



Mark Youngman
Development Management Group Manager
Hertfordshire County Council
Postal Point CH0242
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: 6/2022/1943/FULL
HCC ref: WH/13629/2022
HCC received: 9 March 2023
Area manager: Matthew Armstrong
Case officer: Senober Khan

Location

LAND BETWEEN 48 & 50 THE RIDGEWAY CUFFLEY EN6 4BA

Application type

Full Application

Proposal

AMENDED PROPOSAL
Erection of a new dwelling with associated landscaping works

Recommendation

Notice is given under article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

Reasons for refusal:

The proposal with a gate in the location proposed would give rise to conditions contrary with and prejudicial to the safety of all road users.

Brief Description of Proposed Development by the applicant:

Response to comment letter of 6 September 2022 by Hertfordshire CC concerning highway matters.

The consultation response letter raised two objections by the highway authority, both of which are addressed with the submission of a detailed plan attached to this statement.

The first issue raised was clarity over the design of the vehicle access and how it will cross the ditch. In designing the scheme the architect had considered that the existing access would have to be widened to 3.1metres to allow Fire Brigade access, that has now been revisited and it is evident that no widening of the access will actually be required for that purpose. The drawing now submitted shows the existing access drive, which passes over a concrete culvert, retained at 2.5metres as it is

currently. That access has been proved adequate for HGV access to the site for management purposes.

The second issue was a request that 2.4m by 66m stopping sight distance visibility splays be demonstrated and these have been checked and are shown on the attached plan. The frontage hedge of the site is about 5m from the carriageway edge and there will be no difficulty maintaining vision across the site frontage; beyond the site boundary any overhanging vegetation cannot be controlled by the applicant but can be controlled by the highway authority requiring that it is cut back.

Highway comments:

The HA comments dated 6 September 2022 recommended refusal in the absence of adequate information regarding the proposed access, on the following points:

The Site Plan needs to demonstrate that adequate visibility splays if 2.4m x 66m can be achieved.

The design of the vehicle crossing needs to be clarified. It is currently a dropped kerb but is shown on the plan as a bell-mouth. Thirdly, there is no information about whether the ditch is currently culverted at this point and what works will need to be undertaken to ensure the ditch remains free from obstruction.

The following comment whilst not a reason for objection nevertheless states that “The application does not appear to mention any proposed gates across the access. This will allow smaller or medium sized service vehicles to enter the site rather than parking on the highway.”

In response the applicant has submitted:

A plan which demonstrates that adequate visibility splays measuring 2.4m x 66m can be achieved.

Whilst the applicant has answered the HA’s question concerning the ditch/culvert however no clarification has been provided regarding is the vehicle access a dropped kerb or a bellmouth, the HA would recommend that the vehicle access be a dropped kerb.

Whilst the above addresses the reasons for refusal given by the HA, however in the plan submitted for the visibility splays a gate is now shown, the HA will not support a gate because given the distance of the proposed gate from the back of the highway, vehicles waiting for permission to be granted to access the site or for the gates to open would obstruct vehicle traffic along the B157 (The Ridgeway), and if denied would have to reverse out onto The Ridgeway from a driveway with a gradient.

It should also be noted that previously the HA had commented “The application does not appear to mention any proposed gates across the access.” and “The proposed driveway provides adequate turning space for cars ensuring that drivers can enter and leave the site in a forward gear as required on a classified road.”

Therefore, the HA would not support the siting of a gate at the proposed location without the provision of a turnaround facility.

RECOMMENDATION:

Until the above issue of the gate is satisfactorily addressed, I am not in a position to support the proposed the development.

Signed
Senober Khan

26 March 2023