

Louise St John Howe
Programme Officer
PO Services
PO Box 10965
Sudbury
Suffolk
CO10 3BF

9 October 2017

By email to louise@poservices.co.uk

My Ref DLA/17/254

Dear Louise,

**RE: WELWYN HATFIELD LOCAL PLAN
LAND AT THE RIDGEWAY, CUFFLEY (Cuf10)**

I write in response to the Inspector's published agenda for the Stage Two hearing sessions (doc. EX22).

We act for the promoter of land at the Ridgeway in Cuffley (Cuf10), one of the unallocated "green sites" i.e. a site that passed Stage 2 of the SHLAA but was not allocated in the submitted Local Plan. In summary, our position is that the Council is not meeting the area's objectively assessed housing need yet has chosen not to allocate sites that were found suitable in the SHLAA. We will pursue the settlement- and site-specific issues at the appropriate stage in the Examination timetable, as invited by the Inspector. We do not intend to appear at stage 2 in respect of this site.

At this stage, and specifically in response to the Inspector's agenda, we have the following brief comments to make:

1. Housing market areas – no comment
2. Full Objectively Assessed Housing Need – our previous representations highlighted concern that the Council was not meeting its earlier-identified OAN. Now that the OAN identified in the SHMA has increased, and looks set to go even higher under the Government's new methodology, this issue becomes even more important.
3. No comment
4. Green Belt Review – our only comment here is a note of caution on the usefulness of Green Belt reviews. In our experience, most sites on the edge of urban areas play some Green Belt function but that does not mean they should not be considered for release from the Green Belt. Conversely, those Green Belt sites remote from towns or villages often play a lesser Green Belt role but are unsuitable for development because of their isolation. It is important to weigh the findings of a

Green Belt review with the site assessment findings and the housing need evidence and come to a balanced judgement.


5. Green Belt Exceptional Circumstances – in our view the scale of housing need clearly constitutes housing need, as do the sustainability implications of not releasing Green Belt in the Borough and forcing development further north, out of the borough and beyond the Green Belt.
6. Spatial vision – no comment
7. Targets for growth – as set out earlier and above, the housing target is not sound and needs to be increased to meet identified need.
8. Five-year housing land supply – the proposed approach to the housing trajectory is not consistent with the need to boost housing delivery in the short-term, as identified in the NPPF. The lack of supply coming through the system must be addressed as soon as possible, rather than deferring the delivery of sites.
9. Overall development strategy – a strategy that does not meet OAN but leaves unallocated sites that were found suitable through the SHLAA process cannot be sound. Additional homes should be provided in Cuffley.

Conclusions

The draft Local Plan is unsound in respect of its overall housing provision. It fails the “positively prepared” and “consistent with national policy” soundness tests in failing to meet identified housing need. The Local Plan can be made sound through the allocation of additional housing sites. Specifically, the site at the Ridgeway in Cuffley (Cuf10) should be allocated for housing.

I hope this is helpful. I look forward to participating in later hearing sessions.

Yours sincerely



Simon Andrews
Strategic Planning Manager