

Bishop's Stortford Goods yard: Response to Draft Master Plan Comments from East Herts Council: 18 Oct 2017

Page	Issue	Comment	Response
4	Town centre boundary	Part of the site is included in the town centre boundary, the draft describes the site as being to the south	Minor text amendment PG4
4	Land use policy designation	The site is designated for mixed use, not just residential, in the emerging District Plan	Minor text amendment PG4
8-9	Context	We understand from discussions, but for others may not be clear which of the precedents is being drawn on as good practice	Text added to PG8-9
11	Town Centre Planning Framework alignment	The draft master plan aligns with much, but not all of the aspirations of the Framework.	Text amended Proposed masterplan shown beside TCPF masterplan. PG11
12	Views of St Michaels Church and river	The master plan should be clear on the degree to which views can be maintained. If they cannot, should be honest and set out the reasons why some views are not maintained. Include commentary on the views through to river	Text amended PG12 Further information to be provided in planning application. It is noted that the view from the station to the spire will be lost even with a single storey development.
13	North south all purpose route	Probably helpful to have more commentary here in relation to the aspirations in the Framework, the potential future removal of one way traffic and how will it assist with wider town centre transport issues.	Text amended PG13 Further information to be provided in planning application. Note that section 3 refers to the evolution of the masterplan so the starting point. The masterplan has evolved further through consultation and design development.

13	Link through leisure site	Need to make clear this is a future aspiration and not delivered as part of this scheme.	Text amended PG13
13	Riverside path	What will actually be delivered in respect of this? What scope is there to improve the riverside environment. Is adequate land controlled?	Minor text amendment PG4 Solum plan to deliver the works between the redline boundary. This will require agreement between stakeholders. A meeting has been held between Waterside Stortford and Solum to which they were in broad agreement of the proposals. Text on PG22.
13	Key areas	Reference to riverside park, what will this consist of? Can an indication of scale and size be given?	This information will be provided in detail in the planning application. The riverside park is made up of a series of spaces with varying sizes. Varying from approximately 10-60m from waters edge to the building frontages and around 100m in length, within the main park area. The riverside park then runs along the Stort River to the southern end of the site. Text on PG22.
13	Connections	Later drawings of the character areas show the ped connection between London Road and the riverside. Does not appear on the connection drawing.	This diagram was early design concept (evolution) and therefore did not pick up all connections. This has only recently been added through the design process.
16	Increased cycle provision	How much and where?	Text amended PG16
	Short stay parking	Please provide clarity, is this to be delivered or not?	Solum have been in discussion with the TOC and is still on going.
	Transit modelling para	This is unclear, what benefits can be achieved for non private car modes and how can they be assured. Little detail about the transport connections beyond the site, what can the development assist with in terms of wider transport aspirations.	Text amended PG16 – Provided by Transport consultant.

	Road speed	Should this be lower still, say 18-19mph to make pedestrians and cyclists comfortable to take priority. Should other management be applied such as restricting heavy goods vehicles/ restrict their times of access? Possibly more space for cyclists (cycle lane?) and less for parking to make this the higher priority use (and to manage road speed down).	Text amended PG16 – Provided by Transport consultant.
	Future maintenance	Will the road be adoptable?	Text amended PG16 – Provided by Transport consultant.
	Bus stops for north south routes	Are HCC in agreement. No mention at all of the provision to be made in the current bus interchange location, can this be enhanced. Neighbourhood Plan (NP) requires better connections all means of transport	Text amended PG16 – Provided by Transport consultant.
	Taxis	How does the stand of 10 spaces relate to current provision? Where are taxis likely to wait whilst not in the rank?	Text amended PG16 - 12 Taxi spaces will be provided which is the same provision as current. Location will be between the Train Station and Station Road along side the office building. There is potential for taxi booking office at the ground floor.
	Cycle routes	What certainty is there that enhanced riverside provision will be secured and delivered? Can the cycling improvements be drawn out more – separate page?	Information will be provided in the planning application. The enhanced riverside provision will be delivered by Solum – agreement will be required between parties. Cycling will happen on-street, as the street is a pedestrian and cycle friendly zone with reduced speeds. Movement diagram PG17 - The green dashed line shows cycle route though the masterplan. Text on PG22.
18	Mix of uses	What detail can be provided of the housing typologies? Affordable and self build housing. How will housing be accessible and adaptable?	Text added PG20. We are not considering self-build on the site.

	Non residential space	Can some indication be given to how much space will be dedicated to differing uses? Emerging District Plan refers to significant amount of office floorspace in this location. What degree of flexibility can be retained in relation to the amount of provision for office use? Has the potential for primary care uses been explored?	Text outlines current provision. Further details will be provided in the planning application. Discussed at the Steering Group 06 meeting, 18.10.2017.
	Parking	What is the intended availability and management of the spaces? NP policy requirements GY5	To be confirmed in the planning application.
22	Swales and green roofs	Is there actual potential for these, ie sufficient space and any locations of flat roof?	The planning application will provide detail. There are a number of flat roofed areas to buildings, where they face into podium courtyards. Pitched roof areas face the public realm. This provides a number of locations for green (blue, brown) roofs. The podium courtyards will also be green (blue) roofs. Blue roofs provide for water attenuation below the green roof build-up.
	Enhancement to riverside tow path	As above, can this be achieved?	As noted in comments above. Also PG22.
	Landscaping generally	Must be an assurance that good landscaping practice, including treatment to both the urban spaces (station square) and softer spaces (riverside) should not be lost or diluted as more detailed proposals are drawn up.	Agreed.

24	Residential parking	Plan shows a large area of parking adjacent to rail line boundary, can any design solutions be applied to break up the visual impact of this significant area? This seems at odds with the approach taken elsewhere in the site to make parking more discreet.	Landscape design for this area of the scheme is still being developed and will form part of the planning application. As discussed at the Steering Group 06 mtg 18.10.2017. This area is within the outline application area and by the time development is brought forward for this location and EHDC can support further reduction, this can be looked at further at the time.
	Plans and notation generally	Plans are very difficult to read and very little notation to identify points made in text, eg which building blocks?	Noted and added. Planning application drawings will be submitted at A1.
25	Sidings	Character area: The Sidings: What is meant by visual link and connection to rail line. Distinct character areas considered positive – demonstrates how homogeneity can be avoided.	As well as views to the river, views to the railway and signal box have been created to enrich a sense of place and character.
26	Scale of buildings in centre of town	Can the specific reference to which buildings be given. Generally, historical buildings in the town are 3 and 4 storeys in height.	Text amended PG26.
	Massing of blocks punctuated by a number of pedestrian routes	Is it honest to say a number, is it one?	A choice of routes is provided. Station Road, The Lane (between hotel and MSCP01), and from station to anchor street.

28	Maltings character area	<p>Refers to higher number of apartments and hard surfaced landscape. Does this match with the landscape drawings and references to large lawns, parkland etc? hard surfacing would be more compatible with the maltings typology – but inconsistent with messages elsewhere in the document?</p> <p>As a characteristic the ventilation chimneys feature in the document – can they be included on the building typologies?</p>	<p>Text amended PG28.</p> <p>The landscape proposals do create a series of spaces of which some are hard surfaced with trees through. For example, the route/zone between the riverside park and the north-south street junction.</p> <p>The ventilation chimneys will be included within the building design. We consider the Maltings character area to be appropriate for these. These will be shown in the planning application. We will also consider other areas.</p>
29	Elevation drawings	Is a reference needed here to which of the elevation drawing approaches is considered to be most appropriate?	This detail will be provided in the planning application. However the elevations with 3-4 vertical bays seem to be most appropriate.
30	Riverside area	One of the first references to building heights. Generally the document should be clearer throughout in relation to building heights being proposed. Councils aspiration is for 3 to 4 storeys. Can the document be clear if this cannot be achieved and why.	<p>Text updated to each of the character areas in reference to building height.</p> <p>The planning application will describe this in further detail. Building height and roofscape is presented on PG38 and 39. There are a number of local precedents for building heights at 6 storeys. Note that the schemes building heights vary from 2-6 storeys. The top floor being in the space. This providing for variety across the masterplan.</p>
31	Southern most buildings	No detailing to building shown, in contrast to other buildings.	The southern most buildings were presented at the Steering group 06 mtg 18.10.2017. and will be included within the planning application.
32	Sidings character area	Reference to taller buildings, taller than what? Apartments lining the road, however how will they relate to the rail line?	Text amended PG32.

	Landscaped courts	See comment above in relation to detail shown on page 24, this does not appear to show landscaped courts in contrast with the reference on this page (p32).	Amended.
33	Landscaped courts	This reference appears again here.	Text amended PG33. Landscape to be developed for planning application. To include parking and landscaped areas.
34	Block identity	No references on the plans so identity of blocks is a bit of guesswork. Podium parking welcomed – might want to reference the illustrative drawing as being another scheme as shows buildings of large scale.	Noted and added. Noted and added.
	Residential parking	Can the ratio of parking provision be made clear, and how it would be managed (both on and off street). If the ratio is to be low what other measures are to be employed to assist travel, car clubs, electric charging points?	Provided at Steering Group 06 mtg 18.10.2017. Currently; Detailed application area = 0.47 ratio Outline application area = 0.75 Overall = 0.61 A sustainable travel plan will be submitted with the planning application.

38	Building heights	<p>No key is provided to the plans so it is not possible to easily distinguish which plans, blocks and sections relate.</p> <p>Can clarity be provided when referring to floors and storeys, eg can a standard approach be followed of, ground floor plus x floors above gives total of x floors.</p> <p>One of the sections shows a 7 storey building whilst the text refers to buildings of 6 storeys. Generally the predominant height is 5 and 6 storey, the Councils preference is for 3 to 4 storey height.</p> <p>Can an explanation be given for the heights? Townscape or viability driven?</p> <p>NP refers to possible iconic building, using height and materials. Has that been considered by the master plan and discounted? Contemporary buildings for non residential use either side of station is positive. These could act as visual branding elements.</p>	<p>Noted and added. PG38 updated. Description also given at Steering Group 06 mtg. 18.10.2017.</p> <p>The scheme will provide 2-6 storey buildings. The top floor will generally be designed into the roof to reduce the appearance of height. These heights are consistent with local residential building precedents.</p> <p>Iconic building comment – The two key non-residential buildings along side the railway line which bookend the new station square are considered special buildings, which define a sense of place around the square and provide way finding from both town and the river to the station.</p> <p>We also have the Maltings building which relate to the Maltings and other elements which will help with place making and townscape. These will be described further in the planning application.</p>
Various	Building precedent images	<p>Simple modern design seems appropriate. Can more specific assurance be given about the style and design of development to come though at a later stage. Later standardisation of design and too much variety and complexity in design and materials likely to compromise the quality.</p>	<p>Presented at the Steering Group 06 mtg. Further detail will be provided in the planning application.</p>

Issues that are not currently addressed where a reference would be appropriate:

Reference to the landscaped space and residential use at John Dyde Future governance and management arrangements. – This is an aspiration.

What consultation has been undertaken and how did it inform the draft. - Presented by Solum at Steering Group 06 mtg 18.10.2017 and emailed to EHDC.

Amenity and liveability: Building sustainability, efficiency, crime reduction and security measures, noise control – will be provided as part of the planning application.

Reference to other community infrastructure provision for residents: eg education, community facilities, active recreation – to be considered further.

Assessment of heritage assets

Current water quality and improvement, Air Quality Impact – will be provided as part of the planning application.