

Consultancy and Valuation Team
01727 519149

Our ref: P-14-437
7th September 2016



Louise Crosby MA MRTPI - Senior Planning Inspector

C/O Ian Kemp
Programme Officer
16 Cross Furlong
Wychbold, Droitwich Spa,
Worcestershire, WR9 7TA

By email to: idkemp@icloud.com

Dear Madam

**DACORUM SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD – FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS IN RELATION TO
MATTER 2 – GENERAL MATTERS**

LAND TO THE REAR OF 13-17 OAKWOOD, BERKHAMSTED, HERTS, HP4 3NQ

1. Introduction

- 1.1. We represent a group of owners ('the Objectors') in connection with their representations regarding at the definition of the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of the above address.
- 1.2. One of the Council's original stated purposes of the Site Allocations document was the correction of any anomalies in the Green Belt boundary. The September 2014 draft version of the plan recognised some changes to the boundary needed to be made to address cases where the line ran through residential gardens, without any physical feature being followed (see for instance GB/14 Land at Chipperfield Road, Bovingdon on Map 18 & GB/17 Land rear of Farrier Top and High View, Markyate on Map 21).
- 1.3. The Objectors' submitted representations to the emerging Site Allocations DPD in respect of their land situated to the rear of Nos 13-17 Oakwood Berkhamsted on the 14th March 2014 and again on the 21st October 2014. The latter set of representations included a site plan which showed the existing Green Belt boundary and then recommended a more clearly defined line which followed the adjoining A41 trunk road.



Watford Office ■
Abbotts House
198 Lower High St
Watford
Herts WD17 2FF

St Albans Office ■
58 St Peters Street
St Albans
Herts
AL1 3HG

Mayfair Office ■
Cashel House
15 Thayer Street
London
W1V 3JT

Rumball Sedgwick Limited

Registered in England no. 8975990

Registered office address:

Egale 1, 80 St Albans Road, Watford, Herts, WD17 1DL

www.rumballsedgwick.co.uk ■

2. The Anomalous Existing Green Belt Boundary

- 2.1. The Objectors' representations pointed out the unsuitable method of boundary delineation in the subject case which essentially follows a line of trees. In some cases those trees have gone and this demonstrates the failure to adopt a boundary defined by a permanent physical feature (as paragraph 85 of the NPPF advises).
- 2.2. This is not the only example locally, the Green Belt boundary in the adjacent residential cul-de-sac, Hockeridge View, is similarly inconsistent and arbitrary, passing through residential gardens of those properties, following no recognisable physical feature at all.

3. Contribution to the Purposes of Including Land in the Green Belt

- 3.1. The land to the rear of Nos 13-17 Oakwood serves none of the five purposes of Green Belt as set out at paragraph 80 of the NPPF. It is the clear physical boundary of the A41 that prevents any unrestricted sprawl, or that prevents any neighbouring towns from merging into one another. The subject land has long fallen out of agricultural, or other rural land use (like Hockeridge View the land is now used in association with the adjoining dwellings as garden), and so neither is there any contribution to the purpose of preventing countryside encroachment. Furthermore, the setting of the historic town is not affected by the subject land and keeping the land in the Green Belt would not assist with urban regeneration.

4. Conclusions

- 4.1. Confirming the definition of the Green Belt boundary in its current form in the vicinity of Nos. 13-17 Oakwood would be contrary to clear Government advice. The land in question serves no Green Belt function and the boundary should be redrawn to a more defensible position. This can be done without compromising any wider planning objectives.

Yours sincerely



Michael Fearn BA (Hons), Dip TP (Dist), MRTPI

On Behalf of **MR & MRS A RICHARDSON, MR & MRS M FIFIELD, MR & MRS R HALL, MR & MRS S GODWIN AND MR & MRS G BEHR**



Tel: 01727 519149
Mob: 07779 140266
www.rumballsedgwick.co.uk

58 St Peter's Street, St Albans, Hertfordshire, AL1 3HG