Response to Planning application from Hertfordshire County Council (T and CP GDP Order 2015)

District ref: 6/2017/2625/COND **HCC ref:** WH/285/2017 (Amended)

HCC received: 18/12/2017 Area manager: James Dale Case officer: Alan Story

Location

Plot 4100 Gypsy Moth Avenue Hatfield Business Park Hatfield AL10 9UH

Application type

Variation of Conditions

Proposal

Submission of details pursuant to conditions: 5 (details of new roads, accesses, cycleways and footpaths), 6 (Surface water drainage scheme), 7 (site investigation), 9 (Reptile Survey), 12 (details of floof lighting and external lighting) and 13 (details of open storage) on planning permission 6/2015/2043/OUTLINE dated 05/07/16

Amendment

There have been amendments in respect to the application submitted

Decision

Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

Details shown on drawing 3280/130 relocate the bus shelter to a point closer to the new access. The justification for this is unclear. There are no highway benefits to its' relocation and concern is voiced that it is too close to the proposed new access. There have been no discussions with the Highway Authority in regard to proposals to relocate the bus shelter. The distance moved is insufficient for it to have any benefit to accessibility to stops (walk time). The relocated position provides no benefit to vehicles on Mosquito Way if a bus is in position at the stop, still providing no opportunity for safe overtaking. No evidence is available that alternative locations for the bus stop (east of junction of Trident Place / Mosquito Way) have been considered. Concern is voiced over downstream congestion impacting on the adjacent roundabout junction which would not be an issue if the stop was located further to the east.

The Highway Authority consider that it is reasonable that the bus stop / shelter is proposed as relocated in order to maximise the visibility to passers by to vehicles on display (SE corner of plot 4100) with the new bus shelter location obscuring what appears visitor parking. Given the above concerns, the Highway Authority are not satisfied that the suggested bus stop location is appropriate.

The provision of Kassel kerbing for the shelter, and the requirement to provide dropped tactile kerbing to serve the pedestrian crossing (refuge) on Mosquito Way in advance of right hand turn lane, presents concerns over the gradient of transition between these opposing levels in such close proximity to each other.

The developer has taken on board earlier expressed concerns of the Highway Authority that the central refuge provided to the new access / egress onto Mosquito Way failed to provide for the segregated cycleway / footway. The central refuge has been extended and now ensures that the refuge aligns with the entire width of the cycleway / footway.

The Highway Authority remain concerned that the refuge is insufficient in width (at back edge) to accommodate cyclists safely. TA91/05 (DMRB) Provision for Non-Motorised Users Summary directs "6.19 ...The preferred crossing width for cyclist refuge islands is 3.0m to 4.0m (2.5m at constrained locations)."

Drawing 3280/130 Rev 5 features inconsistencies – whilst described as 1:500 at A1 – the scale bar does not conform to this. Introducing concerns for scaling.

Whilst corduroy tactile is provided at both ends of the segregated cycleway either side of the new access, and therefore the crossing is unsegregated shared space, this shall introduce a departure from the desire line and introduce greater risk of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists by encouraging them both to gravitate towards the wider area provided in the refuge. In the absence of a Stage 1 RSA demonstrating that the use of the refuge island for all road users the Highway Authority remain concerned with the proposals.

Reference to vehicle tracking, drawing ITB13336-GA-007 demonstrates that opportunities exist to increase the size of the refuge without affecting the general location of the access / egress.

For the above reasons I am unable to support the approval of details in this matter.

Alan Story

Date 19/01/2018

****Disclaimer**** The information in this message should be regarded as confidential and is intended for the addressee only unless explicitly stated. If you have received this message in error it must be deleted and the sender notified. The views expressed in this message are personal and not necessarily those of Hertfordshire County Council unless explicitly stated. Please be aware that emails sent to or received from Hertfordshire County Council may be intercepted and read by the council. Interception will only occur to ensure compliance with council policies or procedures or regulatory obligations, to prevent or deter crime, or for the purposes of essential maintenance or support of the email system.