

Written Update 1 October Planning Control Committee Meeting

Agenda Item 6 – 24/02889/FP – Land at Roundwood, Back Lane, Graveley, Hertfordshire

1. Updated five-year housing land supply position

As Councillors will be aware, on 21st September 2026 the Council's Five-Year Housing Land Supply Update was published. This sets out our position as of 31st March 2026 and explains how that position should be applied to relevant planning applications and decisions. Please find below a link to view this on the Council's website:

[Monitoring reports | North Herts Council](#)

In summary as set out in the Council's most recent Five-Year Housing Supply Update (September 2026), the total requirement for housing delivery from 1 April -31 March 2031 in our District is 9,041 dwellings. The Council can only demonstrate a five-year land position of **2.43 years** against our objectively assessed housing requirement of 1,120 dwellings per annum, shortfall (to be made up in this five-year period of 1,934 dwellings per year) and 20% buffer amounting to 1,507. This figure falls below the five-year figure as required in the NPPF.

This position is worse than when this application was considered at Planning Control Committee in July 2025. At that point in time the Council could only demonstrate a five-year land position of **3.9 years** against our adopted housing requirement. This position is worse than reported in the current recently published committee report as that was based on the Council's five-year housing land supply position statement of November 2025 which set out that the Council could only demonstrate a five-year land position of **2.6 years**.

It is explained in the Council's most recent Five-Year Housing Supply Update (September 2026) that we are on upward trajectory. However, the Council still cannot demonstrate a five-year land supply.

This does not change the recommendation for approval in the committee report. In fact, it increases the weight that can be afforded to the delivery of private and affordable housing and therefore strengthens the recommendation for approval.

2. Correction to report

There was an error in the figures in the report in paragraph 4.56. The corrected figures are as set out below:

“Officers have calculated that the total contributions agreed in July 2025 would have equated to approx. £12,334,409.46 (if indexed in April 2026) which would have represented approx. £43,895 per unit.”

3. Outdoor sport facilities contributions

Stevenage Borough Council have confirmed that they are seeking outdoor sport facilities contributions towards the following projects, as opposed to the projects set out in their initial consultation response:

£252,463.88 (inclusive of indexation to April 2026) towards the creation of Playzones (construction of 3G pitches) at St Nicolas Park and/or Hampson Park.

The applicant has provided confirmation in writing of their agreement to this.

4. British Horse Society objection

After the committee report had been published, an objection was sent to all Councillors on Planning Control Committee by the British Horse Society and has been published on the Council’s website under the application reference, where it can be read in full. The British Horse Society previously submitted a representation on the application, and this was addressed in the committee report for the 24 July 2025 Planning Committee (paragraph 4.110). At this stage we are only considering viability matters.

5. Bin storage condition

In paragraph 4.140 of the committee report it was set out that there had been a minor change made by the Planning Officer to the wording of recommended Condition 37 relating to refuse and recycling collection and storage. The following sentence had been added: *“All dwellings shall have covered bin storage unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”*

The applicant has confirmed that they were not expecting to provide physically covered bin stores to every dwelling, only for the flats, as already shown on the plans. Adding in such stores would therefore be an additional cost for each house, which could multiply up to something reasonably significant in the context of the tight viability considerations. This is noted and it is recommended that this additional sentence is removed from the condition, given the viability constraints on this site.