

For the attention of Ben Glover, Planning Case Officer

Planning Applications 24/01994/S73 and 24/01883/RM

Further to the letters dated 6th September and 19th September relating to the above applications please note my objections and comments below and include my previous comments/objections in submissions relating to planning application 18/01502/OP and site BK3 during the current Local Plan process.

24/01994/S73 – Section 73 Application - Removal of wording to Condition 3 of planning permission 18/01502/OP (granted on 25th July 2023)

Land between Royston Road and Cambridge Road, Barkway, Hertfordshire.

I strongly **Object** to this condition being removed. Removing the condition would enable the applicant/developer to update the permission without referring back for approval by the planning officers. The condition should remain and I would urge North Herts (District) Council to refuse this application.

24/01883/RM – Reserved Matters

Land Between Royston Road and Cambridge Road, Barkway, Hertfordshire.

Reserved Matters: Application for the approval of reserved matters comprising details of the siting, design and external appearance of the development and the landscaping of the site in respect of the approved outline of planning permission ref. 18/01502/OP for the development of 140 dwellings and a new shop on the land between Royston Road and Cambridge Road, Barkway.

Design and Parking

The design of the houses appears to be more suited to new development in an urban environment rather than a rural village and I would suggest that the developer gives serious consideration to the emerging Barkway and Nuthampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

It would be preferable to spread the affordable housing and parking spaces more evenly across the development.

There will be no gas across the development and new dwellings will have electric air source heat pumps and underfloor heating in the private dwellings, whilst electric panel heaters and hot water heat pumps (more expensive to run) will be installed in affordable dwellings. It is disappointing that this approach will result in the affordable properties having more expensive heating costs.

Unfortunately, the application shows no evidence of meeting the aspiration of 10% BNG but instead achieves a minimal net gain. This is particularly disappointing given that the local councils have all declared “climate emergencies”.

These points should be challenged with the developer.

Landscaping/Environment

Boundary Treatment on Northern Side/Bridleway 18

Paragraph 13.34 of the Local Plan (referred to in 4.3.3 of the officer's report on application 18/01502/OP) confirms that the site is identified for up to 140 homes with policy criteria including that development should include extensive tree planting, maintenance of the existing boundaries and hedgerows and should include measures to create visible and sound barriers between the development and the stud to minimise the impact on Newsells Park Stud. In terms of proximity of built development, noise and increased activity should be of a sensitive design to respect the setting of Cokenach Registered Park and Garden and listed buildings within Newsells Estate, to include reinforcing of hedgerows and landscaping along site boundaries access arrangements designed to minimise harm to heritage assets.

There should be a guarantee for immediate extensive planting of mature trees and replacement of any trees/hedges that die early on.

The current master plan shows access points to bridleway 18 through hedgerows not owned by the developer but in the ownership of Newsells Park Stud. Hidden, narrow access points are a safety issue for horses and riders as any sudden movements could frighten the horses.

The existing entrance where bridleway 17 crosses bridleway 18 should remain the only entrance along the site boundary.

The proposed road crossing design needs to be revisited as the views could be restrictive for horse riders and vehicles.

Boundary Treatment on Southern Boundary

The NHDC Landscape Officer raised a concern regarding the lack of planting along the southern boundary, stating that insufficient planting is proposed so views from Periwinkle Close will be adversely affected. This has not been addressed and the proposed close boarded fence (1.8m) could lead to fly tipping (garden waste) over the fence, as has occurred in other developments. Such a fence would also cause a separation between the development and existing part of the village.

The developer's own design statements do not support blank fences and gables.

General

The current site for the playground should also be reconsidered as the activities could cause the horses to be spooked.

Boundary treatments within the site should show more consideration to hedges and trees rather than relying mainly on close boarded fencing, which has no regard for wildlife or the surrounding area of the existing village.

Proposals for a Tarmac surface to the bridleway will not create the appropriate conditions for a rural setting or wildlife corridor and should therefore be reassessed, also taking into account that Tarmac can be slippery in adverse conditions.

Conditions in Planning Application 18/01502/OP

The conditions agreed in the Outline Planning application should remain and be strongly adhered to. Below are some particular concerns where there have been recent issues in other developments.

Condition 4 – Landscaping

Close monitoring to ensure the submitted details enable proper consideration to be given to the appearance of the completed development.

Hedges and trees should be more prevalent than close boarded fences.

Condition 5 – Trees

Close monitoring of this condition needs to take place to ensure that no trees to be retained are felled without written agreement from the Local Planning Authority. This has occurred on various developments in the past.

Condition 9 – Sewerage

The requirements of this condition do not appear to have been made yet. There are significant issues currently with treatment of sewage and there is a need for Sewage Treatment Upgrades to accommodate any proposed development.

Condition 10 – Archaeology

This should not be given merely “an intermittent watching brief”. There is evidence of archaeological remains in other sites around the area and the County Archaeologist needs to be involved until there is clear evidence that there is no longer a need for monitoring the site.

Condition 19 – Construction Traffic Management Plan

It is imperative that no development commences until the Plan is in place. This includes ensuring a compound is in place for construction vehicles to avoid pressure on the existing network at peak times, such as when children are going to and from school.

Condition 23 – Retail Shop

The detail for viability of a “retail shop” is given little attention and this is arguably the only reason given to support the development being sustainable. The sustainability of the development continues to remain a concern.

Please include this submission as part of the formal planning process.

Fiona Hill

County Councillor for Royston East and Ermine