

Planning Committee

Supplemental Agenda

Meeting date	16 th December 2021
Officer	James Chettleburgh
Agenda Item	2
Proposal	<p>Full planning permission for the erection of 390 dwellings (including 117 affordable dwellings and 4 self-build plots), a cricket pitch and/or football pitches with temporary community shop (Use Class E/F2), public open space and amenity space (including children's play), associated landscaping and ecological enhancements, internal highways, parking, footpaths, cycleways, drainage, utilities, service infrastructure, acoustic bunding and fencing, improvements to existing access routes across A1(M) via Six Hills Way, Bessemer Drive, Redcar Drive and Meadway (including a new underpass at Meadway and associated accommodation/engineering works) and highway improvements along Chadwell Road.</p> <p>Outline planning permission for up to 1,110 dwelling units (including 30% affordable housing and self-build plots), principal employment area (up to 10,000 sq.m Use Class E(g) space), a residential care home (up to 72 beds) and up to 400sq.m Use Class E space, a mixed use local centre (Use Class C3 and up to 900 sq.m of Use Class E/F2 Space), a neighbourhood square (including mobility hub and up to 150 sq.m of Use E/F2 Space), a primary school (up to 3FE), a mobility hub with flexible community workspace adjacent to the Meadway underpass, a pavilion and mobility hub adjacent to the cricket and/or football pitches, public open space and amenity space (including children's play), sport facilities (including informal multi-use games area), associated landscaping and ecological enhancement works, acoustic bunding and fencing, internal highways, parking, footpaths, cycleways, drainage, utilities, service infrastructure and future connections into safeguarded land in North Hertfordshire, and a new car park and pavilion at Meadway Playing Fields (with some matters reserved). This application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement.</p>
Reference	21/00356/FPM
ADDENDUM INFORMATION	

The Planning Committee is requested to note the following amendments and updates to the committee report.

4. Public Representations

- 4.1 Comments received from St Paul's Walden Bury Estate Company Limited, St Pauls Walden Bury, Hitchin. They seek affirmation that there is no intention to provide access from the development to B656. In addition, they advise in their correspondence that in order to preserve the rural character of the land to the west or south-west of the development, there will be space to plant appropriate trees on the ridge.

5. Consultations

5.8 Highways England

Comments received 10th December 2021

- 5.8.1 Recommend that conditions should be attached to any planning permission that may be granted. National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current
- 5.8.2 This response represents our formal recommendations with regard 21/00356/FPM and has been prepared by Penny Mould. The proposed development site comprises of 1,500 dwellings, 10,000sqm of office, research & development and light industrial uses as well as a 3 form-entry primary school and a new underpass at Meadway beneath the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

New Underpass

- 5.8.3 The new underpass at Meadway proposes a construction method using a pipe canopy structure, which is new technology for National Highways (NH). An Options Report for the underpass has been prepared and approved in accordance with Appendix O of control document CG 300 'Technical approval of highways structures' (Rev O, Mar 2020). Following the grant of planning permission NH require the applicant to complete the Approval in Principle (AIP) report for the new structure.

Transport Assessment

- 5.8.4 NH have reviewed the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan that supports the planning application. The review has revealed a higher than expected number of accident at A1(M) J8 these being 3 'serious' and 29 'slight' accidents. NH have agreed with the applicant and Highways Authority that a safety study is undertaken to identify safety improvements for the junction and that the agreed safety improvements/mitigations are delivered by the developer.
- 5.8.5 National Highways, therefore request that the following planning conditions form part of any grant of planning permission in relation to this planning application.

5.11 Council's Parks and Amenities

Comments received 10th December 2021

Landscaping

- 5.11.1 We are pleased to find that the landscaping within the built environment has been vastly improved in this amended application, and we support the proposed inclusion of additional planting throughout the development streetscape in particular. There have also been some positive steps towards creating a landscaping strategy for the site.
- 5.11.2 While the landscaping plans and sketches within the DAS provide some information on the proposed layout and design, at this stage, some detail is still lacking in terms of figuring out how planting may work in specific spaces, particularly within the first phase. This is primarily due to the scale in which the landscaping plans are currently provided (currently 1:500).
- 5.11.3 Consideration is to be given for planting with pedestrian desire lines in mind. There are some areas in the design where planted areas separate parking courts, but it could be expected that people may wish to walk directly across planted areas (see example image below). This may cause issues with planting establishment due to erosion, trampling etc. Therefore, all planted areas should be designed to allow for anticipated desire-lines and, where necessary, protected from damage.
- 5.11.4 Any planting that abuts a parking space must be designed to provide space for vehicle access and egress, maintainability (when spaces are occupied) and allowing good visibility for access and egress. Narrow planted/grassed areas should be avoided where possible as they could struggle to establish.
- 5.11.5 The soft and hard landscaping design must consider large turning vehicles (such as refuse freighters or delivery trucks). Some potential areas could be vulnerable to damage and should be suitably designed and protected from harm. It may be possible to achieve this by including a hard landscaped buffer edge adjacent to the road or installing obstacles such as bollards.

Maintenance Strategy

- 5.11.6 Failed or struggling plants should not necessarily be replaced on a like-for-like basis as there could be several reasons for the failure. Allowances should be made to ensure planting for the longer term. If a chosen plant is struggling to survive in a particular area, the strategy should allow flexibility to consider other suitable alternatives for the location.
- 5.11.7 Any proposed bark mulching of planted areas shall require to be topped up when needed to retain moisture and control weed growth. Planted beds shall also be designed to ensure bark mulch cannot wash off onto surrounding surfaces, block drainage, etc.
- 5.11.8 Play facilities should be inspected on a more frequent basis. Stevenage play areas are checked weekly, with any remedial works carried out on a priority basis. The current proposals for one inspection every couple of months should be increased.

There should also be plans for signs to be erected in or around play areas that provide contact details on reporting any issues.

5.11.9 Throughout the maintenance strategy document, it often refers to various inspections; however, there is no mention of a strategy of how the appointed management company is expected to deal with issues as they are identified or how they propose to deal with them. For example, if an inspection identifies a defect in a path with a potential trip hazard – how will the defect be assessed for priority, timescales for rectification, monitoring, etc.

5.11.10 Reactionary works – There should be a process for reacting and dealing with unexpected issues as they arise/are reported—for example, fly-tipping, encampments, dangerous trees, damaged play equipment etc. The maintenance schedule should allow flexibility for the leaf collection months. The maintenance strategy makes account for arrangements up to 15 years; however, it should make provision for continued maintenance arrangements for the lifetime of development. The maintenance strategy should detail proposals on how the maintenance and upkeep will be funded adequately for the lifetime of the development. For example, through service charges, developer contributions etc. This could also include successful case studies from similar schemes.

Meadway access arrangements/ Redcar Drive

5.11.11 We require clarity on the total remaining area of the sports field within Meadway playing fields following completion of the infrastructure works. The road alignment and widening work proposals eat into one of the senior football pitches, and it is unclear if it is possible to retain two full senior pitches on this site. Should we determine that it is not possible, we may look for a contribution towards playing pitch improvements at another location to help offset any loss.

5.11.12 There are currently significant parking issues along Redcar Drive. The development shall demonstrate that this issue will be addressed and managed to ensure that the problems are not exacerbated. Meadway Playing Fields car park is currently used for staff parking, and there is no capacity within the Council's car park on Cavendish Road to accommodate all staff vehicles if the car park at Meadway is closed off. We require details on how disruption will be minimised while facilities and infrastructure are being built out. E.g. temporary car park provision, pavilion facilities, timing etc., before the commencement of any works.

5.11.13 Meadway playing fields must remain secure at all times from unauthorised vehicle access and encampments. Whilst we anticipate details being provided later, we need to ensure that any pavilion replacement meets the requirements for now and future use – similarly with parking provision. There is also an opportunity to improve the buildings' energy efficiency (renewable if possible) and incorporate suitable landscaping where appropriate.

5.11.14 SDS shall seek a financial contribution from the developer for the provision of the planting and fencing proposed outside of the red line boundary within Meadway playing fields. This will also include the additional costs for future maintenance and upkeep for 20 years.

5.11.15 The proposed infrastructure works adjacent to the open space adjacent along Redcar drive (also known as the Gypsy Park) result in potential loss of trees and

vegetation along this boundary. We request details as to whether the ecological impact has been assessed and any mitigation measures required to be implemented by the developer. Furthermore, this open space shall be protected at all times from unauthorised vehicle access or damage. Suitable protection measures will be required (such as vehicle hoops) and replacement planting whilst still providing access for maintenance, e.g. drop bollard.

- 5.11.16 Meadway Lane cycle/footway – we request clarity on why the proposals seek to widen this cycleway, which could have an additional impact on the trees, vegetation, wildlife etc. We also currently experience a level of soil/debris wash off from the banks along this lane, resulting in increased cleansing. We request the developer consider proposals to help reduce this issue - soil retention.

Bessemer Drive access arrangements / Norton Green

- 5.11.17 The proposed scheme must consider addressing some of the neighbouring Norton Green and Chadwell Road issues. Due to the limited access and manoeuvrability within Norton Green, problems occur with HGVs causing damage to the Common. We expect access onto Chadwell Road to be limited for all heavy traffic (except only for access) to help address this issue. We note the proposals for Chadwell Road to include calming restrictions; however, we note the signage appears after the opportunity to turn around. Further consideration should be given in this regard for advanced warning. There are very regular fly-tipping issues along Chadwell road and Norton Green – there is an opportunity to look at how the scheme can be designed to help address this issue.

- 5.11.18 As previously advised, we have concerns about the potential impact on Norton Green Common and the SSSI. There is minimal parking opportunity in Norton Green, and increased traffic could further damage the Common from unauthorised parking. Furthermore, the development is likely to result in an increased footfall from nearby residents and visitors of the development, which may impact the SSSI and fragile habitats here. The proposals must show how they will help protect and improve these areas. The developer must conduct an investigation, with support from Natural England, of the potential impact to the SSSI due to these increased pressures and determine possible mitigations and with the provision of suitable funding for implementation.

Play Provision

- 5.11.19 We have concerns about the proposed location of a LEAP play area next to the cricket facility, particularly concerning the safety of children and adults from ball strikes. The developer must ensure play areas are suitably located and designed to mitigate this risk. A ball strike assessment should be undertaken to determine the risk.

- 5.11.20 We note the proposals for several landscaped play opportunities/trails within the design rather than the provision of LAPs. We support this approach, but we require further detail on their design later. From initial proposals, the design should incorporate more play landscaped features through planting, mounding, boulders, paths, etc., rather than necessarily providing specific play items requiring regular inspection (and maintenance).

5.11.21 To ensure fair opportunities for residents and visitors, consideration should also be given for walking distances to play facilities. In addition, it would be helpful to see a map of the catchment for all play areas and sport provision across the site, as this will help determine possible areas of deficiency (or over-provision). Below is a copy of Stevenage's play access standards which should be used for consistency. This is similar to the Fields in Trust Guidance but differs slightly.

	Accessibility Straight Line Distance (m)	Minimum Number of Play Activities	Age Range (years)
Primary	600 (approx. 8 min walk)	8	0 - 16
Secondary	400 (approx.. 5 min walk)	5	0 - 10
Play Landscape	60	Imaginative play	0 - 6

5.11.22 We have some concerns about the potential accessibility of some play opportunities within the current designs and proposals. Play areas must be designed to be inclusive and provide a range of play opportunities – access to the facilities must also be considered part of the design. This could include plans for accessible paths, sensory planting and play, sounding play items, accessible play equipment etc.

5.11.23 We require details on the proposed delivery of the play areas regarding the development programme, and currently, there is a lack of detail. Play provision should ideally be delivered early within a development programme, before occupation, so residents know what is available on offer. The play designs must allow all items to be robust, safe, situated on a level and well-drained area. They must consider their location in residential areas yet be mindful not to attract antisocial behaviour. We have concerns over some of the proposed play items and materials in the typology report regarding robustness – Robinia should be used where wooden equipment is offered.

5.11.24 The use of loose-fill hard aggregate (including pea shingle) is not acceptable in play areas or for decorative landscaping. Impact Absorbent Surfacing – we do not recommend loose fill (such as play bark or sand) for surfacing within play areas. A programme of play surfacing maintenance and upkeep should also be implemented. Careful consideration should also be given for the use of rubber mulching and its care, and we do not recommend the use of brown coloured rubber mulch. Wet pour safety surfacing provides the best long term solution for play; however, we recommend bricked edging rather than PCC due to improved binding.

5.11.25 All equipped play areas must conform to BS EN 1176 & 1177 standards. In addition, an independent post-installation report is to be carried out by an accredited ROSPA inspector to ensure any play area conforms to the safety standards. Any issues raised in the report must be suitably addressed before opening. As per the comments regarding maintenance strategy, the developer must provide the required arrangements and funding to ensure the play area continues to be safe and operational in perpetuity. In addition, the life span of any equipment and surfacing must be considered, along with the provision for replacements, repairs etc., to be carried out when required.

Cricket provision/ Village Green/ Pavilion

5.11.26 The proposed village green/cricket facility and pavilion must be planned with the future provision in mind. Consideration must be given to ensure the space continues to provide value to the community in various possible circumstances. For example,

ensuring that the facility can cater for possible alternative recreation uses as the demand for cricket and football ebbs and flows. This also applies to the pavilion building facilities, which must be designed to provide future-proofed value to the community beyond just provision for cricket and football. An assessment should be undertaken to determine the parking provision in relation to the demand for the facilities.

5.11.27 The sustainability of the new pavilion facility must play a vital element in the design. This could include waterless urinals and water-efficient showers, energy-efficient and improved heating, solar panels, triple glazing, sustainable choice materials, greywater/rainwater collection irrigation system, etc. The pavilion building shall be designed to be fully secure and incorporate features to deter vandalism, damage etc. e.g. electric rolling shutters, CCTV etc. Whilst we expect details at a later stage, the accessibility of the proposed pavilion must also be considered. For example, if the pavilion is proposed to have 2 floors, a lift shall be fitted for access, ramps, induction loops, etc.

5.11.28 We understand that the developer will transfer the pavilion and cricket/village green over to SBC to maintain and manage. As such, SDS shall seek a financial contribution for the maintenance and upkeep of these facilities for 20 years. These sums can only be calculated with full details of the pavilion and facilities expected to be transferred to the Council. We require full details of the extent of the proposed land and buildings to be transferred to the Council and whether the LEAP facilities will be included. This shall also include details of any guarantee and defect liability periods for the facilities.

5.11.29 The proposals must make consideration for a maintenance equipment storage facility. SBC may also require an additional contribution to maintenance equipment costs, e.g. rollers, mowers, etc.

General

5.11.30 We seek details on the proposals for providing a route for horses and ponies and how this links to the broader access network. We note outline proposals for a BMX track around the landscaped buffered edge along the bund. Whilst we support this idea in principle, we require further details of the design and how this is proposed to be managed and maintained at the relevant stage.

5.11.31 As a result of this proposed development, we anticipate increased demand for allotments within the borough of Stevenage. Allotments are currently in very high demand. Therefore, we shall seek an appropriate contribution towards delivering improvements to allotment sites within Stevenage, to which we anticipate the residents having access. We seek to determine that any open space areas within the development are adequately safeguarded from further future developments.

5.29 Council's Community Safety Manager

5.29.1 I have been talking to Russel Sparrow regarding issues we have at Dyes Lane with fly tipping and he said it may be worth me having a conversation with you regarding the West of Stevenage development. The area around Dyes Lane has been a real problem for a number of years with recently 8 lorry loads of fly tipping having to be

removed from the area. A “bund” was installed a few years ago to stop the tipping but this has been unsuccessful.

- 5.29.2 Russel is looking at quotes for me around “designing out of crime“ the area with fencing and I wondered whether this is something that possibly the developers would contribute towards as part of section 106. He also mentioned that the underpasses in the area may be altered, if you could let me know how and which ones so I can have this factored into any quotes

7.3 Affordable Housing and Section 106 Planning Obligations

[New Paragraph to be added]

- 7.3.45 The Council’s Community Safety Manager has raised concerns around fly tipping within the area of the development site. In order to deal with this issue, they are looking to secure the area with fencing and have asked whether the developers would contribute towards this fencing as part of the Section 106. Following a discussion with the developers, they have agreed that fly tipping is an issue area and are willing to assist in controlling this. Therefore, they have agreed to contribute towards the provision of new fencing and/or liaise with the Community Safety Manager to provide measures to deal with fly tipping. As such, this can be secured as part of the Section 106 agreement. It is also recommended that delegated powers are given to the Assistant Director of Planning and Regulation in consultation with the Chair to negotiate and agree the financial obligation and / or mitigation measures to deal with fly tipping.

[Existing Paragraph 4.3.45 as set out in the Committee Report is amended to paragraph 4.3.46].

7.11 Trees and Landscaping/Open Space and Public Realm

Updated Arboricultural assessment following dialogue with the Council’s Arboriculture and Conservation Manager

Comment 1 – Avenue of Trees

- 7.11.1 The avenue of trees in Meadway, currently located between the road and car parking bays are shown as proposed to be removed. I am of the view that these trees can be kept within the proposed layout. If necessary, perhaps the proposed road could be moved slightly. Retaining such an established avenue of trees by the entrance to the new site is, in my view, very beneficial in lessening the adverse impact on the existing landscape.
- 7.11.2 In order to address the points raised, it has been confirmed that the road alignment has been pushed to the limits of the land made available by the Borough Council (as reflected by the redline boundary) in order to try to keep the trees. The applicants Landscape Architect was hopeful that the trees could be retained in the landscape strip between the new road and footpath/cycleway, although did identify that this was subject to Arboricultural advice. However, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment identified that the proposals do still effect a significant extent of their RPAs which is beyond the suggested threshold for acceptability put forward within BS5837:2012. Accordingly, this precludes technical confidence in their capacity to tolerate the proposed works and they were left with little choice but to recommend their removal as part of their assessment.

7.11.3 However, the applicants have asked that if the Council can be flexible with the application of the relevant standards, could it be agreed to retain these trees as part of the detailed landscape proposals and monitor their health post completion of the access road. Further, should these trees show signs of deterioration, then they would be removed at that point. In addition, they advise that the proposals will still include compensatory planting on the assumption that they will eventually be removed.

7.11.4 Following discussions with the Arboriculture and Conservation Manager, they have confirmed that are happy to apply some flexibility on BS5837 on this occasion, in order to keep the established Maple trees. The strip of land the trees grow on is already confined within two roads (road and car park) and expect the new layout to reflect a similar footprint. Nevertheless, they do advise that arboricultural supervision should apply to ensure the impact on these trees is minimal.

Comment 2 – Group G9

7.11.5 Group G9 has special significance to us, colleagues of the Stevenage Direct Services; more specifically, the semi mature Silver Birch within. It was donated by and planted with one of our colleagues, whom sadly passed away a few months later. We have maintained this tree afterwards, ensured it established well and it is now a way to remember our lost colleague. If this tree had to be removed due to the development, can I please ask that it is relocated, in a suitable nearby location?

7.11.6 It is advised that tree Group G9 is where the new Meadway car park is indicatively shown on the plans. This would be delivered by the Borough Council as part of the Meadway Pavilion re-provision and therefore, it is within the control of the Council to either retain the tree through an amended car park design or relocate it.

Comment 3 – Trees 56 to 59 on Meadway Lane

7.11.7 Trees numbers 56, 57, 58 and 59 on Meadway Lane are proposed to be removed. These Mature Oak trees are, in my view, the most prominent and valuable trees in this part of the lane and would therefore their loss would not be desirable. Separately, if Meadway Lane is to be resurfaced as part of this development, I would urge caution when excavating within the RPA of the trees on both banks. I would also recommend appropriate crown reduction works to compensate for any encroachment on existing roots

7.11.8 The developers have agreed to commit to review the need to remove these trees when the detailed landscape design of the Meadway Lane improvements are considered in Phase 3 of the development. In addition, they would also consider the resurfacing works in relation to root protection areas as part of Phase 3. As such, this approach is agreed by the Council's Arboriculture and Conservation Manager.

Comment 4 - Loss of trees on Council Land

7.11.9 Any tree loss on council land, for the purpose of this development, should be compensated for at a ratio of 3:1 in line with our current policy. The cost for the council to plant a new tree (supply, plant and maintain until established) is £350/tree.

7.11.10 This is acknowledged by the applicant and their illustrative landscape plans show replacement planting on Council controlled land and it is expected this to be a matter to be agreed through the S106.

Comment 5 – Canopy cover

7.11.11 In order to comply with our policy in terms of the 30% future canopy coverage for the new development, I would like to see a plan to show (area measurements) how this is achieved.

7.11.12 It is important to note the above is not a planning policy requirement of the adopted Local Plan. The site extends to circa 80ha, and to require 30% canopy coverage would equate to 24ha. It is not feasible to achieve this whilst also delivering on the requirements of the site allocation policy.

7.11.13 Following discussions with the Council's Arboriculture and Conservation Manager, they have suggested that the 30% canopy coverage should be reflected into planning policy as it is the agreed stance by the council's executive earlier this year by the adoption of the Amenity Tree Management Policy. Notwithstanding, they do appreciate that all aspects of this proposed development have to be considered and that the canopy coverage is just one of them. The Council's Arboriculture and Conservation Manager does add that the 24 hectares of canopy coverage would not have to be actual woodlands or tree belts. They advise that this area can be achieved as an accumulation of all existing coverage and new tree planting on streets, gardens, parks, avenues, etc. calculated at maturity.

7.16 Other matters

Comments on late third party representations

7.16.1 In regards to the comments about the proposed development connecting to the B656 London Road, this road is located to the west of the site by approximately 1km. The proposed development, as such, is not seeking any form of access to this road with the main access points off Meadway and Bessemer Drive.

7.16.2 Looking at the comments on regarding tree planting, detailed landscaping proposals would form part of any future reserved matters applications for phases which would affect the rural edges of the site. In regards to Phase 1, whilst the details provided are indicative, they do show the retention of significant levels of soft landscaping along with the western edge of the site. In addition, they do show a significant level of additional tree planting which would further soften the developments impact on the rural edges of this Phase.

9. Recommendations

Additional Conditions to be imposed if it was resolved to grant planning permission:-

89. New underpass at Meadway

The Approval in Principle (AIP) report for the new underpass at Meadway shall be completed prior to delivery of the 390th dwelling. The AIP shall be submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with National Highways.

REASON:- To ensure the safe operation of this part of the strategic road network.

90. Highway Safety Improvements at Junction 8 - A1(M)

Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme to improve highway safety at A1(M) J8 shall be undertaken. The safety scheme shall be submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with National Highways and the Highway Authority.

The scheme shall include drawings and documents showing:

- How the improvement interfaces with the exiting highway alignment and carriageway markings including lane destinations;
- Full signing and lighting details where applicable;
- Confirmation of full compliance with departmental standards (DMRB) and policies (or approved relaxations/departures from standards);
- Evidence that the scheme is fully deliverable within land in control of either the highways authorities or the applicant;
- An independent Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) including recommendations, carried out in accordance with DMRB.

REASON:- To ensure the safe operation of this part of the strategic road network.

91. Delivery of Highway Safety Improvements at Junction 8 - A1(M)

The highway safety scheme at A1 (M) J8 as approved in condition 90 shall be implemented and brought into use prior to delivery of the 390th dwelling.

REASON:- To ensure the safe operation of this part of the strategic road network.

General Updates

Hertfordshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)

The LLFA was re-consulted on the 9th November 2021 on the updated drainage strategy. However, no comments from the LLFA have been received since the publication of this addendum report.

Natural England (NE)

The applicants have engaged Natural England through their Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) in order to overcome their concerns. Following initial discussions with NE, it was advised that the Council would seek to impose suitably worded conditions in order to mitigate any harm to the SSSI (See paragraphs 7.12.42 to 7.12.48). In addition, it was discussed with NE that the applicants are willing to work with them in order to agree an appropriate Scheme of Mitigation which could also be secured by condition. Furthermore, certain measures could also be secured through a S.106 agreement.

Taking the above into consideration and as set out in the Committee Report (paragraph 7.12.47), it is recommended that delegated powers be given to the Assistant Director of Planning and Regulation in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee to negotiate and secure any financial obligations which may be required to mitigate the impact this development could potentially have on the SSSI. It is noted from verbal discussions with NE that they were amenable to this approach as it gave them assurance that their concerns can be addressed through post committee with suitable mitigation measures being secured accordingly.

Turning to the AONB, it was clarified on the emerging potential designation, and that no weight is afforded at this time until later stages in the process. As such, it seems to be a misunderstanding on our part and that Natural England position on the AONB is an informative at this stage, rather than an objection. Notwithstanding, in the event the AONB is at the stage in the process of formal adoption that weight has to be given, then future reserved matters will be assessed and treated as such accordingly.

Officers are yet to receive written confirmation on the above following the meeting with NE. However, if any comments are received before the meeting is held, they will be circulated accordingly.

Hertfordshire County Council as Highways Authority

Email correspondence with Highways Officer & HCC CRoW Service (Updated on PROW)

The Hertfordshire County Council's CRoW Service understand the physical constraints at Chadwell Road and accept that 'Quiet Lane' status at this location is a reasonable compromise. It must be noted however, that all vulnerable non-motorised users will habitually get off-road at the earliest opportunity, i.e. the 2 short sections of off-road provision shown in the attached plans (19206-036-RevB) will be accessed by equestrians and this must be allowed and catered for legally.

I attach a screen-grab with the desire lines highlighted that will inevitably be used:



This is easily achieved through acceptance of these short routes as multi-user status, signed with the blue Cycle+Ped+Horse signs from the TSRGD 2016 / Signs Manual; "Figure 11-19 Diagram 956.1 (S3-2-30) Route for use by pedal cycles, horses and pedestrians only".

