

**Response to formal planning application**  
**21/01882/FP | Proposed residential development for 42 dwellings, access, parking,**  
**landscaping and associated works, including provision of an electrical sub-station. | Land East**  
**Rhee Spring And Orwell View Royston Road Baldock Hertfordshire**

The Baldock , Bygrave and Clothall Planning group are compiling a response to the consultation for the above site. The consultation period closes on 16<sup>th</sup> July.

Please note that this response is not intended to replace individuals submitting their views directly to the council. **It is imperative that all views are submitted by as many residents as possible.** This response is designed to augment those responses. However, if you would like to comment on our intended response then please email us at [info@bbplan.co.uk](mailto:info@bbplan.co.uk) before 14 July.

**Background to the application:**

This site is allocated in the emerging Local Plan (as site BA4), and is eligible for being given permission now because it lies outside the Green Belt (unlike the other land around Baldock) It is an application for full permission, which means they are seeking to agree all the details now, rather than some being reserved for later.

Some improvements on the previous iteration of the scheme have been made such as a less rigid layout and an attempt to improve the eastern boundary (which fronts onto the adjoining open space) – the latter is now a low fence with trellis.

However there remains some significant concerns:

1. **The Neighbourhood plan has not been considered systematically**, especially the design guidelines, and the key policy on Royston Road has been referred to only selectively.
2. **The responses that were made to the previous informal consultation by this Planning group have not been taken into consideration** and remain of concern:-

**Urban edge**

- a) In spite of the adjustments to the urban edge to the east of the plot, there is **no illustrative elevation in the application** to indicate how well the green edge will integrate effectively with the open space to the east
- b) The orientation of the dwellings **do not adhere to the design guidelines** in the neighbourhood plan, which states that rear gardens should not face onto the open land.

**Royston Road landscaping**

- c) It is unclear how the proposed landscaping and pedestrian/cycle access would relate to the wider treatment of Royston Road, especially once neighbouring sites are developed. **Policy E6 in the neighbourhood plan requires a landscaping strategy for Royston Rd before this or the other applications are approved. This has not been included in the application. The planning statement, accompanying the application, fails to mention that the neighbourhood plan has not been adhered to in this regard.**

**Access**

- d) Access via Aley Way and Constantine Place remains a big concern given their small size and residential character. Access via Royston Road would be better, possibly by adding a roundabout.

Information included in the application to justify the proposal is inadequate.

- It does **not correctly consider the volume of traffic** that would need to access the site, particularly during peak times. With 2 car parking spaces allocated to each of the 42 dwellings there could be an additional 80 cars morning and evening.
- **The width of the road is insufficient to enable refuse and emergency vehicles to pass through.** Residents have provided pictures of the roads where cars parked on the road prevent wider vehicles from passing through.
- **The safety of road junctions needs to be properly considered.** The junction from Yeomanry Drive into Aleyn Way is a sharp bend and is a concern due to the visibility of oncoming traffic being restricted from view when turning into Aleyn Way when heading from Tapps Garden centre direction. The impact of a potential 99 additional vehicles as mentioned within the planning application all accessing the new development via this route poses a risk of collision.

#### Building Design

- e) The design remains uninspiring. It still contains too many blank facades. **The neighbourhood plan requires a design review process before the site is approved;** This has not been included in the application.
3. **There are a number of issues that we have found that relate to drainage on the site.**

The application is not consistent in its assessment of

- a) the existence of watercourses in the area
- b) the flood risk of the area and the effect of the addition drainage needs

These will be outlined in our formal response.

We will also question the use of soakaways in chalk areas where they are within 20m of any building.

This information is also being displayed on our website [www.bbplan.co.uk](http://www.bbplan.co.uk).