

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: 6/2022/0374/COND  
HCC ref: WH/11165/2022  
HCC received: 24 February 2022  
Area manager: Matthew Armstrong  
Case officer: Steven Knight

**Location**

CAMPUS WEST THE CAMPUS WELWYN GARDEN CITY AL8 6BX

**Application type**

Approval of Details

**Proposal**

Submission of details pursuant to condition 1 (Construction Traffic Management Plan), 2 (full site survey), 3 (detailed surface water drainage scheme), 4 (landscape and biodiversity plan), 5 (arboricultural method statement), 6 (updated remediation scheme), 7 (noisy works and ancillary operations) on planning application 6/2021/2207/MAJ

**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:

The information provided in the Construction Traffic Management Plan is insufficient and does not meet the requirements stated in the condition as well as the highway authority's previous response. Specifically in relation to the following:

- Issues raised by the vehicle swept path analysis for HGVs
- The requirement for HGVs to reverse into the site phases 7 and 8
- Results of the consultation with local business and the proposed delivery times
- Details of the letter drops to neighbours
- Before and after condition survey of the highway
- Details of wheel washing and highway cleansing
- Details of on-site parking requirement and proposals to encourage the use of car sharing and public transport
- Plans for Campus East Car Park
- Arrangements for the layby/drop off area for the leisure complex

COMMENTS:

The application seeks approval for the discharge of conditions 1 (Construction Traffic Management Plan), 2 (full site survey), 3 (detailed surface water drainage scheme), 4 (landscape and biodiversity plan), 5 (arboricultural method statement), 6 (updated remediation scheme) and 7 (noisy works and ancillary operations) relating to planning application 6/2021/2207/MAJ.

### **HGV access**

Vehicle swept path analysis has been provided for large vans, fire tender, mobile cranes and 20.5m HGVs. The plan proposes the temporary removal of the central island to allow access for HGVs. However, the island provides a useful refuge for pedestrians crossing the access road so thought should be given to how pedestrian safety can be maintained. Warning signs would be required at a minimum. The suggestion that this could be included within the S278 agreement should be carefully considered as it would require the S278 works to be approved and undertaken before works commence.

The swept path diagrams also show that HGVs will overrun the grass verge on both sides of the access road, although it is difficult to confirm the extent of this from the screenshots provided. There are large trees on both sides that are very close to the kerb line, but these don't appear to be shown of the swept path diagrams. It also seems likely that the canopies of these trees may be lower than the height of a lorry.

The plan divides the construction into eight phases and shows the on-site turning movements for each phase. It is particularly concerning that phases 7 and 8 (and possibly 6) will require lorries to reverse into the site from the highway. This should be reconsidered, but, if deemed absolutely necessary, a detailed traffic management plan would be required to be agreed with HCC's Network Management Team as part of this plan. The current reliance on banksmen only is not acceptable.

### **Delivery times and consultation**

Whilst the plan confirms the proposed working hours, which are acceptable, the highway authority previously requested more information about the delivery times. These have not yet been provided as the proposed consultation with local businesses has not yet been completed.

### **Letter drop**

The plan states that there will be a letter drop to the neighbours. This should also be sent to HCC's Network Management Team no less than three weeks before works commence. Given the duration of the scheme, several interim letters would also be good practice, perhaps every 8-10 week or so.

### **Before and after site survey**

A survey should be undertaken of the immediate approach roads and site junctions to record their existing condition with photographic evidence provided to HCC's Network Management Team no less than three weeks before works commence. A similar survey should be undertaken upon completion.

### **Wheel washing and cleansing of the highway**

Although the plan explains that a jet washing facility will be provided away from the highway, this is not shown on the drawings. It is noted that this site unlikely to generate a large amount of mess and that a sweeper will be employed when necessary. However, it is not stated who will monitor the cleanliness of the surrounding roads.

### **On-site parking**

The plan states that the use of car sharing and public transport will be encouraged but no information is provided about how this will be done. Will it be subsidised for example?

Likewise, there is no detail about how the site manager will ensure there is no inappropriate on-street parking. It is noted that the proposed compound layout has been changed from the previous plan and that this now provides 25 on-site parking spaces. It is not clear how many people will be working on site at any time and therefore whether how severe the shortage of parking will be.

### **Phasing**

The plan explains how the work will be phased. However, the highway authority previously requested information about the when the parking spaces available at the Campus East site will be reduced and this has not been provided.

The plan does not confirm whether the drop-off area for the leisure complex will remain operational during the works.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons stated above, the highway authority recommends that condition 1 should not be discharged at this point.

The highway authority does not wish to restrict the discharge of conditions 2-7.

### **Signed**

Steven Knight

16 March 2022