town centres

On behalf of  
Bowmans Leisure (Willows Farm)

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support No Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 As currently worded, the final sentence of Paragraph 8.14 of the RCS and final sentence of Policy CS27 could potentially stifle the future viability and expansion of Willows Farm Village, concerning the provision of any future tourism based retail development that is ancillary to its function as a day visitor attraction. The RCS is therefore considered to be unsound on the basis that it is not consistent with relevant policy guidance contained within the Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism (2006) and PPS4 (2OG9). In particular, Paragraph 1.1 of the Good Practice Guide states that the planning system has a vital role to play in terms of facilitating the development and improvement of tourism in appropriate locations. Policy EC7 of PPS4 states that local planning authorities should, through their local development frameworks, support the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres.

Furthermore, the policy states that local development frameworks should support extensions to existing tourist accommodation where the scale of the extension is appropriate to its location and where the extension may help to ensure the future Viability of such businesses.

Paragraph 8.14 appears under the subheading of Shenley, a settlement whose rapid growth is acknowledged but which remains below most other Settlements of significant size in the Borough's hierarchy. Willows Farm is referred to in the final sentence of Paragraph 8.14. We consider that the policy stance is not justified in the circumstances. It may be true that Willows Farm is located "beyond the settlement hierarchy" and outside any designated centre, but this 'takes no account of the function of the retail element of activities at Willows Farm, which is primarily to serve Visitors. We acknowledge that the categories 'visitor' and 'resident' may not be mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, given their function, we consider that the retail facilities at Willows Farm should not be treated in the same way as those in established settlements.

The farm shop sells produce from Willows Farm itself and also that from nearby farms. In our view the sale of local produce should be supported on the grounds of sustainability, on the other hand, the Council's stance as set out in the final sentence of this paragraph may well be inimical to the maintenance of the attractiveness of Willows Farm and its ability to contribute to the local economy.

We consider it extremely unlikely that the retail facilities at Willows Farm will have any adverse effect on those in settlements. We believe the same considerations apply to Policy CS27.

In addition, we note that the Council stated in its statement of consultation response dated 28 November 2011, concerning our previous representations to the December 2010 Revised Core Strategy, that it "agreed" that Willows Farm should be considered on its own, not in the context of Shenley.

Q.7 We therefore seek the following changes: - The deletion of all after 'retail activities' in the final sentence of paragraph 8.14 and the deletion of all other policies in final sentence of Policy CS27. This additional section would make the RCS sound by bringing it in line with national planning policy regarding and economic development tourism.

Q.8 Yes

Q.9 To ensure that tourism development is afforded the importance in the RCS that it is due.



Rep Number Name: Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust  
*RCS/R27/1296/4/C Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust*

Section  
*9. Implementation and Monitoring Framework*

On behalf of  
Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant Yes (1) Core Strategy Support Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
(2) Sound No (2) In Part Yes Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 Para 9.1 is supported. Previous comments on Local Nature Partnerships should be considered. Table 17: As an additional indicator, we would recommend the Council also records the number and area of Wildlife Sites under positive conservation management (National Indicator 197).

Q.7 Para 9.1 - There should be reference made to the Local Nature Partnership (here or elsewhere in the Core Strategy) to help boost the flexibility of the Core Strategy and make it more consistent with current local and national policy and working in the area of nature conservation.  
Table 17 - We suggest that the Council use NI 197 data to compile an additional indicator of progress in nature conservation: the number and area of Wildlife Sites under positive conservation management.

Q.8 No

Q.9



Rep Number Name: Hertfordshire County Council  
*RCS/R27/4553/7/C Hertfordshire County Council*

Section  
*9. Implementation and Monitoring Framework*

On behalf of  
**HCC Spatial and Land use Planning**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 There are a number of references to bus/rail issues within the Core Strategy Policies. It is therefore considered that a relevant target/indicator should be included within the monitoring framework to reflect this.

Q.8

Q.9

Rep Number Name: London Travel Watch  
*RCS/R27/1069/3/C London Travel Watch*

On behalf of  
London Travel Watch

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Q.6

Q.7 Suggested that indicators for public transport are included.

Q.8 No

Q.9

Section  
*Table 17 Monitoring Framework*

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Rep Number Name: English Heritage (East of England Region)  
*RCS/R27/4548/4/C English Heritage (East of England Region)*

Section  
*Table 17 Monitoring Framework*

On behalf of

English Heritage

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6 For Built Heritage, it would be suitable to broaden the reference from listed buildings at risk, to all heritage assets at risk. English Heritage's register is updated annually and it would be helpful to monitor grade II listed buildings on any locally compiled register.

Q.7

Q.8 No

Q.9

Rep Number Name: The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association  
*RCS/R27/4240/4/C The Radlett Society and Green Belt*  
On behalf of

Section  
*Appendix 2-Key development proposals and policies in neighbouring local authorities*

**The Radlett Society and Green Belt Association**

Do you Consider the DPD is: (1) Legally Compliant (1) Core Strategy Support  
(2) Sound (2) In Part

Do you consider if DPD is unsound because it is not:  
Justified Effective Consistent with National policy:

Q.6

Q.7 Spelling error - 'homes' not 'home' in St Albans paragraph on page 96

Q.8 No

Q.9