



## Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 20 – 22 November, 27 - 29 November, 3 – 4 December, 10 – 13 December 2019

Site visits made on 12 December 2019 and 14 January 2020

**by Phillip J G Ware BSc DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 18 March 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/W/19/3234842**

**Land east of Marshgate Drive, Marshgate Drive, Hertford SG13 7AQ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by St William Homes LLP against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
- The application Ref 3/18/2465/OUT, dated 2 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2019.
- The development proposed is:

375 residential dwellings (comprising 29 houses and 5 apartment buildings for 346 apartments), 420m<sup>2</sup> gymnasium (D2), 70m<sup>2</sup> of residents co-working floorspace, car and cycle parking, access, open space, landscaping and associated works, improvements to Marshgate Drive and the creation of a spine road in the Northern Sector (Full proposal)

The construction of 2,220m<sup>2</sup> of employment floorspace (Class B1c), car parking, landscaping and associated works (all matters reserved except access) (Outline proposal)

---

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2020.

### Procedural matters

1. The first part (housing and related matters) of the proposal is for full planning permission. The second part (employment) of this hybrid proposal is for outline permission, with only access to be approved along with the principle of the development.
2. A draft Unilateral Planning Obligation was discussed at the Inquiry. The final version was received (as agreed) after the Inquiry closed<sup>1</sup>. This was essentially the same document as had been discussed at the Inquiry and there was no need for the parties to make further comments.

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc 20

## Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 375 residential dwellings (comprising 29 houses and 5 apartment buildings for 346 apartments), 420m<sup>2</sup> gymnasium (D2), 70m<sup>2</sup> of residents co-working floorspace, car and cycle parking, access, open space, landscaping and associated works, improvements to Marshgate Drive and the creation of a spine road in the Northern Sector (Full proposal); the construction of 2,220m<sup>2</sup> of employment floorspace (Class B1c), car parking, landscaping and associated works (all matters reserved except access) (Outline proposal) all on land east of Marshgate Drive, Marshgate Drive, Hertford SG13 7AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/18/2465/OUT, dated 2 November 2018, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule to this decision.

## Main issues

4. Various matters which were the subject of reasons for refusal were resolved before the Inquiry. These were the extent of affordable housing provision (no longer contested for viability reasons) and contamination (which could be addressed by conditions). Other matters not in dispute are set out in the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG)<sup>2</sup>.
5. Based on the remaining reasons for refusal and the evidence, as discussed at the pre-Inquiry conference, there are six main issues in this case:
  - Whether the appeal scheme provides sufficient employment floorspace and whether this floorspace can reasonably be delivered
  - Whether the appeal scheme represents good design
  - The effect on the living conditions of residents including those living in canal boats
  - The impact of the proposal on the highway capacity, the effect on bus services, and the level of on-site car parking
  - Whether the appeal scheme is excessive in size
  - Whether the appeal scheme would prejudice the regeneration of the allocated site

## Reasons

### The site and the proposal

6. The appeal site comprises two separate parcels of vacant land, excluding an intervening woodyard, which together comprise around 3.5 hectares. It was formerly a gas works, and the gasholders were dismantled about 10 years ago.

---

<sup>2</sup> Most conveniently at Section 1

7. The site is accessed from Marshgate Drive to the west and from Mead Lane to the south. These roads link to Mill Road which connects to Ware Road and provides access to the town centre and beyond.
8. The northern boundary of the site abuts the River Lea (along which there is a public footpath/towpath), whilst there is a residential development (Smeaton Court) to the west.
9. Hertford East railway station is around 500 metres from the site<sup>3</sup>. The bus station is around 780 metres from the northern access to the site, with a supermarket at a slightly lesser distance.
10. The wider area contains a mix of uses, including residential (Victorian terraces and newer flatted buildings) and employment development.
11. The northern part of the proposed development would comprise five apartment blocks, a gym and residents co-working space. The southern part would be 29 townhouses along with the employment floorspace. Improvements to Marshgate Drive are also proposed, and the riverside footpath/towpath would be improved. Amenity space would be in the form of podium gardens, new amenity areas along the riverside path, 'parklets' along the spine road, a pocket park fronting onto Marshgate Drive, and an area of publicly accessible wetland.

### **Policy context**

12. The development plan comprises the East Herts District Plan (DP) (2018). The parties agree that this plan is up to date and ought to be given full weight. There was considerable discussion at the Inquiry as to how the policies came to be adopted in their current form. I agree with the appellant that "...whilst this forms interesting and informative background, what is ultimately of significance is the outcome of this process."
13. In a similar vein, the emphasis placed by both parties as to the extent to which the arguments related to the appeal site were considered at the DP examination are of somewhat limited relevance. What matters is the current position as set out in evidence.
14. DP policy HERT1 provides that "around"<sup>4</sup> 200 homes will be delivered as part of a mixed use development in the Mead Lane area<sup>5</sup>, in addition there would be 3,000m<sup>2</sup> of Class b1 employment floorspace or other employment generating uses. The inclusion of the word "around" was changed at the Main Modifications stage of the DP Examination from "at least". For clarity, it is not contested that the current proposal, at 375 dwellings, cannot be considered to be "around 200 dwellings" as set out in DP policy, and that the employment floorspace proposed is below the policy figure. In respect of the residential floorspace, the proposal therefore conflicts with development plan policy.
15. The appeal site (along with the woodyard) is the subject of a specific allocation in DP policy HERT2. This provides, amongst other matters, that around 200

---

<sup>3</sup> Distances set out at SOCG Paragraph 3.4

<sup>4</sup> This word is highlighted as it is the subject of disagreement between the parties, as discussed below

<sup>5</sup> Effectively the appeal site and the woodyard

homes are to be delivered by 2027<sup>6</sup>. HERT2 requires that a Master Plan Framework (MPF) be produced – this has been done and was approved by the Council in 2018. Given that the production of the MPF is a policy requirement and has been approved by the Council I consider that it is a document to which considerable weight should be attached, although the Council’s written evidence mentions it only briefly.

16. Overall, based on these policies, the Council does not object to the principle of a mixed residential and employment development on the appeal site.
17. The planning Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) sets out the policies which the parties consider are relevant, including those referred to in the reasons for refusal<sup>7</sup>, further material considerations and other relevant documents.
18. Prior to the adoption of the DP, the Council produced the Mead Lane Urban Design Framework SPD (2014) (used as part of the evidence base for the DP). Some of the Council’s reasons for refusal allege a breach of the SPD but, from everything I heard and read, although it remains outstanding it has been largely subsumed into the DP.

### **The provision and deliverability of employment floorspace**

19. This issue relates to two reasons for refusal. The first is concerned with the quantum of employment floorspace in the appeal scheme in comparison with policy, and the second with the potential deliverability of the floorspace. I will deal with each aspect in turn.
20. DP policy (HERT1) provides that 3,000m<sup>2</sup> of employment floorspace is to be provided on the overall allocation (including the appeal site and the woodyard). The Council accepts that the gym and co-working space comprise employment floorspace, and the proposed 2,710m<sup>2</sup> of employment floorspace is therefore below the 3,000m<sup>2</sup> figure by around 290m<sup>2</sup>.
21. There was some debate at the Inquiry and in written evidence as to whether the DP anticipated some flexibility in the quantum of the employment floorspace, or whether it is to be interpreted as a fixed figure. The appellant’s position is that the DP Examination<sup>8</sup> considered the need for flexibility in relation to the quantum of floorspace to be provided on the HERT2 site, and this led to the insertion of flexibility in the supporting text.
22. However the insertion of the word “normally” was in a section dealing with economic growth, although clearly referencing HERT2, rather than in the policy itself. This leads to a confusing position, with one part of the adopted plan giving a precise figure and another part allowing for flexibility. Whether this was deliberate I cannot say but, if faced with a choice between these conflicting policy positions, I would have to prefer the site specific policy HERT2 as my start point.
23. There is clear evidence from the Council that there is a healthy demand for employment floorspace along with a serious shortfall in supply in Hertford and

---

<sup>6</sup> SOCG Paragraph 3.8

<sup>7</sup> SOCG Paragraph 6.2

<sup>8</sup> In which they were actively involved

the wider area<sup>9</sup>. In addition, it was not disputed that HERT2 is the only opportunity to deliver employment floorspace in Hertford. The Council's evidence was based on a number of studies and the professional opinion of its witness, and is persuasive. The only significant counter argument was put forward in a written statement by the appellant's employment consultants<sup>10</sup>. However they were not called at the Inquiry and it was therefore not possible to fully understand how their conclusion had been reached – apparently contrary to their previous position and contrary to reports from other experts (including the appellant's previous consultants). Under these circumstances I give this evidence less weight and I agree with the Council's position.

24. However that does not mean that a proposal for a slightly different figure from that in HERT2 should automatically be rejected. With that background I turn to the consequences of the shortfall below the 3,000m<sup>2</sup> figure. Various material considerations come into play:

- The policy, however it is interpreted, requires 3,000 m<sup>2</sup> of employment floorspace on the overall HERT2 site. However HERT2 does not identify where on the overall allocation site the floorspace should be located. The appeal site does not cover the entire HERT2 site, as it omits the woodyard. It was quite clear in evidence and cross-examination that the Council's witness dealing with this topic had not appreciated this point, and this reduces the weight I give to their expert evidence.
- The future of the woodyard site is uncertain. The evidence is that the occupiers are 'stuck' and are currently unable to move. But the woodyard site is currently in employment use and, even if the existing occupier were to remain there would be well over the HERT2 policy floorspace on the overall allocation site.
- If this situation changes in the future, as the occupiers of the woodyard clearly hope it will, there is no reason why the redevelopment of that site could not provide an element of employment floorspace – as required by policy. The Council make the point that the woodyard site is identified as being in the residential area, and the Council allege that the most this site could deliver would be an employment use which would be ancillary to the dwellings. However, even if this were the case, it would still generate employment - bearing mind that the Council accepts the co-working space and gym in the current scheme as being employment floorspace. There would be no reason to treat such provision as other than employment floorspace.
- In any event, if a scheme comes forward on the woodyard site, it would be considered in the light of then-extant policy. Given that the appeal scheme falls slightly below the quantum set out in HERT2, the Council would be in a position to seek employment space as part of the potential development.
- Finally, even though I prefer the approach to the 'fixed' quantum in HERT2 as opposed to the flexibility found elsewhere in the plan, the fact

---

<sup>9</sup> CD 3.13

<sup>10</sup> CD 1.16

that some element of flexibility is envisaged elsewhere in the DP remains a material consideration.

25. Even reading the HERT2 requirement at face value and discounting the contribution made by the woodyard site (now and in the future), the shortfall below policy is very small. The statement by the Council's employment witness that this shortfall would undermine the Council's development strategy and ability to meet its employment needs is a considerable overstatement in view of the limited scale of the shortfall. In the light of the above matters, there are compelling material considerations to accept a floorspace below that set out in the HERT1 and HERT2 which, in any event cover the whole allocation site. There is no conflict with these policies.
26. I now turn to the deliverability of the employment floorspace. The Council considered the compatibility of the employment scheme with the character of the area only briefly in evidence and the Council's design witness did not deal with it at all. There is nothing before me to suggest that the illustrative scheme would harm the character of the area and, even if it did so, this could be addressed at the detailed stage. With that in mind I move on to the feasibility of the employment scheme and whether it is likely to be delivered.
27. This matter can be dealt with briefly, as this part of the proposal is in outline, and the illustrative material put forward by the appellant (in considerably more detail than might have been expected) is not part of the proposal before me. It simply serves to show how the site could be approached.
28. The Council's position is that there is significant doubt as to whether the quantum of employment floorspace could realistically be delivered, in relation to functional and operational requirements. The authority considers that a significantly larger area of land would be required and that the illustrative material submitted by the appellant, showing excavation and basement servicing, would raise concerns about viability. Overall the Council considers that the limited servicing and loading/unloading space would threaten the delivery of the floorspace.
29. A careful reading of the illustrative plans, assisted by the scheme architect at the Inquiry and by my visit to the site, does not show a basement. Rather it is a response to a fall in the land, and in any case it was explained that it was not proposed that this area would be used by trade vehicles. There is sufficient servicing space shown for this type of scheme on the illustrative plans.
30. Much of the Council's concern was based on the position that a 40% plot ratio was required. But this appears to be based on a very conventional approach to the provision of employment floorspace – whereas such development can come in many forms. Although comparison with other schemes in different locations is not especially helpful, the Council's 40% assumption tends to imply a very traditional form of development. The 40% figure seems to have originated in a document<sup>11</sup> which itself recognises the possibility of more dense developments and which cautions against blanket assumptions.

---

<sup>11</sup> Document 6

31. In such a sustainable location, I see no reason why a denser development on multi-levels should not be provided in a perfectly satisfactory manner. The illustrative details clearly show perfectly satisfactory approaches to the delivery of the employment floorspace, as was explained in some detail by the architect and the appellant's highway witness. Sufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the employment floorspace can be delivered in an appropriate manner in line with policies DES4 and HERT2.

### **Good design**

32. In this section I am purely dealing with design considerations, rather than any restraint on development arising from highway matters. I will return to that issue below.

33. As a backdrop to the design considerations it is noted that this is a brownfield and sustainable site, and there is a clear policy requirement to optimise density. This is set out in the DP<sup>12</sup>, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the National Design Guide. It is also important to note that the site is not in a Conservation Area, and that there is no suggestion of harm to heritage assets or landscape.

34. The area around the site is very mixed and includes modern blocks of flats, traditional terraced housing, open space and commercial development. Some of the residential development in the area was stated by the appellant to be at a density above that proposed by the appeal scheme – this was not contested by the Council.

35. The Council criticised the overall approach of the scheme architect, which was to consider the site as a blank canvas in design terms, taking no account of the quantum of development set out in the DP. It was stated by the Council that he should have specifically drawn this approach to my attention. However, on reading the various documents explaining the genesis and refinement of the proposal, this approach was entirely apparent and did not need to be re-emphasised. This is especially the case as the limitation on the quantum of development appears to be transport related and not a design constraint, so it is reasonable for the architect to take the approach that he did. In any event others in the appellant's team would have been able to identify any design policy constraints which the architect should have fed into the process.

36. There was also some limited concern by the Council relating, in design terms, to the lack of a comprehensive approach to the entire allocation site. However the authority accepted that there is no requirement for a single application on the HERT2 site. There was no clear explanation as to how the current proposal would have implications, in design terms, for the remainder of the site. I will return to this matter below.

37. The relevant reason for refusal refers to the size, scale, form, siting, orientation and design of the flatted blocks, which are said to fail to respond appropriately to the riverside location resulting in an overbearing and dominant form. However there is also a considerable range of agreement on elements of the

---

<sup>12</sup> Especially DP policy HOU2



design concept – perhaps most significantly the quantum of outdoor space, legibility and the living environment.

38. The massing of the apartment blocks along the river, sitting on a podium, would be a clear and dominant feature in the local scene. However there is no measured height restriction in any policy document, and the MPF refers to the need for development to respond to its context, which ranges up to four and five storeys. From a careful study of the plans and supporting material, especially on my site visit, I have reached the conclusion that the perception of the mass of the blocks, especially when viewed from the towpath, would not be as dominant as the Council suggested.
39. In coming to that view, I have taken account of the fact that the Council's evidence erroneously referred to five storeys across the whole site. Even assuming that this refers to only the northern part of the site, this statement ignores the connecting blocks which are lower.
40. The roof design and elevations were amended on a number of occasions and would be, in my view, well articulated when viewed from the towpath. I appreciate the approach which to the architect has taken in reflecting mill architecture, which I consider appropriate in this riverside location, and I do not find the ridgelines and roofscape to be monotonous.
41. There was some criticism by the Council that the scale of the development would be seen when viewed from Hartham Common. However it was not explained how such a view would equate to harm, especially bearing in mind that the MPF encourages views from the proposed apartments to Hartham Common. Logically the reverse view must be available and there is no suggestion in the MPF or elsewhere that this equates to harm.
42. Overall, I consider that the proposed apartment blocks respond positively to their riverside location and would not represent an overbearing or dominant form.
43. Turning to the proposal as it relates to the footpath/towpath, the scheme has a significant benefit in terms of widening the public realm and providing a landscaped setting for both the buildings and the towpath. In addition there would be three locations along the towpath where there would be a wider area which could accommodate seating. The setback of the blocks from the towpath would be quite significant - in excess of 8 metres from that part of the path closest to the buildings, and obviously wider if one measures the distance from the edge of the path closest to the river. This is quite a significant distance set in the context of the absence of any specific guidance as to the relevant distance.
44. The slope up to the podium was itself the subject of criticism by the Council, on the basis that it would be too steep to be usable, although the authority was not able to identify how steep the slopes would be. The appellant provided the gradients (8 – 25 degrees) for the slopes, and these were not contested. From these figures and my site visit I see no reason why the slopes should not be an attractive and usable element of the scheme.



45. There would also be landscaped areas between the apartment blocks along the river frontage. These were criticised by the Council on the basis of extensive use of grasscrete and the intrusion of significant amounts of parking into the areas. However I suspect this has arisen as a misunderstanding in that grasscrete between the blocks was abandoned at a much earlier stage, and the amount of parking was reduced substantially. On that basis I see no reason why the areas between the blocks should not be usable and attractive landscaped areas.
46. Although not supported by evidence, there was a point raised by the Council in cross-examination as to whether higher density development should be more appropriately located at the eastern or western end of the appeal site. However what matters is the overall design consequences of the appeal scheme, not any guidance as to the best location of more dense elements.
47. The iterations of the appeal scheme have been presented twice to the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel (DRP). The Council has stated that the DRP "...raised serious concerns about the scheme...overbearing, with a relentless or monotonous quality..<sup>13</sup>"
48. I have read the comments of the two DRPs carefully, and have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the Council's extracts and summary are somewhat selective. It is certainly true that, when first presented to the DRP, various critical comments were made with a view to improving the design. The scheme was significantly amended following these comments, and it is clear to me that, when presented a second time, the DRP considered that the scheme had considerably improved and had a clearer design philosophy and better legibility. Overall the DRP comments, taken in the round, clearly indicate that the second submission represented good design, said by the appellant to be on the verge of being exemplary. It should also be noted that, after the second DRP, the scheme was further amended. There appeared to be some criticism that the proposal was not put back to the DRP again, but I see no reason why this should have been done.
49. Overall and on the basis of the above matters I consider that the appeal scheme represents good design, and that the Council's concerns are not justified. It complies with DP policies HERT2, DES1 and DES4, Framework guidance and the provisions of the Mead Lane Urban Design Framework (2014).

### **Living conditions of nearby residents**

50. In the committee report Council officers reflected the objections from some boat residents, but did not give their considered view on the matter. However planning permission was refused, amongst other matters, on the grounds of impact on the boat residents. The reason for refusal can be divided into 2 parts, which I will deal with in turn. Firstly an objection on the basis of the effect on the living conditions of the permanent canal boat residents in relation to natural light and overlooking. Secondly the reason for refusal alleges that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed

---

<sup>13</sup> Council's opening submissions

dwellingings would not be adversely impacted by the employment element of the scheme.

51. Dealing first with the living conditions of the residents of the canal boats located on the opposite side of the river, both parties agreed that the issue related to those permanently occupied. There was a debate at the Inquiry as to which fell into that category and Council tax records were submitted in order to attempt to clarify matters<sup>14</sup>. There was also reference to those boats which had formed small onshore garden areas, and whether these were indicative of permanent occupation. Overall, the position remained somewhat unclear, but it is safe to assume that some of the boats, probably four in number, are occupied as permanent dwellingings.
52. The start point is DP policy DES4 which seeks to avoid significant detrimental impact. However this is an unusual case in that neither party was able to point to policy, guidance, or case law related to the impact of a proposal on residential canal boats. Both parties used the BRE<sup>15</sup> guidance in considering this issue, but this is only advisory, and the guidance also provides that the matter should be approached in a flexible manner.
53. An important consideration is that the Council did not adopt a two-stage test in assessing the daylight and sunlight implications of the scheme, although the Council's witness accepted that this was the appropriate approach as set out in case law and appeal decisions. The correct approach is firstly to calculate whether there would be a material deterioration in conditions, using the BRE guidance. But after that there has to be consideration of policy and wider amenity issues (including policy to make effective use of land). It is this second stage which the Council initially failed to address, and the fact that the Council initially did not adopt this approach casts some doubt on their evidence.
54. Along with the fact that there is no policy or guidance dealing with residential boats there are a number of other background issues affecting the expectations of the boat residents and the measurement of the effects. I have considered these before moving to the details of the calculations:
  - It is clear from the Canal and River Trust's standard terms<sup>16</sup> that the residents of boats have a licence to occupy, but no particular right to a specific mooring. It appears that they can easily be required to move. The evidence relating to the potentially residential boats is that they have moved on occasion. In this respect there is a significant difference between residents of a boat and those living in bricks and mortar.
  - The configuration of the boats is such that the windows are at a low level close to the water. The appellant suggested that this meant that they were analogous to basement rooms. I do not entirely agree with this approach, but nevertheless it makes assessment difficult and arguably sets a lower expectation than if they were conventional windows.

---

<sup>14</sup> Document 1

<sup>15</sup> CD 5.6

<sup>16</sup> Document 2

- Some boats have portholes to some areas within the boat as I saw on my visit. Doubtless this gives a degree of natural light, but this would be far less than a conventional window.
- The BRE approach to VSC<sup>17</sup> should be assessed 1.6 metres from ground level – but this is not possible in the case of canal boats.
- Some residents have chosen to curtain or otherwise block windows facing across the river to the appeal site, presumably for privacy reasons. They probably rely on windows facing the other way, which would be unaffected by the proposed development.

55. A number of matters were agreed between the parties. In particular that there is no issue related to daylight distribution and sunlight hours. The main issue relates to Vertical Sky Component (VSC) which measures a single point of light on a window. Useful though this measure is, it does not allow for the size or shape of the room in question or the presence or absence of other windows. This makes calculation of the VSC particularly problematic when dealing with boats.

56. As a general position I prefer the appellants calculations of the VSC to that of the Council for three reasons:

- Firstly and most importantly the Council's evidence plotted the position of the boats incorrectly. This allegation was not contested at the Inquiry and I confirmed the error for myself on my visit.
- The Council's calculation did not initially include an existing wall, around 4 metres in height, which currently runs along the northern boundary of the appeal site and obviously affects the current situation. Although this was accepted and corrected during the course of the Inquiry, it casts some doubt as to the weight to which the evidence can be afforded.
- The Council's witness did not show how the results had been calculated, unlike the appellant's witness. Although I have no reason to doubt the calculations, leaving aside the two points above, it would have been easier to verify the results if the workings had been revealed.

57. The BRE Guidance provides that a retained VSC of greater than 25% represents adequate skylight potential, and that a reduction of 20% would not be noticeable. The appellant took this further and adopted (with explanation) an approach with a retained VSC of 21.6% as the minimum level. This was specifically accepted by the Council's witness in cross-examination. On that basis, there would be only a very small number of windows falling below that level, and those which did fail would only do so by a narrow margin.

58. Overall, because of the peculiarities of this particular case as summarised above, I find that the very limited numerical infringement of the VSC in some cases to be such that it would be difficult to allege harm to living conditions on that basis. I now pass briefly to deal with the second stage of the accepted approach.

---

<sup>17</sup> Vertical Sky Component

59. In particular I am conscious that the policy requirement is that "significant detrimental impact" will occur. I do not consider that the numerical infringements in this case even come close to that level of harm. In reaching that conclusion I am also conscious that there was no assessment by the Council of typical VSCs in the area, whereas the appellant's assessment - showing some recent developments with lower VSCs - was not challenged.
60. In addition the appeal site has been cleared of buildings and other structures for some years and is allocated for development in the DP. It is therefore to be reasonably expected that some change will occur on this site, and that the amenity of canal boat residents would be affected to a degree. This is particularly clear as the MPF and the SPD suggest the potential for river frontage development.
61. Overall the appeal scheme would not reduce the daylight received by the residents of the boats to a significant degree.
62. Turning to the consequences for sunlight, the Council suggests that there would be significant changes to sunlight on the river throughout the year, adjacent to several areas of the residential boats. The authority considers that this part of the river provides critical amenity space for houseboat dwellers and it is therefore reasonable to assess the situation in that light.
63. The Council therefore adopted the BRE guidance on open spaces and gardens to include the river itself. The authority considered that the water represented an external visual amenity and created a set of theoretical areas for each boat within which to assess sunlight. However the Council accepted that there was no policy or guidance in support of such an approach, nor any relevant appeal decisions which endorse it.
64. The approach seems to me to be unsupported and unrealistic, as the areas in question can be passed along by boats and are not exclusive to particular residents. I agree with the appellant's suggestion that it would be similar to assessing the effect of development on a road. In any event, having put forward this approach, the Council's evidence shows that at least two hours of sunlight is available on 21 March. There is no need to go beyond this, as the Council sought to do, to consider tests relevant to critical areas.
65. The reason for refusal also alleged harm due to overlooking to the boat residents. However the Council offered very little evidence on this matter, other than a reference to a perception of overlooking. The design of the proposed apartments is such that the extent of potential overlooking would be very limited and the intervening distance between the boats and the apartments would be significant. In addition, the low-level nature of the boats would further serve to reduce any such perception.
66. The reason for refusal alleged that there was insufficient evidence to judge the impact of the employment element of the scheme on the proposed houses. However the Council's daylight/sunlight witness was not instructed to consider this aspect and no evidence was offered by the authority. The appellant assessed the potential impact, based on known parameters, with the result that there was a marginal deficiency in winter sunlight to one window in one

room at a lower level of a proposed house, and to one room in an existing dwelling in Marshgate Drive. There is nothing to suggest that these marginal infringements, considering the local context, should lead to a dismissal of the appeal.

67. Overall, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of residents including those living in canal boats. It complies with DP policy DES4.

### **Highway matters**

68. The highway reasons for refusal raise three interconnected issues. Firstly it is alleged that the amount of development would have a severe capacity impact which would adversely affect the approach routes to and at the junction of Mill Road/Ware Road and the Bluecoats roundabout. Related to that the second issue is the alleged adverse effect on the reliability of bus and rail replacement services in the area. Finally the level of on-site parking proposed is alleged to put pressure off-site and contribute to the capacity issue. The second of these issues is almost entirely parasitic on the first, but I will deal with each in turn.
69. The background to these issues is that the appeal site is a large part of the area allocated for significant residential and employment development, and that the accessibility of the site is not in doubt. It is also common ground that the proposed highway sustainability measures have the potential to make a positive contribution to accessibility.
70. A range of matters are agreed in the Highways SOCG<sup>18</sup> and were confirmed at the Inquiry. These do not need to be repeated in full here, but include site layout and design, trip generation and assignment, travel plans and highway safety. In terms of trip generation it is agreed that a reduction to predicted traffic generation should be applied to the completed (2024) figure to reflect the Travel Plan and other sustainable transport initiatives. The mitigation measures and their funding are clearly explained in evidence and largely agreed in the SOCG. I will return to them later.
71. In terms of highway capacity, the area of disagreement is very limited. In essence it is the effect of the traffic associated with the proposal at the Bluecoats roundabout and at the Ware Road/Mill Road junction, and at the approaches to these locations.

### *The existing situation*

72. Dealing first with the current highway position, this is most succinctly set out in the A414 Corridor Strategy, which was adopted during the course of the Inquiry<sup>19</sup> (as discovered by the appellant). It states that the fact that many different routes coincide at the Bluecoats roundabout causes congestion. This is uncontested.
73. It was explained in evidence that the Council has undertaken considerable work on signal timings at the roundabout and at the junction to avoid blocking. Both parties showed drone footage (obtained by the appellant) and I was also able

---

<sup>18</sup> Document 21

<sup>19</sup> Document 17

to observe the position throughout the morning and evening peaks on my second site visit. The appellant also presented a full turning count of traffic and queues<sup>20</sup>, which was not contested. The Council did not produce any such data.

74. My very clear conclusion is that the roundabout and the junction, whilst exhibiting some queueing on the approaches, display little stacked traffic on the roundabout itself. What blocking back did occur during my visit was brief in duration and appeared to be well managed by the signals.
75. Historically the evidence suggests that flows on the A414 have been generally decreasing in recent years. This is suggested by a significant reduction between 2006 to 2015 (as referenced in the County Council's 2015 letter<sup>21</sup>). The Council sought to cast doubt on the reliability of the DfT figures but, whilst I appreciate that some of these are estimates or spot counts, they contribute to the overall picture - even though they may not be as useful as other evidence in relation to small links.

### *Modelling*

76. Turning to the way in which the effects of the proposal have been modelled, the Council has stated that it is not clear how the appellant has arrived at a reduced trip generation of 25% to reflect the decreased on-site parking. In fact the appellant was clear as to the calculation - the trip generation has simply been reduced pro rata. I do not find this to be an unreasonable approach, which was not contested by the Council.
77. The appellant has submitted two models to the Inquiry - a LINSIG model and a microsimulation (VISSIM) model. Before considering these models, it should be noted that the Council emphasised that one of their highway witnesses had direct experience of highway modelling, whereas the appellant's witness relied on others. However the appellant's evidence was clear and cogent and, although the witness was not a modeller himself, he detailed his lengthy experience as part of a team dealing with modelling. The Council's criticism adds no weight to my considerations.
78. LINSIG modelling is well-established and widely used software for modelling networks and large compound junctions such as signalised roundabouts. Its use is supported by the guidance produced by DfT. With that background it is perhaps surprising that the Council say that it suffers from flaws which make it unsuitable. In particular it is said that it fails to address queue lengths where these exceed the road space available to accommodate it. In effect queues are stacked vertically in the model.
79. It is clear that the LINSIG model operates in this way regardless of the actual available road capacity. However these queues are transient, and this is a standard feature of the model, which has been used and endorsed in many areas. I am not persuaded that the model should be cast into doubt because of this generally accepted feature.

---

<sup>20</sup> CD 4.6

<sup>21</sup> Document 5



80. LINSIG modelling shows that the mitigation proposed at the Ware Road/Mill Road junction does not add to queueing on the roundabout and has only a limited effect on Ware Road. The Council produced some hand drawn diagrams of the queues said to be produced by LINSIG modelling. But these did not appear to be entirely accurate and in any event did not show any real difference to the extent of queueing.
81. There was much discussion over the fact that the Council, at the application stage and in the SOCG, describe LINSIG as being “broadly robust”, yet at a subsequent stage raised criticisms of it. It was explained by the Council that it is regarded as a broadly robust model only once errors are removed, which has not been the case in the view of the authority. This is, at best, a confusing position and it is hard to see how the model could have been described as robust. In any event, the current position of the authority is that LINSIG is not an appropriate modelling tool and that a microsimulation model was additionally needed.
82. In response to the Council's concerns the appellant explained that they had considered the use of PARAMICS modelling, but this had proved unsatisfactory. No party suggested that this model would be of any particular use in this context. The approach then switched to VISSIM modelling.
83. There was a disagreement at the Inquiry as to the timeline of the production of the VISSIM model, which was published (along with a validation report) by the appellant around a month before the Inquiry. Regardless of how this came to be produced, which is not germane to my decision, the Council were able to respond in full to this new modelling, and had ample time to explain their position.
84. The Council’s position is that this model includes significant errors, the most important of which are considered below:
- There was concern that the study area of the model was too small. Certainly it does not extend particularly widely beyond the roundabout and the junction, but I see no reason why it should do so as the study area is more than sufficient for its intended purpose. That is to say the consideration of the potential blocking of traffic on the Bluecoats roundabout.
  - In this respect there was a suggestion that there could be blocking back to the A10 junction - some 2.2kms away. But this was suggested on an anecdotal basis and supported, to a very limited extent only, by Google Heat Maps, which include very wide definitions and are unsuited for this purpose.
  - The Council was concerned that actual flows rather than demand flows have been input into the model. It certainly appears that actual flows, adjusted where necessary, were the primary data source. However from the evidence before me this appears to be standard practice and is supported by TfL modelling guidelines.
  - The use of a dummy signal in the model serves the reasonable purpose of simulating delays from the upstream junction. This accords with what



can be appreciated from the drone footage and from my site visit, and seems an entirely unobjectionable input into the model.

- The Council was concerned that the journey time on the approaches to the junction and roundabout are too short. However the professional witnesses on both sides accepted that this is a matter of judgement, and I have not been provided with evidence to suggest that those building the model were in error.

85. In response to the Council's concerns regarding the appellant's VISSIM modelling the authority reran the model with revisions. However this revised model has not been validated to demonstrate that it represents existing conditions before it was used for forecasting. This substantially reduces the weight which can be placed on the revision.

86. In addition I am concerned that the Council's unverified model extends the approaches to the Bluecoats roundabout well back beyond a number of other junctions. These other junctions would clearly affect traffic and were not, in themselves, modelled. This further limits the weight which I can place on this exercise.

87. The Council, as a result of the revised model, now state that the model has demonstrated that the proposal would increase queuing along Fore Street as it enters the roundabout. However it is agreed that there would be no direct traffic from the development along Fore Street, so any effect would relate to the increased traffic on the Bluecoats roundabout itself. This increased traffic on the roundabout would be very limited indeed and it seems highly unlikely that there would be any significant effect on Fore Street.

#### *Mitigation*

88. There are a number of matters put forward by the appellant in mitigation. These would enhance the accessibility and sustainability of the site and are agreed. They include:

- Contributions to improvements at the Mead Lane crossing, Hertford East station and the towpath.
- The improvement of the Marshgate Drive/Mead Lane junction.
- Other works to Marshgate Drive.
- The production of Travel Plans and a car club.
- A future bus route through the site, along with a turning area and subsidy.

89. The only proposed improvement which is not agreed between the parties is the work at the Mill Road/Ware Road junction. The consequence of the proposed rearrangement is that it would allow more traffic to enter the main road heading towards the roundabout.

90. The written evidence of the Council's two highway witnesses is that this would have a positive impact on Mill Road, but that the effect would be problematic at the Bluecoats roundabout. However the Council's evidence was somewhat confusing, as it was contended that there would be no benefit in terms of releasing traffic onto Ware Road, but at the same time that there would be an adverse impact on the same road. This seems a contradictory approach and on balance it is clear that this element of the mitigation package will be beneficial in overall terms.

*The role of the UTP*

91. A significant amount of Inquiry time was taken up considering the evidence presented to the DP Examining Inspector. This is partly of relevance because the position of the authority is that the appellant's arguments put to me were essentially the same as those put to my colleague dealing with the DP.
92. The UTP was said by the appellants to be a critical part of the evidence base for the examination and that it was this document which effectively fixed the quantum of development on the HERT2 site. Both the Council's planning evidence and Statement of Case for this appeal emphasises the importance of the UTP, and the appellant's position also seems to be supported by the SOCG for the DP Examination. However the Council took a different position, whilst accepting that there was no other trip generation evidence related to the HERT2 site other than the UTP. The position of the authority was that it did not rely on the trip generation data from the UTP, nor LINSIG or Paramics modelling to underpin their position at the DP examination. Rather the evidence base was the trigger point analysis, and it was this which led to the optimisation of the housing trajectory. There was reference made to a spreadsheet prepared for the DP examination, but this was not produced.
93. To the extent that the role of the UTP at the DP examination is relevant at this time, this is a very unsatisfactory position. The written and verbal evidence of the two parties, both of whom were actively engaged in the DP examination, is in conflict as to the documentary source of the limitation affecting the current appeal site. What is clear is that there is no other reason beyond highway capacity for limiting the development of the HERT2 site. On balance, in trying to reconcile the conflicting information, it seems to me that at least the UTP had an important role at the DP examination. There are a number of consequences flowing from that conclusion:
- The modelling which underpinned the UTP was a combination of LINSIG and microsimulation modelling – essentially the same approach as the current position.
  - The option of a Ware Road/Mill Road mitigation scheme was tested and found to be useful.
  - The quantum of development on HERT2 was set in the context of a higher volume of traffic using the Bluecoats roundabout than that which currently exists.
  - The Council's witness agreed in cross-examination that it is relevant to compare the traffic to be generated by the appeal scheme and that

assumed by the UTP that the HERT2 site would generate. The evidence suggests that there was spare capacity in the peak periods.

*The A414 Corridor Strategy and the WARE2 site*

94. There is little doubt that the A414 will act in the medium term as a constraint on delivering development in the wider area, including housing growth. The Council's position was that the 'excess' of development currently proposed in the appeal would trigger the point at which the A414 Corridor Strategy requires a strategic intervention (agreed to be some considerable time away). However it is apparent that this would occur only following a review (if necessary) to facilitate a transport system in the town.
95. I am not persuaded by the evidence that the quantum of residential development currently proposed would trigger the need for strategic intervention along the A414 corridor at a significantly earlier point than envisaged, thereby delaying delivery of other sites<sup>22</sup>. In particular the authority referred to the strategic allocation at WARE2, to which I return later.

*Conclusion on capacity*

96. To conclude on capacity, neither party disputes that the Bluecoats roundabout and Ware Road/Mill Road are busy junctions at peak times and that there is some congestion. However there is no persuasive evidence that locking of the roundabout currently occurs.
97. Overall, the LINSIG modelling is robust, although I can understand the Council's concern that it might not reflect potential blocking of the roundabout. The VISSIM model was produced to address this concern and has demonstrated to my satisfaction that this would not occur.
98. The traffic associated with the proposed development would be 62 movements in the morning peak and 70 in the evening peak. The consequences of this would be to slightly increase queuing at the Ware Road/Mill Road junction, but this small effect can be mitigated. The residual impact is very small at around 1.3% in the peak hours. This is not a cumulative severe impact which the Framework requires to resist a development.
99. For these reasons I do not consider that there would be a severe capacity impact adversely affecting the free flow of traffic on the approach routes to, and at, the key junctions. The proposal does not conflict with DP policy TRA2, national policy, or the Hertfordshire County Council Local Transport Plan (2018) in this respect.

*The effect on bus services*

100. I now turn very briefly to the effect on bus services approaching or leaving Hertford. This is an entirely parasitic issue based on the reliability of the appellant's transport modelling.

---

<sup>22</sup> Document 14

101. The Council maintains that the appellant's modelling, once corrected, shows significant delays at the junction or at Bluecoats roundabout. However as set out above I do not accept that this is the case and there would therefore be no significant effect on buses.
102. In addition, there is the new problem related to delays to buses alleged by the Council arising from the analysis of the VISSIM modelling. This relates to queueing on the Fore Street approach to the Bluecoats roundabout. As I concluded above, the increased traffic on the roundabout would be very limited and it seems highly unlikely that there would be any significant effect on Fore Street. In any event, this effect has been produced using an unvalidated model.
103. Overall, I see no reason why the proposal would adversely affect the reliability of existing bus and rail replacement services. The proposal would not conflict with DP policy TRA1 or the Local Transport Plan in this respect.

*The consequences of reduced parking provision*

104. The final issue is the effect of the reduced level of parking provision on the appeal site, in that it might lead to pressure for on-street parking and fail to depress car ownership.
105. For this reduction in on-site parking to have a beneficial effect in suppressing demand, three matters need to be in place:
- There needs to be a limit on the quantum of on-site parking. This has been provided as part of the scheme.
  - There needs to be a package of sustainable transport measures. This is in place.
  - Finally there needs to be restrictions on off-site parking, without which the development could add to pressure for on street parking and increase traffic flows. It is this last element which is in dispute.
106. The Council maintains that there is no guarantee that the proposed parking controls will be in place. This would need a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), which is not supported by the District Council.
107. However the appellant is making a financial contribution towards the making of and implementation of the off-site parking restrictions. There is nothing to suggest that a TRO could not be made affecting the appellant's suggested locations.
108. No proper reason has been given for the Council's position and it is not unreasonable to assume that the sole purpose in opposing the idea of a TRO stems from its opposition to the appeal. That cannot be a reason for failing to seek a TRO in the future and this will doubtless be reviewed at a later date.
109. For these reasons I consider it highly likely that the package of sustainable transport measures can be provided and there would not be displaced parking

onto the road network. The proposal in this respect is therefore in accordance with DP policy TRA2 and the Local Transport Plan.

### **The size of the residential scheme**

110. The reason for refusal in relation to the size of the residential development effectively splits into three parts. Firstly there is the allegation that the development would be excessive in scale in relation to the number of dwellings, density and massing. (To some extent density and massing are design issues which I have already discussed.) The second element is that the alleged harm should be considered taking into account the Council's ability to demonstrate a five year housing land supply (this is a matter to which I return below). Finally there is the concern that the development is unnecessary and undesirable and would prejudice a more balanced distribution of housing growth on the HERT2 site and other allocated sites.
111. There is no dispute between the parties that the residential element of the appeal scheme represents a material increase above that allocated for the HERT2 site as a whole in the DP. The allocation is for "around 200" dwellings across the area as a whole, whereas the current scheme exceeds that number on only a part, albeit a large part, of the allocated site. Although the proposal is therefore not in accordance with the development plan in this respect, this matter is covered elsewhere and is not duplicated here.
112. The reason that the DP seeks to limit the residential content of the HERT2 allocation to around 200 homes is, in my view, clearly related to highways matters. No other reason for this limitation was put forward and the officer's report dealing with the application makes it clear that it is the highway capacity issue which has limited the number of dwellings<sup>23</sup>. The authority emphasised the fact that the appellant's highway witness stated in cross-examination that there were other reasons for the limitation on the scale of development aside from highway matters. However this is not a good point as the appellant's entire case indicated otherwise, and this was clearly an error from a witness not giving evidence on overall planning matters.
113. There was a discussion at the Inquiry around the fact that neither the MPF nor the report related to it sets a quantum of development for the site. This is factually correct, and it might arguably have been more clear had it done so. However the MPF is set in the context of the DP, which does set the 'normal' quantum. The point does not really go anywhere as the parent policies to the MPF specify the amount of development expected.
114. There was considerable debate about the extent to which arguments concerning the scale of the scheme were put to the DP Inspector. Leaving aside the detail of the evidence which was submitted to her, it is clear to me that the nature of the Examination and its purpose, together with the considerable difference in duration between the relevant part of the Examination and this Inquiry, leads to the conclusion that the examination would not have been as detailed as that at the current Inquiry. Nor will the evidence have been the subject of cross-examination.

---

<sup>23</sup> CD 1.12 Paragraph 8.18

115. Turning to the potential consequences of the size of the residential development, I consider it of note that none of the commonly found issues related to overdevelopment are alleged here. In many instances overdevelopment expresses itself in a range of ways, for example cramped living conditions and inadequate amenity space. With the exception of the natural light issue related to residents off the site, which I have dealt with above, none of these issues are alleged here.
116. I fully accept the Council's assertion that, if highways concerns had not been acting to constrain development, it would be wrong to allege that the only concern would have been to maximise the potential of the site. There could well have been other policy and detailed issues to be considered. However, although this is undoubtedly a reasonable position in theory, no other relevant issues have been raised stemming from the alleged overdevelopment.
117. The Council states that this matter should be considered in the light of their claimed five year housing land supply. I will deal with this matter below. However national policy is to significantly boost the supply of housing and, even if a housing land supply exists, it does not act as a cap on development.
118. The Council alleges that because of the size of the proposed residential element, there would be prejudice to the distribution of development in the area. This is largely based on the constraint said to be imposed on development by the A414 corridor strategy and the timing of major interventions in the corridor, focussed around an east-west Mass Rapid Transit system.
119. Rather late in the day the Council raised the question of potential prejudice to a specific site, WARE2, caused by what the authority regards as the overdevelopment of the appeal site. Up to that point the Council's position had been much more generalised. The extent of evidence in relation to this allocation was limited, but I am mindful that the DP process examined both the WARE2 and HERT2 allocations and found the plan sound.
120. Leaving aside my conclusions above related to the traffic generation and highways capacity in the area, the Council's position at the Inquiry was that approval of the appeal scheme would prejudice the delivery of 1000 homes at WARE2. This figure is particularly important as it was stated to be the figure necessary to ensure the delivery of infrastructure - the overall development being larger than that. However the situation is very far from clear in that the officer's report dealing with the current proposal refers to prejudice arising above that figure - which would presumably not impact on infrastructure delivery and would be at a time further into the future.
121. In conclusion on the WARE2 site and prejudice to other developments, even leaving aside the highways conclusion above, the limited evidence before me falls short of demonstrating that the size of the current proposal would have prejudicial effects.
122. Overall the proposed residential development would not be excessive in size and scale. It would not be contrary to the various policies in the DP set out in the reason for refusal.

### **Prejudice to the regeneration of the allocated site**

123. The relevant reason for refusal notes that the appeal site comprises two disconnected parcels of land on the overall HERT2 site, and asserts that the scheme would prejudice the ability for the overall site to be delivered holistically. The proposal is alleged to be not in accordance with the MPF for that reason. Beyond that the Council's position is that by omitting the woodyard site there is a real risk that this would not be developed.
124. It is common ground that there is no policy requirement for the whole of the HERT2 allocation to be the subject of a single planning application. That is an entirely reasonable position. The woodyard site is held up for reasons unrelated to this proposal and if the requirement were for a combined application, this could stall the development of the entire site.
125. The DP requirement is that there should be an agreed MPF, which has been prepared (in conjunction with the owners of the woodyard) and approved.
126. There was some suggestion at the Inquiry that the Council considered the appeal scheme to be unsatisfactory in terms of interconnectivity or permeability of the woodyard site. However there is no explanation as to how the proposed layout would harm the future preparation of a satisfactory development on the woodyard site – indeed the appellant suggested a way in which this could be achieved.
127. That only leaves the Council's position related to the alleged lack of available highway capacity if the appeal scheme were to be developed. I have already dealt with the highways capacity matter above and cannot conclude that the transport situation justifies the allegation that the current scheme would prejudice overall regeneration.
128. It is also noteworthy that the occupiers of the woodyard site have not objected to the proposal, but have in fact expressed their support for it.
129. Overall I do not consider that the appeal scheme would prejudice the regeneration of the overall allocated site. It would be in accordance with DP policies HERT2 and DES1.

### **Other matter – housing land supply**

130. The Council's position is that it can deliver a 5.6 year supply of deliverable housing sites – not including the 200 allocated dwellings on the appeal site and the woodyard<sup>24</sup>.
131. There are a number of agreed matters in this respect. Most particularly that a 20% buffer is appropriate in the light of the record of delivery.
132. There is a difference between the parties as to the quantum of the shortfall, but not the time period over which it is distributed. The Council considers that the shortfall can still be made up by the end of the period to 2027, due to a number of sites due for delivery in the middle of the period. From the

---

<sup>24</sup> Positions set out in Document21



evidence before me I do not consider that this is unrealistic. The Council's windfall allowance is supported by historic evidence of a high level of windfall completions.

133. However the main difference between the parties relates to the deliverability of some sites within the Council's claimed supply. In particular whether sites without a submitted application can be considered to be deliverable and whether sites with undetermined outline applications can be delivered at the Council's assumed rate. In both cases the central issue is the amount of clear evidence needed to justify their inclusion.
134. In order to be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years. The Council's approach in relation to some sites could in some cases be described as optimistic, but in all cases save one I consider that clear evidence has been provided.
135. The exception to that conclusion is Bishops Stortford High School where, based on evidence at the Inquiry, there remain too many obstacles (not the least being the relocation of the existing school for which government approval has to be obtained) for this to be considered in the supply figure. However removing that site from the calculation still leaves about a 5.5 year supply. On that basis the so-called tilted balance is not engaged.
136. It is important to note that although the appeal scheme would take the position still further above that required for a five year supply, this cannot be a basis for dismissing the appeal. If the supply had fallen below five years, that would have had consequences for the overall planning balance. But the achievement of a five years supply is not a ceiling on further housing development. In line with national policy, weight should still be given to the provision of housing and affordable housing.

### **Conditions**

137. A set of agreed conditions were prepared between the parties and discussed at the Inquiry. I have only slightly modified them in the interest of precision. They relate separately to the full and outline parts of the scheme.
138. Given the scale of the development, a condition is necessary clarifying the sequence of events (Condition 2).
139. A wide range of details need to be submitted for both the full and outline parts of the development largely in the interests of the appearance of the scheme (3 – 7, 24 - 26).
140. The management of the external communal areas needs to be the subject of detailed approval to ensure its continuing maintenance (8).
141. Drainage details need to be approved to ensure proper provision (9 – 10, 27 - 28).

142. In the interests of protecting residents from noise from traffic and the proposed gym, noise details need to be submitted and approved (11, 12). For the same reason, the hours of operation of the gym need to be controlled (13). An air quality protection scheme needs to be submitted for approval (39). A Construction Management Plan is necessary for amenity and highway reasons (43), and noise controls imposed on plant and machinery (44).
143. Given the nature of the development, it is necessary to remove permitted development rights from the approved dwelling houses (14).
144. Various measures are necessary to encourage sustainable transport, including electric vehicle charging points and a Travel Plan (15, 23, 31, 32, 33).
145. In the interests of highway safety, a range of conditions are necessary to ensure satisfactory details (15 – 20, 29 – 30, 40 – 42).
146. The details of the dwellings in relation to the Building Regulations need to be controlled in the interests of the living conditions of the future occupiers (21 – 22). Measures to encourage water efficiency are necessary (52).
147. Mitigation measures to protect against flooding and protect groundwater need to be provided (34, 36 - 37).
148. In the interests of ecology, a landscape and ecological management plan need to be approved (35).
149. For heritage reasons, a programme of archaeological work needs to be approved (38).
150. The provision of high-speed broadband connections needs to be facilitated (45).
151. Given the previous use of the site, a range of controls are necessary to protect the health of future occupiers (46 – 50).
152. In the interests of clarity, the approved plans need to be specified (53)
153. One matter which was not agreed was the mechanism for the provision of fire hydrants. All parties naturally agreed that these would be necessary. The Council and the appellant agreed a condition (51) which provides that a scheme relating to hydrants should be approved and implemented. However the County Council, in a document dating from 2011<sup>25</sup>, have expressed the view that adoptable hydrants are not covered by the Building Regulations and that their provision should be ensured by way of a planning obligation.
154. The County Council's main concerns<sup>26</sup> relate to enforceability and funding. If the provision of hydrants was dealt with by a condition rather than an obligation, the enforcement of the condition would fall to the District Council, rather than the County (who are not the Fire and Rescue Service). However this seems to anticipate a poor relationship between the two authorities, and

---

<sup>25</sup> Document 12

<sup>26</sup> Document 10

I have no evidence that this is, or is likely to be, the case. In addition, the County Council may provide the infrastructure in preparation for the development, funded from its own reserves. The County Council states that this has been challenged by developers who have sought to avoid paying contributions. However there is no indication that this is likely, and no specific examples have been given.

155. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. In this case, based on what has been put before me, I am confident that a planning condition is acceptable and enforceable.

### **Planning obligation**

156. A s106 Unilateral Planning Obligation<sup>27</sup> has been made in favour of the District and County Councils. The final draft of this was discussed at the Inquiry and the various provisions were explained in evidence and by various submitted documents<sup>28</sup>.

157. The provisions are supported by DP policy DEL2, which provides for planning obligations in general terms, and by other policies as set out in the Council's CIL Compliance Statement<sup>29</sup>.

158. In particular the provision of affordable housing is required to comply with various DP policies and the Planning Obligations SPD. The Council has agreed that the 15% affordable element is the most which can be provided on viability grounds. On that basis, the scheme complies with DP policy HOU3 and full weight must be given to this compliance – not 'some weight' as suggested by the Council. It would be wrong to seek to reduce the weight given to this matter in circumstances where the quantum of the provision is agreed and in line with policy.

159. Because the occupiers of the development would be likely to use Hartham Common and would have an additional impact on it, it is necessary to provide funds towards the replacement of the bridge. This would be in line with DP policies. The new residents would also be likely to increase pressure on other infrastructure facilities (Hartham Leisure Centre; Pinehurst Community Centre; GP provision, primary, secondary and early years provision; youth services; mental health and community healthcare; Hertford Library) and it is reasonable that contributions are made toward specified local projects.

160. A transport improvement contribution, including works to Mead Lane, at the station and on the towpath are included in compliance with policy. The extent of these improvements is clearly related in scale and kind to the development and are necessary.

161. In order to support sustainable transport initiatives, and in line with policy, various measures are included in the Obligation. These include a Car Club, a bus service contribution, travel vouchers and a Travel Plan. Land for a bus

---

<sup>27</sup> Documents 20

<sup>28</sup> Documents 10, 15, 22

<sup>29</sup> Document 22

link is required to benefit the occupiers of the development and the wider area.

162. Although not accepted as a principle by the Council (as discussed above) a vehicle parking contribution to assist with off-site parking controls is necessary to reduce the likelihood of overspill parking on the public highway.
163. All the contributions are directly related to the proposed development, are supported by the development plan and other documents, and are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Therefore, I consider that the Obligation meets the policy in the Framework and the tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. Some of its provisions are designed to mitigate the impact of the proposal and these elements therefore do not provide weight in favour of the scheme. However other matters, most notably the provision of affordable housing, weigh significantly in favour of the appeal.

### **Planning balance and conclusion**

164. I have considered whether the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, so as to potentially trigger the so called "tilted balance ". I have addressed a range of policies based on the Council's reasons for refusal, which are central to this decision, and have considered each of these in relation to the Framework. Taken as a whole these policies cannot be regarded as being out of date for the purposes of my decision. For this reason and given my conclusion on the five year housing land supply matter, the so called tilted balance does not apply in this case.
165. The scheme includes a wide range of benefits, of which the most important are:
- It would secure a development in what is agreed to be a highly sustainable location, a few minutes' walk from the railway station and only about 10 minutes' walk from the town centre.
  - It provides the opportunity to remediate a contaminated brownfield site, which the Council has long wished to see developed, and make the best use of the land – for a mix of uses which in themselves are not objectionable to the Council and which are in line with the allocation in the development plan.
  - The provision of market and 15% affordable housing<sup>30</sup>, incorporating a dwelling mix which is acceptable to the Council. The authority urged that a 'policy compliant scheme', which the authority does not consider the appeal scheme represents, could deliver more affordable housing. However this is only speculation and in any event I have to deal with the proposal before me.
  - The provision of employment use on part of the site in line with the allocation, with only a very limited shortfall from that sought by the development plan.

---

<sup>30</sup> Agreed on the basis of an independent viability assessment

- The generation of employment during the construction period and additional local expenditure after occupation.
- A package of highway measures which, although largely benefitting the appeal scheme, would also be of some wider benefit.
- The provision of public and private open space, with the former being available to those beyond the development itself.
- Enhancement of the riverside by widening and improving the existing towpath.

I give these benefits very substantial weight.

166. Overall the appeal provides a very wide range of benefits and is in accordance with the majority of development plan policies. The only issue in terms of the compliance with the plan relates to the quantum of housing development on the site. For the reasons set out above, in particular my conclusion that this quantum was fixed in relation to highways considerations which cannot currently be justified, I consider that there are substantial material considerations to justify a departure from the development plan in this limited respect.
167. The Council suggested that the appellant was seeking to downplay the conflict with this part of the development plan and therefore accord it reduced weight. Even if this had been the appellant's approach, I have not sought to downplay the weight to be accorded to the development plan, but rather have considered material considerations which justify allowing the appeal. On a development of this complexity it is highly unlikely that any scheme would comply with all aspects of the development plan, although in this particular case the scheme is in compliance with the overwhelming majority of the policies raised by the Council.
168. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*P. J. G. Ware*

Inspector

**Schedule of conditions**  
**Land east of Marshgate Drive, Marshgate Drive, Hertford**

Conditions relating only to that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted (land shown as white on drawing number. 6925 PL 102 B)

1. The development hereby approved on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B shall be begun within a period of three years commencing from the date of this notice.
2. Prior to the commencement of any works on that part of the site for which detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102B, a site wide Construction Programme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Programme shall set out the details of the proposed sequence of development. Once approved, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Construction Programme.
3. Prior to any above ground construction works being commenced on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B details of all external finishing materials shall submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development on this part of the site shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
4. Prior to the first occupation of the development on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B details of any external lighting proposed in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development on this part of the site shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
5. Prior to the first occupation of the development on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B details of any communal television reception facilities proposed in connection with the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development on this part of the site shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
6. Prior to the first occupation of the development on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B details of landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include full details of both hard and soft landscape proposals (including any play equipment), finished levels or contours, hard surfacing materials, retained landscape features, planting plans, schedules of plants, species, planting sizes, density of planting and an implementation timetable. Thereafter the development on this part of the site shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

7. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
8. Prior to the occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B details of the arrangements for the management and maintenance of all external communal areas shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include a plan identifying all external communal areas which are to be managed and maintained. Thereafter all such areas shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.
9. No development shall take place on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted until the final design of the drainage scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage system shall be based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment reference C85529-R001E dated October 2018 and the Drainage Assessment reference C85529- R002A dated October 2018 carried out by JNP Consulting Engineers and supporting information. The scheme shall include:
  - Full detailed engineering drawings including cross and long sections, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features. This should be supported by a clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing pipe networks. The plan should show any pipe 'node numbers' that have been referred to in network calculations and it should also show invert and cover levels of manholes.
  - All calculations/modelling and drain down times for all storage features.
  - Demonstration of an appropriate SuDS management and treatment train and inclusion of above ground features reducing the requirement for any underground storage, incorporation of the use of catch pits, interceptors and additional swale features etc. for highway drainage.
  - Silt traps for the protection for any residual tanked elements.
  - Details of final exceedance routes, including those for an event which exceeds to 1:100 + CC rainfall event.

The drainage scheme shall be fully implemented and thereafter maintained, in accordance with the approved programme for implementation or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

10. Upon completion of the surface water drainage scheme in accordance with the approved programme for implementation, a management and maintenance plan for the surface water drainage scheme, inclusive of any SuDS features, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:
  - Provision of a complete set of as built drawings for site drainage.



- Details of all maintenance and operational activities.
- Any arrangements for adoption and/or other measures to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Thereafter the surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

11. Prior to the commencement of any above ground development a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from noise arising from road traffic and commercial/industrial noise sources in accordance with the recommendations identified in the Cole Jarman Planning Noise Assessment Report (Ref: 17/0333/R2) dated 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2019, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures included within the approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwellings to which they relate and thereafter, maintained for the lifetime of the development.
12. Prior to the first use of any part of the buildings hereby approved as a D2 (Gymnasium), a scheme of sound attenuation works shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their written approval, installed and thereafter retained. The scheme of works shall be capable of restricting noise breakout from the D2 use to the flats above to levels complying with the following:
  - Bedrooms – Noise Rating Curve NR20 (23:00 TO 07:00hrs)
  - Living Rooms – Noise Rating Curve NR25 (07:00 to 23:00hrs)The Noise Rating Curve shall be measured as a 15 minute linear Leq at the octave band centre frequencies 31.5Hz to 8kHz.
13. Prior to the first use of any part of the buildings hereby approved as a D2 (Gymnasium) details of the hours of operation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The gym shall thereafter only operate in accordance with the approved details thereafter.
14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (As Amended), or any amending Order, the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of any dwelling house as described in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Order shall not be undertaken without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
15. Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby approved on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted, a scheme for the installation of and measures to facilitate the provision of electric vehicle charging points in accordance with the recommendations of the Vectos Transportation Assessment dated November 2018 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme, which shall include a timetable and method of delivery, shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of that part of the development to which it relates and shall be retained thereafter.

16. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby approved on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted, full engineering and construction details for the construction of:
- The Northern Marshgate Drive access, shown on drawing number 162527/A/26 Revision C in "Vectos response to HCC Comments – April 2019" and
  - The Southern Marshgate Drive access, shown on drawing number 162527/A/31 in the "Vectos response to HCC Comments – April 2019"

shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented prior to that part of the development to which they relate being first occupied.

Thereafter the Northern and Southern vehicular accesses to Marshgate Drive shall be retained as approved with the permanent provision of the visibility splays as shown on these plans, within which there shall be no obstruction to visibility between 600mm and 2 metres above the finished carriageway level.

17. Prior to the vehicular accesses to the individual dwellings along Marshgate Drive first being brought into use, triangular vision splays shall be installed to both sides of each access, measuring 0.65 metres along the fence, wall, hedge or other means of definition of the front boundary of the site, and 0.65 metres measured into the site at right angles to the same line along the side of the new access drive. The vision splays so described and on land under the applicant's control shall be maintained in perpetuity free of any obstruction to visibility exceeding a height of 600mm above the adjoining footway level.
18. Before the Northern Marshgate Drive access as shown on drawing number 162527/A/26 Revision C in the "Vectos response to HCC Comments – April 2019" is first used, any existing access not incorporated in the approved plans shall be permanently closed. Details of the means of closure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with those details thereafter.
19. Before the Southern Marshgate Drive access as shown on drawing number 162527/A/31 in the "Vectos response to HCC Comments – April 2019" is first used, any existing access not incorporated in the approved plans shall be permanently closed. Details of the means of closure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with those details thereafter.
20. Before any part of the development on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted is commenced details of all hard-surfaced areas within the site, including but not limited to, all roads, footways, forecourts, driveways, parking and turning areas, and associated drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All such approved hard surfaced areas shall be provided and made available for use before that part of the development to which such hard surfaced areas relate is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained in the approved form

21. All dwellings hereby permitted shall be constructed to meet Category M4 (2) (Part M) of the Building Regulations. Thereafter the dwellings shall be retained in the approved form.
22. Before any of the dwellings hereby permitted to be provided as Shared Ownership affordable dwellings in Blocks N7 and N8 shown on drawing numbers 2017.00485\_PL\_150.0; 2017.00485\_PL\_150.1; 2017.00485\_PL\_150.2; 2017.00485\_PL\_150.3 are first occupied, eight of these dwellings (equating to 15% of the Shared Ownership affordable dwellings to be provided) shall be constructed to meet Category M4 (3) (Part M) of the Building Regulations. Thereafter these dwellings shall be retained in the approved form.
23. No occupation of the development on that part of the site for which detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B shall take place until a detailed Travel Plan for residential and employment use based on the Hertfordshire County Council document 'Hertfordshire's Travel Plan Guidance for Business and Residential Development' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be occupied in accordance with the approved Travel Plan.

Conditions relating only to that part of the site for which Outline Planning Permission is granted (land shown as pink & blue on drawing number. 6925 PL 102 B)

24. No development, in relation to that part of the site for which Outline Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B apart from site clearance and access works, shall commence before detailed plans showing the layout, scale and external appearance (including details of all external finishing materials, external lighting and any communal television reception facilities) of the building(s) to be constructed and landscaping (including details of all hard and soft landscaping proposals and finished levels or contours) to be implemented (hereinafter referred to as "the Reserved Matters") have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved.
25. Application(s) for approval in respect of all matters reserved in this permission in relation to that part of the site for which Outline Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B shall be made to the Local Planning Authority within a period of 3 years commencing on the date of this notice. The development to which such approval of reserved matters relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of a period of 2 years commencing on the date upon which final approval of reserved matters is given by the Local Planning Authority or by the Secretary of State, or in the case of approval given on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved by the Local Planning Authority or by the Secretary of State.
26. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Any trees or plants that, within a period of five years after planting, are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of species, size

and number as originally approved, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

27. No development shall take place on that part of the site for which Outline Planning Permission is granted until the final design of the drainage scheme has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage system shall be based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment reference C85529-R001E dated October 2018 and the Drainage Assessment reference C85529- R002A dated October 2018 carried out by JNP Consulting Engineers and supporting information. The scheme shall include:

- Full detailed engineering drawings including cross and long sections, location, size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features. This should be supported by a clearly labelled drainage layout plan showing pipe networks. The plan should show any pipe 'node numbers' that have been referred to in network calculations and it should also show invert and cover levels of manholes.
- All calculations/modelling and drain down times for all storage features.
- Demonstration of an appropriate SuDS management and treatment train and inclusion of above ground features reducing the requirement for any underground storage, incorporation of the use of catch pits, interceptors and additional swale features etc. for highway drainage.
- Silt traps for the protection for any residual tanked elements.
- Details of final exceedance routes, including those for an event which exceeds to 1:100 + CC rainfall event.

The drainage scheme shall be fully implemented and thereafter maintained, in accordance with the approved programme for implementation or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

28. Upon completion of the surface water drainage scheme in accordance with the approved programme for implementation, a management and maintenance plan for the surface water drainage scheme, inclusive of any SuDS features, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:

- Provision of a complete set of as built drawings for site drainage.
- Details of all maintenance and operational activities.
- Any arrangements for adoption and/or other measures to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Thereafter the surface water drainage scheme shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

29. No development on that part of the site for which Outline Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B shall commence before detailed construction and engineering designs including specification and inclusive of details of the permanent provision of the visibility splays illustrating no obstruction to visibility between 600mm and 2 metres above the finished carriageway level, for the vehicular access shown on drawing number 162527/A/29 Revision B contained in the "Vectos response to HCC

Comments dated April 19 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The vehicular access shown on drawing 162527/A/29 Revision B shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details before this part of the site is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained in the approved form.

30. The detailed plans submitted in connection with approval of Reserved Matters shall show the details of all hard-surfaced areas within the site, including but not limited to, all roads, footways, forecourts, driveways, parking and turning areas, and associated drainage. All such approved hard surfaced areas shall be provided and made available for use before the development of that part of the site is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained in the approved form.
31. The detailed plans submitted in connection with approval of Reserved Matters shall include a scheme for the installation of measures to facilitate the provision of electric vehicle charging points. The submitted details shall include a timetable and method of delivery. Any such approved facilities shall be provided and made available for use before the development of that part of the site is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained in the approved form.
32. The detailed plans submitted in connection with approval of Reserved Matters shall identify the provision of sufficient facilities for cycle storage. Any such approved facilities for cycle storage shall be provided and made available for use before the development of that part of the site is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained in the approved form.
33. No occupation of the development on that part of the site for which Outline Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B shall take place until a detailed Travel Plan for the Class B1c employment use based upon the Hertfordshire County Council document 'Hertfordshire's Travel Plan Guidance for Business and Residential Development' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be occupied in accordance with the approved Travel Plan.

Conditions relating to the whole site for which Planning Permission is granted:

34. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment: 'Flood Risk Assessment; Former Gasworks, Marshgate Drive, Hertford' prepared by JNP Group (reference: C85529-R001E October 18) and the following mitigation measures it details:
  - Finished flood levels shall be set no lower than 35.92m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) plus 300mm freeboard for the Northern parcel, and 36.82m above Ordnance Datum (AOD) plus 300mm freeboard for the Southern parcel.
  - Compensatory storage shall be provided to the full volume of 1 in 100 year plus 35% climate change allowance; 3965m<sup>3</sup> for the Northern parcel and 46m<sup>3</sup> for the Southern parcel.

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwellings and/or employment generating use(s) to which they respectively relate in the northern and southern parcels and subsequently in accordance with the Construction Programme approved by the Local Planning Authority. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

35. Prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted a landscape and ecological management plan, including long term design objectives and mitigation actions shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the landscape and ecological management plan shall be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The landscape and ecological management plan shall include the following elements:

- Details of any new habitats created on site
  - Details for the treatment of buffers around water bodies
  - Details of the Biodiversity value of the site
  - Details of an invasive species management plan.
  - Details showing how the landscape and ecological management plan relates to the parts of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission and Outline Planning Permission is granted respectively.
36. No piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods and/or any excavation below the chalk ground water table shall take place other than with the express written approval of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated by a piling or other risk assessment that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
37. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment reference C85529-R001E dated October 2018, the Drainage Assessment reference C85529-R002A dated October 2018 carried out by JNP Consulting Engineers and supporting information. The surface water drainage scheme shall include:
- Implementation of the appropriate drainage strategy for the northern site based on attenuation and discharge into the River Lee Navigation Channel (restricted to
  - 5l/s).
  - Implementation of the appropriate drainage strategy for the southern site based on attenuation and discharge into the Thames Water surface water sewer
  - (restricted to 5l/s).
  - 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 for both the northern and southern sites.



- Undertake the drainage to include blue/greens roofs, tanked permeable paving and attenuation tanks as indicated in drawings C85529-SK-201 Rev G and C85529SK-200 Rev E.
38. No development shall take place until a programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, (including details of programme and timing of works, recording, reporting and any publication as may be required) which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
39. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted a scheme for protecting and enhancing the air quality of future occupiers of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall follow the mitigation measures recommended in the Air Quality Impact Assessment (reference 01.0097.001/AQ) produced by Isopleth Limited 2018. The scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in accordance with those details thereafter.
40. Before occupation of any part of the development, the improvement works to Marshgate Drive and Mead Lane as shown on drawing numbers 162527/A/26 Revision C, 162527/A/31, and 162527/A/29 Revision B shall be carried out and completed in accordance with engineering and construction details including details of specification which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
41. Before occupation of any part of the development, the improvement works to the Mead Lane / Marshgate Drive junction as shown on drawing number 162527/A/34 shall be carried out and completed in accordance with engineering and construction details including details of specification which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
42. Before occupation of any part of the development, upgraded pedestrian crossover points at the Railway Street/Mitre Court junction, to include pedestrian dropped kerbs and tactile paving shall be carried out and completed in accordance with engineering and construction details which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
43. Prior to commencement of the development, a 'Construction Management Plan' shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

The 'Construction Management Plan' shall include:

- The means of access to the site for construction vehicles, together with details of construction vehicle routing.
- The number of construction vehicles attending the site each day including details of their type and size.



- The hours of construction operation and construction vehicle movements (including hours of delivery).
  - Details of any highway works necessary to enable construction to take place.
  - Details of construction vehicle parking, turning and loading/unloading arrangements .
  - Details of any hoardings.
  - Details of how the safety of existing public highway users and existing public right of way users will be maintained.
  - Details of construction traffic management.
  - Methods for the control of dirt and dust on the public highway, including details of the location and methods to wash construction vehicle wheels.
  - The provision for addressing any abnormal wear and tear to the highway.
  - The details of engagement with local businesses or neighbours.
  - Waste management proposals.
  - Mitigation measures to deal with environmental impacts such as noise and vibration, air quality, dust, light and odour.
  - Details of any piling works to be undertaken, including a vibration impact assessment and justification for the chosen piling method.
  - Details of surface water drainage measures to be implemented during the construction of the development.
44. Prior to first use, any externally mounted plant, machinery or other equipment associated with the development hereby permitted, shall be installed and made available for use in accordance with details of any resulting noise emissions and associated mitigation measures which shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, such externally mounted plant, machinery or other equipment shall only be used in accordance with the approved details.
45. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby permitted apart from site clearance, details of the measures required to facilitate the provision of high speed broadband internet connections shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include a timetable and method of delivery for high speed broadband for each residential and commercial unit. Once approved, high speed broadband infrastructure shall be implemented thereafter in accordance with the approved details including the timetable and method of delivery.
46. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby permitted, a site investigation scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall take into account the principles of the risks identified within the JNP Ground Investigation Report M41973 R001 Rev H (October 2018), JNP Options Appraisal and Remediation Strategy- North Site M41973 / R002 Rev A (March 2019), JNP Options Appraisal and Remediation Strategy- South Site M41973/R003 Rev A (March 2019) and any associated uncertainties and shall provide for, where relevant, the sampling of soil, soil vapour, ground gas, surface and ground waters. In implementing the approved scheme, all works must be carried out by competent persons in compliance with the Environment Agency Model

- Procedures (CLR11) and other relevant Standards and good practice guidance.
47. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby permitted, a quantitative risk assessment report must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall describe and assess the degree and nature of contamination identified by site investigations (recent and historic as appropriate). It will include a description of a conceptual site model identifying contaminant linkages and present an assessment of the risks to people and the environment associated with the development. All works must be carried out by competent persons in compliance with the Environment Agency Model Procedures (CLR11) and other relevant Standards and good practice guidance.
48. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby permitted, a scheme of remediation works and measures (a Remediation Strategy) to deal with the identified risks to human health, controlled ground waters, property, environment or ecological systems, associated with any land and/or groundwater contamination present on the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:
- A timetable for implementation
  - Details of any management and/or maintenance of the works and measures
  - A plan for the reuse of site-won soils (if applicable)
  - Details of the process by which the scheme will be validated (a Verification Plan).
49. If following the commencement of development unexpected contamination is encountered which is potentially significant and has not previously been identified, the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately. No further development shall be carried out (unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council) until the unexpected contamination has been assessed and a scheme of remediation works and measures has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter any such revised scheme of remediation works and measures shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
50. Prior to the occupation of any individual dwelling and/or use of the gymnasium (Class D2) and/or employment floor space (Class B1C) a Verification Report (or reports) confirming that the approved scheme of remediation works and measures as may relate to such dwelling and/or use has been carried out and demonstrated to be effective and appropriate to the use(s) hereby approved, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The verification report(s) shall include all responses to any unexpected contamination discovered during the course of the development.
51. No development works shall commence on any part of the site until a detailed scheme for the provision of mains water services providing fire hydrants has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

No occupation of the development shall take place until the approved scheme for the provision of mains water services providing fire hydrants has been provided in full. Thereafter the development shall be retained and maintained in the approved form.

52. Prior to the first occupation of the development, measures shall be incorporated within the development to ensure that a water efficiency standard of 110 litres (or less) per person per day is achieved.
53. The development hereby approved on that part of the site for which Detailed Planning Permission is granted and shown on drawing number 6925\_PL\_102 B shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings and specifications:

Illustrative Masterplan 6925\_PL101 Rev J June 19  
Parameters Plan 6925\_PL\_102B June 19  
Block N1-N2 Ground Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_100.0 Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 First Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_100.1 Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 Second Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_100.2 Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 Third Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_100.3 Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 Fourth Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_100.4 Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 Roof Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_100.R Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 Ground Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_101.0 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 First Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_101.1 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 Second Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_101.2 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 Third Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_101.3 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 Fourth Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_101.4 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 Roof Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_101.R Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 Ground Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_102.0 Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 First Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_102.1 Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 Second Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_102.2 Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 Third Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_102.3 Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 Fourth Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_102.4 Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 Roof Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_102.R Rev A April 19  
Blocks N7-N8 Ground Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_103.0 Rev A April 19  
Blocks N7-N8 First Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_103.1 Rev A April 19  
Blocks N7-N8 Second Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_103.2 Rev A April 19  
Blocks N7-N8 Third Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_103.3 Rev A April 19  
Blocks N7-N8 Roof Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_103.R Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 Street Elevation Canal Elevation 2017.00485\_PL\_210 Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 East Elevation West Elevation 2017.00485\_PL\_211 Rev A April 19  
Block N1-N2 Internal Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_212 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 Street Elevation Canal Elevation 2017.00485\_PL\_213 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 East Elevation West Elevation 2017.00485\_PL\_214 Rev A April 19  
Block N3-N4 Internal Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_215 Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 Street Elevation Canal Elevation 2017.00485\_PL\_216 Rev A April 19  
Block N5-N6 East Elevation West Elevation 2017.00485\_PL\_217 Rev A April 19

Block N5-N6 Internal Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_218 Rev A April 19  
Block N7 Front and Rear Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_219 Rev A April 19  
Block N7 Side Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_220 Rev A April 19  
Block N8 Front and Rear Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_221 Rev A April 19  
Block N8 Side Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_222 Rev A April 19  
4 Bedroom Houses Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_230 Rev A April 19  
3 Bedroom Houses Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_231 Rev A April 19  
Site Sections Blocks N1-N6 2017.00485\_PL\_250 Rev A April 19  
Site Sections Blocks N7-N8 Cross Sections 2017.00485\_PL\_251 Rev A April 19  
3 Bedroom House 4 Bedroom House 2017.00485\_PL\_510 Rev A April 19  
Southern Parcel Houses Entrance Floor Plan 2017.00485\_PL\_104.0 April 19  
Existing 1 in 100 year +35% Fluvial Flood Depth Map C85229 SK003 Rev A April 19  
C85529-SK-205 C - Drainage Proposed Drainage Layout (North) C85529-SK-200 Rev E April 19  
Proposed Drainage Layout (South) C85529-SK-201 Rev G April 19  
Proposed Levels (North) C85529-SK-202 Rev G April 19  
Proposed Levels (South) C85529-SK-203 Rev G April 19  
Proposed Commercial Block Indicative Elevations 2017.00485\_PL\_240 April 19  
Mooring Distances 2017.00485\_PL\_016 April 19  
Balcony Strategy 2017.00485\_PL\_506 April 19

**<<<<<<<<<End of conditions>>>>>>>>>**

**APPEARANCES**

FOR THE COUNCIL:	
Ms Saira Kabir Sheikh QC, instructed by the Head of Legal Services Assisted by Miss Daisy Noble	
She called	
Mr C MacCullagh BA(Hons) MSC MA IHBC	Conservation and Design Officer
Mr R Flowerday BA(Hons)	Group Manager and Head of Profession, Hertfordshire County Council
Mr M Chilvers MSc BSc MCIHT	Technical Director WSP
Ms K Mead BA(Hons) PGDipTP MRTPI	Principal Planning Officer, strategic policy
Ms N Blaken PGURP MRTPI	Director, Nupremis Cambridge
Ms R Collard BA(Hons) MSC LMRTPI	Principal Planning Officer, Development Management
Mr G Francis BA(Hons) PGDip	Associate, Avison Young
<i>Round table sessions:</i>	
Ms C Sime MRTPI	
Mr M Armstrong	Hertfordshire Country Council, Highways
Ms Saila Haq Moran	Housing officer
Mr G Pavey	Five year housing land supply witness

FOR THE APPELLANT:	
Mr James Maurici QC, instructed by Lichfields	
He called	
Mr D de Sousa RIBA ARB	Director, PCKO Architects
Mr S Slatford BA(Hons) MRTPI BPI	Senior Director, Lichfields
Mr G Ingram	Partner, GIA
Mr I Dix BSc(Hons) MSc MCIT MCIHT	Director, Vectos
Mr C Pullan (BA(Hons) DipUD	Urban Design Director, Lambert Smith Hampton
<i>Round table sessions:</i>	
Mr D Wood	Solicitor to the appellant
Mr S Gough	Development Director St William
Ms R Clements BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI	Associate Director Lichfields

**INQUIRY DOCUMENTS**

1	Council tax records for moored boats
2	Canal and River Trust standard mooring terms and conditions
3	Hertford and Ware Urban Transport Plan (2010) - extract
4	Hertford and Ware Urban Transport Plan (2010) - fuller extract
5	Letters (27 July 2015 and 26 January 2016 from Mr Flowerday to Mrs Mead
6	Technical Note 3. Transport Assessment Modelling Note – Modelling Review (Marshgate Drive)
7	Revised sunlight and daylight tables (25 November 2019) from Mr Francis
8	Mr Francis’s supplementary material and photographs
9	Yorkshire Forward – Planning for Employment Land
10	Information in support of planning obligation for non-highways services – County Council
11	Information in support of County Council position on planning obligation – Travel Plan
12	Bundle of correspondence on fire hydrants
13	National Planning Policy Framework
14	Five year HLS position tables
15	Planning Obligation summary note
16	Agreed conditions
17	Bundle of papers relating to A414 Corridor Strategy (extract)
18	Council’s closing statement
19	Appellant’s closing statement and authorities
20	Planning Obligation dated 19 December 2019
21	Statements of Common Ground – planning, highways (including Council’s addendum) and HLS
22	CIL Compliance Statement

**CORE DOCUMENTS**

	<b>Application documents</b>
1.1	Submitted plans Parameters Plan ref. 6925_PL_102 Rev B Illustrative Masterplan ref. 6925_PL101 Rev J Outline Application Illustrative Layout ref. 6925_103 Rev A Block N1-N2 Ground Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_100.0 Rev A Block N1-N2 First Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_100.1 Rev A Block N1-N2 Second Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_100.2 Rev A Block N1-N2 Third Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_100.3 Rev A Block N1-N2 Fourth Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_100.4 Rev A Block N1-N2 Roof Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_100.R Rev A Block N3-N4 Ground Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_101.0 Rev A Block N3-N4 First Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_101.1 Rev A Block N3-N4 Second Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_101.2 Rev A Block N3-N4 Third Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_101.3 Rev A Block N3-N4 Fourth Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_101.4 Rev A Block N3-N4 Roof Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_101.R Rev A Block N5-N6 Ground Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_102.0 Rev A Block N5-N6 First Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_102.1 Rev A Block N5-N6 Second Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_102.2 Rev A Block N5-N6 Third Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_102.3 Rev A Block N5-N6 Fourth Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_102.4 Rev A Block N5-N6 Roof Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_102.R Rev A



	<p>Blocks N7-N8 Ground Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_103.0 Rev A                  Blocks N7-N8 First Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_103.1 Rev A                  Blocks N7-N8 Second Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_103.2 Rev A                  Blocks N7-N8 Third Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_P_103.3 Rev A                  Blocks N7-N8 Roof Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_103.R Rev A                  Block N1-N2 Street Elevation Canal Elevation ref.2017.00485_PL_210 Rev A                  Block N1-N2 East Elevation West Elevation ref. 2017.00485_PL_211 Rev A                  Block N1-N2 Internal Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_212 Rev A                  Block N3-N4 Street Elevation Canal Elevation ref. 2017.00485_PL_213 Rev A                  Block N3-N4 East Elevation West Elevation ref. 2017.00485_PL_214 Rev A                  Block N3-N4 Internal Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_215 Rev A                  Block N5-N6 Street Elevation Canal Elevation ref. 2017.00485_PL_216 Rev A                  Block N5-N6 East Elevation West Elevation ref. 2017.00485_PL_217 Rev A                  Block N5-N6 Internal Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_218 Rev A                  Block N7 Front and Rear Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_219 Rev A                  Block N7 Side Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_220 Rev A                  Block N8 Front and Rear Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_221 Rev A                  Block N8 Side Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_222 Rev A                  Four Bedroom Houses Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_230 Rev A                  Three Bedroom Houses Elevations ref. 2017.00485_PL_231 Rev A                  Site Sections Blocks N1-N6 ref. 2017.00485_PL_250 Rev A                  Site Sections Blocks N7-N8 Cross Sections ref. 2017.00485_PL_251 Rev A                  Three Bedroom House 4 Bedroom House ref. 2017.00485_PL_510 Rev A                  Southern Parcel Houses Entrance Floor Plan ref. 2017.00485_PL_104.0                  Balcony Strategy ref. 2017.00485_PL_506 Rev A                  Proposed Site Plan Mooring Distances ref. 2017.00485_PL_016                  Existing 1 in 100 year+35% Fluvial Flood Depth Map ref. C85229 SK003 Rev A                  Proposed Drainage Layout North Sheet 1 of 2 ref. C85529-SK-200 Rev E                  Proposed Drainage Layout (South) Sheet 2 of 2 ref. C85529-SK-201 Rev G                  Proposed Levels (North) Sheet 1 of 2 ref. C85529-SK-202 Rev G                  Proposed Levels Sheet 2 of 2 ref. C85529-SK-203 Rev G</p>
1.2	Design and Access Statement (Nov 2018)
1.3	Design and Access Statement Addendum (2019)
1.4	Planning Statement (Nov. 2018)
1.5	Transport Assessment (Nov. 2018)
1.6	Letter from EHDC case officer with feedback on the application (25 January 2019)
1.7	Letter from EHDC case officer with feedback on the application (1 February 2019)
1.8	Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (dated 31st October 2018)
1.9	Transient Overshadowing Assessment (dated 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2019)
1.10	Updated Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (dated 2 <sup>nd</sup> April 2019)
1.11	Updated Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (dated 28 <sup>th</sup> June 2019)
1.12	Committee Report, Addendum and accompanying Briefing Note for Members
1.13	Decision Notice
1.14	List of Conditions
1.15	Letter from Lichfield accompanying amended application (3 April 2019)
1.16	Report on Employment Prospects Site at Hertford Former Gasworks for St William Homes LLP (dated 31st October 2018)
1.17	Report on site at Former Hertford Gasworks, Hertford (dated 1st April 2019)



	<b>Appeal documents</b>
2.1	Appellant Statement of Case
2.2	East Herts Council Statement of Case
2.3	Inspector's Case Management notes
2.4	EHDC Note October 2019
2.5	Email exchange between EHDC and the appellant on the 'new issues'
2.6	Representation of HCC Statement in support of planning obligations sought towards Hertfordshire County Council (non-highways) services 24 September 2019
2.7	Letter from Peter Norbury to St William Homes (October 2019)
	<b>Development Management Documents</b>
3.1	Report on the Examination of the East Herts District Plan 2011-2033 (July 2018)
3.2	Hert 2 Masterplan Framework (October 2018)
3.3	East Herts District Plan (adopted 23 October 2018)
3.4	Report by Leader of the Council on Mead Lane Area Masterplan Framework (October 2018)
3.5	Mead Lane Urban Design Framework (2014)
3.6	Planning Obligations SPD (October 2008)
3.7	Hertford and Ware Urban Transport Plan, (November 2010)
3.8	East Herts District Plan Topic Papers – Employment, TPA/005 (March 2017)
3.9	Hertford and Ware Employment Study, Wessex Economics (June 2016)
3.10	Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (LTP4) (May 2018)
3.11	Review of employment prospects assessment, Land east of Marshgate Drive, Hertford, Nupremis (March 2019)
3.12	Hertfordshire LEP Report 'Loss of Employment Space in Hertfordshire' (February 2019 prepared by Lambert Smith Hampton)
3.13	West Essex and East Hertfordshire Assessment of Employment Needs, Hardisty Jones Associates (October 2017)
3.14	Statement of Common Ground, between EHDC and St William, for Local Plan
3.15	Lichfields' representations and Hearing Statements on behalf of St William for Local Plan EiP
3.16	Extracts of Transcripts of Local Plan EiP (7 <sup>th</sup> November 2017)
3.17	Extracts from PPG: Ref ID: 66-006-20190722 on "How are daylight & sunlight regulated?" Reference ID: 68-004-20190722 Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 68-007-20190722 Paragraphs: 001 - 0023 Reference ID: 26-001-20191001 to 26-023-20191001
3.18	Extracts of District Plan Main Modifications - MM/3/04, MM/7/03 and 05
3.19	NPPF (2019)
3.20	East Herts District Plan Topic Papers – Development Strategy, TPA/001 (March 2017)
3.21	East Herts District Plan Topic Papers – Transport, TPA/006 (March 2017)
3.22	National Design Guide (2019)
3.23	Letter from Minister of State for Housing to Broxtowe BC 2 October 2019

	<b>Extracts of District Plan Main Modifications</b>
4.1	Hertford and Ware Urban Transport Plan (November 2010)
4.2	Hertfordshire County Council Local Transport Plan 4 (2018)
4.3	July 2017 – Vectos – R02-MDC-TA Scoping Report Final 170801
4.4	14 <sup>th</sup> August 2017 – Vectos – N07-MDC-TA Scoping Report Addendum
4.5	7 <sup>th</sup> September 2017 – HCC – Scoping Response (by email)
4.6	8 <sup>th</sup> November 2018 – Vectos – R01-BB-Vectos Transport Assessment
4.7	18 <sup>th</sup> December 2018 – Vectos – N22-ID-Transport Assessment Supplementary Note Erratum
4.8	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2019 – HCC – First Formal Response to Planning Application from Hertfordshire County Council (Dated 28 <sup>th</sup> February 2019)
4.9	12 <sup>th</sup> April 2019 – Vectos – R03-ID- Detailed Response (19.04.12)
4.10	16 <sup>th</sup> May 2019 – HCC Highways Review of Vectos ‘Response to HCC Comments’ Document (April 2019)
4.11	21 <sup>st</sup> May 2019 – Vectos – R04-BB-Response to HCC Highways Review April 2019_Final_Optimized
4.12	23 <sup>rd</sup> May 2019 – HCC – TN4 375 Unit Model Audit
4.13	23 <sup>rd</sup> May 2019 – HCC- Modelling
4.14	23 <sup>rd</sup> May 2019 – Other Matters
4.15	30 <sup>th</sup> May 2019 – Vectos – R05-BB- Response to HCC Highway Review May 2019_For Issue_Optimized- (including Stage 1 RSA)
4.16	5 <sup>th</sup> June 2019 – HCC – Second Formal Response to the planning application based on amended scheme
4.17	1 <sup>st</sup> June 2019 – Vectos – N28-BB- Transport Response to HCC Recommended Reasons for Refusal (190621)
4.18	27 <sup>th</sup> June 2019 – Vectos – Email response to HCC regarding Bus Service Contribution concluding discussions
4.19	1 <sup>st</sup> July 2019 HCC Final Formal Response dated 28 <sup>th</sup> June 2019
	<b>Design documents</b>
5.1	Hertfordshire Design Review Panel HERT02 (6 August 2018)
5.2	Hertfordshire Design Review Panel HERT02 (21 September 2018)
5.3	Landscape officer’s comments (2 sets)
5.4	Conservation and Urban Design Officers Comments (1 set)
5.5	Letter from Canal and River Trust (2 <sup>nd</sup> May 2019)
5.6	Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice 2nd Edition, prepared by the Building Research Establishment (2011)
	<b>Appeal decisions</b>
6.1	Appeal Decision: APP/J1915/A/07/2052693 – Marshgate Drive
	<b>Additional highway documents</b>
7.1	PTV VISSIM 11- User Manual (September 2018)
7.2	TFL Traffic Modelling Guidelines- TFL Traffic Manager and Network Performance Best Practice, Version 3 (September 2010)
7.3	Department for Transport, Transport Analysis Guidelines (TAG 3.1) Highway Assignment Modelling (January 2014)
7.4	HCC A414 Corridor Strategy, Draft for Public Consultation Strategy Summary (December 2018)
7.5	LINSIG 3.2 User Guide (June 2018)