

SUMMONS

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

TUESDAY 22 MAY 2012

COUNCIL CHAMBER, DACORUM CIVIC CENTRE, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD

You are hereby summoned to an Extraordinary Meeting of the Dacorum Borough Council in the County of Hertfordshire to be held in the Council Chamber, Dacorum Civic Centre, Hemel Hempstead on **Tuesday**, 22 May 2012 at 7.30 pm to transact the business set out below.

PART I

Page

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| 1. | Apologies for Absence | 2 |
| 2. | Declarations of Interest | 2 |
| 3. | Public Participation | 2 |
| 4. | Cabinet Referral | 2 |
| 5. | Exclusion of the Public | 2 |

PART II

- | | | |
|----|------------------|---|
| 6. | Cabinet Referral | 7 |
|----|------------------|---|



**DANIEL ZAMMIT
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

**Contact: Jim Doyle ext 2222
Pauline Bowles ext 2221**

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of interest.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

To consider questions (if any) by members of the public of which the appropriate notice has been given to the Assistant Director (Legal, Democratic & Regulatory).

4. CABINET REFERRALS

To consider the following referrals from Cabinet:

Minute No.	Date	Title	Yellow Pages	Green Pages
4.1 CA/039/12	24 April 2012	Submission of Core Strategy	3	
4.2 CA/046/12	24 April 2012	Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Regeneration – Phase 1 Proposals and New Public Service Quarter (Part 2 referral see page 7)		7

5. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

To consider passing a resolution in the following terms:

That, under section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded during the item in Part 2 of the Agenda for this meeting, because it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that if members of the public were present during this item there would be disclosure to them of exempt information relating to the financial and business affairs of the Council and third party company/organisation. (Cabinet Minute CA/046/12).

ITEM 4 - REFERRALS FROM CABINET

24 APRIL 2012

4.1 SUBMISSION OF CORE STRATEGY (CA/039/12)

Decision

1. That the significant new issues arising from representations received to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy and the impact of new advice be noted.
2. **That Council be recommended to approved that:**
 - (a) **no significant changes are made to the Pre-Submission Core Strategy as a result of representations received; and**
 - (b) **the Submission documents are submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.**
3. That authority be delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration to approve any further minor wording changes to the Core Strategy prior to consideration by Full Council.
4. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) to:
 - (a) Finalise the Report of Representations and other Submission documents; and
 - (b) Agree any further minor changes arising during the course of the Examination.

Reason for Decision

To agree the process for submitting the Core Strategy to the Planning Inspectorate, taking into consideration the significant new issues raised through representations on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy in late 2011.

Implications

Financial

The process of preparing the Core Strategy, and wider Local Planning Framework (LPF), has financial implications. Cabinet considered the implications of a three year budget programme in November 2009. Budget provision, together with a reserve, is made for 2012/13.

Having an up-to-date planning framework helps reduce the incidence of planning appeals (and hence costs associated with these). It will be the most effective way of ensuring the optimum level of developer contributions to infrastructure and in mitigation of development impacts can be achieved. This process will be further improved and simplified through the adoption of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) approach.

Value for money

Where possible, technical work that supports the Core Strategy has been jointly commissioned with adjoining authorities to ensure value for money.

Legal

Jameson and Hill have been appointed to provide external legal support for the Core Strategy. They will provide the Council with any advice required regarding the implication of new Government advice; assist with responding to key representations; advise on the production of any additional evidence and support Officers through the Examination process itself.

Human Resources

It is critical that the Strategic Planning and Regeneration team are fully staffed to enable the agreed LPF timetable to be delivered. An experienced Programme Officer has been appointed by the Council to provide administrative support to the Inspector and act as a single, independent point of contact for all parties throughout the Examination process.

Land

The Core Strategy will play an important role in decisions regarding future land uses within the Borough. The Council has specific land ownership interest in two of the Local Allocations - LA1 (Marchmont Farm) and LA2 (Old Town).

Risk Implications

Key risks are identified in the Local Development Scheme and reviewed annually with the Annual Monitoring Report. They include failure of external agencies or consultants to deliver on time, changes in Government policy and team capacity. A separate risk assessment prepared for the Core Strategy Pre-Submission identifies a number of risks relating to the Examination process and particularly the soundness tests with which the Core Strategy must comply.

Corporate Objectives

Preparation (and delivery) of the Core Strategy and other components of the Local Planning Framework contributes to all the corporate objectives. The aim is to achieve high quality, sustainable development in the right place, at the right time and with the right infrastructure, whilst also recognising the need to protect green space.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration introduced the report which was a culmination of Task and Finish Groups and various consultations. Whilst there were a number of objections relating to the level of housing, developers found the targets too low and local residents found them too high.

The Local Allocations which were green belt housings would be managed as countryside until being required for housing. This would push the requirement to use green belt back in the plan and, therefore, would prioritise the brown field and other windfall sites to be used first.

The new Duty to Co-operate contained within the Localism Act had allowed the Council to comment on and receive comments from neighbouring councils and to open informal dialogue on cross boundary work. There were no major issues raised through the omissions consultation.

With the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework in March, there could be some small amendments required to keep the Core Strategy in line with the new

legislation. It was proposed that any changes required should be agreed under delegation to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration.

Provided there were no significant changes proposed by full Council which would require further consultation, it was proposed to submit the Core Strategy to the Planning Inspectorate by the end of May.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) said that, with regard to the new National Planning Policy Framework, the timing of the Core Strategy was significant. Any minor changes would be built in.

The Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services asked for confirmation that the Council would always have planning policy guidance in place to deal with any challenges raised at the Development Control Committees.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) said that the National Planning Policy Framework would not do everything. A key feature was that it delegated down to local level. The Council was in a strong position when it came to these matters.

The Leader of the Council said the National Planning Policy Framework had come into effect on 28 March but the existing Development Framework would stay in place for a further 12 months. The Leader of the Council expressed concern that the National Planning Policy Framework was a framework for developers around the countryside and would not offer the protection the Council would seek to have in Dacorum. The Leader of the Council wanted to be confident about protecting development in the area.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Regeneration) said it would be good if the Council could show it had a robust plan. The key issue that would be the subject of the public examination would be the level of housing supply. The Council must demonstrate there was adequate housing supply. The Council had taken advice and the indication was that the Council had that robust supply.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability asked how interested parties could be heard at the inspection hearing.

The Team Leader, Strategic Planning and Regeneration, advised that the Programme Leader would circulate an agenda to all parties who had expressed an interest. If a person's name had not featured on that list, that person could request a seat. It was at the Inspector's discretion if a person could participate.

The Leader of the Council said that recommendation 2 of the report was to make recommendations to full Council. A special meeting of the Council was required to consider item 11 on the Cabinet agenda, Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Regeneration. The Leader of the Council suggested the special meeting of the Council be held on Tuesday 22 May and that the Submission of the Core Strategy also be considered at that meeting.

This was agreed.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

The report refers to consultation undertaken on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. The results of this will be summarised in the Report of Representations that will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate alongside the Core Strategy. The results of all previous consultation are summarised in the Report of Consultation that accompanied the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. Volume 7 provides an overview. Development Plans Task and Finish Group were consulted at regular intervals during the preparation of the Core Strategy. The Local Strategic Partnership Board also discussed the content of the Core Strategy at key stages in its production. Corporate Management Team has been appraised of progress and have expressed support for the recommendations set out in this report.

Voting

None.