

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: 3 July 2020
Area manager: Alan Story
Case officer: Paul Marshall

Location

1 MAYNARD PLACE CUFFLEY POTTERS BAR EN6 4JA

Application type

Full Application

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

Drawing 1254.01.001 demonstrates an unsatisfactory form of car park layout. My first issue is with the site visit in relation to parking. I assume from the Transport note the visit was undertaken in June of this year? Having visited the site on the 21st July and speaking to business owners the parking conditions are not typical during this Covid period. My impression is this area does not provide the required number of parking bays and parking is a very real problem for residents and business owners.

The second issue I have is that not all of the garages are owned by residents. Indeed, one of the garages is owned or rented by the Parish Council for the storage of Christmas lights. A number of the garages are used for local businesses for storage. This may not be an issue if the applicant has arranged to purchase the garages separately? However, if this is the case then there is a shortfall in the parking requirements.

The third issue I have is in respect of the swept path analysis as shown on drawing 2000460-001 Rev C. I would expect a maximum of 3 manoeuvres to access a garage / bay this is not the case with a number of the garages most likely 4,5,8,16, and 17. Furthermore, the medium size car used in tracking in my view is too small at 4.319m in length. I would expect to see at least 4.571 (Skoda Octavia) model.

Looking at parking bays 1 to 4 these 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'. Parking bays 5-7 do not have the required 6m manoeuvrability as the boundary line restricts this. Any possible future development up to the boundary line would leave a minimum of between 3 and 5m manoeuvrability.

A suggestion in sec 4.9 of the transport statement states, 'the restricted on-site car parking area, it is considered that staff at the commercial units and some visitors of the residential units could park within the local Maynard Place 'pay and display' car park within close proximity of the site' I believe at £10 for over 4 hours would not be the first choice. This in turn would not encourage residents and commercial staff from first attempting to park in the restricted parking area leading to congestion.

CYCLE PARKING

The TTN 4.21 states, 'the overall development requires a total of 9 cycle parking spaces. These shall be provided in the form of 5 Sheffield Cycle Stands to be sheltered and secure and to be confirmed as part of a condition, this is acceptable.

ACCESS

Drawing 1254.01.100 demonstrates proposed gates. I fail to see how these would work in respect of parking bay 1. No detail has been provided on the gates. Roads in Herts 4 sec 1.9 recommends gates should be set back 6m from the back edge of the carriageway. Although this is demonstrated on the drawing, due to the unsatisfactory form and layout it is evident that congestion would occur within the parking area with the possibility of vehicles in conflict with each other when vehicles trying to enter encounter vehicles trying to leave. There is then a possibility vehicles would reverse onto Station Road obstructing the free and safe flow of traffic. On another note, Station Road is a secondary distributor road and vehicles are required to exit in a forward gear.

ACCIDENTS

The access to the parking area from Station Road cannot be said to have direct relation to the seven accidents recorded within the area. However, it is evident that Station Road is vulnerable to accidents and I am not satisfied (in respect of congestion in the parking area with the possibility of vehicles reversing) that the proposals would have an overall negative effect.

BOUNDARY INFORMATION

No boundary information has been provided to demonstrate where the highway and private access are delineated. This is important in respect of the siting of the proposed gates.

TRIP GENERATION

The application uses TRICS in assessing the likely trip generation. HCC accept the basis upon which survey sets have been selected. The Transport Technical Note (TTN) presents that the proposed development would generate 3 vehicle trips in the AM peak and 3 PM peak vehicle trips. Such level of trips amounts to approximately 1 additional vehicle every 20-minutes across an hour in the AM and PM, which in itself would not present an unacceptable impact on local highway conditions.

VISIBILITY

The location and vehicular to vehicular visibility from the PROPOSED / EXISTING access is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with 'Manual for Streets (MfS)' and 'Roads in Hertfordshire: A Design Guide'

PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY / SUSTAINABILITY

It is evident that the site is within acceptable walking distance of local amenities, bus stops and the rail station therefore can be considered to be sustainable

EMERGENCY ACCESS

The nature of the site puts the proposals / access within 45 meters from the public highway (Maynard Place) (As required in accordance to MfS 6.7.2)

REFUSE / RECYCLING

The proposals for recycling bin storage are not in line with Manual for Streets. It appears the bins are the 4-wheel type Manual for Streets 6.8.11 advises the distance over which containers are transported by collectors should not normally exceed 10 m for four-wheeled containers. Furthermore, a swept path analysis should be provided to demonstrate a recycle vehicle can turn around and exit in a forward gear.

CONCLUSION

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. However, as the parking proposals are completely unsatisfactory and allow for confusion and congestion within the site the implication is, the proposals may have a direct affect on the free and safe movement of traffic on the surrounding highway network. On this basis the Highway Authority are unable to extend the grant of planning permission at this time.

Signed
Paul Marshall

30 July 2020