

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 11 JANUARY 2017

Application Number	3/16/1218/FUL
Proposal	Demolition of buildings. Closure of access points. Erection of 29 dwellings with associated infrastructure and creation of access to Cambridge Road
Location	The Chestnuts and Glanton, Cambridge Road, Puckeridge
Applicant	Beverley Homes Ltd
Parish	Standon
Ward	Puckeridge

Date of Registration of Application	26 May 2016
Target Determination Date	25 August 2016
Reason for Committee Report	Major Planning Application
Case Officer	Martin Plummer

RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to a legal agreement and the conditions set out at the end of this report.

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 Members may recall that this application was reported to the Development Management Committee on 9th November 2016, with a recommendation for approval. The Committee resolved to defer making a decision on the proposals to enable Officers to give further consideration to matters of highway safety, density of development and sustainable transport infrastructure.
- 1.2 Those matters have been subject to further assessment and discussion with the applicant. The outcome is set out in this report. Based on the outcome, which does not result in additional harm being assigned in relation to these matters, Members are requested to consider all relevant policy and material planning issues as set out in this report and the report presented to Members at the previous Committee meeting, on 9 November 2016 (**Essential Reference Paper 'B'**), and reach a decision in relation to the proposals. Your Officers recommendation remains that the proposals are not considered to be significantly and demonstrably harmful and that planning permission can be granted.

2.0 Site Description

2.1 The site description is set out in the previous report attached as **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.

3.0 Background to Proposal

3.1 The development proposes the demolition of the two existing dwellings on the site and the erection of 29 new dwellings (thus a net increase of 27 units). The development incorporates a mixture of semi-detached and terraced dwellings which includes 4no x 1 bed, 7no x 2 bed, 10no x 3 bed and 8no x 4 bed units. The 1 bed and 2 bed units are proposed to be affordable (11 in total) which amounts to the provision of 37.9% affordable units.

3.2 The plans incorporate the closure of the vehicle accesses to the existing properties on the site and the provision of a single new access with adjacent footway. This access leads to a cul-de-sac arrangement of dwellings which are generally two storeys in height (with two and a half storey height frontage dwellings). These frontage dwellings comprise four pairs of semi-detached properties, linked by garages with dormer windows on the front roof slope.

3.3 As indicated, the planning application was reported to the Development Management Committee on 9 November 2016 and a copy of that earlier report is attached as **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**. This sets out the background to the proposal in more detail.

3.4 At the Committee meeting on 9 November 2016, Members resolved to defer making a decision on the application to enable Officers to consider the following matters further:

- The cumulative impact of additional traffic generated by these proposals (and other nearby sites) using the Cambridge Road/A120 junction;
- Density of development on the site;
- Local sustainable transport infrastructure.

4.0 Key Policy Issues

4.1 These relate to the relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the adopted East Herts Local Plan 2007, the pre-submission District Plan and the emerging Standon Neighbourhood Plan (NP).

Key Issue	NPPF	Local Plan policy	Pre-submission District Plan policy	Standon NP
The principle of residential development within the Rural Area, land supply and the emerging Neighbourhood Plan	Para 14, section 6	SD2, GBC3	DPS2, GBR2	SP1
Whether the development represents a sustainable form of development – including the housing mix	Para 6 – 14, section 8		INT1	SP10, 11, 15, 21, 24
Impact on character and appearance of the area and neighbour amenity	Section 7	ENV1	DES3	SP3, 13, 14
Transport and parking	Section 4	TR7	TRA1, TRA2, TRA3	SP18, 19, 20

Other relevant issues are referred to in the ‘Consideration of Relevant Issues’ section below.

5.0 Emerging District Plan

- 5.1 The Council resolved to proceed to the publication of its pre-submission version of the District Plan at the meeting of Council of 22 Sept 2016. Consultation on the Plan has recently been completed and the detail of the responses is now being considered by Officers. The view of the Council is that the Plan has been positively prepared, seeking to ensure significantly increased housing development during the plan period. The weight that can be assigned to the policies in the emerging plan can now be increased, given it has reached a further stage in preparation. There does remain a need to qualify that weight

somewhat, given that the detail of the responses to the consultation is yet to be considered.

- 5.2 It may be possible, at the meeting, for Officers to be in a position to provide further advice to Members with regard to the policies in the emerging plan that have not been subject to comment during the consultation period. Officers are also undertaking a further assessment of housing land supply, through the annual Authority Monitoring Report, the outcome of which will be reported to Members at the meeting if it is available.
- 5.3 Further progress has been made with regard to the preparation of the Standon NP subsequent to the consideration of the application at the November DM Committee. The consultation period on the plan has now closed. Officers will seek further feedback from the Parish Council and/ or NP group, prior to the Committee meeting, on the outcome of that consultation.
- 5.4 The site was promoted as being available for development through the District Plan call for sites process

6.0 Summary of Consultee Responses

- 6.1 A summary of consultee responses is provided in **Essential Reference Paper 'B'**.

7.0 Parish Council Representations

- 7.1 Standon Parish Council objects to the development on the following grounds:
- Lack of engagement in the Neighbourhood Plans process;
 - Flood risk;
 - Harmful impact on public sewerage system;
 - Traffic impact on Cambridge Road and A120;
 - Poor layout of development and siting of children play area;
 - Poor design and layout of parking;
 - Tenure difference between affordable and open market dwellings;
 - No management details of communal areas.

8.0 Summary of Other Representations

- 8.1 Four representations in objection were received prior to the application being reported to the Development Management Committee meeting in

November. One additional representation has been received since the November meeting and this refers the Council to the concerns highlighted by the Parish Council.

9.0 Planning History

- 9.1 There is no planning history of relevance relating directly to the site. Outline planning permission has been granted on a different but nearby site for up to 24 dwellings. This is the land to the east of Cambridge Road, allowed on appeal under LPA reference 3/14/1627/OP (details included as ERP A). That decision was dated 21 Sept 2015.

10.0 Consideration of Relevant Issues

- 10.1 The issues covered in this report relate to the reasons for deferral of the application at the November Committee namely a) the impact of the additional traffic likely to result at the Cambridge Road / A120 junction; b) the density of development on the site; and c) local sustainable transport infrastructure. Taking into account the information set out below it is then necessary for Members to judge the proposals against the relevant taking all other material planning issues into account in reaching a decision. It is necessary also then for the information set out in the previous report to be taken into account in reaching a decision.

Impact of Traffic Generation

- 10.2 Members will be aware that, in relation to policy considerations, the NPPF sets out that development should only be prevented on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impact, after taking account of mitigating measures, is severe. Policy TR1 of the current Local Plan sets out that developments will be required to incorporate measures, commensurate with the scale of additional traffic generated, to ensure that alternative transport options are available. Policy TRA1 of the emerging District Plan refers to ensuring that a range of sustainable transport options are available.
- 10.3 Policy TR2 in the current Local Plan requires that highway proposals will be assessed against the standards set out in the HCC highway design guide. In the emerging District Plan, policy TRA2 sets out that proposals should ensure that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users.
- 10.4 Policy SP18 of the NP sets out the requirement for the creation of a new access to the southbound A10, between it and the Cambridge

Road, immediately to the north of this site and in association with the development of the three Cambridge Road sites identified in the NP.

- 10.5 In the policy context the issue to be considered then is the additional traffic associated with the development and the impact that this would have on highway safety at the Cambridge Road / A120 junction.
- 10.6 The Council has engaged a Highway Consultant (Transport Planning Associates, TPA) to review the highway modelling work submitted in relation to the development proposals at the Café Field site (LPA reference 3/15/2081/OUT). That work has now been undertaken. Officers have subsequently requested that the consultant consider the cumulative impact of the development associated with the land to east of Cambridge Road (which now benefits from full planning permission as approved under LPA references 3/14/1627/OP and 3/16/1918/REM); the development at Café Field (LPA reference 3/15/2081/OUT – also being considered at the Committee meeting on 11 January 2017); and the development proposals at this site.
- 10.7 That cumulative assessment in relation to all three of these sites is not strictly appropriate at this stage, as the Café Field proposals do not represent a firm commitment (in that they neither benefit from planning permission or yet represent an allocation of land for development in the development plan). The impact of each development should be considered against the current operation of the highway and traffic generated by committed development. However, in order to provide a robust assessment in this case, because Members are being asked to consider the Café Field proposals elsewhere on this same agenda and because it features as an emerging land allocation, the traffic generated by all sites has been considered by the Council's consultant.
- 10.8 The consultant has considered all of the relevant highway information relating to the above mentioned planning applications, together with consultation responses from the Highway Authority. The consultant has also visited the site during peak hours in the morning, 07:30 to 09:30, and observed the junction in operation. The road conditions in the immediate and wider surroundings have been fully considered as part of the consultant's assessment.
- 10.9 The consultant advises that the existing junction is currently operating well within capacity during the critical peak period in the morning (i.e. when the impact of the development on the performance of the junction would be greatest).

- 10.10 With regard to highway safety, the consultant advises that the existing junction may be perceived as 'dangerous', but accident records confirm that the junction has a good safety record. Site inspection indicates that traffic exiting Cambridge Road southward and making a right turn onto the A120 was observed to edge out onto the eastbound carriageway and into the right turn lane (the central island which allows vehicles on the A120 heading in a westerly direction to exit onto Cambridge Road) before entering into a gap in the westbound flow of traffic. This 'manoeuvre' increases the time that vehicles exiting the junction onto the A120 are exposed to traffic arriving from the roundabout. However, the consultant considers that, given the speed of vehicles exiting the A10 roundabout in an easterly direction, there is sufficient time for vehicles exiting the roundabout to slow and allow vehicles to exit safely.
- 10.11 With regard to the speed of the traffic, the consultant advises traffic exiting the A10 as travelling at a 'relatively slow speed'. To understand that, Officers instructed the consultant to carry out further survey work and speed monitoring of traffic. The survey work included an Automatic Traffic Count Survey (ATS) and radar surveys conducted on the A120 close to the Cambridge Road junction. The results from these surveys show that the average speed of traffic exiting the A10 roundabout in an easterly direction (at the point where such traffic would be able to observe traffic exiting the Cambridge Road junction) is 29.8 mph and the 85th percentile speed (that is the speed of vehicles which were travelling at 85% of the highest speed) is 38.4 mph.
- 10.12 The 85th percentile speed is normally used to calculate stopping distances. In this case, that would equate to a stopping site distance of 87m using the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges stopping site distances. This distance is very close to the actual distance that would be available to stop in. This would mean that, if the driver of a car exiting the roundabout, observed a car exiting from Cambridge Road, that was unable to progress into the westbound traffic lane, the driver should be able to stop in time, provided that they reacted immediately. Having assessed vehicle speeds and driver behaviour, the consultant could not conclude that the impact of development with regard to highway safety, placing more traffic on the junction, would be severe.
- 10.13 With regard to the operation of the junction, the consultant observed that the delay, in vehicles being able to make the right turn out of Cambridge Road onto the A120 at the junction is, on average, 20-25 seconds. The maximum time was observed as over a minute and the maximum queue length was observed at 4 vehicles (although there were long periods of no queue).

- 10.14 Between the Cambridge Road/ A120 junction and the main part of the village, the Cambridge Road is wide and free flowing. There is traffic calming in the village and on street parking, which effectively makes the route through the village single lane in many places. Traffic flows through the village were not observed to be high during the early morning peak, and no significant delay was encountered. The typical journey time between the Cambridge Road/ A120 junction and the roundabout to the north of the village with the A10 is about 2 minutes.
- 10.15 The consultant notes that traffic flows through the junction are highest during the peak period of 07:30 - 08:30. This may result in the junction operating above capacity during this period with the addition of the development attracted traffic. The consultant considers that the delay to vehicles being able to exit the junction onto the A120 is indicated to rise to 105 seconds (currently, the average is 20-25 seconds). The consultant considers that any traffic which may divert through the village to avoid this delay would do so when traffic flows and pedestrian activity through the village is low. The conclusion is that the impact on Puckeridge village centre would not be severe during the peak hours in the morning.
- 10.16 The information provided in the Transport Statement for this application, of a net gain of 27 dwellings, sets out that the development is expected to generate 16 new trips in each peak (10 – 11 in the peak direction, 5 – 6 in the other direction), amounting to one vehicle every 3-4 minutes. This is a low increase in traffic movement. The consultant has endorsed these numbers and considers they will have negligible impact on traffic levels. A slightly lower level of traffic movements will be associated with the 24 dwelling scheme which now has full planning permission along Cambridge Road (LPA references 3/14/1627/OP and 3/16/1918/REM).
- 10.17 The Transport Statement for the development at Café Field (LPA reference 3/15/2081/OUT and which considers the impact cumulatively with the permitted Cambridge Road site, 3/14/1627/OP) sets out that a development of 200 dwellings (NB this number of dwellings has been amended and is now up to 160 dwellings), will generate a total of 221 vehicle movements in the AM peak. Further commentary will be provided on the traffic generated by these proposals in the separate report but, for the purposes of cumulative consideration here, the consultants conclusions are that the modelling is robust and that it is not considered likely that a significant proportion of traffic using the Cambridge Road/ A120 junction would experience the increased delay

modelled at the junction or perceive the safety of the junction as sufficient reason to divert their journey through the village. Therefore the conclusion is that the impact on the village is not severe.

- 10.18 Against that conclusion, the consultant has now been asked to consider also the additional impact of the traffic generated by these proposals. As indicated, this scheme is likely to result in a further vehicle travelling from the site and along Cambridge Road once every 4-5 mins. His conclusion is that this is not likely to have a significant impact above that already modelled.
- 10.19 As indicated, the NPPF sets out that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impact of development is severe. Relevant Local Plan and District Plan policies also seek to ensure that development proposals do not have an unacceptable impact on the operation of the highway and highway safety. Emerging NP policy SP18 supports the delivery of a new access to the southbound carriageway of the A10 from the Cambridge Road. Taking all the policy context into account, the stage that has been reached in policy formulation, the advice of the Highway Authority and the Councils own highway consultant, Officers conclusion in relation to this matter is that the proposals do not have an unacceptable impact, that adequate arrangements are made and that no negative weight can be assigned to the proposals as a result.

Density of Development

- 10.20 The NPPF defers to local policy on this matter setting out that planning authorities should set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances. There is no policy within the current Local Plan that directly addresses the matter, although policy ENV1 does require all development proposals to be of a high standard of design and layout that demonstrates compatibility with the structure and layout of the surrounding area.
- 10.21 Policy HOU2 of the pre-submission District Plan is more specific regarding density and outlines that proposals are required to demonstrate how the density of the development has been informed by the character of the local area and contributes to emerging policy DES3; housing mix; adequate provision for open space and retaining existing site features. Policy SP7 of the NP supports the development of this site for 23 dwellings and policy SP13 seeks to ensure that densities do not exceed 25 homes per hectare.

- 10.22 Following the consideration of the proposals at the 9 November 2016 DM Committee meeting, the applicant has been requested to indicate whether they would be minded to reduce the density of the development proposed. No amendment in that respect has been forthcoming and therefore, the density of development proposed remains at 30.9 dwellings per hectare, greater than the approved density at the Cambridge Road site (LPA references 3/14/1627/OP and 3/16/1918/REM) which is 23 dwellings per hectare, but substantially less than the existing development to the east of Cambridge Road, which comprises of Vintage Court, a former motel, which has a density of as much as 170 dwellings per hectare.
- 10.23 It is important to consider the visual impact of the proposed density, and its impact on character and other relevant policies issues, rather than judge the proposals solely on the basis of the numbers. In that respect, the Vintage Court density is clearly very high and maybe unexpectedly so, given the actual visual appearance of the development. This is because, even though the ratio of built to unbuilt space is clearly high, its limited overall extent, location isolated from other development of a similar character and flatted nature of the development, enable any impact to be assimilated without undue harm.
- 10.24 It is necessary then to consider whether the density of the application would result in harm to the character of the area. This was assessed in the previous report (ERP B paragraphs 10.22-10.28). The perception from Cambridge Road will be of the row of frontage dwellings, set back from the road with intervening landscaping and open space. It will be more difficult for the observer on Cambridge Road to perceive much in relation to impact caused by the remainder of the development because of retained hedging to the north and as it is to be located behind the frontage dwellings. Views through the access road are likely to be of a character which is comprised more by buildings, roofs and hard surfaces than landscaping or soft surfaces however.
- 10.25 There will be a change to the character of the road in the area of the site. It is also acknowledged that the density of development sought in the NP is exceeded. However, taking all the policy considerations into account, your Officers conclusion remains as set out in the previous report that the character change which will result will not necessarily be one that is considered harmful and therefore, as set out previously, the proposals are considered acceptable in respect of this matter.

Sustainable Transport infrastructure

- 10.26 Members also previously expressed concern relating to the weight to be attached to the availability of public transport; accessibility to services and amenities, and safety concerns with regard to the facilities for pedestrians or cyclists to safely cross the A120.
- 10.27 The policy requirements of the NPPF, the current Local Plan and emerging District Plan, in respect of these matters, has been set out above. In addition to those, policy SP20 of the NP indicates that improvements in facilities for pedestrians and cyclist should be sought as part of development proposals.
- 10.28 The previous Officer report (ERP B) considers the issues relating to accessibility in paragraphs 10.10 – 10.13. Officers consider that the site is well positioned to access day-to-day facilities and amenities which are available in the village, the limitations in public transport are acknowledged with the result that most future residents would rely on the use of private vehicles for access to employment and larger shopping excursions. Some negative weight may therefore be assigned to the proposal in this respect.
- 10.29 However, in overall terms, and having regard to the comments from the Planning Inspector in the appeal relating to the approved development to the north of the application site, the development is considered to be sustainable in transport terms.
- 10.30 With regard to the facilities available to enable safe crossing of the A120, the Council's Highway consultant has also been asked to review this matter. The consultant comments that currently, observations indicate that there are not a significant number of pedestrians crossing the A120 close to the Cambridge Road junction. However, pedestrians were observed to use the uncontrolled crossing to the west of the Cambridge Road junction (which includes a central island) which allows crossing in two stages, to gain access to the footpath to the south of the A120. This crossing point is not, however, on the 'desire line' between the Café Field development (generating the majority of additional foot traffic) and the bus stop the other (southern) side of the A120.
- 10.31 He comments that traffic flows along the A120 are significant during peak times and, if significant numbers of residents were expected to access the bus stop on the other (south) side of the A120, then an additional uncontrolled pedestrian crossing (with an island) should be provided to the east of the junction. The location would need to be

carefully designed and alterations to the existing bus stop bays may be required.

- 10.32 The applicant has agreed to make financial contribution of £4909 to improve bus stop provision on the A120. As part of the Café Field proposals, the Highway Authority has sought a further contribution of c£32,000 toward bus stop improvements. Whilst no detailed assessment has been undertaken, these amounts in total c£37,000 are unlikely to secure provision of additional crossing and associated bus stop improvements. The applicant in this case has been approached with regard to the provision of the additional payment of £32,000, were the café Field site not to come forward. The applicant has initially declined this further infrastructure funding request, but is considering a further response prior to the Committee meeting. At this stage, your Officers view is that further funding, in light of the policy requirements relating to the availability of sustainable transport provision, and in the absence of any alternative improvements as part of this site, such as improvements to footpaths or cycle provision, is reasonable. If Members are minded to support these proposals that Officers seek delegated authority at this stage to undertake further negotiations with the applicant in relation to this matter.
- 10.33 Overall then, the conclusion of Officers in relation to this matter is that the shortcomings of the site in transport sustainability terms remain acknowledged and are assigned some negative weight. With regard to local accessibility however, the site is considered acceptable. Funding can be secured to be put to measures, subject to the agreement of the Highway Authority, to improve bus stop provision and accessibility to the bus stop to the south side of the A120 and the countryside to the south, as part of these proposals.

11.0 Conclusion

- 11.1 It is necessary then for Members to consider the relevant planning policies and all other relevant material planning issues in coming to a decision on these proposals. In the earlier report (ERP B), Officers advised that the development was considered to be sustainable and that, in accordance with the NPPF, planning permission should be granted for the proposals unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so.
- 11.2 Some harmful weight was assigned to the proposals due to the housing mix proposed and the harm, with regard to transport sustainability is noted here. In relation to the issues that have now been subject of further consideration above, your Officers have reached the view that

no further harmful weight should be applied. This takes into account the further advance that has been made in relation to policy preparation and the emerging housing land supply position.

- 11.3 The conclusion reached previously in relation to these proposals was that, whilst some harm was identified, it did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As no further harm has been identified as a result of the reconsideration of certain matters in this report, the recommend to Members remains that planning permission can approved subject to conditions and a legal agreement.

Legal Agreement

- Funding to be provided to secure improvement works to the two bus stops closest to the application site on Standon Hill and to provide funding toward to exploration and implementation of an additional pedestrian crossing point on Standon Hill (and Officers be delegate to explore the potential and costs of this additional crossing with the applicant);
- Nursery education contribution towards increasing places at Spins pre-school;
- Middle education contribution towards expansion of Ralph Sadlier School by 1 form of entry;
- Childcare Service contribution towards increasing places at Spins pre-school;
- Library service contributions towards Ware library to develop and improve the adult fiction area of the library;
- Youth Service contributions towards signage at Ware Young Peoples Centre;
- The provision of affordable housing;
- A financial contribution towards of £9,809 towards the improvement of parks and public garden facilities within the parish;
- A financial contribution of £31,162 total towards the provision of outdoor sport (£27,152) and/ or facilities for children and young people (£4,010) in the parish;

- A financial contribution of £7,247 towards an extension to the Puckeridge Community Centre;
- Details of the provision of a LAP as indicated on drawing reference 733/DHA2 Revision D together with details of the management of this area and all amenity areas not within private ownership of future residents;
- A financial contribution of £2,088 towards recycling facilities;
- Sum of £16,879 toward the improvement of health care facilities in the village

Conditions

1. Two year time limit (1T121)
2. Approved plans (2E103)
3. Materials of construction (2E111)
4. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment by EAS reference 933 dated May 2016 and the revised SuDS Layout (SK05 REV D) submitted and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:
 1. Implementing appropriate drainage strategy based on attenuation and restricted outfall to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year event.
 2. Undertaking the drainage to include permeable paving, oversized surface water pipe system, swale, pond and hydrobrake or similar vortex control as indicated on drawing SUDS LAYOUT SK05 REV D.
 3. Ensuring finished ground floor levels are raised at least 300mm above the existing ground levels at the site.
 4. Maintaining overland flowpaths by keeping gaps between the buildings and allowing open pathways to the Puckeridge Tributary for surface water to flow.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the local planning authority.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site.

5. No development shall take place until the final design of the drainage scheme is completed and sent to the Local Planning Authority for approval along with the evidence of the discharge feasibility. The design of the drainage scheme shall also include:
 1. Details of how the pond and the swale will take part to the attenuation strategy.
 2. Detailed engineering details of the design of all the proposed SuDS components in line with The SuDS Manual (CIRIA C-753).
 3. Confirmation of permission to connect discharge points into the Puckeridge Tributary from the Environment Agency.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, both on and off site.

6. No development shall take place until an ecological mitigation and management plan that is based on the submitted Ecological Scoping Survey (Hillier Ecology, April 2016) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure no net loss of biodiversity from the development in accordance with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. Visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 43 metres shall be provided and permanently maintained in each direction within which there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 0.6 metres and 2 metres above the carriageway.

Reason: To provide adequate visibility for drivers entering or leaving the site.

8. Tree/hedge retention and protection (4P05)
9. Provision and retention of parking (3V23) add "and turning of vehicles"

10. Details of a scheme for the allocation of the parking spaces to be submitted and agreed and therefore implemented.
11. Wheel washing (3V25)
12. Hard surfacing (3V21)
13. Landscape design proposals (4P12)
14. Landscape works implementation (4P13)
15. Hours of working – plant and machinery (6N054)
16. Prior to any above ground building works details of an acoustic fence of a minimum height of 2.3 meters along the western boundary of the site next to the A10 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate provision for noise protection to future occupiers of the development in accordance with policy ENV25 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007.

Informatives

1. Highway works (05FC2)
2. Street Naming and Numbering (19SN5)

Summary of Reasons for Decision

East Herts Council has considered the applicant's proposal in a positive and proactive manner with regard to the policies of the Development Plan; the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The balance of the considerations having regard to those policies and the way in which the development will address housing land supply issues is that permission should be granted.

KEY DATA**Residential Development**

Residential density	30.9 units/Ha	
	Bed spaces	Number of units
Number of existing units demolished		-2
Number of new flat units	1	
	2	
	3	
Number of new house units	1	4
	2	7
	3	10
	4+	8
Total		27

Affordable Housing

Number of units	Percentage
11	37.9

Residential Vehicle Parking Provision

Current Parking Policy Maximum Standards (EHDC 2007 Local Plan)

Parking Zone		
Residential unit size (bed spaces)	Spaces per unit	Spaces required
1	1.25	5
2	1.50	10.5
3	2.25	22.5
4+	3.00	24
Total required		62
Proposed provision		64

Emerging Parking Standards (endorsed at District Plan Panel 19 March 2015)

Parking Zone		
Residential unit size (bed spaces)	Spaces per unit	Spaces required
1	1.50	6
2	2.00	14
3	2.50	25

4+	3.00	24
Total required		69
Accessibility reduction	<i>None considered appropriate</i>	
Resulting requirement		69
Proposed provision		64

Legal Agreement – financial obligations

This table sets out the financial obligations that could potentially be sought from the proposed development in accordance with the East Herts Planning Obligations SPD 2008; sets out what financial obligations have actually been recommended in this case, and explains the reasons for any deviation from the SPD standard.

Obligation	Amount sought by EH Planning obligations SPD	Amount recommended in this case	Reason for difference (if any)
Affordable Housing		37.9%	No difference as no policy requirement for affordable housing
Parks and Public Gardens	£9,809	£9,809	n/a
Outdoor Sports facilities	£27,152.50	£27,152	n/a
Amenity Green Space	£4,176.40	£0	No contribution as on site provision of amenity space
Provision for children and young people	£4,010	£4,010	n/a
Maintenance contribution – Parks and public gardens	£0	£0	No maintenance requirement as no on-site provision
Maintenance contribution – Outdoor Sports facilities	£0	£0	No maintenance requirement as no on-site provision

Maintenance contribution – Amenity Green Space	£0	£0	n/a
Maintenance contribution – Provision for children and young people	£0	£0	No maintenance requirement as no on-site provision
Community Centres and Village Halls	£7,247	£7,247	n/a
Recycling facilities	£2,088	£2,088	n/a