

Core Strategy Pre-Submission 2012 Responses Received: Addendum

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Title	What Section-2? - Please specify the paragraph number and/or policy reference which you wish to comment on.	Online System Number	Question 1 - Are you (please tick one)	Question 2 - a) Legally Compliant	Question 2 - b) Sound	Question 3 - Do you consider that the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Question 4 - Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.	Question 5 - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.	Question 6 - If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Question 7 - If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
682030	Mr Mike Kember	Bovingdon Parish Council					LA6	Other	Objecting	Yes	No	a) Justified	<p>It is not sound because it is not justified or effective.</p> <p>Previous submissions made by the Parish Council have indicated heavily qualified support for a local allocation on Green Belt land at Chesham Road/Molyneaux Avenue - indeed the Parish Council would not support a local allocation on Green Belt land anywhere else given the specific and unique features of Chesham Road/Molyneaux Avenue.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, these specific qualifications have also included the need for a minimum provision of 40% affordable housing on site (of a size/type to meet local need and with local nomination rights) and that, of the remaining 60%, an appropriate proportion are provided as specialist accommodation for the elderly. The principles set out under LA6 do not include the need to provide an appropriate proportion of the remaining 60% as specialist accommodation for the elderly, the provision of which (on site) forms part of the basis to the Parish Council's qualified support for the site. The absence of such materially reduces the Parish Council's qualified support for the site, and otherwise reduces the effectiveness of the Core Strategy given that such accommodation is unlikely to be delivered (to any scale) on smaller sites elsewhere within the confines of the village.</p>	<p>The Principles set out under Proposal LA6 should include the following, separate bullet point after the first bullet point -</p> <p>'of the remaining 60%, an appropriate proportion of the housing should be provided as specialist accommodation for the elderly'</p>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order that the Parish Council can fully explore and examine the various justifications given.

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Title	What Section-2? - Please specify the paragraph number and/or policy reference which you wish to comment on.	Online System Number	Question 1 - Are you (please tick one)	Question 2 - a) Legally Compliant	Question 2 - b) Sound	Question 3 - Do you consider that the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Question 4 - Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.	Question 5 - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.	Question 6 - If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Question 7 - If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
													The above comments should be read in conjunction with the submissions in respect of Paragraph 24.2.			
682030	Mr Mike Kember	Bovingdon Parish Council				Managing Selected Development Sites	CS3	Policy	Objecting	Yes	No	a) Justified	It is unsound because it is not justified or effective. Policy CS3 does not indicate what would be done in the event that, for whatever reason, a Local Allocation is proven not to be deliverable within the Plan Period. To be effective, the Policy should clearly indicate the steps, if any, that should be taken in these circumstances, which will vary by location. In this regard, the Parish Council is strongly of the view that if the tests in CS3 (a)-(d) are met, but Local Allocation 6 (Chesham Road/Molyneaux Avenue) does not come forward, then the effect should not be to consider an alternative (Green Belt) Local Allocation at Bovingdon, since the Parish Council do not consider that there are any other Green Belt sites on the edge of the village where such a local allocation would overcome the Green Belt constraints. In this event, the Core Strategy should make clear that the housing 'allocation' to Bovingdon is reduced commensurately (i.e. by 60 units)	The following should be added to Policy CS3: 'In the event that Local Allocations prove to be undeliverable, despite the tests in (a)-(d) being met, there will be no presumption that alternative sites need to be identified in the settlement of Bovingdon due to its Green Belt constraints'	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order that the Parish Council can fully explore and examine the various justifications given.
682030	Mr Mike	Bovingdon Parish Council				Paragraph	24.2	Paragraph	Objecting	Yes	No	a) Justified	It is unsound because it is not justified or effective.	Paragraph 24.2 should be amended to delete ' <i>an element</i> ' and replace	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order that the Parish Council can fully explore and

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Title	What Section-2? - Please specify the paragraph number and/or policy reference which you wish to comment on.	Online System Number	Question 1 - Are you (please tick one)	Question 2 - a) Legally Compliant	Question 2 - b) Sound	Question 3 - Do you consider that the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Question 4 - Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.	Question 5 - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.	Question 6 - If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Question 7 - If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
	Kember												<p>The Vision set out after paragraph 24.1 states that '<i>new housing development has helped to secure new open space and a high level of affordable housing</i>'. At paragraph 24.2 it is indicated that the Local Allocation will '<i>provide an element of affordable housing</i>'. The use of the word 'element' is inconsistent with the Vision which references a 'high level' of affordable housing the majority of which will, inevitably, come forward as part of the Local Allocation. This inconsistency reduces the effectiveness of The Vision/Bovingdon Place Strategy.</p> <p>Previous submissions made by the Parish Council have highlighted the need for appropriate accommodation for the elderly. Paragraph 24.2 references that consideration will be given to the provision of a residential care home. Notwithstanding the lack of any spatial dimension as to how this will be delivered given Green Belt constraints and the structure of the village (see response to Proposal LA6), the Parish Council do not consider that a 'residential care home' is the most appropriate, or sole, means of meeting the readily accepted housing needs of the ageing population and that a wider, and more flexible definition of specialist accommodation for the elderly should be incorporated in Proposal LA6.</p>	<p>this with '<i>a high level</i>'.</p> <p>For reasons set out in respect of Proposal LA6, the following should be deleted from the final sentence -</p> <p><i>' a residential care home for the elderly and'</i></p>		examine the various justifications given.
368342	Mr Lyn	RPS Planning				Paragraph	18.39	Paragraph	Supporting	Yes	Yes		We support the recognition of the established use of the Buncefield Oil Terminal within the ' <i>Looking after</i>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Title	What Section-2? - Please specify the paragraph number and/or policy reference which you wish to comment on.	Online System Number	Question 1 - Are you (please tick one)	Question 2 - a) Legally Compliant	Question 2 - b) Sound	Question 3 - Do you consider that the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Question 4 - Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.	Question 5 - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.	Question 6 - If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Question 7 - If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
	Powell												<i>the Environment</i> section of the Core Strategy and we welcome the intention to restrict development around the Terminal through the East Heme! Hempstead Area Action Plan. As we have stated previously, any new development proposals in the vicinity of the Terminal should be consistent with the standard development control criteria including the advice of HSE in relation to existing fuel storage facilities and the risks associated with them,as required by Policy CS1.			
368342	Mr Lyn Powell	RPS Planning				Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy	Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy	Other	Supporting	Yes	Yes		<p>We support the vision for Hemel Hempstead as detailed within the Hemel Hempstead Place Strategy and specifically the character areas outlined in Figure 22 which highlight Buncefield Oil Depot as a major land use inthe area within the Vision Diagram.</p> <p>We also support the regeneration of the Maylands Business Park in general (paragraph 20.4 refers). Any new development proposals should, however, be consistent with the standard development control criteria including the advice of HSE in relation to existing fuel storage facilities, and should not compromise the approved redevelopment of the Buncefield Oil Depot and its future operation.</p> <p>We note that East Hemel Hempstead will be the subject to a separate Area Action Plan(AAP) progressed jointly with St Albans City and District Council and</p>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Title	What Section-2? - Please specify the paragraph number and/or policy reference which you wish to comment on.	Online System Number	Question 1 - Are you (please tick one)	Question 2 - a) Legally Compliant	Question 2 - b) Sound	Question 3 - Do you consider that the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Question 4 - Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.	Question 5 - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.	Question 6 - If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Question 7 - If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
													support the production of this document (paragraph 21.15 refers). As you will be aware, we duly made representations to the draft AAP in August 2009 and any subsequent publication of the document should have regard to the approved redevelopment of the Depot and, consequently, take forward Option 1: Reinstatement of the Terminal.			
368342	Mr Lyn Powell	RPS Planning				Summary of the Strategy	Summary of Strategy	Other	Supporting	Yes	Yes		<p>We broadly support the Strategy, Vision, Strategic Objectives and the Settlement Hierarchy contained within the Summary of the Strategy.</p> <p>With regard to Part A-Context, we particularly support the recognition that the Buncefield Oil Terminal contributes to the Dacorum economy and that it is stated to be of national significance for the storage and distribution of fuel. We also support the recognition that the Terminal is being reconstruction following the incident at the site in 2005 (paragraph 3.8 refers).</p> <p>We also support the strong regeneration focus given to Maylands Business Park in recognition of its importance both locally and sub-regionally (paragraph 4.4 refers) subject to the details of any new development being consistent with standard development control criteria including the advice of HSE in relation to existing fuel storage facilities in the area, and subject to the proposals not compromising the approved redevelopment and future</p>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Title	What Section-2? - Please specify the paragraph number and/or policy reference which you wish to comment on.	Online System Number	Question 1 - Are you (please tick one)	Question 2 - a) Legally Compliant	Question 2 - b) Sound	Question 3 - Do you consider that the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Question 4 - Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.	Question 5 - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.	Question 6 - If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Question 7 - If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
													operation of the Buncefield Oil Terminal.			
368342	Mr Lyn Powell	RPS Planning				Distribution of Development	CS 1	Policy	Supporting	Yes	Yes		<p>We support Policy CS1:Distribution of Development with Hemel Hempstead being the principal focus for future development, including the regeneration of the Maylands Business Park. Criterion (f) of the policy is supported as being particularly important in that it will ensure that all new development proposals will be located a safe distance away from hazardous installations, such as the Buncefield Oil Terminal. Safe distances in such instances should be determined having regard to the advice of the HSE.</p> <p>We also support the future development of East Hemel Hempstead and the designation of site specific development being guided by the forthcoming EastHemel Hempstead Area Action Plan (AAP). As you will be aware, we duly made representations to the draft AAP in August 2009 and any subsequent publication of the document should have regard to the approved redevelopment of the Buncefield Oil Terminal and, consequently, take forward Option1:Reinstatement of the Terminal.</p>	Not applicable.		Not applicable.
368342	Mr Lyn Powell	RPS Planning				Paragraph	11.5	Paragraph	Supporting	Yes	Yes		We generally support paragraph 11.5 of the ' <i>Strengthening Economic Prosperity</i> ' section of the Core Strategy that states that substantial employment grow that	Not Applicable.		Not Applicable.

Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Person ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Title	What Section-2? - Please specify the paragraph number and/or policy reference which you wish to comment on.	Online System Number	Question 1 - Are you (please tick one)	Question 2 - a) Legally Compliant	Question 2 - b) Sound	Question 3 - Do you consider that the Core Strategy is unsound because it is not:	Question 4 - Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.	Question 5 - Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy legally compliant or sound.	Question 6 - If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	Question 7 - If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.
													Hemel Hempstead will be planned through four key objectives including 'reconstructing and rationalising the Buncefield oil storage depof. However, the paragraph should recognise that there development of the Depot has been approved. We would also reiterate that new development proposals in the vicinity of the Depot should be consistent with the standard development control criteria including the advice of HSE in relation to existing fuel storage facilities, as required by Policy CS1.			
368342	Mr Lyn Powell	RPS Planning				Paragraph										
682030	Mr Mike Kember	Bovingdon Parish Council					Table 8	Other	Objecting	Yes	No	a) Justified	It is unsound because it is not justified or effective. Table 8 should be amended to deal with the circumstances described in the Parish Council response to Policy CS3	Table 8 should be amended to the following: Bovingdon – 130* *- to be reduced by 60 in the event that the Local Allocation proves undeliverable.	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	In order that the Parish Council can fully explore and examine the various justifications given.