

Date: 26 February 2016  
Your Ref:  
Our Ref:  
Contact: Laura Wood  
Email: [laura.wood@dacorum.gov.uk](mailto:laura.wood@dacorum.gov.uk)  
Directline: 01442 228661



Mrs Louise Crosby  
Planning Inspector  
c/o Mr Ian Kemp

Civic Centre  
Marlowes  
Hemel Hempstead  
Hertfordshire  
HP1 1HH

Telephone: 01442 228000  
[www.dacorum.gov.uk](http://www.dacorum.gov.uk)  
DX 8804 Hemel Hempstead  
D/deaf callers, Text Relay:  
18001 + 01442 228000

Dear Mrs Crosby,

Thank you for your letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> February 2016. I have responded to your questions and comments below in the order raised.

We apologise for the confusing manner in which the representations have been presented. We have discussed the issue with Mr Kemp and propose to remedy the issue as set out below.

Firstly, regarding the way the hard copies of the representations are presented in boxes, we propose to label each response with the person ID number and refile them in ID number order. This will be accompanied by a schedule showing the following:

Agent ID	Agent Full name	Agent Organisation details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Comment ID	Consultation Point Answered
----------	-----------------	----------------------------	-----------	-----------	----------------------	------------	-----------------------------

Due to the volume of representations received, and in order to save us reprinting them all, we would be grateful if you could return the box files previously sent to you containing the representations. We will send Mr Kemp the labelled hard copies of the responses by courier as soon as we receive the original boxes of responses back from you.

Secondly, regarding the presentation of the comments in the Report of Representations, we have reported each issue raised, (with some issues raised by more than one respondent), rather than reporting each representor's comments individually. I understand that you have now spoken to Mr Kemp about this and that we do not need to make any changes to the Report in the immediate term.



If, once you have reviewed the labelled and ordered representations and accompanying schedule, you do require us to add Person ID numbers to the Report of Representations we can of course do this.

For clarification, in the Report of Representations, Table 3, where the Response to an issue says 'change required', this is addressed through the focused changes document, and the change reference number is given in the 'Amendment Required' column.

I turn now to the issues you have raised regarding the Master plans associated with the Local Allocations included as site allocations. It is our view that the Site Allocations DPD does conform with the regulations and guidance, specifically:

*'The Local Plan should make clear what is intended to happen in the area over the life of the plan, where and when this will occur and how it will be delivered'* (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 002 ID 12-002)

and

*'Where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the 'what, where, when and how' questions).* (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 002 ID 12-010)

Policies LA1 – LA6 in the Site Allocations DPD, pertaining to the Local Allocations, provide an appropriate level of detail about the nature and scale of development to give clarity to the above mentioned groups. The policies are clear about what is intended to happen in that they define the number and mix of homes and facilities to be delivered along with other requirements for the sites. The Key Development Principles give further information about the form the development will take and include key principles around provision of affordable homes, access, design, landscaping, utilities, links to the countryside and more.

The Site Allocations DPD shows where the proposed developments will happen through the maps in the Site Allocations Map Book. This shows the proposed changes to the Policies Map, and includes the boundary of each Local Allocation and the area to be removed from the Green Belt. Indicative Spatial Layouts are also included in Policies LA1 – LA6 which show the intended locations of key elements of the proposed developments. The Delivery and Phasing sections of Policies LA1 – LA6 explain when developments are scheduled to occur, in line with Core Strategy Policy CS3: Managing Selected Development Sites, and how they will be delivered. This includes whether the development will be delivered in a single or multiple phases, key planning obligations or CIL requirements and transport and utilities requirements.

If, on further consideration of the Site Allocations document you feel that additional information on requirements are needed within any of the Local Allocation policies, then we would be happy to reflect this through the main modifications process.

We agree that the master plans will not be part of the formal examination, and that you will not be considering detailed comments received as part of the consultation on the Master plans. This was made clear at the time of consultation as shown by:

- Questionnaire for each master plan (Part B – Background Information) (the questionnaire for LA1 is attached to this letter for your information)
- Display material for the public exhibitions ‘How To Comment’ (p. 83 Report of Representations 2015 Part 1 – Examination Document SUB12) (N.B. this was also available in the form of a handout, which people could take from the exhibitions and from the Civic Centre).
- Notification letters, in particular, the ‘What happens next section’ (pp 100-105 Report of Representations 2015 Part 1 – Examination Document SUB12)
- The ‘Next Steps’ section on page ii of the consultation Draft Master plans (September 2014) (For example, see Examination Document LA8)

Furthermore, at the public exhibitions and when Officers had other contact with members of the public regarding the consultation, it was made clear verbally that comments made in relation to the Master plans would not be directly considered by the Site Allocations Inspector, although the Consultation Report would form one of the background documents.

However, we recognise that many of the comments and concerns raised on the Local Allocations draft master plans were equally applicable to the Local Allocation Policies within the Site Allocations document itself. Indeed, most local objections with regard to the Local Allocations were directed towards these documents rather than the Site Allocations DPD. In drawing up the proposed changes Policies LA1 – LA6 Officers have therefore had regard to the master plan feedback. These issues were considered by Cabinet in October 2015 and are summarised separately in the Local Allocations Masterplans Consultation Report (November 2015).

For clarification, we have not sent you copies of the individual comments received on the master plans, i.e. they are not mixed in with responses received to the consultation on the Site Allocations DPD. However, the examination library includes the Cabinet Report dealing with the master plans consultation (Examination Document LA1) and the Local Allocations Master plans Consultation Report 2015 (Examination Document LA2), which summarises the issues raised.

I hope the above information clarifies the relationship between the consultations on the Site Allocations and master plans and how issues raised relating to the master plans influenced proposed changes to Policies LA1-LA6 of the Site Allocations document. I further hope that this addresses your concerns, but please let me know if you require any additional information or clarification.

Yours sincerely



**Laura Wood**  
**Team Leader (Strategic Planning)**  
**Strategic Planning and Regeneration**