

Christine Whyte

From: Dilys Pryor <DilysP@phillips-planning.co.uk>
Sent: 10 September 2015 12:44
To: Local Plan
Subject: Representation to Site Allocations & Development Management Policies Plan
Attachments: SADM Response Form submitted 10.09.15. (PPS Ltd obo Mr M. Homan).pdf

Please find attached completed Representation Form in response to the above on behalf of our client Mr M. Homan.

Your sincerely,

John Phillips

Dilys Pryor

Secretary to John Phillips



Phillips Planning Services Ltd

Office Tel - 01234 272829
Office Fax - 01234 271412

E-mail - dilysp@phillips-planning.co.uk
Website - www.phillips-planning.co.uk

Registered no: 2696302
Registered Office England and Wales

Disclaimer

The Information in this message is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this message by any other person is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. Unless otherwise stated the content of this email is only governed by English Law



**Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan
(SADM)**

Publication Stage Representation Form

For office use
only

Reference No:

Date received:

Please use this form to make Representations

Please return to Hertsmere Borough Council by 5pm on Monday 14 September 2015

By post: Policy and Transport Team, Planning and Building Control, Hertsmere Borough Council,
Civic Offices, Elstree Way, Borehamwood, Herts, WD6 1WA.

By email: local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk

This form has three parts:

Part A – Personal details (only needed once).

Part B – Your representation(s). Please complete a separate sheet (Part B) for **every** representation you wish to make, remembering to insert your or your organisation's name at the top of the page.

Part C – What information you want the Council to provide you with about future progress of SADM (only needed once).

Please read the guidance notes at the end before completing this form. They explain the terms used and will help you make your representation(s).

Part A	1. Personal details*	2. Agent details (if applicable)
Title	MR	MR
First name	MARK	JOHN
Last name	HOMAN	PHILLIPS
Job title (where relevant)		MANAGING DIRECTOR
Organisation (where relevant)		PHILLIPS PLANNING SERVICES LTD
Address		KINGSBROOK HOUSE 7 KINGSWAY BEDFORD
Post Code		MK42 9BA
Telephone number		01234 272829
Email address		johnp@phillips-planning.co.uk

*If an agent is appointed, please enter the person and/or organisation being represented in column 1 and complete all contact details in column 2.

Please note that all representations received will be made publicly available and cannot be treated as confidential. This means that the names of all those making representations will be publicly available. Other personal information relating to private individuals, including Contact details, will not however be made publicly available.



Part B

Name or organisation: PHILLIPS PLANNING SERVICES

For office use only
Ref No:
support:
object:
change:

IMPORTANT: Please use a separate Part B form for each representation

3. To which part of SADM ('the Plan') does this representation relate?

Paragraph 2.9/2.11 Policy SADM 1&2 Policies Map D Other part of Plan (specify)

4. In relation to the part of the Plan you identified in 3, do you consider the Plan to be:

Please tick which boxes apply

4(a) Legally Compliant Yes No no comment to make
4(b) Compliant with the Duty to Co-operate Yes No no comment to make
4(c) Sound Yes No no comment to make

If you have entered 'No' to 4(c), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Q6.

5. If you consider the Plan to be unsound is this because it is not:

5(a) Positively prepared
5(b) Justified
5(c) Effective
5(d) Consistent with national policy

6. If you consider the Plan is not legally compliant or fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate or, having regard to the criteria you ticked at 5 above relating to soundness is unsound, please give details of why. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to comment in support of the Plan's legal compliance, compliance with the Duty to Co-operate or soundness or wish to make any other comment, please also use this box.



The draft SADM plan is 'unsound' because it fails to accord with the policies of the NPPF notably para 14 which in relation to plan making states:

- "local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area;
- Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:
 - Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
 - Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted."

The context for our representations is the following. The Inspector who conducted the Inquiry into the Local Plan Core Strategy 2011 expressed in her report dated December 2012 some concerns about both the Council's assessment of housing requirements and housing land supply but decided to approve the strategy subject to an 'early' review. That review has yet to commence and an up-to-date SHLAA has not been published. An 'early' review is therefore not possible to achieve. In addition the Core Strategy was prepared largely on the basis of the then Regional Strategy, withdrawn in January 2013, and since when National Population and Household Projections have been revised significantly upwards.

For these reasons it is important that the SADM is demonstrably capable of delivering at the very least the housing requirements adopted in the Core Strategy. However it is considered that this is not the situation because of

1. The over reliance of the SADM on the emergence of small and large unidentified sites.
2. The significant contribution expected from the Elstree Way Corridor which is dependent on complicated land assembly and the delivery of high cost infrastructure none of which is guaranteed.

Given the above it is considered that the sites safeguarded for housing under policy H4 should now be brought forward for housing development. Of the five such sites identified two have already received planning permission and one has been designated as a village green. 16 Watford Road, Radlett, was first identified as a possible site safeguarded for housing development in 1997 and its status was confirmed in the adopted local plan in 2002. The Council and previous Inspectors have consistently found Radlett to be a highly sustainable settlement and 16 Watford Road a sustainable site. Since that date the site has been subject to a number of appraisals by the Borough Council but no substantive reason has ever been given as to why the site should not now be released for housing development, particularly since Radlett, as one of the four sustainable settlements in the District, has the lowest proportion of identified housing sites. The most recent appraisal of the site is contained in the Council's response to the representations received on the draft SADM. In the appraisal no substantive objection is raised to the site's development and the Borough Council states,

"Starveacres is a substantial site which is protected from general housing development as if it was in the Green Belt. However if additional land needs to be identified for housing in order to meet the Core Strategy target, the Council accepts that as a matter of principle safeguarded sites should be used in preference to new greenfield Green Belt sites."

During the time that the site has been safeguarded other greenfield sites not allocated for housing have received planning permission. There would now appear to be no reason why 16 Watford Road (Starveacres) should not be allocated particularly given the context of increased housing pressures and requirements that have developed since the Core Strategy was original conceived. To render the plan 'sound' additional sites free of constraints and readily capable of development, including 16 Watford Road, should be allocated for housing development in accordance with the NPPF to,

"particularly seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area."

7. Please set out as precisely as possible what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan

- legally compliant or
- sound (having regard to the criteria you ticked at 5 above relating to soundness).

You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text.

In order to contribute to increasing the supply of identified housing sites and make the plan sound

1. Under Policy SADM1 allocate 16 Watford Road, Radlett for housing with an estimated number of dwellings of 55.
2. Amend the Proposals Map accordingly.
3. Move 16 Watford Road from policy SADM2 to policy SADM1 and identify as above.

(continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity for further submissions based on the representation you are currently making. After this current publication stage, further submissions will only be able to be made at the Inspector's request, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for Examination.

8. If you do not consider the Plan to be sound and the Council is prepared to make changes to the Plan which reflect your suggested change, would you be prepared to enter into a 'Statement of Common Ground' with this Council?

Yes No

9. If your representation is seeking a modification/change to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the Examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral Examination Yes, I wish to participate at the oral Examination

10. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

In order to represent our clients adequately about the soundness of the plan and to advocate why the representation site should no longer be safeguarded but should be allocated.

(continue on a separate sheet/expand box if necessary)

Please note: the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the Examination.

Signature: _____ Date: 7th Sept 2015



Part C

(Only needed once)

Name (Print): _____ JOHN PHILLIPS _____

X

If you wish to be informed of the date of the submission of the Plan to the Secretary of State, please tick this box.

X

If you wish to be informed of the recommendations of the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to carry out the independent Examination of the Plan, please tick this box.

X

If you wish to be informed of the adoption of the Plan by Hertsmere Borough Council please tick this box.

If you no longer wish to receive communications from the Council on SADM please tick this box.