

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 19 JULY 2017

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Application Number | 3/16/2296/OUT |
| Proposal | Redevelopment of existing offices and storage and distribution premises, to create residential development of 30 dwellings with associated access roads, vehicle parking and landscaping; creation of new publicly accessible open space within development site and in adjacent woodland. Outline consent – permission is sought for access and scale. |
| Location | Land East of Netherfield Lane, Stanstead Abbots, SG12 8HE. |
| Applicant | Webster Estates Ltd |
| Parish | Stanstead Abbots CP |
| Ward | Stanstead Abbots |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Date of Registration of Application | 14 October 2016 |
| Target Determination Date | ETA – 5 th May 2017 |
| Reason for Committee Report | Major planning application |
| Case Officer | Lisa Page |

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 The site is in the Metropolitan Green Belt. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), redevelopment of ‘previously developed land’ (PDL) is a form of development that is not inappropriate. The site meets the definition of PDL and the proposed development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, or the purposes of including land within it, than the existing development, which are other criteria against which the proposals should be tested. Given that, it is not necessary to undertake the normal balancing exercise in relation to green belt policy to determine whether very special circumstances occur.
- 1.2 The other key issues which fall to be considered include the loss of land currently in employment use. In that respect, no marketing of the current buildings has been undertaken, the applicant pointing out their shortcomings and their unattractiveness to the

market. With regard to the viability of the proposals, advisors indicate that the development actually results in a financial loss. No affordable housing is therefore proposed.

- 1.3 Taking into account these key and all other relevant issues, the view has been reached that the delivery of housing, when weighed against the NPPF test that there should be significant and demonstrable harm for development to be resisted, means that planning permission can be granted.

2.0 Site Description

- 2.1 The application site (2.26 hectares) is shown on the attached OS extract. The site is currently in an employment use, with buildings in office and commercial use toward the site frontage (west), central and southern parts of the site. Around them are extensive areas of hardstanding for employee and operational parking and storage. The rear (north-eastern) parcel of land is currently an area of inaccessible woodland and grassland.
- 2.2 Whilst the frontage and employee parking areas are open to Netherfield Lane, the remainder of the site is gated for security purposes.
- 2.3 The site is on the south-eastern outskirts of Stanstead Abbots. It lies outside of the settlement boundary and within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The wider surroundings are of open countryside to the north and south. To the east, beyond the woodland/grassland area lie residential dwellings that front onto Roydon Road. The site is bounded to the west by Netherfield Lane, to which a number of residential dwellings front onto. Access is taken from Netherfield Lane to Roydon Road which lies 100 metres to the north.

3.0 Background to Proposal

- 3.1 Outline planning permission is sought for the development as outlined above. All matters except access and scale are reserved. The application has been submitted with illustrative drawings of the layout and design, together with parameter plans indicating limits of scale. An access with parking provision for 4 vehicles is proposed for the Almshouses that face onto Roydon Road.

4.0 **Key Policy Issues**

4.1 These relate to the relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the pre-submission East Herts District Plan 2016 and the adopted East Herts Local Plan 2007. There is no Neighbourhood Plan for the site.

| Key Issue | NPPF | Local Plan policy | Pre-submission District Plan policy |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Principle of Development in the Green Belt and loss of Employment site. | Chapter 3, and 9 | SD1, GBC1, EDE2 | GBR1, ED1 |
| Housing land supply and Sustainability | Chapter 6 Introduction | SD1, SD2 | INT1 |
| Flood Risk and Drainage | Chapter 10 | ENV19, ENV21 | WAT1, WAT2, WAT3, WAT5 |
| Highway matters | Chapter 4 | LRC9, TR1, TR2, TR7, TR20 | TRA1, TRA2, REA3 |
| Impact on Designated Sites and Protected Species | Chapter 11 | GBC14 | NE1, NE3 |
| Affordable housing and other financial contributions | Chapter 6 | HSG3, HSG4 | HOU3 |
| Impact on neighbours amenity | | ENV1 | SES3 |

Other relevant issues are referred to in the 'Consideration of Relevant issues' section below.

5.0 **Emerging District Plan**

5.1 The District Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. 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 Plan has yet to be examined.

6.0 Summary of Consultee Responses

- 6.1 HCC Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission. It recommend that any permission shall include conditions for a construction management plan and full details of roads, visibility splays, access arrangement, parking and cycle provision and loading and turning to be submitted and agreed. It comments that as Netherfield Lane would remain as a Bridleway, the Highway Authority could then still contribute up to 10% of reasonable maintenance costs – to be secured via a s278 Agreement.
- 6.2 Lead Local Flood Authority raises no objection and comments that in order to prevent flooding from surface water and to mitigate risk of flooding, a condition should be imposed.
- 6.3 Environment Agency raises no objection.
- 6.4 EHDC Engineering Advisor comments that the site is within Flood Zone 1. The development is likely to increase the permeable area. He advises that the conveyance swale and above ground Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) should both be utilised to provide flood risk reduction benefits as well as biodiversity, amenity and water quality improvements.
- 6.5 Thames Water comments that surface water drainage is the responsibility of the developer. In respect of sewerage it comments that connection to the public sewer will require approval from Thames Water.
- 6.6 EHDC Housing Development Advisor notes that no affordable housing has been provided.
- 6.7 Herts Ecology do not anticipate adverse impacts upon the nearby Wildlife Sites. It comments that they are pleased to see that ecology, habitat management and biodiversity enhancement have been considered in the scheme which can be secured via condition.
- 6.8 HCC Development Services comments that it seeks the provision of financial contributions for library services and youth services.
- 6.9 HCC Minerals and Waste comments that it seeks to promote sustainable management of waste including the re-use of

unavoidable waste where possible and the use of recycled materials where appropriate to the construction.

- 6.10 EHDC Environmental Health Advisor advises that any permission shall include conditions for contaminated land and remediation.
- 6.11 Herts Police Crime Prevention Advisor raises no concerns and would encourage the development to achieve Secured by Design accreditation.
- 6.12 Herts Fire and Rescue Service detail the required access for firefighting vehicles and comments that it seeks the provision of fire hydrants.
- 6.13 NHS England have made no comments.
- 6.14 Lee Valley Regional Park Authority comment that in the event of planning permission being granted, they recommend conditions relating to an ecological design strategy; further bat surveys; and boundary treatments.

7.0 Parish Council Representations

- 7.1 Stanstead Abbots Parish Council responded with an objection making following comments:
- Would result in loss of employment land, without full justification or investigation of alternative uses of the buildings
 - Contrary to Green Belt policy.
 - Would place strain on local schools, which are already oversubscribed
 - No provision of affordable housing
 - Concerns regarding traffic management, during construction and after. Would result in congestion and danger
 - In an area that has suffered from flooding
 - Is a missed opportunity to provide modern technologies such as solar thermal, solar PV's and air or ground source heat pumps.

8.0 Summary of Other Representations

- 8.1 The application has been advertised by way of press notice, site notices and neighbour notification.

8.2 14 letters have been received, commenting:

- The site is Green Belt and a Conservation Area
- Loss of jobs and loss of employment land
- Residential development is a reasonable alternative to the present use.
- Will benefit the village and help with housing shortage
- Loss of trees
- Creation of footpath and passing bays will take a portion of the green belt
- Dwellings in density and type will need to fit in with the area
- Consider this number of dwellings is the maximum to prevent traffic and parking problems
- Is proposing too many houses – expensive and will not support 1st time buyers. Lack of affordable housing
- Concerns regarding flooding and drainage
- Local doctors, schools and dentists are already at capacity
- Increase of traffic, congestion and safety concerns. Bridleway 12 will suffer
- Lack of parking on site, additional on street parking will cause issues
- Safety concern from public space and vandalism, litter and similar
- Concern regarding impact on power, water, drainage, sewerage capacity
- The public open space should link to existing footpaths to make it accessible
- Any future lighting to the bridleway would be harmful
- Adverse impact to nature reserve, disruption to wildlife

9.0 **Planning History**

9.1 The following planning history is of relevance to this proposal:-

| Ref | Proposal | Decision | Date |
|--------------|--|-------------------------|------------|
| 3/98/0935/FP | 2 Storey side office extension and single storey extension | Granted with conditions | 18.11.1998 |
| 3/94/0773/FP | 2 storey office extension | Granted with conditions | 13.07.1994 |

10.0 Consideration of Relevant Issues

Principle of development

- 10.1 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt, where any proposal for new residential development and other associated buildings in the Green Belt is contrary to Local Plan policy GBC1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at Paragraph 89 however, states that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate, one of a number of exceptions being, 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing development'.
- 10.2 Having reviewed the definition of previously developed land (PDL) as set out within Annex 2 of the NPPF, this site, where it is currently developed, fits that description in its current form. The main issue therefore is whether the proposed development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing development.
- 10.3 With regard to openness, the starting point would ordinarily be a comparison between the existing and proposed building(s) floor area and volume together with a consideration of siting and dispersal of development on a site. In this application, layout is a reserved matter and therefore the assessment is in relation to just floorspace and volume and whether, if 30 new homes were provided, as is proposed, they could be created within the floorspace envelope proposed, and no more. The application has been amended from the original submission to reduce the amount of development and a scale parameters plan forms part of the application.
- 10.4 The volume of the proposed development would be identical to the volume of the existing buildings, and in terms of the floor area, there would be a 5% increase (existing 2792sqm and 2948sqm proposed). Given that the general perception of buildings is in terms of their volume the proposed development in these terms would therefore have no greater impact upon the openness of the Green Belt than the existing buildings on site. This amount of development can be secured via condition.

- 10.5 The layout is of course a reserved matter. The indicative plans show a wider spread of buildings across the site than currently exists and more individual buildings than the currently consolidated form on the site. The indicative layout shows the potential to 'open up' the site, creating views through it where they do not currently exist. In this way, the impact on openness can be considered neutral, at worst.
- 10.6 If a planning permission is supported, this confirms that the Council is of the view that 30 dwellings can be created within the floorspace and volume which is thereby supported. The illustrative layout indicates a range of unit sizes between 1 and 4 bed. None of them is shown to be, or indeed, could be, extensive in scale, the largest being 1300sqft (or 121sqm) in floorspace and the smallest one bed unit being a very modest 476sqft (44sqm). In considering any future reserved matter submission, it would have to be made clear to applicants, that units which were more extensive in size would require a reassessment to be made in relation to the impact of development on the green belt. Given the sizes proposed, which are not outside of the scale of acceptable sized units, it should be possible to accommodate 30 units on the site.
- 10.7 On a separate matter, and to which no weight should be given at this stage, as layout is not under consideration, a more closely grouped and less suburban layout may ultimately be appropriate for the site, providing it with an improved character and more closely reflecting the current footprint of development at the site.
- 10.8 Turning to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt (Paragraph 80 of the NPPF), the main purpose to consider would be 'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'. This consideration has to be undertaken against the current use of and buildings at the site. Given the current characteristics of the site, with buildings and hardstandings covering much of it, it is considered that the scale of the housing proposed would result in no greater encroachment into the countryside than currently takes place.
- 10.9 Subject to this amount of development being advanced through the reserved matters application (to be secured via condition) the development would amount to appropriate development, therefore and, whilst located in the green belt, is not subject to objection in principle.

Loss of Employment land

- 10.10 The proposal would result in the loss of a site currently in employment use, (the site is not a designated employment site). There are 3 existing occupiers at the site utilising the buildings and land for office and commercial and storage uses. The leases of all commercial premises on the site are due to expire on 31st December 2018. The relevant policy within the Local Plan, EDE2 states that, where a development will cause the loss of an existing employment site, or one that was last in employment use, it will only be permitted where the retention of the site for employment use has been fully explored without success.
- 10.11 The application has been submitted with a Planning Statement and Addendum which addresses the loss of the employment site. No marketing of the site has been undertaken instead a justification for the loss of the site based on attractiveness and suitability of the site for redevelopment or occupation by other business, has been submitted.
- 10.12 This justification reviews the Hertford and Ware Employment Study (2016) which identifies that the principal issue for employment land supply relates to the quality not the quantity. The Statement outlines that a Valuation Report concludes that the existing buildings are dated and in need of refurbishment. It refers to forthcoming legislation, due to be enacted on 1st April 2018 which will prevent the letting or renting of buildings which have an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) of F or G. The main building on site and a number of others have been given an F rating.
- 10.13 The Statement and Addendum details that the existing buildings are of a poor standard and significant investment is required to upgrade the conditions in order that these are fit for re-use. It concludes that such investment to upgrade or entirely redevelop the site for employment use is likely to be economically unsustainable. In addition, the layout of the site is stated as poor where the office accommodation and storage building are separate such that they do not lend themselves to a range of future occupiers.
- 10.14 The commentary on the quality of the buildings is not disputed and the justification given as to the reasons why the site is unlikely to be retained for ongoing employment use or redevelopment for such use is noted. However, it is ultimately the

case that the site has not been marketed in any respect and as such there has been no testing of the potential that, despite all the current shortcomings of the buildings at the site, a future owner/occupier may be willing to either utilise the buildings in their current form or invest in them such that they fit their purpose. This is in direct conflict with the requirements of Policy EDE2 and does not sit comfortably with the policy requirements of the NPPF which seek to support economic development. As such, it is considered that this attracts some substantial weight against the proposals.

Housing land supply and Sustainability

- 10.15 The Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that in these circumstances relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date.
- 10.16 In this case the scheme would provide up to 30 dwellings. That would clearly represent a benefit in terms of the provision of land for housing. This attracts positive weight, however, as Members will see later in this report, this weight is tempered as no affordable housing units are proposed to be provided.

Locational Sustainability

- 10.17 The site is on the edge of Stanstead Abbots which is a sustainable settlement with a range of services and facilities and relatively good public transport. The distance between the site and the railway station, at the far end of the High street, is no more than 1.3km approx. The majority of the facilities to be found in the High Street will be closer than this. So, whilst a little detached from the main area of the settlement, it is considered that the location of the site is one which can be considered sustainable.

Flood risk and drainage

- 10.18 The site is located entirely within flood zone 1, an area of low probability of flooding where, in accordance with the NPPF and the East Herts Local Plan, new development is directed. The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and a Drainage Strategy and the Local Lead Flood Authority have confirmed that matters of flood risk and drainage can be adequately managed. As the application is in outline form, where

the proposed scheme is yet to be determined in detail and a number of conditions are imposed to ensure that this matter is addressed satisfactorily.

- 10.19 However, whatever layout may ultimately come forward, the redevelopment of the site to remove the significant areas of hardstanding and the replacement of them with private garden areas and public green spaces, must be considered a benefit in sustainable drainage terms to which positive weight can be attached.

Highway matters

- 10.20 The application has been submitted with a Transport Statement. County Highways are content that in terms of traffic generation it is not anticipated that there would be any increase and that the junction of Roydon Road and Netherfield Lane is suitable for development of this scale and nature.
- 10.21 The development requires regrading of the existing carriageway between the site entrance and the junction of Netherfield Lane, which is to be secured via condition. Furthermore, it is proposed that land immediately to the north, east and south of the site (within the sole ownership of the applicant), be used to accommodate road widening and the provision of a dedicated pedestrian footpath along the eastern edge of Netherfield Lane. This is to be owned by the applicant and facilitated by section 52 of the Highways Act.
- 10.22 Detailed matters of internal access roads and parking layout and provision will be a matter for the reserved matters application. However, it is considered that there is reasonable scope to ensure the provision of parking appropriate to the scale of development that is proposed.
- 10.23 The works to provide access to the Almshouses raises no objection. This is put forward as a betterment for the occupiers of these properties, modest positive weight can be assigned to this aspect of the proposals.

Scale, design and Layout

- 10.24 Scale is a matter for this outline application. It is proposed that 2 storey dwellings be developed. Given the scale of the current buildings on the site this is considered appropriate and would

ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable in scale terms and that the impact on the openness of the green belt is contained. The maximum height of dwellings would be secured by a condition.

- 10.25 Matters of layout and detailed design of the dwellings will be a reserved matter. The illustrative layouts do not fetter later considerations.

Impact on Designated Sites, Protected Species and trees

- 10.26 An Ecology Impact Assessment confirms that there would be a net gain in biodiversity and habitat provision given that the site is extensively hard surfaced. The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site however the impact upon it is considered modest and no impact upon protected species is anticipated. Herts Ecology does recommend a condition in respect of an Ecological Design Strategy to ensure appropriate ecology and habitat management.
- 10.27 Although landscaping remains a reserved matters, it is clear that trees and planting to the boundaries can be retained and strengthened in the interests of visual amenity.
- 10.28 The indicative layout for the proposals shows the provision of green and open spaces both within the proposed housing and beyond it to the eastern side of the site. A local area of play is proposed in the green area within the housing. It is certainly the case that the land to the eastern end of the site should be maintained undeveloped. Development here would encroach beyond the area of the current employment uses and would represent inappropriate development in green belt terms.
- 10.29 The size of the open space, in relation to the housing proposed, is extensive, and it is not clear whether dedication as public open space will result in a valued and useable amenity and whether the maintenance liability will be welcomed by whoever it is ultimately vested in, and, therefore, whether the space will be a successful one. It is self-contained within the site and unconnected and cannot be seen as having a wider public benefit. No positive weight is assigned to the potential provision in this case. The green area within the housing can be seen as something that would normally be required to enable a suitable quality of development.

Affordable housing and other financial contributions

- 10.30 The application was submitted with a Viability Report based on the provision of no affordable housing. This has been independently assessed by consultants on behalf of the Council who determine that the proposed development will result in a deficit of £123,000. It is assumed that a sales growth over the construction period may be anticipated and as such a mechanism to review the viability of the proposals and to potentially secure funding, rather than direct provision of affordable housing will need to be contained within the legal agreement.
- 10.31 The lack of any affordable housing on site must be a matter that reduces the positive weight that can be given to housing delivery.

Impact on neighbour amenity

- 10.32 In respect of the impact of the development on neighbouring properties, it is considered that the layout, design and access arrangements could be planned in such a way as to prevent the development having any unacceptable impact upon neighbouring resident's amenity. With regard to the levels of amenity that the development could provide for future occupiers, Officers are satisfied that this would be acceptable and in compliance with Policy ENV1 of the East Herts Local Plan.

11.0 Conclusion

- 11.1 The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt wherein in accordance with the NPPF, redevelopment of 'previously developed land' may be appropriate. The volume of the development proposed is identical to the existing and the floor space only slightly increased, such that the development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing. Equally the proposed development would not have a greater impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The development therefore constitutes appropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 11.2 In the absence of land supply significant positive weight has to be assigned to proposals that bring forward land for housing development. As indicated, that positive weight is reduced in this case as no affordable units are proposed to be provided as part of the development.

- 11.3 Positive weight is also assigned to the proposals with regard to their impact on flood risk and sustainable drainage improvements. The improved access and parking arrangement for the Almshouses to the north is also assigned modest positive weight.
- 11.4 Weighed against this, buildings and land in employment use would be lost, without any testing of the market to establish whether, despite any limitations of the site and buildings, other owners and occupiers would be willing to invest in them. This must be assigned significant negative weight. In relation to all other matters the proposals are considered to impact in a neutral way.
- 11.5 Members will be aware of the requirements of the NPPF in the absence of sufficient supply of land for housing development. Where development proposals are otherwise sustainable, the test set out in the NPPF in such cases is that, unless a development proposals will result in significant and demonstrable harm, development should be allowed to proceed. Against that test, taking into account the weightings as assigned above, it is not considered that the harm caused by the development is so significant, when weighed against the benefits, that permission should be withheld in this case.
- 11.6 There will be some harm in respect of the loss of the employment land, however Officers are content that adequate reasoning has been given as to the reasons why the site is unlikely to be retained for ongoing employment use and given the wider benefits of the proposal in respect of housing delivery, with a lack of other harm identified, the loss can be justified.
- 11.7 Furthermore, highways matters, issues of flood risk and drainage, impact to protected species and neighbour amenity are also acceptable subject to conditions.
- 11.8 Accordingly, Officers consider that the development proposal can be supported and recommend that planning permission is approved subject to the legal agreement and planning conditions as set out below:

Legal Agreement

- A mechanism to review the financial viability of the proposals and to potentially enable funds to be secured for affordable housing provision

- A financial contribution towards Outdoor Sports Facilities based in table 8 of the EHDC Planning Obligations SPD;
- A financial contribution toward the provision of facilities for Children and Young People, parks and public gardens and amenity green space, based in table 8 of the EHDC Planning Obligations SPD, in lieu of direct provision on site in the event that does not occur
- A financial contribution towards the provision of community centres and village hall based upon table 11 of the EHDC Planning Obligations SPD;
- A financial contribution towards the provision of recycling collection facilities based upon table 11 of the EHDC Planning Obligations SPD;
- A financial contribution toward the maintenance of outdoor sports facilities in accordance with the SPD
- A financial contribution toward the maintenance costs of public parks and gardens, amenity green spaces and provision for children and young people, in accordance with the SPD, in lieu of direct provision on the site in the event that does not occur;
- A financial contribution towards the adult section of the Ware library based upon table 2 of the Hertfordshire County Council Planning Obligation toolkit;
- A financial contribution towards youth service for the development of an allotment project for young people attending Ware Centre based upon table 2 of the Hertfordshire County Council Planning Obligation toolkit;
- Details of the private agreements to secure the management and maintenance of the public open spaces throughout the site.

Conditions

- 1 Outline permission time limit (1T03)
- 2 Details of the appearance, landscaping and layout (hereinafter called the 'reserved matters') of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: To comply with the provision of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

- 3 Any reserved matters application submitted pursuant to this outline approval shall be limited to a development with an overall

maximum built volume of 9,814 sqm and an overall maximum floor space of 2948sqm. The scale of all buildings shall be limited to 2 storeys with a maximum height, to the highest part of all roofs, of 10 metres, when measured against the adjacent ground level.

Reason: To ensure that the development is in accordance with Policy GBC1 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review April 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 Approved plans (2E103)
- 5 Contaminated land survey and remediation (2E33)
- 6 Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall be based on the submitted Ridge and Partner LLP Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, Version 1.2 dated 28/09/16. The scheme shall include:
 - Limiting the surface water run-off generated by the 1 in 100 year + climate change critical storm so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site and not increase the risk of flooding off-site.
 - Providing attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.
 - Implementing the appropriate drainage strategy, using appropriate SuDS measures such as swale and pond as indicated on strategy drawing LON.0368_07 REV .
 - Details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion.
 - Detailed engineering drawings of the proposed SuDS measures.
 - Detailed drainage calculations to include the whole site area.
 - Updated modelling calculations to ensure there is enough capacity provided by the proposed system.
 - Where discharging to the drainage ditch and French drain, confirmation should be provided about the ownership and assessment of the condition.

The scheme shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of the residential units hereby permitted, and subsequently maintained 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 flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site and to reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future users.

7 Existing access closure (3V05)

8 Wheel washing (3V25)

9 Prior to the commencement of the development, a 'Construction Traffic Management Plan' shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. Thereafter, the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan. The 'Construction Traffic Management Plan' shall identify details of:

- Phasing for the development of the site, including all highway works;
- Methods for accessing the site, including construction vehicle numbers and routing;
- Location and details of wheel washing facilities; and
- Associated parking areas and storage of materials clear of the public highway.

Reason: To ensure the impact of construction vehicles on the local road network is minimised.

10 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted full details in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority to illustrate the following:

- i) All roads (including improvements to Netherfield Lane between the access to the main part of the site and Royden Road, to adoptable standards), footways and pedestrian links to be provided;
- ii) Visibility splays in both directions at the vehicle access and ii) Access arrangements for vehicles expected to access the development including a swept-path analysis.

Reason: To ensure that the access arrangement and internal layout is constructed to the Highway Authority's specification as

required by the Local Planning Authority and to comply with those policies of the Development Plan.

Directives

1. Other legislation (010L)
2. Highway Works (06FC2)
3. Street name and numbering (19SN)
4. Summary of reasons for decision (JG1)

KEY DATA**Residential Development**

| Residential density | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| | Bed space | Number of units |
| Number of existing units demolished | | 0 |
| Number of new flat units | none | |
| Number of new house units | Up to 30 | |

Affordable Housing

| Number of units | Percentage |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| 0 | Nil |
| | |

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 | Unknown – outline application |
| 2 | 1.50 | |
| 3 | 2.25 | |
| 4+ | 3.00 | |
| Total required | | |
| Proposed provision | | |

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 | Unknown - outline application |
| 2 | 2/00 | |
| 3 | 2.50 | |
| 4+ | 3.00 | |
| Total required | | |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Accessibility reduction | | |
| Resulting requirement | | |
| Proposed provision | | |

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 | Up to 40% | Nil | Viability assessment indicates inability to provide |
| Parks and Public Gardens | Not established at this time | Contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD, or direct on site provision | N/A |
| Outdoor Sports facilities | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD | N/A |
| Amenity Green Space | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD or direct on site provision | N/A |
| Provision for children and young people | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD or direct on site provision | N/A |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|-----|
| Maintenance contribution – Parks and public gardens | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD required if no on site provision and/ or maintenance arrangements for it. | N/A |
| Maintenance contribution – Outdoor Sports facilities | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD | N/A |
| Maintenance contribution – Amenity Green Space | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD required if no on site provision and/ or maintenance arrangements for it. | N/A |
| Maintenance contribution – Provision for children and young people | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD required if no on site provision and/ or no maintenance arrangements for it. | N/A |
| Community Centres and Village Halls | Not established at this time | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD | N/A |
| Recycling facilities | Not established at this time. | The contribution based on table 4 in the Planning Obligation SPD | N/A |