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1. **Introduction**

1.1. In early 2015 Dacorum Borough Council, Hertsmere Borough Council, Three Rivers District Council and Watford Borough Council commissioned consultants GL Hearn (in conjunction with Justin Gardner Consulting) to carry out a Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the south west Hertfordshire area. An Economy Study for the same area was commissioned in parallel, from consultants Regeneris, in conjunction with GL Hearn.

1.2. Both studies have been carried out using the framework set out by Government in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

1.3. The PPG encourages the early co-operation and involvement with a range of local stakeholders when preparing housing and economic need assessments:

   Local communities, partner organisations, Local Enterprise Partnerships, businesses and business representative organisations, universities and higher education establishments, house builders (including those specialising in older people’s housing), parish and town councils, designated neighbourhood forums preparing **neighbourhood plans** and housing associations should be involved from the earliest stages of plan preparation, which includes the preparation of the evidence base in relation to development needs.

(Paragraph: 007Reference ID: 2a-007-20150320)

1.4. In order to comply with this advice, and also to test market perceptions of the draft recommendations arising from both studies, a stakeholder workshop was held on 14 September 2015, at the South Hill Centre, Hemel Hempstead. The purpose of this workshop was:

   “To provide feedback and comment on the draft findings of the SW Herts Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Economy Study and discuss the inter-linkages between the number, type and distribution of future homes and jobs.”

1.4. Attendees were also made aware that the figures coming out of both studies for home and jobs needs do not necessarily equate to future Local Plan / Core Strategy targets and that the event was not an opportunity to promote individual sites.

2. **Invitees**

2.1. Invitations to attend the workshop were sent out by Dacorum Borough Council on behalf of all commissioning authorities on 3rd August 2015. These invitations were sent to a wide range of companies and organisations with an interest or involvement in the south west Hertfordshire area, including:
2.2. A copy of the invitation letter and associated attachments is set out in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 shows a full list of those invitees contacted.

2.3. Invitees were asked to confirm their attendance prior to the event, by completing the form provided.

2.4. Attendance was generally limited to one representative per organisation to enable as wide a range of attendees as possible. Due to the high demand for places, the venue was changed from Dacorum Borough Council’s offices, to the South Hill Centre, Hemel Hempstead.

2.5. Attendees were notified of the final arrangements for the workshop by email (see Appendix 4).

3. Attendees

3.1 Forty four representatives from the development industry and other organisations attended the workshop. In addition to this, there were also a number of representatives for the commissioning authorities, some of whom were active participants in the workshop discussions, whilst others acted as facilitators and note takers.

3.2 Appendix 3 provides a list of attendees, based on the sign in sheet used on the day. It is possible that a small number of individuals did not register, so will not be included on this list.

4. Format of workshop

4.1 A draft agenda for the workshop was sent out with the initial invitation letter. This was resent (with updated venue information) to confirmed attendees in advance of the workshop. The final agenda is attached as Appendix 4.

4.2 Attendees were sub-divided into 7 groups, with representatives from similar organisations put together where possible. This was in order to aid discussion, help enable each group to reach consensus regarding the answers posed during the workshop session and allow the facilitators to focus discussion around those questions of most interest to particular participants (Appendix 5). Those who had not replied to the workshop invitation but arrived on the day were asked to join the smaller groups.

4.3 The presentation given by GL Hearn on the initial findings of the SW Herts SHMA covered the following:
The presentation given by Regeneris on the initial findings of the SW Herts Economy Study covered the following topics:

- Policy Context
- Functional Economic Area
- Growth Scenarios
- Preferred Scenario
- Floor-space and Land Requirements
- Development Potential at Strategic Sites
- Conclusions and Questions

Copies of the full presentations will be published as part of the final technical studies.

The questions asked for each of the two workshop sessions (one for the SHMA and one for the Economy Study) are set out in Appendix 6. Copies of the presentations were available in A3 format for each group to refer to as necessary during their discussions. The study consultants were not allocated to particular groups, but sat in of different parts of each group’s discussion and help answer any detailed technical questions that arose.

5. Feedback

5.1 Feedback from the stakeholder workshop was received in a number of different ways. Whilst the main mechanism was through the structured group discussions (based on a series of pre-set questions), there were also opportunities to raise questions direct with the consultants, place comments on a ‘Park Board’ or pass feedback through on the study via email for those invitees unable to attend the event in person.
a) Questions and answers after presentations

5.2 Following the presentations by GL Hearn (regarding the SHMA) and Regeneris (regarding the Economy Study), and prior to the group break-out sessions, there was an opportunity for attendees to raise any general questions regarding the studies. The questions raised, and answers given, were as follows:

**SHMA:**
(All answers given by Nick Ireland, G L Hearn)

**Q1 What does the study assume in terms of future commuting trends?**  
(Questioner not noted)

The study looks at current information available on commuting ratios. This shows a net out commute from the SW Herts area of about 9%. The study assumes this trend will continue. So whilst the percentage remains the same, the absolute number of people out commuting will increase slightly.

**Q2 It is noted that the Housing Market Area (HMA) includes St Albans District, but their suggested OAN figure is omitted from the figures provided. Isn’t this rather disingenuous considering that this figure can be obtained by deducting the other SW Herts figures from the HMA total?**  
(Bob Sellwood, Sellwood Planning)

St Albans District is not one of the commissioning authorities for the SHMA. It is therefore not considered appropriate to explicitly state their OAN in the report’s recommendations. It is however agreed that the figure can easily be calculated.

**Q3 As we are still in uncertain times economically, what are the consultants’ thoughts regarding the robustness of the data that they have used to inform the study. Surely there are a number of key factors that could potentially change e.g. trends in international migration, affordable housing policy and other government policy changes?**  
(Jane Wakelin, Wakelin Associates)

Studies such as this always have to make assumptions and look at trends. The SHMA is governed by a framework methodology set out in the Planning Practice Guidance which needs to be followed. The judgements made within the study are the best possible in the context of the information available. It is however important to ensure the situation is appropriately monitored and assessments updated as necessary.

**Q4 It is noted that the Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) figure being suggested for Dacorum is much higher than its current Core Strategy housing target. Is this the same for all of the other commissioning authorities?**  
(Chris Taylor, DBC)

Yes. Although the figures aren’t immediately to hand, all of the Councils’ current housing targets are lower than the OAN figures being suggested in the SHMA. This is where the two stage process comes into play: the role of the SHMA is to recommend an OAN figure in a ‘policy off’ context. This then needs to be tested in a ‘policy on’ context – taking account of factors such as land availability, Green Belt constraints, landscape designations such as the AONB etc, before a target is set by Local Plans.
Q5 What is the interrelationship between housing need and factors such as the likely future trend in office to residential permitted development and infrastructure projects such as the potential Crossrail extension to Tring? (Matthew Wood, Lambert Smith Hampton)

This is an issue which has been picked up explicitly through the Economy Study, so will be better addressed through the second workshop session.

Q5 How do you end up with a single OAN for the area when there are so many variables? (Steve Baker, CPRE)

Government guidance requires each HMA to identify its OAN (broken down by authority area if necessary), so there has to be a single recommended figure put forward in the SHMA. However, the SHMA has tested a number of different scenarios (as summarised in the presentation) and these will be set out in the final report.

ECONOMY STUDY:
(All answers given by Ricardo Gomez and/or Oliver Chapman, Regeneris)

Q1 How will the tension between identifying strategic sites for the competing demands of housing and employment be resolved? (Matthew Wood, Lambert Smith Hampton)

It is important that existing identified employment sites within SW Herts are protected for employment uses as they are recognised, established locations that serve a very important function. It is the role of other technical work being carried out by the commissioning authorities to look at the role that should be played by other existing sites, and the uses that would be appropriate for any newly identified sites. This is beyond the scope of the current study.

Q2 Is the scale of office growth a net figure? Does it take into account recent losses through changes of use to residential through the permitted development regime and existing vacancy rates, which are considered to be high in some areas such as Maylands? (Steve Baker, CPRE)

The overall figures show a net increase against a 2013 baseline. The study has considered office to residential conversions that have occurred under recent changes to permitted development rights. The trend however varies across the study area and it has been agreed that each authority will decide how to take recent losses into account and whether to decide to try to replace these losses.

b) Questions posed during workshops

5.3 Two further questions were raised by participants within workshop group 5, which could not be answered by the group facilitator. Responses have however been sought subsequent to the workshop from the consultants. These responses are set out below:

Q1 Does the affordable housing need for Dacorum (366 of the 728 OAN) include any historic shortfalls within the Borough? (Mark Sommerville, Savills).

Yes, the affordable housing takes into account the current need – including from households who are concealed or homeless.
Q2 In reference to the influence of London and level of out- (as well as in-) commuting, do the household projections factor in a breakdown of the demographic profile (e.g. age brackets) of those commuting to London for employment but living within the HMA (i.e. those attracted to the graduate jobs market)? This needs to be ascertained before a judgement or view can be given as to whether there is the right balance between homes and jobs within the HMA. (Isabella Slattery, CBRE).

The household projections deal with numbers of people moving to the HMA. They include projections for both in and out-migration by age group. The sources of migration are not however specifically modelled – albeit that the wider evidence shows that a key source of in-migration to SW Herts is from London.

The economic-led scenarios assume that the commuting ratio stays constant – and thus whilst employment in the area grows, it is assumed that net commuting to London also increases.

c) Workshop write ups

5.4 The questions attendees were asked to address in the two workshop sessions followed those set out on the agenda. A full set of questions (with associated prompts for facilitators) is set out in Appendix 6.

5.5 Notes were taken of the key points made in each group’s discussion. These are reproduced in Appendix 7.

d) ‘Park It’ board

5.6 Attendees were alerted to the availability of a ‘Park It’ board in the introductory presentation to the day. The role of this board was to provide a space for attendees to write down (using post it notes on each group table) either:
(a) Questions that they considered had not been answered during the workshop and to which they would like a response; and/or
(b) Key things which they wanted to ensure were recorded as their main feedback from the day.

5.7 Whilst a number of questions were raised within the group sessions (see above), only one additional point was placed on the Park It board. This stated that:

“Scale of Employment Land ‘safety margin’ and vacancy allowance should be much lower to reflect study area’s constraints – particularly Green Belt and AONB.” (Source unknown)

e) Response from non-attendees

5.8 The original invitation letter (see Appendix **), stated that “If you are unable to attend the workshop, but would like to make your views known on the issues set out on the draft agenda, please email your comments to the above address before 14th September and we will ensure your comments are passed to the consultants.” Questions posed were as follows:
• What demand is there locally for different types of homes (in terms of tenure, size and type)?
• How do we ensure the right balance when setting jobs and housing targets?
• What do you expect to be the most buoyant economic sectors in the coming years?
• Do we have the right type of employment land in the right locations?
• What are your future needs likely to be in terms of employment premises, and is the local market able to provide for these?
• Have we got the assumptions right for things such as plot ratios and building heights for employment land?
• What are the obstacles to delivering housing and employment growth and how can Councils help overcome these?

5.9 Two invitees, Historic England and the Greater London Authority (GLA) took the opportunity to provide such feedback. Their full responses are set out in Appendix 8.

5.10 Historic England stated their hope that the historic environment would be taken into consideration when considering overall housing numbers and employment targets across the SW Herts area, in order to avoid harming the historic environment and specific heritage assets. They also included a copy of their draft site allocations advice note, which sets out an approach to considering sites and their impact on the historic environment. This complements their published good practice advice note on local plans.

5.11 The GLA referred to their earlier input into the SHMA and reiterated the Mayor’s wish to see the consideration of longer-term (10 years) historic migration trends within the study. A projection based on longer-term migration is included within the SHMA analysis.

5.12 All responses have been passed on to the consultants and will help inform the final SHMA and Economy Study reports.

6. Next steps

6.1 The final closing presentation of the day briefly summarised the next steps and expected timescales for publication of the final SHMA an Economy Study. Key points of action noted were:

a) Write up feedback from today and pass to consultants.
b) Consultants to prepare final draft reports for commissioning authorities to review.
c) Final reports to be published on Councils’ website: target is end October / November.
d) Information from these and other technical studies to inform individual Councils’ Local Plan reviews.
e) Ongoing discussions between Councils through the ‘Duty to Co-Operate.’
f) Local Plan production timetables vary for each authority – see relevant Local Development Schemes (LDS).
Dear Sir/Madam,

South West Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Economy Study stakeholder workshop invitation: Monday 14th September 2015, 2pm-5pm (refreshments from 1.30pm)

I am writing on behalf of Dacorum, Hertsmere, Three Rivers and Watford Councils to invite you to a workshop on the afternoon of Monday 14th September, to discuss draft results from two key pieces of technical work that will help shape our new Local Plans.

As you may be aware, every local authority is required to complete a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and technical work looking at economic trends to help ensure our planning documents set appropriate targets for new homes and jobs. This work will also support future policies on housing size, mix and tenure and assist in the identification of land for different employment sectors and new homes for each Council.

Dacorum, Hertsmere, Three Rivers and Watford Councils have appointed consultants GL Hearn and Regeneris to carry out these studies on our behalf. The study area also includes St Albans City and District, although St Albans Council are not one of the commissioning authorities. This joint approach has the benefit of ensuring we build up a full picture of needs and trends across the wider South West Hertfordshire area and also ensures our approach to homes and jobs is properly linked.

Although the final results from both studies are not due to be published until this autumn, we are keen to provide an opportunity for key business groups and organisations to discuss the initial findings and provide feedback on whether these reflect your knowledge and experience of the area.

Whilst this event is not intended to be a forum to discuss the merits of individual development sites, or your particular business needs, we hope that it will provide an opportunity for you to share your views and expertise on questions such as:

- What demand is there locally for different types of homes (in terms of tenure, size and type)?
- How do we ensure the right balance when setting jobs and housing targets?
- What do you expect to be the most buoyant economic sectors in the coming years?
- Do we have the right type of employment land in the right locations?
- What are your future needs likely to be in terms of employment premises, and is the local market able to provide for these?
- Have we got the assumptions right for things such as plot ratios and building heights for employment land?
- What are the obstacles to delivering housing and employment growth and how can Councils help overcome these?
A draft agenda for the event is attached, together with a map giving directions to the Civic Centre in Hemel Hempstead and the location of public car parks.

If you would like to attend the workshop, please complete the attached attendance form and email it to strategic.planning@dacorum.gov.uk. Alternatively, please call my colleague Laura Badham on 01442 228660 and she will add your name to the attendance list.

If you are unable to attend the workshop, but would like to make your views known on the issues set out on the draft agenda, please email your comments to the above address before 14th September and we will ensure your comments are passed to the consultants.

Please note that if the event on Monday 14th September is oversubscribed, we will run a repeat of the workshop on the morning of Friday 18th September. If we need to reallocate some attendees to this second date we will let you know.

If you would like any further information regarding either of the studies, please contact my team using the phone or email address above.

Yours faithfully,

Laura Wood
Team Leader - Strategic Planning
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Dacorum Borough Council

On behalf of Dacorum Borough Council, Hertsmere Borough Council, Three Rivers District Council and Watford Borough Council.

Encs.
– Draft Agenda
– Civic Centre Location Map
– Attendance form
**AGENDA**

**Stakeholder Workshop**
South West Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Economy Study

**Date:** Monday 14th September 2015  
**Time:** 2pm – 5pm (refreshments available from 1.30pm)  
**Venue:** Bulbourne Room, Dacorum Civic Centre, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductions and housekeeping</th>
<th>Dacorum Borough Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of SHMA and initial conclusions from study</strong></td>
<td>GL Hearn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAK OUT SESSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To discuss key issues arising and obtain feedback from public and private sector representatives on issues such as: |  
- What demand is there locally for different types of homes (in terms of tenure, size and type)?  
- How do we ensure the right balance when setting jobs and housing targets?  
- What are the obstacles to delivering future housing growth and how can Councils help overcome these? |  
| **Refreshment break** |  |
| **Role of Economy Study and initial conclusions from study** | Regeneris |
| **BREAK OUT SESSION** |  
To discuss key issues arising and obtain feedback from public and private sector representatives on issues such as: |  
- How do we ensure the right balance between employment land and housing in key growth areas?  
- What do you expect to be the most buoyant economic sectors in the coming years?  
- Do we have the right type of employment land in the right locations?  
- What are your future needs likely to be in terms of premises, and is the local market able to provide for these?  
- Have we got the assumptions for plot ratios, building heights etc right?  
- What are the obstacles to delivering future employment growth and how can Councils help overcome these? |  
| **Feedback from break-out sessions** | ALL |
| **Conclusion and next steps** | Hertsmere Borough Council |
Attendance confirmation form

South West Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Economy Study stakeholder

Please confirm attendance by phone: 01442 228660; by email: strategic.planning@dacorum.gov.uk; or by post to:

Laura Badham
Technical Assistant
Strategic Planning & Regeneration
Dacorum Borough Council
Civic Centre
Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead
Herts, HP1 1HH

---

Your Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (max 1 person):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Schedule of invitees

Business contacts for SHMA
Adaptive Marketing
Cheeky Munkey
Cloud Bookkeepers
Hopespare
Kings Langley School
Machins Solicitors LLP
Ramtacl Computer Systems
Support Services Group
The Gade Group
Utility Warehouse

Economic Development
Beds Co-Operative Development Agency
Berkhamsted & District Chamber of Commerce
Dacorum Industrial Association
Diverse HR Solutions Ltd
East of England International
EDAW
Hertfordshire Careers Services
Herts County Council
Herts Youth Enterprise Service
Tring & District Chamber of Commerce
Tring Together
West Herts College

Estate Agents
Adrian Cole and Partners
Aitchison Raffety
Ashridge Estates
Brasier Harris
Castles
Castles
Cesare Nash & Partners
Cole Flatt & Partners
Connells
Cornerstone
Cushman & Wakefield
DTZ
Fisher Wilson
Freeth Melhuish
Hemel Property
Kirkby & Diamond
Lambert Smith Hampton
Michael Anthony
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Pendley Commercial
Pendley Estates
Poulter & Francis
Strutt & Parker
Stupple & Co

**Key Landowners, Developers & RSLs**
Akeman Property Company Ltd
AMEC
APLC
Barratt Homes
Barton Willmore
Beechwood Homes Ltd
Bellway Homes - North London
Bidwells
Bidwells
Box Moor Trust
Brian Barber Associates
Brixton Properties Limited
CALA Group Limited
CALA Group Limited
Calderwood Property Investment Ltd
Carter Jonas
Carter Jonas (on behalf of the Crown Estate)
Chiltern of Bovingdon Ltd
City & Provincial Properties Plc
Colliers CRE
Courtley Consultants Ltd
D W Kent & Associates
David Wilson Estates
DLP Planning Ltd
DPDs Consultant Group
Drivers Jonas Deloitte
Estates and Property Services
Felden Park Farms Ltd
Gallagher Estates
George Crutcher Planning
Gerald Eve LLP
Gleeson Strategic Land
Gleeson Strategic Land
Griffiths Environmental Planning
Harrow Estates
Henry H Bletsoe & Son LLP
Hives Planning
Horstonbridge Development Management
Housebuilders Federation
Iceni Projects Limited
Jeremy Peter Associates
John Beyer & Associates
Levvel
Lone Star Land Ltd
Main Allen
Maze Planning Ltd
Nelson Bakewell
Oakland Vale Ltd
Parrott & Coales
PDMS Vesty Limited
Peacock & Smith
Pegasus Group
Persimmon Homes Midlands
Picton Smeathmans
PJSA Property & Planning Consultants
Plato Estate Ltd
Rapleys
Renaissance Lifecare Plc
Rolfe Judd Ltd
Savills
Sellwood Planning
Smiths Gore
Steve Morton Brickworks Ltd
Stimpsons
Symbio Energy
Taylor Wimpey
TDP Developments Ltd
Tetlow King Planning
The Planning Bureau Limited
Thomas Eggar LLP
Tibalds Planning & Urban Design
Twigden Homes Ltd.
Vincent & Gorbing
Whiteacre
Zog Brownfield Ventures Ltd
Mr Derek Bromley
The Owner of Rectory Farm
Hightown Praetorian & Churches HA

Planning & Development Consultants
Alan Hedley Partnership
ANCER SPA Ltd
Argyll Developments
Ashill Developments
Bell Cornwell
Blue Sky Planning
BNP Paribas Real Estate
Boyer Planning
Catalist Capital
Catalyst Housing Ltd
CB Richard Ellis Limited
CBRE
CBRE Global Investors
CBRE Ltd
CODE Development Planners Ltd
Consensus Planning
Countryside Homes
Cramond-Ivey Management Limited
Crest Nicholson
Crown Management UK Limited
Dalton Warner Davis LLP
David Ames Associates
David Lock Associates
Dennis Jean Properties
Design Council CABE
Ellam Oxtoby and Peck LLP
Emery Planning
Firstplan
Francis Weal & Partners
Fusion Online Limited
Genesis Town Planning
Gregory Gray Associates
GVA James Barr
Halcrow Group
Harrison Webb
Horstonbridge Property Development
IMR Designs
Indigo Planning Limited
Insight Town Planning
J & J Design
JB Planning Associates Ltd
JS Bloor Homes (Northampton) Ltd
Keepmoat
Knight Frank LLP
Labyrinth Properties Ltd
Land Use Consultants
Linden Homes (Chiltern) Ltd
Living Heritage Developments Limited
Lucas Land & Planning
Malcolm Judd & Partners
Metropolis Planning and Design LLP
Montagu Evans
Murdoch Associates
Nick Shute Associates
NMB Planning Ltd
NTA & Associates
Optimis Consulting Ltd
Persimmon Homes Thames Valley
Peter Brett Associates and Roger Tym & Partners
Peter Brett Associates LLP
Phase 2 Planning & Development Limited
Phillips Planning Services Ltd
Planning Perspectives
Planning Potential
Planware Ltd
PPML Consulting
PRP Architects LLP
Quod
Rapleys
Revera Limited
RGB
RO Developments Ltd
Robert Turley Associates
Robinson & Hall
Satish Jassal Architects
Shire Consultancy
Smith Jenkins
Smith Stuart Reynolds
SSA Planning Limited
Stanhope Plc and Aviva
Stewart Ross Associates
Tanner & Tilley
Taylor Wimpey
Terence O’Rourke
TFM Readers
The W. R. Davidge Planning Practice
Townsend Planning Consultants
Turley
Woolf Bond Planning

The Hertfordshire LEP
John Gourd
Neil Hayes

Public Bodies
Aldwyck Housing Association

Retirement Housing Developers
Anchor
Audley Retirement Villages
Beechcroft Developments Limited
Churchill Retirement Living
Fairview New Homes Ltd
Pegasus Retirement Homes plc

Statutory Consultee and bodies under Duty to Cooperate
Barnet London Borough Council
Central Bedfordshire County Council
Chiltern District Council
Enfield London Borough Council
Greater London Authority (GLA)
Harrow London Borough Council
Hillingdon London Borough Council
South Bucks District Council
Hertfordshire Chamber of Commerce
Amec Foster Wheeler on behalf of National Grid
Aylesbury Vale District Council
Bedford Borough Council
Broxbourne Borough Council
Bucks County Council
East Herts District Council
East of England Strategic Health Authority
English Heritage
Environment Agency
HCC Gypsy Section
Hertfordshire Constabulary
Hertfordshire County Council
Hertfordshire County Council, Hertfordshire Property
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)
Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
Herts Valley Clinical Commissioning Group
Hertsmere Borough Council
Highways Agency - Network Strategy East
Homes & Community Agencies (HCA)
Luton Borough Council
Milton Keynes Council
Mobile Operators Association c/o Mono Consultants
National Grid
National Health Service Executive (NHSE)
Natural England
Network Rail
North Hertfordshire District Council
Sport England
St Albans City & District Council
Stevenage Borough Council
The Environment Agency
UK Power Networks
Welwyn Hatfield District Council
Western Area Police
### APPENDIX 3: Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>DLA Town Planning Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>CPRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Balk</td>
<td>Bidwells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Thrive Homes Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>St Albans DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Bidwells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Calder</td>
<td>Phase 2 Planning &amp; Development Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Churchard</td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Homes and Communities Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Galvin</td>
<td>Hightown Housing Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Gilham</td>
<td>Turley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>National Landlord Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>HCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SQW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Jed</td>
<td>Griffiths</td>
<td>Griffiths Environmental Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Emery Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>Kosky</td>
<td>Barton Willmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Krauze</td>
<td>Audley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>Latham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Watford Community Housing Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>Central Beds DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>Paradigm Housing Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>Payton</td>
<td>Imagine Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>West Herts College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Raikes</td>
<td>Bellway Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Box Moor Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Sellwood</td>
<td>Sellwood Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td>Sibley Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>Slattery</td>
<td>CBRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Sommerville</td>
<td>Savills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Wakelin</td>
<td>Wakelin Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>Heronslea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Whetham</td>
<td>Horstonbridge Development Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>HCC - Hertfordshire Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>Lambert Smith Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Nicky</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
<td>Pegasus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Heginbotham</td>
<td>Stimpsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>King &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Oldroyd</td>
<td>Whiteacre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Hancox</td>
<td>Herts LEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>McBride</td>
<td>Imagine Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council participants:
- James Doe, Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regeneration, Dacorum Borough Council
- Chris Taylor, Group Manager, Strategic Planning and Regeneration, Dacorum Borough Council
- Sara Whelan, Group Manager, Development Management, Dacorum Borough Council
- Sam Bramley, Strategic Housing Officer, Dacorum Borough Council
- Rebecca Oblein, Team Leader – Economic Wellbeing, Dacorum Borough Council

Consultants:
- Justin Gardner, Justin Gardner Consulting
- Nick Ireland, GL Hearn
- Paul McColgan, GL Hearn
- Oliver Chapman, Regeneris
- Ricardo Gomez, Regeneris

Council facilitators / note takers:
- Laura Wood, Team Leader – Strategic Planning, Dacorum Borough Council
- Chloe Thomson, Strategic Planning Officer, Dacorum Borough Council
- John Chapman, Strategic Planning Officer, Dacorum Borough Council
- Ann Darnell, Planning Officer, Hertsmere Borough Council
- Richard Blackburn, Senior Planning Officer, Hertsmere Borough Council
- Claire May, Principal Planning Officer, Three Rivers District Council
- Rachael Goates, Development Manager, Three Rivers District Council
- Martin Wells, Senior Planning Officer, Three Rivers District Council
- Ian Dunsford, Policy Section Head, Regeneration and Development, Watford Borough Council
- Catriona Ramsay, Planning Officer (Spatial Plan Team), Regeneration and Development, Watford Borough Council
• Vicky Owen, Spatial Planning Manager, Regeneration and Development, Watford Borough Council
Stakeholder Workshop – SW Herts SHMA and Economy Study

Thank you for confirming your attendance at the above event on Monday 14th September. Please find attached a final agenda.

Please note that the event will now be held at the South Hill Centre, Cemetery Hill, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1JF. There is no parking available on-site, so please park on-street (metered parking), or use the Water Gardens car park, which is a 5 minute walk from the site. A map showing the location of the venue and local car parks is attached. Please also note that we have also brought the start time forward by 15 minutes – with the event now beginning at 1.45pm (with refreshments from 1.15pm).

If you are no longer able to attend, or the name of the attendee from your organisation has changed, we would be grateful if you could let us know in advance by emailing Strategic.Planning@Dacorum.gov.uk or call 01442 228660.

Kind regards

Laura Wood

Attached:

- Final agenda
- Location map
AGENDA
Stakeholder Workshop
South West Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Economy Study

Date: Monday 14 September 2015
Time: 1.45pm – 5pm (refreshments available from 1.15pm)
Venue: South Hill Centre, Cemetery Hill, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1JF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introductions and housekeeping</th>
<th>Dacorum Borough Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role of SHMA and initial conclusions from study</td>
<td>GL Hearn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BREAK OUT SESSION**
To discuss key issues arising and obtain feedback from public and private sector representatives on issues such as:
- What demand is there locally for different types of homes (in terms of tenure, size and type)?
- How do we ensure the right balance when setting jobs and housing targets?
- What are the obstacles to delivering future housing growth and how can Councils help overcome these?

**Refreshment break**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of Economy Study and initial conclusions from study</th>
<th>Regeneris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BREAK OUT SESSION**
To discuss key issues arising and obtain feedback from public and private sector representatives on issues such as:
- How do we ensure the right balance between employment land and housing in key growth areas?
- What do you expect to be the most buoyant economic sectors in the coming years?
- Do we have the right type of employment land in the right locations?
- What are your future needs likely to be in terms of premises, and is the local market able to provide for these?
- Have we got the assumptions for plot ratios, building heights etc right?
- What are the obstacles to delivering future employment growth and how can Councils help overcome these?

**Feedback from break-out sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion and next steps</th>
<th>Hertsmere Borough Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Parking at South Hill Centre

South Hill Centre has its own car park with a limited number of spaces available. Unfortunately there will not be enough spaces available for your event. Individuals attending this event are therefore encouraged to walk, come via public transport or car share where possible. Limited short term pay and display parking is available on Cemetery Hill.

Parking for this event will be at neighbouring public car parks, within short walking distance of the Centre. These are shown on the map below. Long stay (more than 4hr) parking is on the top floor of the Watergardens (N) car park. Public Car parks cost around 80p for 1hr; up to £2.50 for 4 hrs and around £3.50 for the whole day.

Additional free parking areas may be available, on request, for evening and weekend bookings.
APPENDIX 5: Workshop Groups

Group 1 (Housing Associations and landlords) – Facilitator: Ann Darnell, HBC
1. Sam Bramley – DBC Strategic Housing
2. Tony Lewis – Watford Community Housing Trust
3. Sam Galvin – Hightown Housing Association
4. Peter Merchant – Paradigm Housing Group
5. Billy Gill – National Landlord Association
6. Matthew Wilson – Herts County Council
7. Chris Pearson - West Herts College

Group 2 (Local Government and organisations) – Facilitator: Claire May, TRDC
1. Chris Briggs – St Albans District Council
2. Andrew Marsh – Central Beds District Council
3. Rebecca Oblein – Economic Wellbeing, Dacorum Borough Council
4. Nick Gough – Highways, Hertfordshire County Council
5. Joan Hancox – Herts LEP
6. Steve Baker – CPRE
7. Ian Richardson – Box Moor Trust
8. Sara Whelan – Dacorum Borough Council

Group 3 (Agents / Consultants) – Facilitator: Vicky Owen, WBC
1. Chris Green – SQW
2. Jane Wakelin – Wakelin Associates
4. Matt Wood – Lambert Smith Hampton
5. Edward Sibley – Sibley Law
6. Amy Gilham – Turley
7. Oliver King – King and Co

Group 4 (Agents / Consultants) – Facilitator: John Chapman, DBC
1. Tom McBride – Imagine Group
2. Simon Andrews – DLA Town Planning Ltd
3. Bob Sellwood – Sellwood Planning
4. Jed Griffiths – Griffiths Environmental Planning
5. Rod Latham (1st session only)
6. Stephen Harris – Emery Planning
7. Mrs Maureen West (1st session only)
8. Steven Kosky – Barton Wilmore (1st session only)

Group 5 (Agents / Consultants) – Facilitator: Chloe Thomson, DBC
1. Richard Butler – Bidwells
2. Ed Whetham – Horstonbridge Development Management
3. Mark Somerville – Savills
4. Danny Payton – Imagine Group
5. Sarah Churchard – Robinson & Hall
6. Isabella Slattery – CBRE

Group 6 (Mixed Consultants and Developers) – Facilitator: Richard Blackburn, HBC
1. Melissa Balk – Bidwells
2. Michael Calder – Phase 2 Planning & Development Ltd
3. Stuart Oldroyd – Whiteacre
4. Ben Krauze – Audley
5. Simon Warner – Heronslea
6. Alex Francis – Homes and Communities Agency
7. Nicky Parsons - Pegasus Group

Group 7 – (Housebuilders) – Facilitator: Laura Wood, DBC
1. Jo Barrett – Thrive Homes
2. Charles Raikes – Bellway Homes
3. Robert Taylor – Persimmon Homes
4. John Higgenbotham – Stimpsons

The following is noted as having attended, but it is not clear which group they joined:

- Martin Woodard, Reynolds Conservation
APPENDIX 6: Workshop Questions

SHMA:

Q1. (Note: question not listed on agenda) The ‘market area’ for both studies is identified as the whole of SW Herts including St Albans, although it is clearly influenced by London. Is the definition of the housing and economic market area reasonable?

(a) If so, why?

(b) If not, why not and how should it be drawn differently?

Q2. What demand is there locally for different types of homes (in terms of tenure, size and type)?

(a) Does this vary across the study area? If so, how?

(b) Is this demand likely to change across the plan period (and beyond?). If so why?

(c) How should we take account of elderly persons’ accommodation within the study? How should we differentiate between C3 (units) and C2 (bed-spaces)?

(d) What can Councils do to increase delivery of affordable homes?

(e) Are there any particular areas of the housing market where demand outstrips supply?

(f) Are you aware of any particular need or demand for self-build housing?

Q3. How do we ensure the right balance when setting jobs and housing targets?

(a) Is it important for there to be a balance at local authority area level, or is it better to plan across the wider housing market area? Why is this?

Q4. What are the obstacles to delivering future housing growth and how can Councils help overcome these?

(a) Please discuss what these obstacles are.

These can be policy obstacles (local or national), physical obstacles or perceptual obstacles and could include:

- image of the area
- land values / costs
- Local Plan policies
- land designations i.e. Green Belt
- national planning / housing policies
- availability of land

(b) What can be done in the short-term to boost housing delivery?
Q1. Do you agree with the scale of jobs growth in the preferred scenario?
   (a) Does the overall growth rate [of 0.8%p.a.] look reasonable and justified when compared to past trends and the forecast growth rates of competing locations?
   (b) Do you think the adjustment for Dacorum is justified and reasonable?

Q2. What do you expect to be the most buoyant economic sectors in the coming years?
   (a) In your experience, what sectors have been driving the demand for floor space in South West Herts?
   (b) What sectors will drive growth in future years?
   (c) How important are these sectors in creating new jobs?

Q3. Are the assumptions used to derive floorspace and land requirements reasonable?
   (a) Does the adjustment for home working go far enough given changing work patterns?
   (b) Do the employment densities and plot ratios look reasonable?
   (c) Do you agree with the need to apply a 10% safety margin given the significant increase in the office space requirement?

   Note the answer and reason(s) given. If the answer is no, what should be different?

Q4. Do you think the conclusions on the broad distribution and type of employment demand are valid across South West Herts?
   (a) If so, why?
   (b) If not, what do you think should be different (and why)?

Q5. What are the main challenges in supporting future employment growth in South West Herts?
   a) What have been the effects of the relative lack of recent commercial development? Are there competing locations which have benefitted from this? Are there examples of where locations in South West Herts have lost out on potential new investors or existing firms because of a lack of suitable employment premises?
   b) Are there particular types of premises or locations where the market is under-providing or over-providing?
(e.g. are there shortfalls for town centre or business park locations or specialised types of employment land?)

c) How do we ensure the right balance between types of employment land and types housing in key growth areas?
   [Note: By the term 'key growth areas' we mean types of homes and types of jobs, rather than growth locations.]

d) What role should the Councils play in addressing these challenges?

Q6. What are your future needs (and clients’ needs) likely to be in terms of sites and premises?

   Note: Consider size and type of premises and location (e.g. town or district).

   a) Is the local market able to provide for these needs? If not, what can we do to remedy this?
APPENDIX 7: Workshop feedback

WORKSHOP SESSION 1 – STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT

Q1. The ‘Market Area’ for both studies is identified as the whole of SW Hertfordshire including St Albans, although it is clearly influenced by London. Is the definition of the housing and economic area reasonable?

Group 1
- London influence is significant - people moving out of London, due to Local Authorities in London doing deals with private developers.
- Interaction both in and out of the SW Herts. area.
- Office Space being converted into housing units. Where will the balance be met, and who will decide? - Linked to the employment growth of the area- will all jobs/offices be in clusters?

Group 2
- St Albans DC doesn’t think the area is reasonable, as their net predictions are different.
- Central Beds’ SHMA area also includes parts of St Albans district (Harpenden rural).
- CPRE is concerned about potential impacts on the Green Belt and AONB.
- There is an interrelationship between Central Beds' SHMA area and the adjoining SHMA area for North Herts.
- Issues over times frames should it be five years or ten years. St Albans DC prefers ten years.

Group 3
- Yes, HMA is reasonable – should include St Albans which is fundamentally interlinked and could potentially be wider (Welwyn Hatfield was mentioned).
- Concerns over fulfilling Duty to Co-Operate / how relationships will be managed to deliver targets.
- There is a clear gap/overspill from London Housing market.

Group 4
- St Albans not party to the SW Herts. HMA and implication this has for plan making – there is a need for an aligned position and Duty to Cooperate.
- St Albans has specific characteristics and relationship with Welwyn Hatfield should be considered.
- St Albans consider itself to be a self-contained HMA.
- Requirement to match need and supply in such a large HMA. Each district has a specific figure.
- General consensus that HMA is appropriate.

Group 5
- Assume that the 9% net commuting remains the same (assuming that Cross Rail 2 has not been confirmed).
- Impact of CRL (sooner)
- Influence of London questioned by the group – the Further Alterations to the London Plan (F.A.L.P ) suggests an increase in outward migration post 2017
- Keeps the area meaningful -Where to draw the line?
- Should Welwyn Hatfield have been included?

Group 6
- There are sub regions within the market area - North and South
- London also has an influence
- The market area is a fit for now – but needs flexibility of other influences.

Group 7
- Include St Albans - Broadly happy that St Albans is included
• Sensible for Aylesbury and Central Beds to be part of separate studies (noted that Aylesbury used GL Hearn as well) – subject to liaison under the DTC. Pleased to hear that districts are already meeting neighbouring authorities as part of this work.
• Concerns of Central Beds progress.
• Bucks work is progressing in similar way to SW Herts in terms of looking at issue on a cross-boundary basis.
• Herts is too big to look at as a whole HMA – SW Herts grouping makes sense – fits in with Bellway’s regional office structure.
• Important to look at implications of London Market.
• Noted that Welwyn has done own SHMA and been part of SW Herts group in terms of attending meetings group.
• Internal market – Watford very different to others but interrelated. (Watford housing in lower income groups.)

Q2. What demand is there locally for different types of homes (in terms of tenure, size and type)?

Group 1
• Hightown Housing Association dropping shared ownership provision from 50% to 30%. Not developing too many 3 beds.
• Rent even at 80% market rent is still too high.
• Should reduce provision of 3 bed units and increase 2 beds.
• Alleviate housing need by providing for the elderly population through ‘flexi care’. Hope to start a chain reaction of housing provision.
• Age barrier the only differential for C2/C3.
• Registration / level of care defines C2/C3.
• Planning is a way to maintain and provide affordable housing.
• Housebuilders seem to have too much power. Developers also reduce specification of unit.
• Developers want to pay sum rather than giving up units.
• Watford would ask for contribution on site for development under 10 units – Hertsmere / Dacorum do not. Build costs have gone up.
• Commuter maps provide a clear link to London.
• Flats seem to be extremely common – mainly 2/3/ bed flats.

Group 2
• 3,000 homes delivered across the whole of Herts in 2014.
• Clarification that the AMRs produced by the relevant district/borough councils are being looked at in terms of housing type.

Group 3
Should demand below/district level been looked at?
• No

Does this vary across the study area?
• Yes, locations next to transport links are popular. Developers looking to build for rent or buy to let purchases want to build next to the stations, as less need for cars.

Is this demand likely to change across the plan period?
• Yes. Likely to go up.
• Pressure on school places will fuel demand. Large families living in small Victorian houses – pushes demand up.
• Also older persons housing; Example at Potters Bar, McCarthy and Stone – this type of property is of higher value for developers than standard residential. Also has an important function on the housing market, freeing up larger homes.
How should we take account of elderly persons’ accommodation within the study? How should we differentiate between C3 and C2?

- Office to residential care. (difference in CIL/S106 contributions).
- Yes there is a distinction/does vary. Increase in evidence of people downsizing/moving abroad (cashing in pensions).
- Residential care homes have a bad reputation (stigma?).
- Older persons more thoughtful now about what they want to do as they get older. More want to look after themselves than be looked after.

(Sibley law): noted that clients looking at rental market (gov't schemes that offer guarantees on bonds). Thinks this will increase. Green Belt review will be very important.

What can councils do to increase delivery of affordable homes?

AH need (not necessarily a % in net need).
- Land. Sites that are as viable as possible.
- Viability seems be the argument to get out of affordable housing.
- It was suggested there were several landowners that would be happy to put forward sites for affordable housing.

Are you aware of any particular need or demand for self-build housing?

- High demand for self-build, from a mixture of those in London/locally.
- Might be a hidden demand/aspiration.
- Self-build is difficult/minefield on financial, how to build etc.
- It won’t necessarily solve the housing need situation.
- May need to be a LA initiative like the Green Belt release in Cherwell.
- Return to 2001 household formation rates seems a modest aspiration (noted that this is only for the younger age group).

Group 4

- Growth in older population – vague as how it is to be met and where the need is.
- Need for a type (single storey) and location specific.
- Danger of making an over simplistic assessment of need and desire to live in a mixed environment.
- Need right policy prescription in the plan to meet need where it arises.
- Policy for local needs in villages e.g.; exceptional sites including self build.
- Self build – may be some pent up demand but not sure it is as much as suggested by the Government initiative.
- Affordable houses – need to grant permissions to meet the need.
- Overall affordable housing percentages need to be realistic to ensure developments are viable.

Group 5

- Demand for different types of homes varies within each local authority area. For example, in Dacorum there is a difference between housing demands within Hemel Hempstead compared to Berkhamsted.
- More affordable homes needed.
- Family homes needed.
- Older people who are in 3/4/5 bed houses –Can’t downsize (may want to). Larger flats may help entice people out of these homes.
- First time buyers ‘skipping’ one bed accommodation (requiring 2-3 bed dwellings) due to the increased age of first time buyers – typically 25-34 year olds.
- Extra care homes +55 quality/choice.
- Need for C2 units should be shown in addition to the OAN.
- Demand outstrips supply across the board.
- Include self build if possible. Nice to have but not essential.
Group 6
- Need for larger affordable housing units.
- Need for temporary accommodation.
- Demand for shared ownership.
- Does more housing mean more affordable housing?
- To tackle the affordability problem, increase total housing
- How AH top up is calculated?
- Who delivers affordable housing? – consider:
  - grant funding
  - the use of public land
  - what can be funded by market
  - the value of land / actions of landowners
- Pressure from out migration – pressure from London
- Provide a variety of mix of size units (for all housing). This will vary by location.
- Consider provision by sub-region and mix/tenure (rather than by individual district)
- Number/target before allocation to area
- How to tackle older persons need – through specialist housing
  - When older people move into this accommodation it releases existing stock – bringing back family houses
  - care communities can do this (more over 65s than over 18s): on the model described, people move into the new unit and stay there; the level of care increases as their needs change.

Group 7
- St Albans has no plan in place
- Watford has different requirements
- Depends on location – 4 bed exec homes in suburban locations – flats near stations.
- Viability is key.
- Concerns over future of market rent and meeting social housing need with government changes
- Different size of homes – pent up demand in 20-34 age group
- Market housing is generally bigger
- Lifetime homes – don’t think concept is very valid. There is evidence to suggest that people stay 7 years in a home before moving.
- Older person housing – down sizing increasingly common – specialist housing Churchill is in demand – however, need integrated communities.
- Have ageing populations been factored in - i.e. older person staying in larger houses?
- More flexibility in homes for older people staying in larger houses.
- More specialist providers – private, RP’s and specialists will need to work together to deliver sites – 150-200 most schemes.
- Self build – very few asking for plots – not a market – developers want high quality schemes and aren’t keen on self-build as have no control over what happens on those allocated self-build plots.

Q3. How do we ensure the right balance when setting jobs and housing targets?

Group 1
- People who work in London live in Watford and workers in Watford commute in. – The M1 commute.
- Local authority boundaries are not really the issue.
- The housing need no matter where will impact on the lack of local infrastructure in the local area.

Group 2
- There should be a balance between southwest Herts and the remainder of Herts, in order to have a good comparison.
- There is a risk that the estimated housing trends could lead to dormitory areas for London.
There appears to be a fair fit between micro-economic area and the housing market area.
The AONB and Green Belt need to be factored into housing growth throughout the SHMA area.
There is some concern about balancing housing and economic growth. However, the LEP pointed out that there is a fair amount of established employment land in the county that can be used to support the economic growth in Hertfordshire.
There also needs to be consideration for the support of other infrastructure e.g. schools, health centres etc.
Questions raised as to who is going to pay and provide the necessary infrastructure for the estimated level of housing growth across the southwest SHMA area.

Group 3
- Office to residential PD has made it difficult for Local Authorities (also a big London problem). Shortage of office/industrial stock becoming a problem due to PD change.
- Is it delivering infrastructure requirements/ in sustainable locations?
- However, it does help deliver housing targets.
- LA’s need to balance this carefully, looking at the interrelationships. Studies have approached this in the correct way. When identifying – this balance – i.e. looking at GB review/sites – should GB be put forward as an option.
- Market forces often dictates where development should go. (not all agree).

Group 4
- Market signals – 10% uplift has been applied in some other LPA’s
- Is the uplift of 95 p.a sufficient to meet the needs of for 25-34 year olds.
- Is the assumption that commuting remains the same?
- Growth numbers but rates stay the same – policy off
- Policy on – is it a SW Herts issue for each authority to determine?
- Future issues – such as Cross Rail 2.

Group 5
- Allocate employment land – and protect it for employment
- Are commuting patterns broken down? This may need to be investigated further.
- Balance employment and housing numbers where possible. Inform types of jobs needed.
- Also need to balance infrastructure, leisure, quality of life as a whole.

Group 6
- Consider local and sub-regional dimensions
- Consider the effect of different size employers; the presence of large employers can have a much bigger impact on supply of labour and housing.
- Consider the options of sustainable travel v self-containment
- What is the presence and/or effect on infrastructure?
- House design – telecom (broadband) – can increase homeworking and therefore travel / location of development.

Group 7
- Bus routes poor.
- Job locations change rapidly.
- Should Hertsmere take more homes to balance jobs?
- Big issue is the Green Belt – Watford has no land.
- PD conversions from office to residential has caused confusion and doesn’t always deliver high quality hoes of the right type / size.

Q4. What are the obstacles to delivering future housing growth and how can councils help overcome these?

Group 1
- More available land would reduce the competition and overpaying of land.
- Planning: time it takes to get planning (the planning process on a whole).
• Viability issues lead to (arguments for) loss of units on developments.
• Unsuitable land. Flooding seems to be the issue in this area.

**Group 2**
• Monetary constraints.
• Delays to the plan making process (e.g. changes to national legislation)
• Policy changes.
• Political will.
• Potential reaction from members of the public.
• Perceived impact of developments.
• Developers potentially land banking.
• Access issues.
• Green Belt constraints.

**Group 3**
*What are these obstacles?*
• Planning committees (politics), political leadership.
• Appeal process – takes ages/cost
• Resource of officers at LA’s
• Highway department – under resourced
• Pre – apps are helpful.

*What can be done in the short-term to boost housing delivery?*
• Release Green Belt
• Grant appeals
• Many Local Authorities in the South East are under-delivering due to political reasons.
• Identify more land – brownfield is highly competitive and has already been looked at numerous times.

**Group 4**
• Green Belt – need for review and objective assessment, i.e. not a landscape designation.
• Timescales for plan making.
• Need for co-ordinated response for delivery and one voice for greater funding to meet need.
• Elected Members – (not planning issues) impact on plan making
• Provision of infrastructure
• LEP – the Herts LEP’s main focus is on the eastern side of Hertfordshire and is not meeting the needs for economic growth in SW Herts.
• Impact from expanded Heathrow.

**Group 5**
• There is a disparity between local planning authorities and how they interpret and approach the need for growth.
• Green Belt is one of the biggest constraints – release of land inevitably needed to meet needs and there are two approaches to the level of releases: (a) large allocations to meet the bulk of needs, where infrastructure can also be delivered; or (b) smaller sites with lesser impact on the Green belt and settlement boundaries. This would be a policy decision by the respective LPAs.
• Work together (SHMA areas)
• Transparency for policies
• Viability
• Links from towns and stations
• High-rise where appropriate.
• Smaller rural sites would also be needed to meet more local needs.

**Group 6**
The principal constraints are political, public opposition to development and planning policy (Green Belt).
Land must be made available. There was not considered to be an inherent problem in the market delivering. However, there needs to be several sites in progress: larger sites (200+ homes) are built in phases.
Labour constraints were note considered to be a significant issue.

Group 7
Where Local Authorities are landowners they should work better with private developers – work done with landowners for Dacorum Green Belt sites considered a good example that should be replicated
Planning performance agreements good idea and need to include delivery timescales
Different requirements where schemes cross boundaries – can be problematic. Need better liaison.
More Green Belt needs to be released to meet needs
Local Authorities need to do proper Green Belt reviews to release sites
Competition for sites with other users
Resources in Local Authorities needs to be addressed - staffing issue especially in policy teams
More constructive feedback at early stage from Local Authorities i.e. better pre-app advice is needed to allow developers to make investments decisions.

WORKSHOP SESSION 2 - ECONOMY STUDY

Q1. Do you agree with the scale of jobs growth in the preferred scenario?

Group 1
In/out EU, has this been investigated? Difficult to measure could be a significant impact on the South East.
40% increase in office is a big number.
Have interest rates been considered and has impact of the living wage been looked at?
Maylands/skills in Hemel Hempstead.

Group 2
Question the demand for extra B1 office space in St Albans. Town centre office location is more important, due to workers’ access to the town centre and quick rail links to London.
The demand is for lower spec provision.
In St Albans, the Crown Court has a large effect in terms of using the office space in the City. St Albans also has the highest level of home workers in the area.
What are the constraints going to be on economic development sites when compared to housing?
The growth in working age population attracts more work in south west Herts.
Problem is generating a sound assumption, as 10% growth is being applied, but this will be reviewed to see if it is still justified.

Group 3
Looks reasonable. No particular views.
EEFM projection was unusual for Dacorum – requires some adjustment.
Looks basically right – the differences in projections 0.8 or 0.9% aren't wildly different.

Group 4
0.8% seems to be within range of growth rates historically
0.8% would keep the current out-migration pattern.
Why has employment led scenarios been chosen when high growth scenarios may be more realistic?
SW Herts is losing employment land to housing.
General consensus is that it is about right.
• Implications on economic growth with a lower OAN if that was chosen?
  If Council wants to meet the job growth, there is a need to identify the appropriate sites.

**Group 5**
• 0.8% - very broad, when there is such a wide range of sectoral growth.
  Note that further work will drill down on this and look at land availability (2nd stage study)

**Group 6**
• Makes sense when comparing to past trends.
• Market for the space is there
• Dacorum adjustment – level was low before adjustment
• Reasonable to assume Dacorum would grow alongside the other SW Herts districts.

**Group 7**
• 0.8% figure - How robust is this for Inspectors? Have you planned for enough? Have you taken into account new infrastructure sufficiently?
• SW Herts has not been delivering numbers of jobs, but is this due to the image of area in Watford District? Dacorum also has office market but not so large as Watford’s.
• Borehamwood ok for offices – but some growth jumping over Herts to Northampton etc – especially B8 uses.

**Q2. What do you expect to be the most buoyant economic sectors in the coming years?**

**Group 1**
• ‘Golden triangle’ and Hertfordshire is in the centre of the triangle.
• Maylands mixed use including residential (Heart of Maylands)
• Southwest Hertfordshire, film, pharmaceuticals, distribution, office, creative industries.
• Consumer led growth.
• Self employment is a real job creator, silicon circle. M25 fringe.
• Location for smaller creative industries.

**Group 2**
• Professional services will be a key driver in economic sectors in this area (head offices, IT firms etc).
• Example of this is the firm ‘Imagine’ which built three new high spec offices in Dacorum, due to the proximity of schools, access and transport.

**Group 3**
• E-commerce – outskirts of London locations (ie SW Herts) for having logistics for demand of delivery to London (e-commerce). Has that role to some extent already (distribution sectors).
• Probably get greater online shopping.
• Lots of growth potential
• Health and education
• Support services

**Group 4**
• Most likely area for growth is high level logistics (b8) where to locate at M1/M25/London. For example East of Hemel.
• Is level of office growth forecast by Regeneris realistic and achievable?
• Is B8 growth likely to be more than identified?
• Rail freight terminal and knock on effect of that site.
• Office development needed along A414 corridor due to issues of losses at town centres.
• There is potential for high level manufacturing, particularly east of Hemel.

**Group 5**
• Smaller scale office (i.e. >5,000m² offices) is one of the main drivers of demand for employment space. Demand has arisen from office to residential permitted development rights losses.
• 3,000 - 10,000m² units B8/B2 units needed
• Creative and digital industries likely to be drivers of future growth in SW Herts (i.e. at Elstree and Leavesden), as well as hi tech engineering
• Mega-shed demand is prevalent in Maylands and this could be affected by the Strategic Rail Freight Depot at Radlett if developed.

Group 6
• Growth might not happen because of the land restrictions. So trends may change. Must assume there will not be political constraints.
• More land for employment. Can easily go back to greenbelt if not taken up within plan review period (safeguarding) – long term projection.

Group 7
(No views expressed)

Q3. Are the assumptions used to derive floorspace and land requirements reasonable?

Group 1
• Working from home assumption, difficult to quantify as companies expand they take on more people and the need for smaller office space.
• Technology, requires high speed internet.
• No real opinion on whether 10% safety margin is sufficient.

Group 2
• Assumptions used agreed to be reasonable.
• St Albans DC do not think available sites are to do with the overall trend. Many sites are on long established locations within the district.
• St Albans consider their needs for employment areas are quite different to the numbers quoted.
• Shared office/residential space is not going to happen due to the value of the land. No longer cost effective.

Group 3
• Office floorspace density lower due to more modern work practises such as hot desking.
• General consensus that figures are reasonable but may be localised differences e.g. Watford Town Centre.
• When discussing whether the allowance for homeworking was enough, it was noted that office occupiers tend to look at having more break out areas, so still need space. Will reach saturation at some point. 20% seem high – although no experience to qualify this.
• Trend in offices to require gyms/restaurants not just per worker sq.m
• B1 (b) seems to have less space (usually lower than B1 (a)). No guidance just precedent from Cambridge experience. Would question the B1(b) size, depends what this is based on.
• Pharma forecast to decline. Feedback from consultation with agents that this is not the case and won’t decline.
• If office to residential is made permanent can be a good way to protect against the Green Belt release which is the only real choice. Not convinced that the overall figure should be spread. Agree it should be built in. Good practise to include, might be beneficial to look at strategic sites – site specific at a later date.

Group 4
(No views expressed)

Group 5
• Quite different across whole study area (town centres/business parks)
- Influence of home working/hot desking - there are long-term trends for increased desk sharing and therefore less floorspace per FTE required (currently 12m² per FTE).
- However, other industries anticipating growth with a view to providing office space for employees. For example, some businesses are planning ahead and acquiring large spaces with the expectation of providing desks for staff.
- Uncertain about effect.

**Group 6**
- Is the home-working growth likely to continue? – Self employed rather than home-working for corporations.
- Working from home as a necessity (small business) but over time may move into their own office.
- Hot desking – home workers still need spaces -½ days per week.
- Cyclical - homeworking may become more favourable for some companies. There will still be a demand.
- Sensible 10% safety margin. Reasonable to have flexibility.

**Group 7**
(No views expressed)

**Q4. Do you think the conclusion on the broad distribution and type of employment demand are valid across South West Herts?**

**Group 1**
(No views expressed)

**Group 2**
(No views expressed)

**Group 3**
- Borehamwood has always been lower than other areas for employment.
- Surprised there is a lower spread of warehousing. Especially Dacorum doesn’t have higher figures for distribution/warehousing.
- Would need to look in more detail at any potential reuse of manufacturing land that is using distribution uses.

**Group 4**
- No reason to question the distribution on data given today.
- Interesting to compare how proposed distribution compares with previous delivery since 1980’s and years in between.
- Squeeze in town centre offices, may have resulted in greater demand for new B1 floorspace.

**Group 5**
- Different demands for types of office floorspace across different areas – not consistent across SW Herts
- Need to plan across whole area and agree which areas are best for which type of development
- Include trends for online shopping
- Town centres good for offices.

**Group 6**
- Major growth and major land requirement in office space – seems logical combination of both past trends and current demand. Elected Members will want warehousing figure to be as low as possible because it isn’t a desirable use.

**Group 7**
(No views expressed)
Q5. What are the main challenges supporting future employment growth in the South West Herts?

**Group 1**
- Constraints – difficulties of getting high speed broadband.
- Highway / Transport links.
- Supply of high quality office accommodation in the right locations.
- Maylands not considered to be ‘high end.’

**Group 2**
- Being able to safeguard existing/proposed employment sites.
- Push for development of sites through the SHMA.
- Attracting new employers to the area.
- Marketing of sites
- Unlocking costs
- New regeneration package to redevelop areas.

**Group 3**
- Loss of office space to residential
- Spatial plan – opportunities in certain employment areas that won’t appeal as sites due to logistics etc, then residential gets delivered and employment goes elsewhere. Makes sense but not always sustainable.

**Group 4**
*(No views expressed)*

**Group 5**
- Rate of residential delivery – responsive to the market.
- Green Belt land inevitably required and dependent upon the rate and extent of releases made.
- Land pressures and adequacy of existing brownfield sites.
- Permitted development (PD)
- Need to also deliver nearby amenities and leisure facilities (shops/gym) e.g. in town centres and within appropriate distances from new settlement extensions.
- Attractive locations

**Group 6**
- Any underprovision or over provision – B1(a) primary business use.
- Shared occupancy rates preferred sometimes where people do not want to be in tied into certain length leases.
- Possible obstacles – transport links

**Group 7**
*(No views expressed)*

Q6. What are your future needs (and client needs) likely to be in terms of sites and premises?

**Group 1**
*(No views expressed)*

**Group 2**
- Boxmoor Trust consider that all interested parties should work together more to provide what is really needed in terms of sites and premises.
• Councils must be aware of what they want in terms of sites.
• Clarity in planning policies.
• Sites should be identified by developers. This will provide more certainty in terms of the deliverability, rather than simply allocating sites.

**Group 3**
- Dacorum – industrial stock – lack of industrial units/sizes
- Lead in time
- No land location
- Pension pots who want to find a site
- Strategic sites near transport links that are allocated.
- Speculative space and flexible terms (whether Local Authority can actually do anything about that).
- Air conditioning – not all buildings need/want that but rents go down due to this.
- LDO’s Peterborough RAF Alconbury – SPZ’s and LDO’s – business rates ploughed back in - LEP has a big role to play.

**Group 4**
- Green Belt and need for objective assessment.
- Plan making timescale
- Infrastructure
- Are employment sites might to meet need better for alternative uses.
- Great need is to get sites released for mixed employment areas.
- Hemel is not the correct location for a new science park – delivery is key to meet demand e.g. Office and B8 in Hemel.
- Herts needs a portfolio of sites to meet the need.
- Need to be flexible when planning to meet the need as to when the economy demands sites.
- Re-designate railway land for employment development, when available and suitable.

Other issues –
- Not much is said about SMEs and their needs.
- Providing new small scale units to meet local needs e.g. car repairs.

**Group 5**
- Town centre offices with access to services.
- Small to medium light industrial units (5-10,000m²)
- Provision of alternatives (e.g. rural outbuildings)

**Group 6**
*(No views expressed)*

**Group 7**
*(No views expressed)*
APPENDIX 8: Responses from non-attendees

Responses from non-attendees

Dear Laura

Thank you for the workshop invitation and apologies for the slow response. Unfortunately we will not be able to attend the workshop, but hope that the historic environment will be taken into consideration when considering overall housing numbers and employment targets. The appropriate distribution of housing and employment land across this part of Hertfordshire will be a key challenge and should avoid harming the historic environment and specific heritage assets.

For assistance, I’ve attached a copy of our draft site allocations advice note, which sets out an approach to considering sites and their impact on the historic environment. This complements our published good practice advice note on local plans (also attached).

We would be interested in seeing the outputs of the workshop and look forward to advising further in due course.

Kind regards

Tom

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge | Principal Historic Environment Planning Adviser
Direct Line: 01223 582775
Mobile: 07826 532954
Email: tom.gilbert-wooldridge@historicengland.org.uk

Historic England | East of England Office
24 Brooklands Avenue | Cambridge | CB2 8BU
Dear Laura,

I am sorry that we did not respond to you earlier and in time for the meeting. We have contributed at earlier stages (during autumn 2014), and I would just like to re-iterate that the Mayor would welcome the consideration of longer-term (10 years) historic migration trends within the emerging SHMA.

Please keep me informed of progress with the further development of these two studies.

Many thanks

Jorn

Jörn Peters  
Senior Strategic Planner – Spatial Strategy  
Development, Enterprise & Environment  
GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY  
City Hall, The Queens Walk, London  SE1 2AA

T:  +44 (0)20 7983 4432  
E:  jorn.peters@london.gov.uk