

**Post -Stage 3 Hearing Sessions – 20, 21, 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2018**

**Notes of Inspector’s round up with WHBC**

**This is not a verbatim note or transcript. The table below summarises the key matters discussed**

<b>Summary of matter discussed at round-up session</b>
Community facilities (SP6): Include a reference in the supporting text to the evidence, e.g. standards for community facilities in IDP and Planning Obs SPD (and the cycle of review where relevant)
Panshanger: Inspector: Do not want a repeat of Tuesday’s debate in June. Is there room for a grass runway or not. If not, will the residential area be reduced? Is there another location for a runway.
Cemetery: Inspector will look at the assessment although expansion of existing facility is usually the less problematic solution.
Cycling: WH to discuss with HCC. Promotion of sustainable modes of transport/how feasible is it to include reference to strategic cycle routes? WH: IDP will offer more certainty on specific proposals.
Rural Roads: Cannot be used as a reason the omit GB sites just because they will inevitably increase capacity on rural roads. WH to consider policy in a different guise. There is a point for some rural roads, e.g. south of Essendon. Green Belt continues to provide protection.
Galleria: Inspector will read through the evidence
SP7: Look again at accessible and adaptable housing – WH to liaise with participant on this
G&TNA: WHBC to include participation rates (within document or addendum as relevant)
SP7: Older people C3 (715 – amend to around 700, don’t be so precise). Ditto C2.. Figures are likely to change – unlikely to go down.
Self-build: WH: Didn’t have representations but WH concerned not meeting its duty so proposed mod but wasn’t raised by the Inspector during the hearing session. Inspector happy with the mod, otherwise would have raised the matter.
Economy: Will bring the Woolmer Green issues that weren’t resolved to the settlement stage of hearings. No change to the 3 year/1 year – no.
Tall Buildings: Liaise with GCE for wording - design vision to be set out in masterplans.
SADM12: Look at criterion ii) – doesn’t read well - review
Flood risk off-site/Down-stream flooding – make this more clear in supporting text
SP11: Tables 7 and 8 need reworking – look at text for locally designated assets. Check with Historic England SADM15 – changes.
Q75: WH to liaise with HCC (Archaeological and potential for assets).
SADM15/SP11: Make reference to ... value to QoL WH: possibly supporting text, liaise with GCE. WH to consider.
Look at the order of policies – should SADM15 come after SP11. Plan is not unsound. Just seems a bit odd. Not prescriptive. Could be more logical.
Biodiversity net-gains – make a note in supporting text to “empirical assessment”
River Mimram – reference in supporting text – mods already proposed around WFD/RTMP, opportunity to refer to importance of Mimram.
SADM15: Importance of “setting” in supporting text – never thought it was an issue.

Green Corridor – put a minimum width like 50m (tell developers not a race to the bottom). Got to be in the supporting text.
SADM16 – measuring net gains – biodiversity – same as previous day
15m buffer strips to ancient woodland, some buffers may need to be wider (supporting text)
SADM17 – UOL – WH might like to see if it can be tightened up a bit. HCC could give themselves planning permission they would need to demonstrate the suitability against a set of criteria . Last thing you want is a policy that stops primary school provision.
City Park – provide Inspector with plan of the site subject to appeal and UOL areas in next 6 months (appeal does not affect all of the UOL area). Inspector will visit site. Council consider when the examination gets to WGC sites.
Ellenbrook: Figures 8 and Figure 14 are not consistent. The SGI takes a different path – review. Should it be called a country park? They want to build in part of the park. Park arose from the redevelopment of the BA site. Always expected there would be mineral extraction. That application has been approved subject to S106. Already discussions with Mr Maddox’s clients around the management of country park and handing it over to a management company.
Q99: HE mod was following MoU. WH to discuss with HE.
Reference: European protected Species Licence requirements in supporting text (validation checklist doesn’t sufficiently require)
Q115: WFD/RBMP – mods as discussed on Weds.
Infrastructure – reference to cycling. Consider whether a modification could be made to reference the promotion of sustainable modes of transport and how feasible it might be to refer to cycling routes. In supporting text associated with SP4 or SP13? Consistency. Don’t repeat things. Where is the best place to put it?
Mr Adams revised policy – If this had been a public inquiry people would have been asking for an adjournment.
Panshanger – have a look - anywhere else to locate an airfield? Don’t know what the situation is with sand/gravel workings in WH. Any scope to provide site for a runway? Don’t think anywhere in WH, might be in other districts? MLP Reg. 18 just been out to consultation. MLP Reg. 19 in summer. Proposed allocated sites around west of Hatfield. Sites currently being worked in East Herts and St Albans. Looking long term. Take the site west of Hatfield, estimated restoration 2048. Nowhere immediately at hand that offers proximity in time. Not been a new non-military aviation facility for many years, probably suggests not viable?
Timescales for next sessions – try and get this sorted by Easter.