

## CHAPTER 21 – THE PROPOSALS MAP

### 21.1. PROPOSALS MAP: GENERAL

#### Objections

<i>Rep No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Rep No</i>	<i>Name</i>
749	Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust	4762	Mr & Mrs M R & A B Chapman
4116	Lucas Aerospace		

#### Key Issues

- (a) Whether all nature conservation sites should be identified on the proposals maps. (749)
- (b) Whether the Deposit Draft edition of the Proposals Maps is clearly identified. (4116)
- (c) Whether references on Proposals Map Sheet 4 correspond with the Written Statement. (4762)

#### Inspector’s Conclusions

##### *(a) Nature conservation sites*

21.1.1. I have already addressed this issue in paragraphs 13.9.5 and 13.9.6 of my report. While I appreciate the objector’s desire for Wildlife Sites to be shown on the Proposals Map it is important that the Map is clear. In the light of the scale of the maps, the substantial number of wildlife sites involved and the fact that they often overlap other designations I consider their inclusion on the Map could lead to an unacceptable loss of clarity. In the circumstances, the production of supplementary planning guidance, as the Council proposes, is, in my view, likely to be the most sensible way to address this issue, particularly as it would allow new sites to be recognised more quickly. I, therefore, recommend that no further modification should be made to the Plan in response to this objection, other than those I have already made in respect of Policy 103. (See paragraphs 13.9.14 and 13.9.15)

##### *(b) Deposit Draft edition*

21.1.2. Since the relevant date appears on each sheet of the Proposals Map and the title Deposit Draft appears on the cover of the folder I consider that there is sufficient information to distinguish the sheets from the earlier adopted Plan Proposals Map sheets. However, I consider that in the interests of ensuring maximum clarity it would be sensible for the final sheets to each be clearly labelled with the title and date of the adopted Plan. I recommend that the Plan be modified accordingly in response to objection 4116.

##### *(c) Sheet 4 and the written statement*

21.1.3. The objector does not make clear which errors are being referred to. I have previously drawn one error relating to the identification of two Housing Proposal Sites as H30. The Council proposes to correct this under FC161 by deleting the High Street Green site. I endorse this change. There may be other errors that have not come to my attention but without their being specifically identified all I can do is urge the Council

to ensure the final version of the Proposals Map is thoroughly checked before the Plan is adopted.

- 21.1.4. As far as the written statement goes I accept that there are a number of errors and inconsistencies throughout the document. Other comments, which have clearly been carried through from the adopted Plan, would appear out of date. However, in a document of this length it is not surprising that some errors have crept in. While I understand the objector’s view that this brings into question the soundness of the Plan’s proposals, I am not satisfied that these errors are sufficient either individually or cumulatively to seriously undermine the overall reliability of the Plan’s strategy.
- 21.1.5. The Council has accepted that there are a number of errors throughout the Plan and have published an errata list at Appendix 1 to the Index of Council Further Changes to the Plan (CD51E). In addition to this it acknowledges that there are a number of reference errors in section 9 of Part 4 of the Plan which they propose to address under PICs 266 and 267. I support these corrections. I see no need for any further changes other than those I have already recommended in my report. Accordingly, I recommend that the Plan should be modified in accordance with PICs 266 and 267 and Appendix 1 to CD51E.

### **Recommendation**

21.1.6. **The Plan be modified as follows:-**

- (a) each sheet of the Proposals Map should be clearly labelled with the name and date of the Plan;
- (b) amend section 9 of Part 4 of the Plan in accordance with PICs 266 and 267<sup>1</sup>;
- (c) make the corrections to the Plan that are listed in Appendix 1 to CD51E.

## **21.2. PROPOSALS MAP: SHEET 4**

### **Objections**

<i>Rep No</i>	<i>Name</i>
4117*	Lucas Aerospace

### **Key Issue**

- (a) Whether T10 (North East Hemel Hempstead Relief Road) is correctly identified on the Proposals Map. (4117)

### **Inspector’s Conclusion**

21.2.1. The Council accepts that the North East Hemel Hempstead Relief Road is wrongly

<sup>1</sup> The Council will wish to note that the second part of PIC267 relating to the Policy Statement for HCA29 was not included in the Composite Plan.

identified on Sheet 4 of the Proposals Map as T10. It therefore proposes under PIC288 to correct the Map to show the appropriate reference. Since this would clearly address the objection and would help to ensure greater accuracy I endorse this change. I recommend therefore that the Plan should be modified in accordance with PIC 288.

**Recommendation**

21.2.2. The Plan be modified in accordance with PIC288.

---

### 21.3. PROPOSALS MAP: SHEET 6

**Objections**

<i>Rep No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Rep No</i>	<i>Name</i>
4681	Mr J O Mathie		

**Key Issue**

(a) Whether or not the OS base plan used for the proposal maps is up to date enough. (4681)

**Inspector’s Conclusion**

21.3.1. There is no doubt that the Proposals Map does not show the most recent development. However, large scale Ordnance Survey maps are only updated every so often. The Council contends that the most up-to-date maps available were used as the base for the Proposals Map. I find no reason to question this. I would, however, support the Council’s intention to use more up-to-date Ordnance Survey maps for the adopted Plan if any are available.

**Recommendation**

21.3.2. The Council use the most up-to-date Ordnance Survey maps available when drawing up the Proposals Map for the adopted Plan.

---

END OF CHAPTER 21