

FURTHER STATEMENT ADDRESSING MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS AS FAR AS THEY RELATE TO TRING SPORTS FORUM'S REPRESENTATIONS

1.1 The Planning Inspector asks whether the Site Allocations Plan represents the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances (see Matter 1, paragraph 4).

1.2 We would contend that SC10 - as currently worded - fails to support Dacorum BC's own Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan (2015), in that additional playing fields, identified in that plan as required by the local community, will only be provided (for dual use with Tring School) should the school expand. If the school does not expand, there will be no new playing fields for the local community.

1.3 We have therefore suggested a change in the wording of SC10, in order to make clear that the requirements for the school and the local community can both be met by the allocation – individually or in partnership - but without one being dependent upon the other.

1.4 We would add that Dacorum BC's position regarding the Dunsley Farm site seems to be contradictory. Thus, for example, in Part 2 of the Report of Representations, January 2016, the Council responds to our comments (at SC10, *Organisations who disagreed*, paragraph 1) with the words “no further changes...considered necessary”, whereas at SC10, *Individuals who disagreed*, paragraph 1, the Council acknowledges the plight of the community clubs in Tring, stating that :

“The need for additional playing pitches is supported by evidence in the form of the Outdoor Leisure Facilities Study Assessment Report completed by the Council in 2014, and also within the follow-up Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan (2015). The Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan identifies the need for additional pitches within Tring as one of the nine high priority actions for the Borough, with particular reference to a shortfall in adult sized pitches required for senior rugby...”

1.5 We would also express our concern that the Dacorum Strategic Planners appear to have misconstrued our representations of 23 September 2015 in their Report presented to the Dacorum Cabinet on 15 December 2015. At paragraph 33 under the “Representations received on Focused Changes” (Significant Changes) sub-section, they state:

“...they [TSF] support the principle of the allocation, but object to the fact that there is no explicit reference to the pitches being available for wider community use (which is incorrect)...”

We made no such objection and I wrote to the Team Leader (Strategic Planning) on 12 May 2016 explaining matters – please see Appendix below.

It is disappointing that the report went forward to the Dacorum Cabinet in this way and doubly disappointing that I have to date received no reply to my email.

Christopher Allen
Hon. Secretary, Tring Sports Forum
2 September 2016



APPENDIX

Laura Wood, Team Leader (Strategic Planning)
Strategic Planning & Regeneration
Dacorum Borough Council
Civic Centre
Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead
Herts HP1 1HH

Dear Ms Wood,

On 5 May 2016 we held a meeting of our members at which we discussed the Council's response to our representations regarding the Site Allocations Pre-Submission Focused Changes.

One particular statement, appearing in the Report presented to the Dacorum BC Cabinet on 15 December 2015 caught our attention. At paragraph 33 under the "Representations received on Focused Changes" (Significant Changes) sub-section you state:

"...they [TSF] support the principle of the allocation, but object to the fact that there is no explicit reference to the pitches being available for wider community use (which is incorrect)..."

TSF's members have asked me to stress to you that we have made no such objection. Rather, we wished to point out that, under the wording of SC10 (Proposal L/4), detached playing fields would, effectively, only be available for community use should they be required for use of the school as a result of its expansion.

If you go to Part B, paragraph 4 of our representation on SC10 and read it again, you will note our concern that "new playing pitches should in our view be provided on the Dunsley Farm site not only for use of the school but also for use of local community sports clubs, irrespective of whether the school expands."

We are pleased to note that dual use is an essential part of the Council's proposal; our worry is that, if the school does not expand, there will be no new pitches at all, and therefore no new pitches for the local community.

I would be very grateful if you could confirm that we now have a common understanding of our position regarding SC10. I would also welcome your confirmation that the Site Allocations DPD (incorporating the Focused Changes), as currently worded, would allow for the potential use of the Dunsley Farm site for playing fields for community use, independent of the school's requirements.

Regards,

Chris Allen (Hon. Secretary)
12 May 2016