

Mark Youngman
Development Management Group Manager
Hertfordshire County Council
Postal Point CHO242
County Hall
Pegs Lane
Hertford
SG13 8DE

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

Director of Planning

Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council
The Campus
Welwyn Garden City
Hertfordshire
AL8 6AW

District ref: 6/2020/1463/FULL
HCC ref: WH/2479/2020
HCC received: 12 August 2020
Area manager: Matthew Armstrong
Case officer: Paul Marshall

Location

1 MAYNARD PLACE CUFFLEY POTTERS BAR EN6 4JA

Application type

Full Application

Proposal

AMENDED PROPOSAL

Erection of a one storey roof extension to create no 6 flats including 3 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed flats, associated parking and cycle and refuse provision.

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:

COMMENTS

The proposals are for the erection of a one storey roof extension to create no 6 flats including 3 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed flats, associated parking and cycle and refuse provision. Station Road is a classified (B156) and provides a secondary distributor function in the road hierarchy. The vehicle speeds past this site are limited to 30mph. There have been seven recorded accidents in a rolling 5-year period.

The site is located off Station Road by an un-adopted private road serving residential dwellings. The Highway Authority are limited in the extent to which it is able to comment, noting that the access road is a privately maintained road, and therefore beyond the authority of the Highway Authority who are responsible for all roads / footways / verges etc. that are considered maintainable at public expense (the public highway).

PLANNING HISTORY

The application site has previous planning history for an advertising board 6/2019/2022/ADV

DRAWINGS

The Highway Authority note the submission of materials in support of the planning application, including drawing numbers 1254.01 - Design & Access Statement 1254.01.001 - 300

PARKING

The Highway Authority has commented on a previous application which resulted in a refusal. I make comment on the email from the applicant's transport consultant Vasco Sa Fernandes.

In respect of the parking the applicant transport consultant states the following:

An improved number of spaces per unit when compared to the existing level (less than 0.79 cars/vans per flat available on average for the existing site and 0.85 for the overall existing and proposed development combined) which exceeds the local Census data and is within the maximum parking standards. This is accepted by the Highway Authority

The 10 garages that are associated with the apartments are to be improved where required and used for residential car parking; a formalised single visitor bay and a double space for deliveries are also to be provided; Secure and sheltered cycle parking is to be provided that is sufficient to store bicycles for all 20 residential flats; this is also accepted.

The applicant states: 'The implementation of the gates and formalisation of the private car park would prevent informal parking and therefore reduce the likelihood of conflict and the requirement for vehicles to reverse into the public highway.' This is accepted however, no detail design of the gates has been provided with no boundary information demonstrating if the gates are on highway land or the private access land, this must be provided.

Drawing 2000460-001 Rev B outlines swept path for parking. In my previous comments Drawing 1254.01.001 demonstrated an unsatisfactory form of car park layout. The accessibility demonstrated by the swept path analysis is substandard with up to 4 manoeuvres required for some of the parking bays and garages, having said I accept the larger vehicle (4.572m) used for the analysis, also that it is not a point to refuse on.

The transport consultant states: 'The proposals are to utilise the existing spaces and garages rather than provide a new reconfigured car park'. As the development is fundamentally changing the site, I do not accept that the existing substandard parking is acceptable. In my previous comments I stated parking bays 1 to 4 do not comply with Manual for Streets 8.3.48 which states 'For parking parallel to the street, each vehicle will typically need an area of about 2m wide and 6m long', this is still an issue, most especially with parking bay 1 with the introduction of gates.

In considering the above, including:

- a) sub-standard parking (bays 1-4),*
- b) no boundary information,*
- c) no detailed design of the proposed gates,*

the Highway Authority are unable to recommend the granting of permission for this application. However, as I have said previously the Highway Authority are limited in the extent to which it is able to comment, noting that the access road is a privately maintained road. With this in mind, should the local authority be minded to approve this application, the Highway Authority shall require additional conditions to any grant of consent, and shall be pleased to provide additional comments in such an instance.

Signed
Paul Marshall

1 September 2020