

18 February 2026

Objection Report on Planning Application 25/03080/HYA at GA2 Land North-East of Great Ashby

1.1 Background and summary of the application

This objection is submitted on behalf of Great Ashby Community Council.

In respect of hybrid planning application **25/03080/HYA** for **GA2, Land North-East of Great Ashby** (described by the Council as “Land North-East of Great Ashby (GA2)”, adjacent to **Stevenage**.

The Council’s published synopsis describes a **hybrid** proposal comprising: (i) a **full application** for “the construction of vehicle access and an active travel link via Mendip Way, with associated landscaping and drainage works”; and (ii) an **outline element** (all matters reserved except means of access) for “up to 640 dwellings”, land for a primary school and additional education land (Use Class F1), and a community hub (Use Class F2), together with internal roads, parking, cycling infrastructure, landscaping and other associated infrastructure.

The statutory public notice categorises the proposal as **major development, EIA development**, “within the Green Belt”, affecting rights of way, and affecting the **settings of listed buildings**.

The Council’s application details page identifies the applicant as **Picture Estates Limited** and the agent as **Iceni Projects**

1.2 The Site



Hertfordshire's Local Nature Recovery Strategy (HLNRS) is a statutory countywide blueprint guiding nature recovery, habitat restoration, and biodiversity enhancement, with a focus on priority species and habitats. GACC would like to draw NHC's attention to the importance of this application site to Hertfordshire, and its inclusion in the HLNRS. Significant parts of this site have been identified by the Herts Local Nature Recovery Partnership as a Local Nature Recovery Focus Area, having 'areas of particular importance for biodiversity', and 'areas that could become of particular importance for biodiversity'. The area surrounding and including the proposed site of the new SUD is identified as having 'species with targeted actions', namely to increase rare arable plant populations. For planning decisions, the strategy may be a material consideration. The Applicant will therefore need to show how it considers the HLNRS.

This site is ecologically important and GACC has separately submitted an ecological objection response to NHC, prepared by Denis J Vickers CBiol, MRSB, MCIEEM.

1.3 Development plan and material considerations

1.3.1 Applicable decision framework

The plan-led duty applies: planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The relevant national policy is the **National Planning Policy Framework** ("NPPF", December 2024). It confirms that decision-taking should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and it sets specific tests relevant to (among other things) transport impacts, flood risk, the Green Belt, biodiversity/irreplaceable habitat, and the historic environment.

The development plan includes the adopted **North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031**, adopted on **8 November 2022**.

For the application site, the key site allocation is **Policy SP18: Site GA2 – Land off Mendip Way, Great Ashby** (Strategic Housing Site for “approximately 600 homes”), including specific planning and master planning requirements.

In addition, the Council adopted a Strategic Masterplan Framework for GA2 as a **material planning consideration** for decisions relating to the site (Full Council, 28 November 2024).

A further material input is the published independent design review undertaken by **Design South East**, which raised substantial issues at masterplan stage regarding (among other matters) highway-dominance, active travel connectivity, drainage realism, and protection of ancient woodland and the setting of **Tile Kiln Farm**.

1.3.2 Core Policy SP18 requirements that are directly engaged by this hybrid application

Policy SP18 expects, among other matters: (a) neighbourhood-level facilities including ~500m² (net) retail/food & beverage floorspace and necessary medical/social infrastructure; (b) **4 hectares** of education land to accommodate **2FE primary** and **4FE secondary-age** provision; (c) principal access from Mendip Way with provision for sustainable modes and comprehensive integration with pedestrian/cycle/public transport/road networks; (d) a Transport Assessment to identify and secure measures to manage traffic flows arising from development along Back Lane; (e) a detailed drainage strategy identifying water infrastructure and delivery mechanisms; (f) at least 6 serviced self-build plots; (g) structural planting to reinforce boundaries and mitigate landscape impacts; (h) addressing existing surface-water flood risk (including flows running south-east from Dell Spring to Newberry Grove) through SuDS or other appropriate solutions; (i) biodiversity mitigation/compensation/enhancement including named local wildlife/woodland assets; (j) integration of public rights of way (including specified footpaths/bridleway); (k) a green infrastructure corridor beneath overhead power lines; and (l) lower intensity development/green infrastructure to the north to minimise harm to the setting of listed buildings.

Given that the current hybrid application seeks approval of the Mendip Way vehicular access and active travel link in full, and means of access is also an unreserved matter for the outline component, Policy SP18’s access, transport integration, and flood risk requirements are not merely “reserved matters issues”: they are central to the determination now.

Application Site Plan

This shows the access road from Mendip Way but other documents refer to this application seeking approval of the active travel links to the site. The Active Travel Connection off Merrick Close has not been identified on this map as part of the full application, however other documents allude to this.

We are unable to locate Appendix A in the Travel Assessment. However, the widening of the path in the proximity of ancient woodland would require habitat cut back and possibly felling of trees, as well as disturbance to protected species. As this part of the application is due to be determined in full, please can the Applicant be asked to provide full details?

Please note that the footpath currently extends onto property in Merrick Close which appears to be privately owned. Is this upgrade to a footpath and cycleway legally permitted as part of the application and have the residents been formally notified of this application?

The Applicant is proposing to upgrade a 2m wide unmade track through covered woodland into a 3m wide path and cycleway. It is further proposed that this reduces back in width to a restricted 2m opening and pedestrians and cyclists would both be forced directly onto roadway within Merrick Close. This close has no pavements and this route cannot be described as a safe active travel connection.

Design & Access Statement

3.11.4 The neighbourhood centre is also served by local bus services.

This is incorrect – no bus goes into the neighbourhood centre. The closest stop is The Beacons.

3.120 The Site is located in close proximity to 'The Beacons' bus stop which is situated 400m to the west of the Site access and is accessible within a 4 minute walk or a 2 minute cycle (from the proposed Site access off Mendip Way).

This is misleading the access road is quite a distance from the proposed housing and it is longer than a 4 minute walk from the main site.

3.121 To access a wider range of bus services, Stevenage Bus Station provides access to an extensive network of bus routes. Stevenage Bus station is located approximately 5km to the south of the Site and can be accessed within a 19 minute cycle or a 13 minute bus journey from 'The Beacons' bus stop (using route SB7).

The amended SB7 route takes 22 minutes according to the bus timetable.

3.123 Walking and cycling routes from the Site access to Stevenage Train Station are safe, direct, adequately lit (appropriately for the environment) and naturally surveyed (active frontages or fairly busy roads are within clear sight). Where possible, cycleways provide a direct and traffic-free route to the Train Station.

There is not a continuous cycle route to from Great Ashby to our knowledge.

Planning Statement

The site area = 62.93 ha. The Local Plan site allocation for GA2 is for approximately 53.5 ha. This is an approximate increase of 18% which is outside of the Local Plan allocation.

2.13 The nearest local amenities are within the Neighbourhood Centre in Great Ashby, which is approximately 5-10 minutes' walk from the Site.

The local amenities are significantly more than 5-10 minutes' walk from the main site.

Site Access off Mendip Way.

GACC is very concerned about the proposed changes to incorporate the access road into the existing road network within Great Ashby. This would see priority given to traffic routing to and from the GA2 site. This junction will cause traffic to back up along Mendip Way for existing residents trying to leave. This will be further impacted by the addition of traffic from GA1 Roundwood, and from the introduction of a bus route.

Mendip Way at this point, together with other roads in the vicinity (Great Ashby Way & Whitehorse Lane together with the Neighbourhood Centre Car Park) have a major parking issue at school pick up and drop off times (photos provided below) and this road layout will exacerbate the issue and in our opinion this solution is dangerous to all road users. For reasons of safety, GACC urges NHC to insist that other options are considered which lessen the impact on existing residents.



Image: Congestion and out-of-bay parking in GA Neighbourhood Centre during school drop off times

Further, GACC considers the extension of a Monitor and Manage scheme in this area to defer the infrastructure issues as if they were insignificant; these will severely reduce the quality of life for existing residents on and around Mendip Way. This is in addition to the impositions forced upon the same residents as a result of approval of the Roundwood site, which are yet to be put in place. Implementation of double yellow lines along the whole extent of Mendip Way will exacerbate the parking issues which were inbuilt by poor initial planning rules and decisions. Again, as with the recently approved GA1 development, the Applicant is suggesting that residents are able to find suitable off the street parking within private parking courts. Great Ashby Community Council can confirm that these spaces are not accessible to anyone other than residents of the apartments and these cannot be used as alternative to off-street parking.

GACC acknowledges the intention to slow traffic on the access road but please note that in a HCC Consultation, Great Ashby residents opposed the use of 20mph speed limits in our residential streets. A speed limit of 30mph remains throughout Great Ashby, with just one zone of 20mph on Whitehorse Lane, in the vicinity of the school.

GREEN TRAVEL PLAN: LAND OFF MENDIP WAY, GREAT ASHBY

The Green Travel Plan provides distances and times for travel using a reference point at the start of the access road on Mendip Way. This is misleading and underestimates journey times. The document states that:

5.108 Setting SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timebound) targets is paramount to ensuring a modal shift away from SOV trips towards sustainable trips.

...and yet all journey times are understated. Also, it states that an estimated target of 50% of journeys will be via sustainable means. This is overambitious when Herts County Council has failed to see a significant increase in modal shift within Hertfordshire. The lack of infrastructure in Great Ashby and the poor bus service (which would only become

worse with an increase to a journey time of almost 30 mins for the SB7 should GA1 and the proposed GA2 site be added to the route,) fail to make this proposed development sustainable. Round Diamond School is oversubscribed and residents close to the school are forced to travel further afield; there will be little chance of new residents gaining entry to the Round Diamond School for their children and as the document shows, journey times to other primary schools, even from Mendip Way, are too far for young children to comfortably walk. The same can be said for secondary schools. Consideration has been given to auditing the secondary school closest to the site, the Nobel School, however this school is generally not allocated to children as far into Great Ashby as the site location. It is more likely that children in the proposed site would attend Barclay Academy or Alleyne's Academy, for which there is an incomplete cycle route.

There are suggested upgrades to the existing PRow network in our parish. GACC would like to be consulted should these ideas progress; our view is that no changes which adversely affect the wildlife and biodiversity in these green corridors, such as widening pathways, should occur without a proven and demonstrated need. The PRowS in and around the GA2 site are very popular for leisure purposes and existing residents enjoy the country-feel to these pathways which we would like to see maintained.

Transport Assessment

The data is incomplete with key junctions missed (such as the St Albans link road and junctions leading to the A1(M)) and the data provided is stale being over 2 years old. Within the past 2 years the local area has seen significant new housing developments realised, such as Gresley Park EOS 600 homes, NS1 for approx. 900 homes, HO3 800 homes, with residential and construction traffic now being generated from these developments. The real impact of traffic from these developments has not been taken into account and it is not clear if the expected cumulative impact of proposed and approved developments such as GA1 Roundwood 281 homes has been taken into account.

Additionally, the Census and road traffic accident data are out of date and will not take account of an increasing driving population, accident generation from other development and the changing demographics in this area, with more young adults remaining in the family home.

Allotment site

It is GACC's view that the allotment site proposed will detract from the natural view of Dell Spring, which the Applicant suggests will be a visually attractive area. The applicant also refers to a community orchard but it is unclear where this is located.

GEA GA2 School Site Ground Investigation (July 2025)

The site is roughly rectangular in shape and measures approximately 200 m southwest-northeast by 130 m northwest-southeast. (p2) The report covers an area of 2.6 ha designated for a primary school site and only appears to include one sample site in the area labelled as 'reserved land for educational purposes.'

No assurance has been given that the additional reserved land would be suitable for educational use; whether it is able to support buildings or free from contaminants. The size is insufficient to accommodate a 4FE secondary school as stipulated in the NHC Local Plan.

In fact, the variance in the readings between this one borehole (BH105) and other two soil samples on the main primary school site, in our view, indicate further investigation is needed; a lead contamination reading of 160 is over 300% more than the average of the other 2 boreholes for which soil analysis is recorded.

GEA Desk Study & Ground Investigation Report (May 2023)

This report is old and excludes the area of land designated in the application for BNG and also the sud area for the site, both of which are on green belt land. Without consideration of these areas it is not possible to determine their suitability for use as described in the Application.

The report notes areas of low to high surface water flood risk, which are shown in the Appendix. There is a complication with the use of soakaways and the interference with the existing hedgerow which act as wildlife connectors between woodland areas (please refer to the ecology report in response to this application submitted by Denis Vickers on behalf of GACC).

The GEA Desk Study & Ground Investigation Report states that EA approval would be required to use deep soakaways (with shallow soakaways not feasible), and this may be restricted (or refused) due to the sensitivity of this land as a principal aquifer.

1.4 Key shortcomings and decision-taking risks arising from the submission

1.4.1 Public document accessibility and the need for robust verification

The Council's own GA2 planning-application page lists a substantial suite of technical documents (including a Planning Statement, Design and Access Statement, Transport Assessment, Road Safety Audit, Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategy, BNG metric calculation, sustainability/energy statements, and Environmental Statement chapters). It also states that numerous technical appendices are embedded within Environmental Statement topic chapters (including archaeology, heritage, arboriculture, landscape/ecology management, health impact assessment, agricultural land classification, transport/audit, and water/flood risk appendices).

Given: (i) the statutory categorisation as EIA development; and (ii) the breadth of SP18 and NPPF requirements engaged (including Green Belt/rights of way/listed-building setting issues), the Council must ensure that the submission is not only complete but that its conclusions are robustly evidenced and that mitigation is clearly enforceable via conditions and/or Section 106 obligations.

1.4.2 Quantum and “policy alignment drift” from the allocation

Policy SP18 describes GA2 as “approximately 600 homes”. The current application seeks up to **640 dwellings**. That uplift is material and must be justified in terms of: (a) the allocation’s environmental/transport/heritage constraints; (b) infrastructure capacity (especially education, health, highways, drainage, and GI); and (c) whether increased quantum prejudices delivery of the site as a whole or undermines masterplan outcomes.

The independent design review panel warned that the developing masterplan was not yet clearly learning from the “failings of Great Ashby,” and that the scheme was overly structured by a loop road that internalises the development and limits connectivity. A quantum increase in this context heightens the risk that the proposal becomes more car-dependent and places additional pressure on constrained junctions and residential streets, unless demonstrably offset by enforceable sustainable-transport and demand-management measures.

1.4.3 Green Belt status and “Golden Rules” implications

The public notice states the proposal is “within the Green Belt.” If any part of the application red line remains Green Belt (or is treated as Green Belt land for the purposes of decision-taking), the NPPF approach to Green Belt decision-making and (for major housing) the “Golden Rules” contributions become material considerations—including expectations around affordable housing, infrastructure improvements, and publicly accessible green space provision.

Separately, the GA2 masterplan report records that the significant majority of the site lies within Weston parish, but that the access corridor from Mendip Way lies within Great Ashby parish and that land interests and negotiations were ongoing in relation to the access corridor. This reinforces the need for careful delineation of what is and is not within the allocation, and what is and is not within any remaining Green Belt designation, because those boundaries affect both policy tests and delivery certainty.

1.5 Transport, access, parking and infrastructure impacts

1.5.1 Transport assessment standard to be applied now

The NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds where there would be an unacceptable highway safety impact, or **residual cumulative impacts** on the road network would be **severe**, taking account of mitigation and “all reasonable future scenarios.”

Policy SP18 requires a Transport Assessment that specifically identifies and secures measures to manage traffic flows “along Back Lane.” This reflects long-standing local sensitivity about displaced traffic and congestion effects beyond the strategic distributor (Great Ashby Way) and through narrower rural links.

In earlier scoping-stage correspondence for GA2, Great Ashby Community Council raised concerns that transport assessment work was inadequate, highlighting cumulative impacts with other developments and the traffic consequences of proposed education provision, and requested more thorough local surveying and modelling. While that letter related to scoping (not this planning submission), it evidences that transport risk—particularly cumulative and school-related traffic—has been a consistently contested topic that requires particularly careful verification at application stage.

1.5.2 Mendip Way access and internal movement hierarchy

The hybrid application seeks full permission for the vehicle access and active travel link via Mendip Way. Policy SP18 requires principal access from Mendip Way, but only where it demonstrably provides for sustainable modes and achieves comprehensive integration with existing pedestrian/cycle/public transport/road networks.

The design review panel explicitly criticised the emerging masterplan for being “primarily structured” by a “loop road” and recommended removing “highways-dominated” design in favour of direct, convenient active travel routes beyond the site boundary to encourage mode shift. They also highlighted uncertainty about long-term public transport funding and the potential for parking layouts to entrench private-car dependency. These issues go directly to NPPF sustainable transport objectives and the credibility of claimed modal shift in any submitted Green Travel Plan.

Given (i) the application is partially “full” at the access corridor; and (ii) means of access is unreserved for the outline element, Great Ashby Community Council objects unless and until the Council is satisfied that: the access arrangements are safe for all users; the transport mitigation package is fully specified and secured; and cumulative impacts (including school peaks, construction peaks, and committed/allocated growth around Great Ashby/Stevenage) will not create severe residual impacts or unsafe conditions on residential streets and rural lanes.

1.5.3 Parking pressure and displacement effects

The Council’s own published policy framework requires that development should not cause unacceptable impacts on the highway network and must protect rights of way, cycling and equestrian routes; and separately requires that parking provision meets applicable standards.

In a location where existing streets function as residential environments, any displacement of parking from within the new development onto surrounding streets can

become a road safety issue (visibility, junction protection, pedestrian crossing desire lines), not merely a convenience issue. This is particularly relevant where the “full” access works introduce a new traffic focus at Mendip Way and the development also proposes (in outline) education uses likely to generate peak-time drop-off and pick-up travel demand unless managed through robust travel planning and a deliverable sustainable-movement network.

1.5.4 Infrastructure requirements and developer contributions

The NPPF requires planning obligations to be necessary, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

Policy SP18 is explicit that GA2 must deliver neighbourhood-level facilities (including shop/food & beverage floorspace and “necessary medical and social infrastructure”) and must reserve education land for 2FE primary and 4FE secondary-age provision. The supporting text identifies that (i) Great Ashby is treated as a “town” for settlement hierarchy purposes; (ii) existing evidence identifies that the three housing allocations to the north of Stevenage will generate a requirement for additional GP provision; and (iii) Great Ashby’s existing primary school is significantly oversubscribed and there is no local secondary school. These are not peripheral observations: they are the Local Plan’s own justification for infrastructure planning and must be reflected in binding delivery mechanisms through the application’s phasing, triggers, and obligations.

1.6 Environmental, landscape, biodiversity, water and climate considerations

1.6.1 Ancient woodland and “irreplaceable habitat” protection

The NPPF states that development resulting in the loss or deterioration of **irreplaceable habitats** (including **ancient woodland** and ancient/veteran trees) should be refused unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists.

The GA2 masterplan report confirms that the site contains and is bordered by established woodland, some classified as ancient woodland, and that this is a key feature of the site context.

The design review panel expressed concern that ancient woodland blocks could become “leftover spaces” rather than integral and safeguarded parts of the masterplan, and recommended engagement with wildlife organisations to develop an active management strategy, potentially within extended woodland buffers, to retain and enhance ancient woodland while providing appropriate public access. A hybrid application of this scale must therefore demonstrate, in an enforceable manner, that: (i) buffers and hydrological protections prevent deterioration; (ii) construction and operational pressures (lighting, recreational pressure, drainage changes, domestic pets, pollution) are mitigated; and (iii) long-term stewardship funding is secured.

1.6.2 Landscape structure, green infrastructure and open space

Policy SP18 requires structural planting to reinforce boundaries (including the revised Green Belt boundary) and requires a green infrastructure corridor beneath overhead power lines, plus integration of public rights of way and routes to the wider countryside.

The design review panel criticised the masterplan approach for being highways-led rather than landscape-led, recommending that topography, ecology and hydrology should structure the masterplan and that green corridors be reinforced before road and parcels are fixed. It also suggested that the NEAP/play provision and allotments should be located to support the “heart” of the development rather than being placed in traffic-heavy or isolated/steep areas. These points are directly relevant to policies requiring high-quality design, healthy communities and functional green infrastructure, and they affect whether the proposal will genuinely reduce car dependence through attractive, direct walking and cycling routes between homes, schools, community uses and open space.

1.6.3 Surface water management, flood risk and drainage realism

The NPPF requires avoiding inappropriate development in flood risk areas, considering cumulative impacts, and ensuring that development is safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. It also expects sustainable drainage systems for major development (unless clearly inappropriate) with appropriate operational standards and maintenance arrangements for the lifetime of the development.

Policy SP18 is unusually specific about known surface water risk: it requires the scheme to “address existing surface water flood risk issues, particularly running south-east from Dell Spring to Newberry Grove, through SUDs or other appropriate solution.”

The design review panel questioned whether the masterplan’s drainage basins were realistically located and called for sectioning, contour overlay and clearer demonstration that SuDS features work with natural flow routes rather than requiring extensive engineering. Great Ashby Community Council objects unless the application demonstrates (through its Flood Risk Assessment, Drainage Strategy and ES Water Resources/Flood chapters) that drainage proposals are hydraulically credible, deliverable in phasing terms, and supported by a secured long-term management body and funding mechanism.

1.6.4 Water resources, chalk aquifer sensitivity and wastewater capacity

Earlier GA2 scoping correspondence from Great Ashby Community Council highlighted that the proposed development overlies a principal aquifer and raised concerns about the consequences of altering topography and drainage for local chalk stream systems (including flows associated with the River Beane catchment), and requested that wastewater/sewerage capacity and environmental consequences be properly scoped.

While scoping-stage representations are not determinative of this application, they indicate that water resource protection and wastewater capacity are material local concerns which the ES must address with particular care and with enforceable mitigation and monitoring.

1.7 Design, housing delivery, healthy communities and heritage

1.7.1 Housing and education land requirements

Policy SP18 requires reserved education land to accommodate 2FE primary and 4FE secondary-age provision, and the supporting text confirms that secondary-age pressures in the Stevenage area were a key concern at plan-making stage.

The Council's GA2 planning-application description confirms that the outline element includes a primary school site and additional education land, but the public synopsis alone does not confirm how secondary-age provision requirements are met in land, phasing, triggers or funding terms. Great Ashby Community Council therefore objects unless the application's education delivery strategy and Section 106 heads of terms: (i) secure land quantum and specifications compliant with SP18; (ii) demonstrate deliverable timing aligned with occupation; and (iii) address cumulative growth pressures in the wider north-of-Stevenage/great-ashby area.

1.7.2 Healthy communities and access to services

Policy SP18 requires neighbourhood-level facilities including retail/food & beverage floorspace and "necessary medical and social infrastructure," and the supporting text explains that ensuring such provision is necessary to avoid the new development being unsustainable and to reduce the need for longer-distance travel.

The design review panel questioned whether reliance on the existing Great Ashby neighbourhood centre is sustainable and suggested that the applicant and Council consider whether a new neighbourhood centre serving Great Ashby could create a stronger focal point and support long-term viability. Regardless of the chosen delivery model, Great Ashby Community Council objects unless the community hub and local facilities are not treated as "aspirational" but as deliverable infrastructure with clear floorspace parameters, phasing triggers, and operational viability strategy secured via the permission and obligations.

1.7.3 Heritage setting and archaeology

Policy SP18 requires lower intensity development and/or green infrastructure to the north of the site to minimise harm to the setting of listed buildings, and its supporting text highlights that the site adjoins Grade II listed buildings at Tile Kiln Farm and that care should be taken to ensure an appropriate setting.

The design review panel recommended retaining and protecting Dell Spring as an unspoilt landscape area to reduce impact on Tile Kiln Farm's setting. The statutory notice further confirms that listed-building settings are affected. Great Ashby Community Council objects unless the heritage assessment and ES Built Heritage/Archaeology chapters demonstrate, with verified visualisations and enforceable parameters, that the proposal avoids harm (or clearly justifies and minimises any harm) and secures the landscape and layout measures required by SP18 to maintain an appropriate setting for these designated heritage assets.

1.8 Conclusion and request

Great Ashby Community Council recognises that GA2 is allocated for development and that a masterplan framework has been adopted as a material consideration. However, allocation does not equate to unconditional acceptability: the application must still demonstrate compliance with Policy SP18's detailed requirements and with national policy, particularly on transport impacts, flood risk and SuDS, and the protection of irreplaceable habitats (including ancient woodland).

On the basis of the information presently available in the Council's published synopsis and the material evidence contained within SP18 and the independent design review, Great Ashby Community Council objects to planning application 25/03080/HYA and requests that **North Hertfordshire District Council** either: (a) refuses the application, or (b) (at minimum) defers determination and requires the applicant to provide clear, application-stage evidence and secured mitigation demonstrating that the scheme will not result in unsafe or severely harmful residual transport impacts, will deliver legally enforceable infrastructure and community facilities, will avoid flood-risk transfer and provide lifetime SuDS maintenance, and will not cause loss or deterioration of ancient woodland or other irreplaceable habitat.

Yours sincerely

Carl Thomas MSc

Director

e. carl.thomas@harwoodsavin.com