

PLANN.
DEPT.
11 AUG 2011
RECEIVED

PLA



Sent: 10 August 2011 18:27
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application N6/2010/2055/MA - Former Shredded Wheat Factory

Response to Planning application from Hertfordshire County Council (T and CP GDP Order 1995)

District ref: N6/2010/2055/MA
HCC ref: WH/251/2010 (Amended)
HCC received: 10/08/2011
Area manager: James Dale
Case officer: Lindsey Lucas

Location
Former Shredded Wheat Factory
Land at Broadwater Road West
Welwyn Garden City

Application type
Full application

Proposal
Retail, Business, Hotel, Residential, Care Home, YMCA, Doctors Surgery, Pharmacy, Swimming Pool & Leisure Centre

Amendment
Final response on TA dated 10 June 2011

Decision
Notice is given under article 10 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

WH/251/2010 Site: Former Shredded Wheat Factory, Welwyn Garden City District Ref: N6/2010/2055/MA

Decision: Refusal

1. Traffic arising from the proposed development will be detrimental to highway safety, capacity and free flow of traffic and therefore fails to comply with PPG13 and Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan.
2. In respect of capacity analysis the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed mitigation measures can (i) adequately offset the potential increases in demand. (ii) feasibly and reasonably be delivered.
3. The applicant has failed to demonstrate satisfactory measures to promote sustainable travel and therefore fails to comply with PPG13 and Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan, in particular,
 - a) Measures to promote sustainable travel have not been agreed. b) The travel plans submitted as part of the application are not robust enough to promote alternative modes of travel.

Comments These comments are based on the TA revision B dated 10 June 2011 and drawings submitted following the issue of a Regulation 19 notice by WHBC. They also relate to pre-application discussions between HCC and the applicants transport Consultants Arup.

A designer's response to an interim safety audit has been received and is also covered in this response.

The assessment is based on the information available at the time of writing and although the Highway Authority considers that some issues may be able to be resolved through discussion there are fundamental issues that account for the Highway Authority recommending the current scheme is refused.

Policy The proposals would be contrary to the guidance in PPG13 which aims to give priority to people over ease of traffic movement and plans to provide more road space to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in town centres, local neighbourhoods and other areas with a mixture of land uses.

New development should help to create places that connect with each other sustainably, providing the right conditions to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport. People should come before traffic.

The proposals would be detrimental to HCC's Local Transport Plan 2011-2031 challenges to:

- Keep the county moving
- Improve accessibility for all
- Improve road safety

To meet these challenges the County Council will ensure the transport and safety implications of development proposals are considered.

Development will be resisted where the proposals would increase the risk of accidents or endanger the safety of road or rights of way users and the proposals would cause or add significantly to road congestion, especially at peak travel times.

Issues relating to the reasons for refusal

Capacity

- Trip Rates Trip rates for the proposed land uses were agreed between the applicant and HCC at the pre-application stage in March 2010. All trip rates are based on sites within town centres with good access to public transport.
- Trip generation Following agreement of the Trip rates a schedule of land use was provided by Arup to calculate trip generation which could be fed into the WGC Paramics model. These figures for trip generation and trip distribution were agreed on 17/03/2010. It was acknowledged that the land use schedule may change before the scheme was submitted for Planning. In view of this Arup recalculated the trip generation and revised trip generation figures were sent for use in the Paramics model on 23/03/2010. These figures were not sent to HCC at the time and there were errors in the figures contained in the original TA, however these have been amended and HCC consider that the trip generation figures used in both the Paramics modelling and the Transyt modelling are robust. The proposed land use submitted for this application will generate slightly fewer trips than used in the modelling work.
- Trip distribution It was agreed at the pre-application stage that the traffic from the site would be distributed 50% north and 50% south from the site.
- Growth rates. It was agreed at pre-application stage that all future year modelling would be based on low growth rates.
- Future year modelling Modelling was carried out for the year 2016, to tie in with the existing Paramics model and being more than 5 years after the date of registration of the application. (dft Guidance on

Transport Assessments 2007) Following meetings between the applicant and the highway authority it was agreed to carry out modelling for 2021 and to include for an SPD compliant development at the Pall Mall site to ensure that the transport impacts of the proposals had been fully explored.

- Modelling of junctions Discussions at pre-application (Arup paper Proposed Transport Assessment Methodology 29 July 2009) agreed that, following the modelling in Paramics, certain junctions would be looked at in more detail, particularly the Bridge Road/Broadwater Road signal junction and the new signalised junctions onto Broadwater. In the first meeting regarding scoping (28/9/2009) it was agreed that Broadwater Road/Chequers Roundabout and Broadwater Road/Osbourne way junctions would be analysed. Although these are considered within the Paramics model which indicates that congestion occurs at these junctions, no further detailed analysis has been carried out which will be required to demonstrate that the mitigation measures proposed would be effective.

- Paramics Modelling 2016 The Paramics modelling for 2016 demonstrates that the network will perform considerably worse in the pm peak when compared with the base model which allowed for an SPD compliant scheme for the site. The modelling includes for widening on the south bound approach to Chequers roundabout.

The main source of congestion in the PM peak proposed scenario is the westbound approach of Bridge Road at the Campus gyratory as the queues consistently block back to the John Lewis roundabout. The Paramics modelling report by MVA (Information Note 1 Version:2 dated 10 May 2010) suggested a number of mitigation measures, including signalisation of the Campus, removal of lengths of on-street parking on Parkway and widening of the northbound approach to the Chequers Roundabout. The results of the Paramics modelling were fed into the Transyt analysis for the signalised junctions on Broadwater Road.

The table below gives some comparisons between the SPD base scenario and Spenhill scenario in 2016. The figures for the base scenario are taken from MVA Information note 1 Version1 dated 15 April 2010 which allows for an SPD compliant scheme but the existing road layout. This is compared with the Spenhill scheme with the proposed changes to Broadwater Road.

2016 AM Peak SPD Base scenario	Spenhill scenario	Current application	Main congestion hotspots
Standborough Road N/B	Chequers N/B	Parkway S/B	Osborn Way S/B
Standborough Rd N/B	Chequers N/B	Parkway S/B	Osborn Way S/B
Bessemer road S/B	Bridge road W/B	Periodic queuing	Bridge Road/Broadwater Road
Broadwater Road	Broadwater Road/Bridge Road	Non released vehicles	

The volume of non-released traffic gives an indication of the vehicles that could not be released into the network due to congestion. If the value is high as in the Spenhill scenario it identifies a congested network that has no available space left for other vehicles to join.

- Transyt 2016 Transyt modelling has been carried out on the three proposed junctions of Bridge Road/Broadwater Road, Broadwater Road/ Hyde Way and the new joint site access with Taylor Wimpey for both 2016. Two scenarios were run for the AM and PM peak, the 'likely peak' scenario and the 'release of held back traffic' scenario.

The junctions operated more efficiently using a 120 second cycle time. However even taking the 'Likely Peak Scenario' levels of traffic there are vehicles movements in both the AM and PM peak which demonstrate the junction is operating above capacity particularly in the PM peak. In the 'held back traffic' scenario, the PM peak again shows the higher level of congestion. Even using a cycle time of 120 seconds queuing on Bridge Road would extend beyond the John Lewis roundabout.

Paragraph 4.51 of Guidance on Transport assessments states that the key issue is the need to ensure that development proposals strive to achieve nil-detriment to the strategic network for the opening year and appropriate horizon year. In this case it is necessary to compare the proposals with an SPD compliant

scenario as the highway authority have accepted that the redevelopment of this site will have some impact on the highway network.

In paragraph 8.5.7 the TA suggests that the 'Release of held back traffic' scenario would not occur as a proportion of the traffic would relocate onto the adjacent road network beyond the limits of the PARAMICS model. This is dependent on there being an alternative route for this traffic. Although some traffic from areas such as Shire Park make chose to use alternative routes, for other traffic originating within or with destinations within the Paramics model there is no obvious alternative north south route through Welwyn or east to west.

The TA also suggests that the trip generation used in the traffic modelling should be considered an overestimate. Although the figures used in the modelling are higher than those that would be used based on the land schedule of the application, the numbers in the 3 hour pm peak are higher by 198 vehicle inbound and 140 vehicles outbound and this is still less than if any vehicle generation was allowed for from the Pall Mall site.

Two scenarios have been introduced for the Pall Mall site, one it being used as warehousing with all traffic accessing the site via the Bridge Road left in and left out and one with an SPD mix of offices and residential with 90% of the traffic using the shared Spenhill Taylor Wimpey road. Trip rates used were the same as those used for the Spenhill site.

The TA also states that the number of car trips for the office element will be lower than predicted due to the restricted parking, public transport links and travel plans. However the trip rates used were based on town centre sites with restricted parking and good public transport links.

- Future year modelling 2021- Transyt The 2021 Transyt modelling was carried out with and without Pall Mall traffic. The cycle time used was 120 seconds and background traffic was increased using low growth factors. Even without allowing for development on the Pall Mall site in the AM peak, the right turn movements on Bessemer Road, Bridge Road East and Bridge Road West are all shown operating with a Degree of saturation (DoS) in excess of 100% and with significant queues forming. In the PM peak, Bessemer Road and Bridge Road East right turn movements, Broadwater Road ahead and left turn and Bridge Road West ahead are all shown operating with a DoS in excess of 100%. The results worsen with the inclusion of Pall Mall traffic.

- Future Year modelling 2021 - Paramics The future years modelling for 2021 showed a worsening of the network performance when compared with 2016. Again the important comparison is between the 2021 base scenario which includes for an SPD compliant scheme and scenario 3 which is for the Spenhill proposals and the off site mitigation measures identified by MVA

2021 AM Peak SPD Base scenario Spenhill scenario (current application) Main congestion hotspots
Periodic queuing unreleased vehicles at Digswell Road junction with Campus Chequers Rd N/B
Stanborough Rd N/B at Gosling roundabout Unreleased vehicles at Bessemer road S/B Chequers N/B
Parkway S/B Bridge road W/B Stanborough Rd N/B at Gosling roundabout Queuing on Bridge Road E/B
Broadwater Rd/Tesco junction Non released vehicles 662 963 Average vehicle speed (kph) 14 13 Average
time spent in network (s) 376 392

2021 PM Peak SPD Base scenario Spenhill scenario (current application) Main congestion hotspots
Unreleased vehicles on Bessemer Rd S/B

queuing on Bridge Road W/B Broadwater Road S/B Digswell Rd S/B Unreleased vehicles on Bessemer Rd
S/B Digswell Rd S/B Chequers N/B

Queuing on Parkway S/B Osborn Rd S/B Bridge Rd E/B Broadwater Rd N/B

Non released traffic 2,050 3,010 Average vehicle speed (kph) 12.7 Average time spent in network (s) 387.735

2021 Saturday Peak SPD Base scenario Spenhill scenario (current application) Main congestion hotspots
Unreleased vehicles on Digswell Rd S/B

Queuing on Bridge Rd E/B Bridge Rd W/B Unreleased vehicles on Bessemer Rd S/B Digswell Rd S/B
Stanborough N/B Queuing on Parkway S/B Osborn Rd S/B Bridge Rd E/B

Non released traffic 976 2291 Average vehicle speed (kph) 18.9 Average time spent on network (s) 282.576

The results of the Paramics 2021 show that allowing for low background growth, and a series of mitigation measures being introduced, by 2021 the proposals will increase queuing and reduce traffic speeds within the town centre. The proposed mitigation works do not result in a nil-detriment scenario.

The TA does not address the concerns raised by Herts Highways Traffic Signals Unit and Road Safety Audit Team regarding some of the phasing, lane layouts and pedestrian safety. Therefore the highway authority can not confirm that the capacity and safety issues on Broadwater Road and the junctions have been addressed.

• Mitigation measures The future year modelling assumes that the off site mitigation identified in the 2016 Paramics modelling are assumed to have been instigated. These measures include the following.

1. Extension by 50m of the Broadwater Rd southbound flare on the approach to the Chequers roundabout
2. Extension by 25m of the Chequers northbound flare on the approach to the Chequers Roundabout
3. signalisation of the Campus
4. Removal of 50m of on-street parking on the Parkway northbound on the approach to the Campus.

To accommodate any future growth and development on the Pall Mall site, further mitigation would be required and is identified within the MVA report. This includes extension of the flare length of Digswell Road on approach to the Campus, increased capacity at the Gosling roundabout and an extension to the southbound flare on Osborn Way.

The TA states a five fold mitigation strategy:

1. The promotion of sustainable travel initiatives with the proposed development and across the wider WGC area.
2. Implementation highway improvements along Broadwater Road included in the traffic modelling assessment and at the Chequers, Gosling and Osborn Way roundabouts, at the Campus and on Parkway.
3. Linked signal timings of the site access junctions and Broadwater road/Bridge Road.
4. Consideration given to limited future highway upgrades on the road network with the aim of redistributing through traffic onto more strategic routes away from the town centre.
5. Continued monitoring of traffic levels in the town centre to identify where future highway upgrades are most needed.

The TA revision B lists the mitigation measures identified by MVA and confirms that two new sets of traffic signals on Broadwater Road will be linked to the Broadwater Road/Bridge Road signals from the outset with a 120 sec cycle time. The report then proposes that all the other mitigation measures are reviewed in more detail at a later date and a monitoring programme is set up to establish how traffic volumes are changes and where highway works are needed.

HCC and WHBC would need to ensure that sufficient levels of contributions were included for within any S106 agreement to ensure these works could go ahead. Without some detailed proposals it is not clear how the sums required could be identified, or how the authorities can assess that the proposed improvements are possible, practical and environmentally acceptable.

The TA admits that despite a number of improvements being made to the geometry and operation of the Broadwater Road/ Bridge Road junction (Para 8.9.4) significant queuing is shown in the 2021 scenario. This is backed up by the Transyt analysis. The TA goes on to suggest that future modelling work could be undertaken during the detailed design of the junction to optimise the performance. There is no guarantee that the performance at this junction can be optimised any further.

Access to Pall Mall site. Although no provision was made within the original Transport Assessment for access to the Pall Mall site, this matter has since been reviewed by Arup and is now included within the TA revision B. It is assumed that should the Pall Mall site be re-used for warehousing, it would continue to use the existing network rail access onto Bridge Road, however if it was redeveloped for offices and residential accommodation in line with the SPD, it is assumed within the modelling work that 90% of the traffic would use the shared Taylor Wimpey/Spennill road and 10% would use the network rail access to Bridge Road. The addition of the Pall Mall site traffic increases the amount of queuing observed in the Paramics and Transyt modelling. The Transport Assessment Rev B states that the access strategy for the Pall Mall site is unclear and that discussions would be required between Spennill, Taylor Wimpey and Pall Mall on an access strategy. It should also be noted that in the Addendum to the Environmental Statement (hurleypalmerflatt June 2011) in paragraph 2.5.1 it states that access to the Pall Mall site will be from the southern access road and that the diagonal route that crosses the recreation ground will be restricted to Network Rail access.

Safety

1. Safety audit Following an interim safety audit by Hertfordshire Highways, the applicants have provided a designers response to the points raised in the audit. This has been reviewed by Hertfordshire Highways. The view of the safety auditors is that while the applicant has managed to address some of the issues raised in the safety audit other matters are still outstanding.

The concern of the Safety Auditors and one which relates to the fundamentals of the scheme is that to enable the level of development proposed on the site it is necessary to increase the amount of highway to accommodate the expected levels of traffic generation. This issue is covered in the points on trip generation and highway impact, but this issue is also raised by the safety auditors in relation to the impact of the scheme on other highway users particularly pedestrians.

Issues still to be resolved include the following.

1. Speed cameras- Discussions still need to take place whether the existing speed cameras will be replaced, or whether the timing of the signals will be set to act as a speed restraint in the off-peak. The applicants have indicated that they are prepared to retain the speed cameras if necessary. 2. New Southern Access - joint with Taylor Wimpey. Although this access has been revised to allow for access to no 29 Broadwater Road, there are still concerns with the layout of this junction. The swept path analysis appears to show that the bodywork of the turning vehicle overhanging the nearside footway and the central traffic islands. There is also concern that the pedestrian crossing incorporated within the junction will lead to additional delays for pedestrians compared with the existing pelican crossing. 3. Broadwater Road/Hyde Way junction. The junction has been modified in response to the comments in the interim safety audit, however the proposed set back stop line on Hyde Way(east) would place the traffic signals equipment and stop line in the middle of an existing long dropped kerb for the existing property. The swept path analysis appears to show that the bodywork of the turning vehicle overhanging the nearside footway and the central traffic islands. There is concern that pedestrian delays will be greater than for the existing Toucan crossing, which may increase the risk of pedestrians or cyclists attempting to cross without waiting for the green man. 4. Broadwater Road/Bridge Road junction. The safety auditors are still concerned that the redesign of this junction will have a negative effect on the accident record as the proposed signal timings and junction layout will introduce points of conflict between opposing vehicles movements that do not currently exist under the current one arm at a time operation. Additionally although at the moment there is no dedicated pedestrian phase the timings of the signals give pedestrians a clear picture of when to cross. The proposals will result

in pedestrians having to wait up to 120 secs for a green man and may result in them trying to cross at other times. The additional traffic generation caused by the development has led to road widening on Broadwater Road on the side of the development. The remaining three arms of this junction will remain essentially the same and therefore this leads to lane alignments that are 'kinked' and will lead to potential side impacts. This issue has been raised with Arup at a meeting to discuss section 278 details.

Although some of the issues raised in the Original Interim Safety report and the Safety Comments are detailed matters that could be addressed during the detailed design process for the section 278 agreement, others need to be addressed to ensure that the proposals will not increase the risk of accidents or endanger the safety of road or rights of way users contrary the LTP3

Sustainability/Accessibility

- PTU There has been discussion between Arup and HCC over the preferred location of the bus stops. The balance is to try and ensure that all residential properties on the site are within walking distance of a bus stop. Three options have been put forward by the applicant and the TA revision B recommends that option 2 is the preferred option as although there are fewer bus stops, all elements of the site are within 200m of a bus stop. This has been reviewed by PTU and they make the following comments on the three options.

Scenario 1 - Currently Proposed I have considered this option carefully and based on the satisfactory outcome that a bus route is diverted (403) via Hyde Way, then this would be the most beneficial. The new pair of stops located south of Bridge Road and Hyde Way would best facilitate a site frontage access and be served by two routes the 403 and 601. It is accepted that the distance between these stops and the existing pair located on Bridge Road is around 200 metres. In physical terms of location I believe that this still need to be agreed.

The Taylor Wimpey site would be around 500 metres from these stops but there will still be an upgraded pair of stops along their frontage area. These stops will be served by the existing 601 service at a 30 minute frequency which would fulfil HCC's accessibility criteria.

Scenario 2 - Pair of Bus Stops moved south of Hyde Way This scenario fails to take into account the diverted bus route via Hyde Way and would not offer frontage access to the store as the closest stops would be along Bridge Road. With this scenario, there would be no point in diverting a service as there would be no benefit. Broadwater Road stops would in turn only be served by the 601 at a 30 minute frequency which would not deliver the aim of increasing accessibility to services along the sites frontage. The only benefit would be that all development areas fall within the 400 meter access criteria but there would be no additional access to further services unless these were fully funded.

Scenario 3 - As Currently Proposed with addition of an additional pair of stops The option provides for the 403 diversion but introduces too many stops along Broadwater Road. This is likely to cause additional delays to buses and traffic if buses are continually stopping at distances of around 250 meter intervals. PTU would not support this scenario.

Summary The preferred scenario would be '1' as the 403 operates commercially throughout the day and agreement in principal has been given by Arriva to divert via Hyde Way which would be subject to appropriate junction alterations at Peartree Way. The pair of stops located south of Bridge Road would see a service level of four buses per hour each way which would give an adequate daytime frequency past the store.

The TA sets out proposed improvements to bus services and funding for bus services that would form part of the S106. Generally the £200,000 towards the 403 service would seem a good starting point for negotiation but no details have so far agreed.

The additional 5 year contribution will again need further discussion and should be towards passenger transport enhancements such as services, accessibility issues at WGC bus station, AVL, etc.

TA states that the bus stop on the south side of Bridge Road would benefit from being recessed back from the existing footway to allow sufficient width for the introduction of a shared footway/cycleway. It doesn't state whether Spenhill are prepared to provide the land to accommodate this proposal and whether they intend to carry out these works as part of the development.

- **Cycling** It is proposed to provide 950 cycle parking spaces across the site, 750 located to serve the various units on the site which meets the requirements of the WHBC parking standards and a further 200 to serve the railway station. Currently there are approximately 120 spaces provided in Hyde Way.

The rail strategy in LTP3 (April 2011) states that safe and secure cycle parking should be provided for 5% of joining passengers. This equates to approximately 400 cycle spaces for Welwyn Garden City Station. If the applicants are proposing to only provide 200 spaces, additional land should be set aside within the development to allow for some additional spaces to be provided as and when required. Currently the cycle racks are located on the public highway. If Hyde Way is stopped up as highway, measures must be put in place within the S106 agreement to ensure that all issues relating to maintenance and access are covered to the satisfaction of the highway authority.

It is proposed that following the stopping up of Hyde Way, a cycle route between the Hyde Way/Broadwater Road junction and the railway footbridge will be provided across the site. Measures to ensure that access for cyclists across the site is maintained will need to form part of the S106 Agreement. Maintenance and responsibility issues for the cycle racks will also need to be covered in the S106 Agreement.

Discussions need to take place between the Applicant and Herts Highways on the proposed cycle network on Broadwater Road and Bridge Road to ensure the needs of all cyclists are met and the negative effect the road widening will have on cyclists using the carriageway are addressed.

- **Pedestrian network - internal/external, crossings** As part of the proposals it is proposed to stop up Hyde Way as public highway. However a pedestrian route linking from Broadwater Road to the footbridge will be maintained as a public route. The details of this will form part of the S106 Agreement. The pedestrian route will be the southern footway of Hyde Way. This is indicated as a 6m wide footway/cycleway within the TA however this width is not shown on the drawings. The layout introduces a number of different vehicle movements at the northern end of the site spine road just at the point where there is a heavy east-west pedestrian movement between the site and the footbridge.

Travel Plan Travel plan submitted is not acceptable A Framework Travel Plan (FTP) should be submitted for a mixed use site such as this but a FTP should set out the overall targets and outcomes for the whole site and the requirement on each of the individual land uses/occupiers to develop their own plans. Each of the occupiers travel plans should have separate modal targets specific to their land use but all will feed in to the FTP; potential occupiers should be able to fully understand what is required of them from the FTP. The FTP co-ordinator should be responsible for ensuring the subsequent plans take in to consideration the site wide targets and they will be responsible for the site attaining the targets. HCC follow the DfT guidelines regarding the requirement of a Full Travel Plans or Travel Plan Statements

HCC consider that it would be appropriate that the travel plans should be based on outcomes. For new developments particularly, outcome targets are best expressed in terms of maximum end levels of car use – e.g. maximum allowable modal share of car use when the development is complete.

The outcome targets and indicators should relate to public transport-bus and vehicle access. Overall site figures should be agreed with 60% maximum vehicle trips as stated in TA and TP.

Mitigation Measures Although the TA mentions that the proposed measures to mitigate against the impact of the development will include the promotion of sustainable travel initiatives across the wider Welwyn Garden City area, there are no details within the TA of what the measures are.

S106 issues Although the TA contains an indicative S106 Schedule this lacks details and it is not clear how this relates to the draft Heads of Terms issued by DP9. There are a number of highway items that would have to be discussed further before a S106 Agreement could be completed. In addition to those mentioned above the following items would need to be addressed.

1. Basement car park structure under the highway It is proposed that the footprint of the basement car parking for both the store car parking and the office/leisure car park will extend eastwards beyond the footprint of the buildings. This is to provide the level of parking that the applicant considers necessary for the proposal. The car parks will be constructed on land that is within the applicant's ownership, however due to the need to widen the carriageway of Broadwater Road, some of this land will need to be dedicated as highway to provide for the footway and cycleway on the west side of Broadwater Road. This will result in the basement carpark being situated underneath the footway and the bellmouth of Hyde Way. The issue for the highway authority is to ensure processes are in place to protect the integrity of the highway. This will mean ensuring the basement structure is constructed to withstand the correct highway loading and that regular maintenance checks are carried out.

This issue has been discussed by the Highway Authority and one solution would be for the footway and bellmouth above the basement to become highway but not maintainable at public expense. This would give pedestrians and cyclists rights to use the footway/cycleway but all responsibility would remain with Spennill. This has yet to be discussed with the applicants. 2. Planting within the highway Due to the widening of Broadwater Road to accommodate the development traffic, all existing trees on the western side of Broadwater Road, including those at the junction of Hyde Way will be removed. The plans show new trees along the western side of Broadwater Road. These trees are located within the footway and above the basement structure for the car park. The Highway authority understands that the trees will be planted within tree pits. The issues for the highway authority are the future maintenance of the trees and ensuring that the species is acceptable for use on the highway and above a basement. These issues would need to be covered within the S106 agreement.

3. Cycle and pedestrian links It is intended that all roads within the site will be privately maintained, and that Hyde Way which is currently public highway is stopped up. Hyde Way forms an important pedestrian and cycle link between Broadwater Road and the footbridge and it is important that these routes and rights of access are maintained. Details of how this will be achieved have still to be agreed and will form part of the s106 agreement

Other outstanding issues that could possibly be resolved through future discussion and submission of revised plans but currently stand as reasons for refusal. However the applicant should be made aware that even if additional information were provided that resolved these issues to the satisfaction of the highway authority, the impact of any changes would have to be assessed by the LPA.

Reason for refusal.

1. The application fails to satisfactorily demonstrate the site's impact upon highway safety, capacity and free flow of traffic as the discrepancies between the various parts of the submission mean that it is not possible to fully address the impacts.

Layout Between Hyde way and the new southern access it is proposed to provide a 2m wide footway on Broadwater Road, however drawing number 568_07_802 of Volume 3-Addendum Drawings and Parameter Plans shows an illustrative plan which indicates that this footway will be oversailed by balconies. A proposed ownership boundary is indicated at the edge of the boundaries. It is not clear whether it is proposed to adopt the footway as highway with licences for the balconies, or whether it is intended to

maintain the footway privately. Although the residential development is in outline only, this matter which affects footway width on Broadwater Road needs to be resolved as part of this application,

The layout is in a grid format which follows the form set out in the SPD. Although the residential part of the site is in outline only, the main roads in the site form part of the detailed application. It is important that all roads within the site are designed to keep traffic speeds to low. This may be difficult to achieve with the lengths of straight carriageway shown.

There are a number of other issues regarding internal layout which need to be addressed before the Highway Authority are satisfied that the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and car drivers have been adequately met and conflicts designed out. These include the circulation in the area outside the Leisure Centre, where there is the potential for conflict, between pedestrians moving east/west across the site, vehicles using the station drop off and vehicles looking for parking for the leisure centre. The parking for the leisure centre is in two locations, surface parking to the north of the leisure centre and basement parking accessed to the south of the leisure centre. Vehicles searching for spaces could have to move between the two locations increasing the amount of circulating traffic in this area.

All road and carriageway widths should be as set out in the TA section 5.4.4. There are inconsistencies between the written description of the highway layout described in 5.4.4 and the highway layout drawings in the TA. Therefore it is not possible to establish whether the highway details described can physically be provided. Issues of concern include the following:

1. It should be noted that the 6m wide footway in Hyde Way described in the text is not shown on the highway drawings and to provide a 6m footway would require the building known as plot J to be relocated.
2. A 3m footway/cycleway is not shown on the northern side of the Bridge Road northern access road. It may be difficult to provide due to level differences between this road and Bridge Road.
3. There does not appear to be a 2m footway along the western side of the 'Boulevard' at the northern end of the Pall Mall Site.
4. Turning facilities for delivery vehicles to the YMCA and Hotel. The TA states there will be a hammer head turning area to the south of the YMCA. I realise this is not part of the detailed application but it is not shown on any of the drawings.
5. It is not clear what boundary treatment will be provided between the leisure centre carpark and the network rail access road to prevent vehicular movement between the two areas whilst maintaining an emergency access route.

Construction traffic The TA sets out details of the expected level of construction traffic and proposed traffic routing. The TA concludes that construction operatives vehicles could have an impact on the operation of the Broadwater Road/Bridge Road signals as they are operating near to capacity. The impact will be dependent on how the highways works are programmed into the construction phase. The main peak for construction operatives vehicles is during weeks 57 and 69 and the store is expected to be completed by the end of week 72. The TA states that the widening and other highway improvements on Broadwater Road will be completed prior to the construction of the subsequent phases. However I consider that the highway works on Broadwater Road are required prior to opening of the store, as the new traffic lights and new road layout will be required to gain access to the store car park, and it would be difficult to complete this section of highway without including the other works in Broadwater Road. The construction phase drawing indicates a kiss and ride layby on Broadwater Road. It is not clear whether this is within the existing highway layout or the proposed highway layout. The construction phasing in the TA is not the same indicated in the revised S106 Heads of Terms and requires clarification.

General Comments

Impact of redevelopment of Pall Mall site The TA assesses the impact of the redevelopment of the Pall Mall site. Two scenarios are considered. The first would be the site being re-used for warehousing and all access being taken via the network rail road. The second allowed for an SPD mix of residential and office on the site and it was agreed that the trip distribution for this would be 90% on the shared access road and 10% via Bridge Road.

For both scenarios the following were agreed between Arup and HCC 1. Potential Pall Mall trip rates 2. Potential Pall Mall trip generation

Layout The proposed layout separates the proposed Tesco store traffic from the traffic from the remainder of the site, each being served by an access onto Broadwater Road. Similarly the traffic for the store service yard, the hotel and the YMCA can only be accessed from the Bridge Road access. Although this layout will prevent the site being used as a rat run to avoid the traffic signals on Broadwater Road, the Highway Authority was concerned that there was no provision for alternative routing should any of these routes become blocked. The revised TA and drawings show an emergency access route between the leisure centre car park and the northern access road which could be brought into use should the main access road to the site become blocked. The Highway authority would recommend that the fire service should be consulted regarding any access requirements they may have.

Servicing The TA sets out the servicing strategy for the development. All servicing will take place within the site from the internal road network using two routes. The northern access road will be used for the food store, hotel and YMCA and the Southern access road and Boulevard for all other uses. This is acceptable to the highway authority. It should be noted that the proposed Highway Layout drawing in the TA no 207043-00-229 still shows the loading layby on Broadwater Road north of the Hyde way signals which I understood to have been removed from the scheme.

Bridge-feasibility It is recognised within both the SPD and the TA that the footbridge forms an important link between the site and the town centre and railway station and is an important east /west pedestrian link. A separate application has been received for the bridge. The provision of a lift and steps will ensure access by all including the mobility impaired.

Shared Access Road The proposed layout includes for an access road at the southern part of the site which is built partly on land which currently forms part of the site belonging to Taylor Wimpey and which was included within their permission granted in March 2011. This land currently provides for that sites northern access road and a row of parallel parking. The development of the application site will affect the highway and parking layout of the existing permission. The TA revision B now provides details of how the Taylor Wimpey Site will link into the proposed shared access road. The introduction of the shared access road will lead to the loss of 24 on street parallel parking spaces for the Taylor Wimpey Site and although the TA states these could be provided elsewhere on the Taylor Wimpey Site The LPA may want to ensure that the proposals will not result in a loss of parking.

Parking The level of parking required for the development will be determined by the LPA, however the agreed levels of trip generation were based on constraint levels of parking across the site. It is noted that for all uses on the site, the levels of parking have been constrained apart from for the proposed food store, where the level of parking is almost the maximum requirement based on the WHBC parking standards. The TA sets out the proposed parking strategy and this should be agreed with the LPA. I note that it states that access to the office car parking will be by swipe card to operate a security barrier at the entrance to the car park. As this car park is also shared by the leisure centre I assume the barrier is to be located between the two sections of car park, however this should be confirmed. Details of the CPZ should be agreed with The LPA.

The TA acknowledges that the development may have an impact on parking in the surrounding residential area and that it may be necessary to introduce a CPZ across the western part of Peartree. It is not clear from the TA whether this would form part of the S106.

The Leisure Centre car park is provided in two locations, with surface level parking to the north of the leisure centre and some in a basement car park. This will lead to increase vehicle circulation in the 'boulevard' as cars search for spaces, just at the location where pedestrians and cyclists cross to link to the footbridge.

Lindsey Lucas

Date 10/08/2011

****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.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.