

Briefing Note



Aldermary House,
10 - 15 Queen Street,
London, EC4N 1TX

T: 020 3848 2500

W: indigoplanning.com

Ref. bfn.003..04250033
Date: 29 May 2018
Subject: Response to Inspectors Preliminary Questions – Land at Park City

Response to Inspector’s Preliminary Questions LAND TO THE REAR OF UNIT D, CITY PARK, WATCHMEAD, WELWYN GARDEN CITY

Introduction

1. We act on behalf of Legal & General Investment Management (“L&GIM”) in relation to the above (“the Site”), which is under its management.
2. We previously submitted representations to the Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission (“DLPPS”) public consultation in October 2016, on behalf of Aviva Investors, the then managers (our Ref. let.001.HM.RA.04850031).
3. For clarification, this response to the Inspector’s Preliminary Questions follows on from our previous comments of October 2016, our Examination Statement submitted on 24 January 2018 and our appearance at Hearing Session 3 in February 2018.

Overview

4. Paragraph 12.19 of the DLPPS states that areas of Urban Open Land (“UOL”) have been designated on the Policies Map (“PM”).
5. The Site is designated as UOL (PM Ref. UOL80) on Policies Map 3.
6. Following an appeal, outline planning permission for the construction of a use class B2/B8 unit with ancillary offices, car parking, cycle parking, diverted bridleway and associated works at the Site was granted on 31 October 2013 (LPA Ref: N6/2012/16544/OP and PINS Ref. APP/C1950/A/13/2198315).
7. Reserved matters details were approved on 24 January 2017 (LPA Ref: 6/2016/2216/RM) and our client intends to implement the consent.

Response to Inspectors Question 35 Should the land at City Park employment area be defined as open land?

8. Given that site has full planning permission for B2/B8 uses, and given the owner’s intention to implement the permission and construct the building permitted (and lay out the parking area and carry out the associated works also permitted), the site should not be defined as open land.

9. In view of the above, it would be confusing for the Site to be designated as proposed.
10. The proposed allocation is therefore not 'justified' and fails the soundness test at paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Precise changes sought

11. The PM should be updated such that the Site is not shown as a designated area of UOL.
12. Our previous comments in relation to the Wildlife Site (DLPPS Ref. WS197) made in our Examination Statement dated 24 January 2018 still stand.