

Examination of the St Albans City and District Local Plan - Stage 1 Hearing Sessions

Hearing Statement – Matter 3

Prepared on behalf of Redington Capital Ltd and CALA Homes



Revision Schedule

Revision	Description	Author	Date	Quality Check	Date	Independent Review	Date
0	Final	JK	10/04/25	JK	10/04/25	FP	10/04/05

Disclaimer

The conclusions in the Report titled ... are Stantec's professional opinion, as of the time of the Report, and concerning the scope described in the Report. The opinions in the document are based on conditions and information existing at the time the scope of work was conducted and do not take into account any subsequent changes. The Report relates solely to the specific project for which Stantec was retained and the stated purpose for which the Report was prepared. The Report is not to be used or relied on for any variation or extension of the project, or for any other project or purpose, and any unauthorized use or reliance is at the recipient's own risk.

Stantec has assumed all information received from (the "Client") and third parties in the preparation of the Report to be correct. While Stantec has exercised a customary level of judgment or due diligence in the use of such information, Stantec assumes no responsibility for the consequences of any error or omission contained therein.

This Report is intended solely for use by the Client in accordance with Stantec's contract with the Client. While the Report may be provided by the Client to applicable authorities having jurisdiction and to other third parties in connection with the project, Stantec disclaims any legal duty based upon warranty, reliance or any other theory to any third party, and will not be liable to such third party for any damages or losses of any kind that may result.

Matter 3 – The Green Belt

Redington Capital Limited and CALA Homes (RCLCH) set out below their responses to the questions raised by the Inspectors. The responses are set out in the order they appear in the Inspectors' MIQs. The Inspectors should assume that no comment is made by RCLCH in respect of the questions that have are not included below.

3.1 Issue 1 – Principle of Green Belt Release

Question 1:

Paragraph 146 of the Framework states that, before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to the Green Belt, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting housing need. This includes making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, optimising the density of development and liaising with neighbouring authorities to determine whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development.

Has the Council examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting housing needs as required by the Framework?

Response:

RCLCH agree with the Council that there are insufficient brownfield sites to meet the Council's housing needs in full. It would also appear that no other local planning authority is able to assist the Council in meeting its needs in their areas. The Council therefore has no other choice but to undertake a green belt review and consider if exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to the green belt boundary to meet its needs.

Question 2:

Paragraph 147 of the Framework then states that when reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account. Where it has been concluded that Green Belt alterations are necessary, "...plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously developed and/or is well served by public transport."

In response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions, the Council refers to the application of buffers around settlements to help determine which sites to allocate. Is this approach justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

Response:

In RCLHC's opinion, there are available and deliverable sites beyond the buffer zones (partially or fully) which are sustainable and accessible locations. They should not automatically be rejected because they are beyond the buffer zones (partially or fully). The Council should be identifying development land on the edge of existing settlements if they benefit from access to a range of services and facilities locally and benefits from access to other services located within a Tier 1 and/or 2 settlement.

One such site¹ is being promoted by RCLCH at land south of Chiswell Green Lane in Chiswell Green which now benefits from an extant planning permission². This permission demonstrates that even though the site was partially located outside the buffer around Chiswell Green, it was still supported by officers at the Council, recommended by a Planning Inspector and allowed by the Secretary of State.

The Inspectors could identify potential sites outside these buffer zones on the edge of existing settlements that have access to a range of services and facilities locally and benefits from access to other services located within a Tier 1 and/or 2 settlement. The Council and Inspectors have an opportunity to bring forward these sites by:

- Discussing the merits of these sites at the 2nd set of Hearing Sessions. They could come forward as an Inspectors' recommended main modification; and /or
- The Inspectors requiring the Council to immediately review its housing and employment delivery sites position and identifies additional sites to meet the new housing target set out in the latest Standard Methodology and as required by paragraph 236 of the NPPF (December 2024).

Question 4:

In deciding to review the Green Belt boundary, how did the Council consider the provision of safeguarded land? Is the Plan consistent with paragraph 148 c) of the Framework, which sets out that, where necessary, areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt should be identified to meet longer-term development needs?

Response:

In RCLCH's opinion, the Draft Local Plan does not currently safeguard land between the urban area and the Green Belt.

The Inspectors could identify potential 'safeguarded' development land on the edge of existing settlements if they have access to a range of services and facilities locally and benefits from access to other services located within a Tier 1 and/or 2 settlement. This could be secured by way of the Inspectors' recommended modifications (to move the green belt boundary) following the 2nd set of Hearing Sessions.

One such site is being promoted by RCLCH at land south of Chiswell Green Lane which benefits from an extant planning permission³. Representations were submitted to the Council on 7th November and can be found under representation reference number 224 on pages 1174 to 1238 of the 'St Albans Draft Local Plan 2041 Regulation 19 Publication by Submission Report' (LPCD 20.03).

¹ Representation reference number 224 on pages 1174 to 1238 of the 'St Albans Draft Local Plan 2041 Regulation 19 Publication by Submission Report' (LPCD 20.03).

² For 391 homes (including 40% affordable), open space provision and land for a 2FE school with planning permission (ref: APP/B1930/W/22/3313110)

³ For 391 homes (including 40% affordable), open space provision and land for a 2FE school with planning permission (ref: APP/B1930/W/22/3313110)

3.2 Issue 2 – Green Belt Review

The approach in the Plan has been informed by the Stage 2 Green Belt Review 2023 (GB 02.02). That followed an earlier Green Belt Review Sites and Boundaries Study in 2013 and 2014 (GB 04.03 and GB 04.04). In response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions, the Council provided a consolidated list of all Green Belt changes proposed in the submitted Plan.

Question 5:

Where the evidence recommended that areas were not taken forward for further consideration, how did the Council consider this in the plan-making process?

Response:

This is for the Council to answer. However, RCLCH note that a large number of the site allocations chosen by the Council were 'not recommended' within the Stage 2 Green Belt Review 2023 (GB 02.02) for release from the Green Belt but have been included in the Draft Local Plan. For example, the following sites were considered to strongly meet the purposes of the Green Belt: Site H1 (North Hemel); Site H2 (East Hemel (north)); H4 (East Hemel (south)); B1 (North St Albans); B3 (West Redbourn); and B6 (West of London Colney). However, in RCLCH's opinion, these sites:

- Are not located within the most accessible locations; and
- Have been chosen by the Council at the expense of other more accessible sites in lower tier settlements, and which (in some cases) have less harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. For example, the site being promoted by RCLCH at land south of Chiswell Green Lane was not recommended within the Stage 2 Green Belt Review 2023 (GB 02.02) for release from the Green Belt (and not subsequently included in the Local Plan) even though it only 'moderately' meets the purposes of the Green Belt – see page 67 and 68 of the Stage 2 Green Belt Review 2023 (GB 02.02).

Representations were submitted by RCLCH to the Council on 7th November to ask for the Council's re-consideration. The relevant submission can be found under representation reference number 224 on pages 1174 to 1238 of the 'St Albans Draft Local Plan 2041 Regulation 19 Publication by Submission Report' (LPCD 20.03). RCLCH are expecting to debate the merits of this site at the 2nd set of Hearing Sessions.

The Council and Inspectors have an opportunity to bring forward these 'not recommended' sites by:

- Discussing the merits of these sites at the 2nd set of Hearing Sessions. They could come forward as an Inspectors' recommended main modification; and /or
- The Inspectors requiring the Council to immediately review its housing and employment delivery sites position and identifies additional sites to meet the new housing target set out in the latest Standard Methodology and as required by paragraph 236 of the NPPF (December 2024).

3.3 Issue 3 – Exceptional Circumstances

Question 1:

Do exceptional circumstances exist to alter the Green Belt boundary in St Albans and has this been fully evidenced and justified as part of the plan-making process?

Response:

In RCLHC's opinion, yes, it has been fully evidenced and justified as part of the plan-making process.

RCLCH agree with Section 7 of the Green Belt and Exceptional Circumstances – Evidence Paper (*GB 01.01*) which sets out the factors that support exceptional circumstances in this case, including the Council's lack for non-Green Belt land and historic chronic failure to deliver homes to meet its needs which cannot be address without adjusting the Green Belt boundary.

Notwithstanding the above, RCLCH consider that the Council could deliver more homes than the minimum required. Therefore, should the Inspectors decide it is necessary to increase supply to address the chronic shortfall in housing in the first five years of the plan, the case for exceptional circumstances would still be relevant to support further amendments to the Green Belt boundary for housing and / or employment floorspace related development.

End

With every community, we redefine what's possible.



Stantec is a global leader in sustainable engineering, architecture, and environmental consulting. The diverse perspectives of our partners and interested parties drive us to think beyond what's previously been done on critical issues like climate change, digital transformation, and future-proofing our cities and infrastructure. We innovate at the intersection of community, creativity, and client relationships to advance communities everywhere, so that together we can redefine what's possible.

Stantec UK Limited
7 Soho Square
London
W1D 3QB
UNITED KINGDOM
stantec.com