

**General**

	<u><b>Summary of</b></u>	<u><b>Council Response</b></u>
SCI/R28//1126/2/O Go-East	<p>O Does not wish to exercise the right to attend and be heard at the examination. Happy for representations to be dealt with in written form. Would like to be notified of the publication of the Inspector's recommendations or of the adoption of the SCI.</p> <p>Glossary should be amended to state that proposals for DPDs and submission DPDs should be sent to the Secretary of State through the relevant Government Office (not to the ODPM as stated) and in the case of submission DPDs, also to the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.5 indicates that the revised draft SCI has been submitted to GO-East, on behalf of the 'Secretary of State for the Environment', which should be amended to the 'First Secretary of State'.</p> <p>Does not consider that the SCI fails the soundness test, but feels it is important that the SCI is factually correct and that these errors should be amended.</p>	<b>No Change in Response to this Objection</b>

SCI/R28//1126/3/O  
Go-East

- O Regarding the timetables included in the tables of appendix 2, consider it unnecessary to include specific dates in the SCI, as this is the purpose of the LDS. Duplication of the timetable in the SCI may lead to inconsistencies between the documents and to the need to unnecessarily review the SCI when/if dates change through a LDS revision. **No Change in Response to this Objection**

Suggest that all dates relating to participation and consultation milestones are removed and that additional text is included in the SCI cross-referring to the LDS, so that readers know to refer to the LDS for the dates of the consultation and participation periods.

SCI/R28//1126/4/O  
Go-East

- O Would like to see the SCI include the full range of review triggers and clearly set out the consultation and participation arrangements to be employed when the SCI is reviewed. **No Change in Response to this Objection**

PPS 12, paragraph 3.10, soundness test 8, requires that the Authority has mechanisms for reviewing the SCI. Although they note from appendix 2 that the Council will monitor the SCI every year and review it every 3 years, it is not clear:

- a) what will trigger the review;
- b) how the community will be consulted in any future revisions of the SCI. They note that appendix 2, table 1 indicates consultation and participation in relation to the preparation of the first SCI, but consider that is is not clear what consultation and participation arrangements will be applied when the SCI is reviewed.

SCI/R28//1126/5/O  
Go-East

- O The SCI, section 7.1, should be amended to provide further clarification about which consultation methods will be used in relation to major, minor and 'other' planning applications. It should also be expanded to set out how/whether people will be notified of a planning application decision. **No Change in Response to this Objection**

PPS, paragraph 3.10 soundness test 9 requires that the SCI clearly describes the local planning authority's policy for consultation on planning applications.

Consider that the SCI does not fully meet the soundness test as section 7 is not sufficiently clear about which consultation methods will be used in relation to major, minor and 'other' applications. Furthermore, section 7 does not set out the notification methods for planning application decisions.

SCI/R28//1126/6/O  
Go-East

- O In the glossary the SCI describes a LDO as removing permitted development rights. However, the function of LDOs is to locally extend the scope of permitted development rights in response to local circumstances (refer to S.40 of PCPA 2004). This paragraph should be amended accordingly. **No Change in Response to this Objection**

Do not consider that the SCI fails the soundness tests on this point, but consider that it is important that the SCI is factually correct and that this error is amended

SCI/R28//1126/7/O  
Go-East

- O The SCI, paragraphs 8.13-8.14, should be amended to show how the Council has considered opportunities for joint consultation and it should commit the authority to joint consultation where the opportunity presents itself and where it is appropriate, for example, with the community strategy. Where joint consultation is not possible, the SCI should indicate this with a brief reason for this being the case.

**No Change in Response to this Objection**

PPS 12, paragraph 3.10, soundness test 2 requires that the local planning authority's strategy for community involvement links with other community involvement initiatives, e.g. the community strategy. Paragraph 8.14 of the SCI sets out the Council's intention to develop links between the process for preparing and reviewing the LDF and community strategy, including sharing and linking public consultation process. However, the SCI does not state clearly whether and when these opportunities may arise.

SCI/R28//1126/8/O  
Go-East

- O The SCI, Appendix 2, should be amended to include more details about the specific consultation methods that the Council will use to engage with particular 'hard to reach' groups. **No Change in Response to this Objection**

PPS 12, paragraph 3.10, soundness test 4 requires that the SCI identifies how the community and other bodies can be involved in a timely and accessible manner.

We consider that the SCI does not fully meet this soundness test since paragraphs 6.2-6.6 do not provide enough detail and certainty about the types of methods that the Council will use to engage with 'hard to reach' groups and at which stage of the LDD preparation process the types of methods will be used. Furthermore, appendix 2 does not make mention of 'hard to reach' groups or set out specific consultation methods that will be used to engage with these groups at the different stages of LDD production.

SCI/R28//1616/1/O  
British Horse Society

- O Believe that it would make sense if local representatives of various bodies such as the British Horse Society and the Open Spaces Society, Hertsmere's Greenways Steering Group or local groups, were consulted at the stage before planning permission is granted. This could potentially save a public inquiry and save a developer having to return for a new permission by early consultation to ensure plans are unlikely to be opposed.
- No Change in Response to this Objection**

Suggest that the SCI should say that where a site notice under Article 8(2)(c) of the 1995 Order, the council should additionally consult the local representatives of the bodies prescribed by Schedule 3 of the 1993 Regulations.

SCI/R28//1656/1/O  
English Nature - Essex Herts & London  
Team

- O Welcomes the opportunity to ensure that nature conservation organisations have the opportunity to engage effectively in the preparation of the LDF.
- No Change in Response to this Objection**

Notes that the following potentially key local stakeholders warrant consideration for inclusion on contact lists:

Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust  
Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre

Considers that the LDF represents an opportunity to contribute to the delivery of the targets set out in the Hertfordshire BAP and believe that every opportunity should be taken to employ these BAP targets as objectives within the LDF.

SCI/R28//4008/1/O  
Bellway Homes North London Division

O

Believe that the council has a responsibility to ensure that resources are available to enable appropriate pre-application discussions to take place. The SCI currently lacks clarity on this matter, which will generate uncertainty.

**No Change in Response to this Objection**

Notes paragraph 7.6 that states that the applicant must pay all costs associated with these pre-application events.

However, Bellway consider that the council has a responsibility to facilitate public exhibitions and other pre-application events. This should be clarified within the SCI.

Notes that the SCI is not clear how the community will be involved in the preparation of the evidence base with the Development Planning Document process. Suggests that this needs to be clarified in Appendix 2 Table 1 regarding Public Consultation Procedures. This also applies to the Supplementary Planning Document process.

Bellway do not consider that it is appropriate to specify that all residential developments involving 10 or more homes, or where the site area is 0.5 hectares or more, should require pre-application discussion, local forums, exhibitions. Believe that this definition is too narrow and suggest that local forums and exhibitions be required for developments involving at least 50 homes. This approach has been proposed by other Local Authorities e.g. Reading Borough Council and would appear to be a more pragmatic approach to ensuring that appropriate consultation methods are delivered with planning applications.

SCI/R28//4009/1/O Hertfordshire Gardens Trust	O	Note that the council was unable to include suggestion that 'development that would affect an historic designed landscape or its setting' be included in Appendix 4 and trust that an appropriate policy will be considered for inclusion in the LDF to protect historic designed landscapes, both those on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and those of local importance.	<b>No Change in Response to this Objection</b>
SCI/R28//1055/1/S Thames Water Property Services	S	Thanks the council for consulting Thames Water.  Has no further comments to make and reiterates the consultation issues and requirements as set out in previous correspondence of 20/07/05 and "Guide for LPA's on planning application and development plan consultation with Thames Water Utilities as Statutory Water and Sewerage Undertaker".	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//1079/1/S BADFA	S	Supports the suggestion made by Dr Wadey of the British Horse Society for the early formal consultation of local bodies like BADFA and of local (or national) representatives of bodies that are statutory consultees for Highways Act rights of way changes, the Open Spaces Society is one such consultee.  Early consultation can not infrequently get a better result for the public in general (in line with the Local Plan and its successor) and sometimes a better result for the developer as well.	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>



SCI/R28//1126/1/S Go-East	S	Thanks the council for the letter of 25/11/05 regarding the SCI for submission and will respond in due course.	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//1174/1/S HCC County Development Unit	S	Supports draft and feels it meets the soundness test.  Would like to be notified of the publication of the Inspector's recommendations or of the adoption of the SCI.	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//1256/1/S Golfwatch Residents' Association	S	Acknowledges receipt of letter and thanks Hertsmere for it	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//1426/1/S Sanctuary Housing Association	S	Has no comments or suggestions to add	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>

SCI/R28//1568/1/S  
Highways Agency

- S Consultants, Faber Maunsell, have developed a transport model to provide some quantification of the extent to which pressures on the trunk road network would be likely to increase, given the housing and employment growth envisioned in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. Believe this may be of some use in preparing LDFs:

**Support Noted and Welcomed**

By 2021 severe congestion may occur on parts of M25, M1, A1(M) and A1 in Hertsmere area. Would therefore welcome opportunity to liaise regarding emerging LDF strategies and development allocations that could impact trunk road and motorway.

No comments to make on draft SCI. Are willing to expand on RSS modeling work if this would be helpful.

SCI/R28//1621/1/S  
Peacock and Smith

- S Thank the council on behalf of clients (Wm. Morrison Supermarkets plc) for the opportunity to comment on the SCI and wish to be informed and consulted on further stages of preparation of documents which are to comprise the LDF, particularly regarding new retail allocations and/or new designated town/district/local centres in Hertsmere and any emerging SPDs.

**Support Noted and Welcomed**

Feels it meets the soundness tests, but seek to change the draft

Would like written representations and would like to be notified of the publication of the Inspector's recommendations or of the adoption of the SCI.

SCI/R28//1631/1/S

S

Barton Willmore Planning Partnership

Kayterm is grateful for this opportunity to engage in the forward planning process.

**Support Noted and Welcomed**

Considers that sections 1-4 set out a helpful context to the LDF process and is pleased that paragraph 1.2 includes a short definition of who is included in the "community".

Considers that there should be a standard, minimum approach to consulting on all LDF documents. The consultation methods should be as comprehensive and predictable as possible so that interested parties do not miss opportunities to be involved.

Notes 2 particular dangers involved in the Council over-committing to a large number of procedures:

1. Predictability and accountability - people must be able to anticipate consultations and continual changes in techniques could lead to criticisms of the methods used being unpredictable, causing increased work for other parties in the form of necessitating the continual monitoring of Council activities; and
2. Delay - the new planning system has been created to speed up delivery and increase efficiency, but we are concerned that the use of multiple techniques for the multiple consultations will create the potential for significant delays.

Suggest that the following should be set out as the standard, minimum form of consultation for LDF documents:

- printed material,
- summary leaflets,
- website (regularly updated),
- letters/emails to members of the Council's database of contacts,
- public exhibitions/meetings.

Kayterm is glad to see that the list of target groups includes both "businesses" and "developers, agents and landowners".

Supports the Council in encouraging early discussions regarding development proposals, including opportunities to consult with local community groups and the general public. However, with respect to paragraphs 7.6-7.8, note that resource constraints limit what developers can do - in a similar way to the constraints faced by Council Planning Officers (paragraph 7.2). Concerned that overly onerous obligations are not placed upon applicants in this respect.

Considers that it would be helpful if paragraphs 7.15-7.16 could clearly set out what the Council's policy is to determining applications at Committee, rather than under delegated powers. For the sake of transparency, it is important that applicants are aware of the parameters under which decisions are made.

Pleased that the Hertsmere website has been recently updated, including some improvements to the facility for searching for current planning applications. Considers that this applications database facility could be further improved to allow searches via address, and planning histories on properties, rather than just by date. However, we are glad to see that information is being made more accessible via the website.

Would like representation to be dealt with in written form and to be notified of the publication of the Inspector's recommendations or of the adoption of the SCI.

SCI/R28//2737/1/S The Ridgeway Road Association	S	<p>Thanks the council for involving them and is impressed by the expressed desire to involve residents in the decision making process.</p> <p>Feel reassured that issues raised are treated seriously and sympathetically with particular regard to the aesthetic qualities of proposals and their impact on local surroundings.</p> <p>Slightly worried about the bureaucratic implications of this exercise.</p>	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//3989//S Environment Agency	S	No further comments. Please contact with any further queries	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//4011/1/S Home Builders Federation	S	Helpful if the SCI included a full list of consultees within the appendices in order that organisations and groups can check to ensure they are included and will be consulted	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//4014/1/S The Countryside Agency	S	Thanks the council for correspondence, but has no further comments to make.	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>

SCI/R28//4015/1/S Hertfordshire County Council	S	<p>Welcome the recognition of Hertfordshire County Council as a statutory consultee.</p> <p>Generally pleased with the content and format of the SCI, which gives a clear and concise outline of Hertsmere's consultation process. It clearly explains the new planning system, the statutory requirements for consultation and the different methods that will be used. The tables and diagrams ensure the document is accessible to a variety of different audiences.</p>	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//4015/2/O Hertfordshire County Council	O	<p>Add text in Section 2.2 to reflect the SCI's aim to engage with communities early in planning process.</p> <p>In section 2 or 4, explain that comments cannot be kept confidential and make reference to the Freedom of Information Act.</p>	<b>No Change in Response to this Objection</b>
SCI/R28//2609/1/S Mr & Mrs A & J Henderson	S	<p>Stresses the importance of involving the members of the constituency and residents in policy making.</p> <p>Feels that rate payers should be given the opportunity to speak at SCI meetings.</p> <p>Requests sending communications with an s.a.e.</p>	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//4015/3/S Hertfordshire County Council	S	<p>Explains concisely various types of consultation, but brief reference to resource implications could be added.</p>	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>
SCI/R28//4015/4/S Hertfordshire County Council	S	<p>Another consultation method to consider is citizen panels/juries, which, in the past, have been useful for tackling complex issues. However, they are time consuming and resource intensive</p>	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>

**General**

	<b><u>Summary of</u></b>	<b><u>Council Response</u></b>
SCI/R28//1621/2/O Peacock and Smith	<p>O Suggests the following amendment to paragraph 7.6:</p> <p>"Developers should have regard to the guidance contained in the 'Companion Guide to PPS12: Creating Local Development Frameworks', specifically, with regard to Table 7.4: Community Involvement in Planning Applications."</p>	<p><b>No Change in Response to this Objection</b></p>

**8) How will we manage community involvement?**

	<b><u>Summary of</u></b>	<b><u>Council Response</u></b>
SCI/R28//1621/3/S Peacock and Smith	S Suggest that the most appropriate methods of consulting both Peacock & Smith and Wm. Morrison Supermarkets plc are by direct mailing, e-mail (cassie@peacockandsmith.co.uk) and on-line. Wish to be informed of the publication and relevant consultation periods for all LDF and emerging SPD documents.	<b>Support Noted and Welcomed</b>