



Mark Youngman
Development Management Group Manager
Hertfordshire County Council
Postal Point CHN115
Farnham House
Six Hills Way
Stevenage
SG1 2ST

Response to Planning application from Hertfordshire County Council (T and CP GDP Order 2015)

Director of Planning

Three Rivers District Council
Three Rivers House
Northway
Rickmansworth
Hertfordshire
WD3 1RL

District ref: 24/2073/OUT
HCC ref: TR/23653/2025
HCC received: 9 July 2025
Area manager: James Dale
Case officer: Lee Smith

Location

Land To North Of Little Green Lane Croxley Green WD3 3SP

Application type

Outline

Proposal

AMENDED PROPOSAL

Outline Application: Development of up to 600 residential dwellings (Use Class C3(a)), construction of a 5-bedroom property for childrens social care and supported living (Use Class C3(b)). Two vehicular access points from Little Green Lane and further pedestrian / cycleway accesses. A one form entry primary school (Use Class F1(a)) (plus expansion land for a two form entry primary school). A mixed use local centre including provision for NHS health and social care services (Use Class E(e)), community building (Use Class F2), retail and cafe provision (Use Class E(a-c)), car parking and associated infrastructure. A country park, areas for play and recreation, allotments, community orchard and landscaping with associated infrastructure including sustainable urban drainage systems. (Layout, scale, appearance and landscape as reserved matters).

Recommendation

Notice is given under article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

There is insufficient information supplied with this application to enable the Highway Authority to reach a recommendation. In the absence of the necessary information, the Highway Authority recommends refusal due to doubt over possible implications for the free and safe flow of public highway users.

The following response relates to the amended Transport Assessment and supporting documents that have been submitted to address our previous comments dated the 28th February 2025.

Site Accesses / Cycle Route Options.

In our previous response we requested Safety Audits for both the proposed site accesses and the shared pedestrian / cycle route that is proposed between the site and Baldwins Lane. We have yet to receive the safety audits.

The proposals will require further design considerations to determine if they can be delivered in accordance the criteria set out in LTN 1/20. We will be undertaking an internal review of the proposals once we receive the safety audit.

TA – General Comments

Accident Data

The amended Transport Assessment has included additional locations as requested. In summary most of the junctions within the study area have fewer than 5 accidents recorded. Some of larger junctions have higher levels but this would be expected as the volume of traffic passing through these junctions would be higher and the majority of the accidents are most likely to be rear end shunts. Two fatal accidents have been recorded one on Sarratt Road which involved a vehicle and cyclist and the other on Hempstead Road which involved a van and pedestrian. Though these incidents are unfortunate there is no evidence that traffic generations from this proposed development would adversely affect highway safety.

Active Travel and Sustainable Travel Proposals

I refer to the Active Travel Route Audit and the applicant's paragraph,

4.41 We investigate traffic impacts at various junctions along the A412 corridor where the LCWIP interventions are planned. As will be seen later in this report, highway improvements are not planned as part of the development proposals, but, in line with the vision to ensure that the site provides everyday facilities and that movements to/from the site are undertaken as sustainably as possible, contributions to the LCWIP proposals will be provided.

Planning Obligation (further financial contributions)

Our Guide to Developer Contributions Policy sets out further information in relation to planning obligations. This can be viewed on the link below.

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/media-library/documents/environment-and-planning/planning/developer-infrastructure-contributions-guide/technical-appendix-1-transport.pdf>

It should be noted that immediate and specific impacts of larger developments are established via a TA and mitigated via S278 obligation, or funded via CIL/S106 agreement in the conventional way. We consider this to first strand of possible transport contributions. The second strand should address facilitating delivery and enhancement of the necessary active and sustainable transport networks, such as the LCWIP interventions identified within Active Travel Audit and/or for example, improvements to Rousebarn Lane. The need for second strand contributions will be balanced against the level of first strand contributions.

Therefore, to establish the balance (therefore, value of strand 2 contribution) we need to understand the value of 'stand 1' supporting infrastructure and services. Is it possible for the applicant to list all supporting (off-site) infrastructure and services (e.g. cycling infrastructure, controlled crossings, proposed bus services, etc) alongside an approximate value of each item. As you can appreciate it

is important that all figures agreed at the planning stage allow us to understand how the overall planning vision can be delivered.

Car Parking

Table 2 sets out the latest parking provision for the development square this now provides higher levels of parking for the residential elements of the scheme and parking levels are in line with the emerging LP requirements. Paragraph 4.54 states that parking for the community hub will not be assigned to any particular use, this will allow this area to be used during the day if the retail parking areas becomes busy. It is anticipated that the community hub will be busier during the evenings when parking demand for the other land uses will be lower. This approach is rational and will allow flexibility across the development square uses.

Traffic Generations

The amended Transport Assessment has adopted a new approach to the trip rate calculations which provides multi modal trip rates for the development site. They have selected mixed private/affordable dwellings (Class 3M) subcategory within TRICS. The vehicle trip rates and numbers are set out in Table 3. This shows an increase in vehicle trips compared to the previous TA approach. The assessment has also included active travel trips rates in line with the comments received from ATE. Table 4 sets out the trip rates and anticipated walking and cycling movements that the site could generate.

Following on from comments received from National Highways the amended Transport Assessment has also considered the other proposed site uses the assessment has demonstrated that the school land use will only generate 9 external car movements and most of the school related trips will be internal to the development. With regards to the other land uses within the local centre we agree that these uses will be primarily internal trips with only small proportion of external movements occurring and these would be fairly local and not affect the SRN.

Construction Traffic

The information provided in Table 8 for the construction related activity is confusing, it is unclear how the correlation between total people light vehicle per day and resultant trips has been derived. Is light vehicle movements LGV's or does this include staff car trips? Also, when you review Phase 1 section of the table for the respective elements of the build the labourer columns differ, i.e. Medical Centre Labourers = 10 people = 10 light vehicles per day = 20 resultant trips. However, the same number of labourers for the Local Centre = 6.7 light vehicles per day and = 13.3 resultant trips. The school Building also provides a completely different number of resultant trips as well. It is unclear why these variations are occurring. We require further information on the construction related section of this amended Transport Assessment.

Traffic Impact and Assessment

We have noted that the surveyed flows shown on Figures 3.1 and 3.2 have two sets of numbers shown along with a percentage figures, the numbers shown in blue include all vehicle types excluding cars, this has then been used to create the HGV %'s for the modelling assessments. This calculation is incorrect as the figure in blue also includes the LGV values these shouldn't be included in the HGV percentage calculations.

The flows shown on Figures 3.1 and 3.2 are incorrect at the junction of Baldwins Lane / Links Way and Winton Drive, the LGV values that were recorded in the traffic surveys have not been accounted for. This equates to approximately 100 vehicles in the AM Peak and 110 vehicles in the PM Peak which have not been included in modelling assessments.

The flows presented on Figures 3.1 and 3.2 have been used in the baseline modelling scenarios for each junction. As mentioned above the LGV values have been included in the HGV percentage calculations it also appears that these values have been included in the PCU conversions with a factor of 2.0 being applied. DfT guidance states that LGV values should not have PCU factors applied to them. The PCU values shown on Figures 3.3 and 3.4 are incorrect.

Figure 5.2 shows the development trip assignment in the PM Peak along Baldwins Lane in the westbound direction 57% of the trips assigned along this link however at the roundabout with the A412 only 33% of the inbound trips are assigned at the junction, 14% of the inbound trips are missing. This error will affect the development traffic flows which have been provided on Figure 5.8

Figure 5.7 shows the development traffic in the AM peak the departures are split between Durrants Drive and Links way with 45 vehicles departing via Durrants Drive these vehicles will pass through the Links Way / Baldwins Lane junction these vehicles have not been included this error flows through into the Future Year Flow diagrams.

The issues that we have identified in relation to the baseline data and the development traffic assignments will impact the junction modelling therefore we are unable to accept the results that have been reported in this amended Transport Assessment.

Signed

Lee Smith

22 August 2025