

# **DACORUM SITE ALLOCATIONS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION HEARINGS**

## **AGENDA – DAY 1**

Tuesday 4 October 2016 at 10.00am

Venue: Bulbourne and Gade Rooms, Civic Centre,  
Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH

**MATTER 1 – LEGAL COMPLIANCE, INCLUDING DUTY TO  
CO-OPERATE**

**MATTER 2 – GENERAL MATTERS**

Please note:

- All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the hearing statements (and any additional evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the examination website.
- Most references to questions refer to those posed by the Inspector in her Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions (already circulated).
- In order to make efficient use of time whilst allowing each participant the opportunity to put their case, the hearing will be run as a 'rolling programme', with no set timings for agenda items. The matters to be discussed will be dealt with in Agenda order unless any participants have time constraints, in which case the programme will be adjusted by agreement at the commencement of the hearing.
- This session will not consider detailed site-specific representations.
- The hearing will run until around 17:00 with a mid-morning and mid-afternoon break.

1. Inspector's Opening, including legal and procedural questions
2. Questions/procedural or programming matters
3. Council's opening statement

#### 4. Matter 1 – Legal compliance and duty to cooperate

- 1) Overall, has the Plan been prepared in accordance with relevant legal requirements, including the 'Duty to Cooperate' imposed by Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)? Has the duty to co-operate been met? What has been the nature of the co-operation and on what issues? How is the 'Duty to Co-operate' work of the various planning authorities co-ordinated?
- 2) Has the Plan been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and met the minimum consultation requirements in the Regulations?
- 3) Having regard to the scope of the adopted Core Strategy (CS) and the Council's intentions, as set out in the Local Development Scheme, are there any obvious omissions, in terms policy guidance, from the submitted Plan?
- 4) Is the Plan based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal? Does it test reasonable alternatives? Does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances? Does the final report set out the reasons for rejecting earlier options?
- 5) What were the main findings of the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) that was carried out in relation to this Plan?

#### 5. Matter 2 - General Matters

- 1) Are the Council proposing any Main Modifications, in addition to the focused changes that are being considered as part of this examination?
- 2) Are any further ones likely to be advanced during the examination? Is there a separate schedule of Minor Changes?
- 3) Where is the Council up to with the partial early review of the CS? What are the anticipated timescales between now and the examination of that Plan?
- 4) Why does this Plan not contain its own monitoring framework? Should it?
- 5) What alternatives to the sites in the Plan have been considered?
- 6) Is it clear from the Plan what supplementary planning documents are to be prepared? What are they, their status and purpose, and what is the programme for their

preparation? Are important decisions that should be made in the Plan being delegated to these documents?

- 7) Are policies flexible enough?
- 8) Has the Plan had regard to heritage assets, including the statutory test set out in S66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990?
- 9) Paragraph 18.31 of the CS says that the Water Cycle Study Scoping Report, which was prepared to support the CS, concluded that further work would be necessary in relation to a number of matters. It also advises that the local authorities and stakeholders involved will continue to plan for the necessary upgrades and that this will be progressed with the Site Allocations DPD. Has this work been undertaken. If so, what were the findings? If not, why not and is the Plan capable of being found sound in the absence of this information?
- 10) What work has been undertaken to assess the likely impact of proposed development on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty?
- 11) Has the principle of removing land from the Green Belt already been established in the CS? If so, does this Plan deviate from principles set out in the CS in this regard?
- 11a) Do the exceptional circumstances, as required by the NPPF paragraph 83, exist to justify the Plan's proposed revision of the boundaries of the Green Belt.
- 12) What is the latest position with the Grovehill Neighbourhood Plan? Are there any other emerging neighbourhood plans?
- 13) Where necessary, do policies make it clear that their geographic application is illustrated on the policies map?
- 14) Are there any policies in the Plan that do not accord with the Framework or advice in Planning Practice Guidance?
- 15) Are there any gaps in policy coverage? Have other policies been considered and discounted?
- 16) Is the evidence base relating to such matters as housing, employment, retail, and flood risk up-to-date and relevant?
- 17) Are there any important developments/changes since the submission of the Plan, for instance in terms of planning permissions/completions? Is the SHLAA and SHMA up-to-date and robust?

18) Does the Council have a programme for reviewing the key evidence base?

19) Has sufficient regard been paid to infrastructure and flood risk? Are any of the infrastructure providers or the Environment Agency opposed to the principle of the development of any of the allocated sites? If so should these sites be deleted from the Plan?

20) Have the highway authority accepted that the scale and location of development in the Plan will not cause significant problems?

6. Any Other Relevant Matters

7. Close