

Planning Application 22/01687/FP - Appendix 1

Land On The North Side Of Pirton Road, Holwell, Hertfordshire, SG5 3SN

Consultee Responses

Hertfordshire County Council highways officer

Recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

The amendments include car ports as shown on drawing OAK PL-01. Manual for Streets 8.3.41 recommends a minimum size of 6 x 3 meters. The carports therefore, should 6 x 6 meters internal dimensions.

The Highway Authority is unable to recommend planning permission until a new drawing is provided with the required measurements as discussed above.

Comments 26 April 2023:

Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

The amendments are contained to the dwellings in respect of design. There are no impacts on the surrounding highway network, therefore the High Authority maintain the previous comments and do not oppose the amendments.

Comments 11 October 2022:

Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions.

COMMENTS

This is an AMENDED PROPOSAL for the erection of nine 4-bed dwellings with associated access, landscaping and parking. Pirton Road is maintainable by the highway authority and is unclassified and provides a local access function in the road hierarchy. The vehicle speeds past this site are limited to 20 mph. There have been no recorded accidents near the site in a rolling 5-year period.

DRAWINGS

The Highway Authority note the submission of materials in support of the planning application, including drawing numbers: C4t5/FOU/HOL1 - P2-01 Rev A, C4t5/FOU/HOL1 - P1-01 Rev A, Existing Site Plan, C4t5/FOU/HOL1 - S00, C4t5/FOU/HOL1 - S10 Rev A, Proposed Site Plan, and Design & Access Statement (D&A), Transport Statement, and letter from Patrick Eggenton 7th October 2022.

SUSTAINABILITY

'Cycle Infrastructure Design' DfT Local Transport Note 1/20 (July 2020) recommends for cycle parking storage should be 2m (1.8m is acceptable) in length by 0.3m space between cycles. There should be parking for 1 cycle per dwelling. Outside cycle parking should be covered and lockable. The provision of well-located, safe and secure cycle parking for residents and visitors is a key factor in encouraging people to cycle as an alternative to using the private car. Cycle parking must be provided in line with LTP Note 1/20.

PEDESTRIAN / VEHICLE ACCESS

After consultation with the applicant, drawing SK10 Rev A (Re letter 7th October) now provides a raised table across the bell mouth extended 12 meters into the site with accompanying footway on the south side. This is welcomed. Section 6.4 of the TS states: 'The nearest bus stops are located at St. Peter's Church with circa 84 metres south of the proposed development where service 89 can be boarded. To promote sustainable travel for residents of the site it is recommended to upgrade the St Peter's Church bus stop with kassel kerbing. This style of kerbing allows easy access for wheelchair users. Please see condition above.

SWEPT PATH

Drawing SK11 demonstrates a swept path for a recycling vehicle. Drawing SK10 Rev A demonstrates hatched areas of no parking allowing service vehicles to manoeuvre safely within the site and exit in a forward gear.

VISIBILITY

The Highway Authority are satisfied that drawing SK02 demonstrates acceptable visibility splays for pedestrians however, forward visibility for vehicles about to turn into the site, see drawing SK14.

EMERGENCY ACCESS

The nature of the site and the proposals access must show that a fire service vehicle can get within 45 meters from the public highway (As required in accordance with MfS 6.7.2). Alternatively, a drawing showing a fire service vehicle can enter and exit the site in a forward gear. Guidance can be found in 'MfS', 'Roads in Hertfordshire; A Design Guide' and 'Building Regulations 2010: Fire Safety Approved Document B Vol 1 – Dwellings'. The required revised swept path for a recycling vehicle has been demonstrated on drawing SK11

TRIP GENERATION

The site has been unused for quite some time and any historic trips will most likely be less than that generated by nine dwellings. The proposals therefore will ultimately generate more trips from this access.

The TS section 6.11 states: The proposed 9 dwellings are likely to generate vehicle generate 4 vehicle trips (1 in / 3 out) in the AM peak hour (08:00 – 09:00) equating to approximately 1 vehicle trip every 15- minutes, and 5 vehicle trips (3 in / 2 out) in the PM peak hour (17:00- 18:00) equating to 1 vehicle trip every 12-minutes. These additional vehicle trips would have a negligible impact on the local road network.

The Highway Authority are content such level of trips in itself would not present an unacceptable impact on local highway conditions.

REFUSE / RECYCLING

The proposals for recycling bin storage are in line with Manual for Streets MfS 6.8.9 residents should not be required to carry waste more than 30m and be within 25m of the kerbside/bin collection point

CONCLUSION

Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority has considered that the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highways and consequently have no objections on highway grounds subject to the above recommended planning conditions and highway informatives.

The amendments are contained to the dwellings in respect of design. There are no impacts on the surrounding highway network, therefore the High Authority maintain the previous comments and do not oppose the amendments.

Conservation Officer

I previously commented on 01/12/2022, 28/02/2023 and 27/04/2023.

I raised no objection to the previously amended iteration partly because I was under the impression that the scheme was acceptable in planning terms and that planning permission was unlikely to be resisted. I took the view that some improvements had been made to the scheme but I remained of the view that my comments regarding car port/garage plan, the rear elevation of Pots 1-3, the soldier arches to the openings on Units, 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 & 9, the brackets to the through-eaves gables of Unit 2, the lack of a plat band to Plots 4 & 5 and the car-dominated layout were all valid design matters that would potentially have enhanced the scheme's character and identity yet further. However, I concluded that I would raise no objection.

The question is whether what has not been submitted is a well-designed layout that incorporates house types with high quality elevations?

My first query relates to the tranche of land that remains open to the left of the site entrance. Whilst there may be some ecological and design benefit of maintaining a managed area of green open space on site, I see there also being a design benefit of moving the unit on Plot 1 away from Plot 2 and potentially redesigning this unit. If the open area is left as an unmanaged open area, then presumably this would leave the door ajar for a further submission later to develop this land.

If the purpose of the resubmission was to in part to reduce dwelling numbers, then to secure this in the long term, I wonder whether a well-designed (may be even larger) dwelling on Plot 1 but placed more centrally on a plot that combines the open land and Plot 1 would remove any prospect of further development and also ease the relationship between the dwellings on Plots 1 & 2. Currently, whereas the repetition of house types for Plot 3 & 4 and for Plots 5 & 6 works reasonably well as these are two distinct pairings, I find the repetition of house types for Plot 1 & 2 which are detached slightly more disappointing and have particularly wide side gables and no chimney stacks. Also, if these dwellings are to be rendered, I would encourage a drip detail over windows rather than the soldier courses shown.

A variation of house-type on Plot 1 would serve to provide some additional interest and it may even be possible to achieve both aims above e.g. larger Plot 1 and an open area, if the southern boundary to Plot 1 is limited to the red line above.

Maybe Plot 1 could have a brick-faced ground floor and even a jettied first-floor and that both Plots 1 & 2 could incorporate a chimney stack(s). Admittedly, a jetty detail to Plot 1 will require the gabled porch to be reconsidered but the jetty concept is a design feature to be encouraged. The gable proportions and chimneys stacks of the previous scheme (below right) worked better, in my opinion, when compared with the current Unit 1. If the dwelling to Plot 1 was repositioned further to the south, rather than having two parking spaces in front of Plot 1, perhaps two covered, weatherboarded carport spaces could perhaps then be positioned to the north of Plot 1 giving separation between the two-storey building forms that are Plots 1 and 2.

I raise no objection to Plots 3 & 4 and 5 & 6.

Suggested conditions

Apart from the standard time condition, it is important in my view that the windows are of sufficiently high quality for this new build (for instance at least something like the Residence 9 system (below left), Bereco (below right) or similar) and with appropriate roof materials i.e.

natural slate and clay machine plain tiles as a minimum (not concrete). Brick samples should also be stipulated.

Recommendation

Whilst not wishing to delay the determination of this application, the matters raised above regarding Plots 1 & 2 and open space are important and that, if taken on board, would potentially enhance the scheme's character and identity. Awaiting feedback and subject to the suggested conditions, I am likely to raise **NO OBJECTION** on the basis that the development would satisfy the provisions of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and would satisfy the aims of Section 16 of the NPPF and Policy HE1 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 - 2031.

County Council Archaeology

Please note that the following advice is based on the policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The development site is in an Area of Archaeological Significance identified in the Local Plan. This includes the historic core of the village of Holwell, the 17th century farmstead of Lordship Farm, and other sites, including Church Farm [Historic Environment Record No 15876, LB Grade II]. Holwell is recorded as Holewelle in an Anglo-Saxon charter dated AD 969 (Gover et al, The Place-Names of Hertfordshire, EPNS, Cambridge, 1938).

Church Farm House is an early post-medieval building, the earliest part of which dates from c.1500, but which is documented in Court Rolls as the home of John atte Church, in 1365 (Gover et al, 1938). The southernmost of its substantial range of farmyard buildings were located within the proposed development site, and are shown on the c.1901 Ordnance Survey map. 20th century aerial photographs reproduced in the Planning Design and Access Statement submitted with the application appear to show that some of these buildings were present at the time the photographs were taken, but other, more recent buildings are also present. All these buildings have been demolished.

It is stated in the Planning Design and Access Statement that 'There remains a significant amount of hardstanding and hardcore in the form of roadways and building foundations from the previous use' and that 'The land is of low quality and has been left to overgrow'. This land use is not immediately apparent on vertical aerial photographs dating to 2000, 2010, and 2016, which show a fairly closely mown grassland site, but this may now not be the case.

The development site is immediately opposite the parish church of St Peter, which though built in 1877, occupies the site of its medieval predecessor [HER 11828].

I note the comments submitted by the North Hertfordshire Archaeological Society with regard to the potential significance of the place-name Holewelle, the presence of the historic spring, and also the possible significance of this space, located between the spring and the parish church.

I believe that the proposed development is such that it should be regarded as likely to have an impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest and I recommend that the following provisions be made, should you be minded to grant consent:

1. An archaeological field survey to locate, plan and record any visible remains of the foundations of the demolished buildings on the site, prior to any development commencing;

2. The archaeological trial trench evaluation of the proposed development site, taking account of the results of the archaeological field survey, prior to any development commencing;

3. Such appropriate mitigation measures indicated as necessary by this evaluation

These may include:

- the preservation of any remains in situ, if warranted, by amendments to the design of the development if this is feasible,
- appropriate archaeological excavation of any remains before any development commences on the site, with provisions for subsequent analysis and publication of results,
- archaeological monitoring of the groundworks of the development, including service trenches, landscaping, and any other ground impact, as appropriate (this should include a contingency for preservation or further investigation of any remains encountered and provisions for subsequent analysis and publication of results);

4. The analysis of the results of the archaeological work with provision for the subsequent production of a report and an archive, and the publication of the results, as appropriate;

5. Such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the archaeological and historic interests of the site.

I believe that these recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications of this development proposal. I further believe that these recommendations closely follow the policies included within Policy 16 (para. 205, etc.) of the National Planning Policy Framework. In this case three appropriately worded conditions on any planning consent would be sufficient to provide for the level of investigation that this proposal warrants.

Hertfordshire Ecology

Summary of advice

- Ecological report provides sufficient information for determination.
- The recommendations in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) should be followed and secured by condition.
- A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) should be provided by condition.

Comments

The Site is a field with rough grassland with a boundary of scrub, trees and hedgerows. A pond lies outside the red line boundary to the north of the site. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal including further Reptile Surveys and Great crested newt Assessment, dated July 2022 and prepared by Skilled Ecology, has been submitted in support of this application. The report concludes the site to be of limited ecological value. Specific reptile and eDNA surveys undertaken in April and May did not record reptiles on site or the likelihood of Great crested newts in the nearby pond. The PEA provides an adequate assessment of the impact of the proposals and are based on appropriate survey methods and effort. The likelihood of an adverse ecological impact is low, but the report suggests reasonable precautionary measures to ensure that legally protected species are not harmed.

Trees will be replaced on a one-for-one basis or two-for-one for any mature trees. Hedgerows will include native species. Reasonable and sensible enhancement measures for bats, birds and invertebrates and sensitive lighting have been suggested. The landscaping scheme will include native and/or wildlife attracting species and wildflower meadow mix. The recommendations and enhancements in the report should be followed. To bring all these biodiversity aspirations together, I advise a LEMP is produced by condition. This should cover at least 5 years and provide details of the maintenance and management practices to be followed and the location of any habitat boxes/features.