



Hertsmere
Borough Council

Civic Offices
Elstree Way, Borehamwood
Herts WD6 1WA
Tel: 020 8207 2277
www.hertsmere.gov.uk

Planning and Economic Development

██████████
Section 62A Applications Team
Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Ref: S62A/2026/0159
Contact: ██████████
Extension: ██████████
Email: ██████████
Date: 11 September 2026

Dear ██████████

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (Section 62A Applications)

Application Number: S62A/2026/0159

Location of Works: Maple House, Nos 8-16 (even) & 30-32 High Street and nos 1-7 Princes Parade, EN6 5BA

Description: Partial demolition of existing buildings (with retention of existing two-storey car park and substation) and redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed-use development comprising residential apartments (class C3) and flexible commercial floorspace (class E) across 4 blocks and associated internal roads, parking, drainage, landscaping, amenity space and associated works.

In respect of the above S62a application, this letter and its appendices comprise the response of Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) and any relevant non-statutory consultees who have provided to their comments to HBC by 11 September 2026.

Given the concerns raised by the Council in this letter, including potential reasons for refusal on design and townscape grounds, the Council would suggest that a hearing would be appropriate to allow for more detailed discussion of the issues. However, if the Inspector feels that written representations is a more appropriate method of determining the application, the Council is satisfied that this response together with its appendices covers its concerns in full.

The application was presented to the HBC Planning Committee on 3 September 2026 and Members voted unanimously to support the officers' recommendation as set out below:

That the Head of Planning, Economic Development and Climate Change be authorised to advise the Planning Inspectorate that Hertsmere Borough Council make the following observations on this application:

- a) No objection in principle to the grant of planning permission for the quantum of development proposed, however;*
- b) The proposed development is of insufficient design quality for its prominent location and importance to the wider regeneration of Potters Bar;*
- c) If the Inspector is minded to grant planning permission, affordable Housing should be sought unless the Inspector is satisfied that the scheme is genuinely unviable, and that no affordable housing on-site or payment in lieu can be secured;*
- d) Any other observations arising from consultee comments which have not been received by 3rd September 2026; and*
- e) If the Inspector is minded to grant planning permission, suggested conditions and Heads of Terms.*

The above position remains and supplementary detail is set out within this letter, which can be read in conjunction with the Committee Report (appendix A).

Principle of Development

The relevant test is that set out at NPPF policy S4; the site is located within a settlement and as such the development should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the Framework. The Council has explicitly supported the re-development of this site to a mixed-use residential-led scheme with Class E uses, through its draft allocation for these uses (site reference HPBA SA2) in the Regulation 18 Local Plan. However, as part of this allocation the site is expected to provide new and improved transport infrastructure including walking routes and cycle ways, as well as public realm and environmental enhancements, including new public open space and planting. There is an opportunity to secure high-quality townscape and built form that would ensure the area contributes positively to the Potters Bar town centre uses. The design-led approach and masterplanning process will require that future development integrates with the town centre's wider townscape.

Impact on Heritage Assets

As noted within the Committee report, the site is located within the setting of a number of Grade II listed buildings and locally listed (non-statutory) listed buildings. No conservation areas would be affected. Per NPPF policy HE4, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:

- a) Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; and*
- b) Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.*

Furthermore, any harm to, or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have clear and convincing justification. Substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (NPPF HE6).

The Council's Heritage Consultant has provided detailed comments and these are appended at Appendix B. In summary, harm has been identified to the settings of Grade II listed White Horse Public House and The Lion Public House. The level of harm identified to the White Horse Public House is 'low' and the level of harm to The Lion Public House has been identified as 'very low'. Per NPPF HE6 paragraph 4, the effect on the assets and their significance should be weighed against any public benefits arising from the proposal.

The provision of market housing where the Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply is acknowledged as a significant benefit. Though, officers consider that it is tempered by the lack of affordable housing and the poor design of the scheme. It is for the decision maker to determine the weight to afford the public benefits and the harms, though in this case the NPPF mandates that substantial weight be given to an asset's conservation. Given that the level of harm identified is low, or very low, it is unlikely to present a heritage reason for refusal. Nonetheless, the issues identified in the Heritage Officer's comments, including the prominence of the development in those views in which the heritage assets are appreciated, are relevant to considerations of the overall quality of the scheme.

Impacts on Character and Appearance

As set out, the relevant NPPF policy is DP3. Hertsmere's development plan policies CS22 of the Core Strategy and SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan are broadly in accordance with DP3.

Policy DP3 paragraph 3 states that development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of DP3 or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan.

The Council's view is that the design of the scheme is inadequate and does not respond to the pre-application comments made by the Principal Urban Designer nor the Design Review Panel feedback. Full comments from the Council's Urban

Designers are appended to this letter (Appendix C) and should be reviewed together with the Design Review Panel feedback dated 20 November 2025 (Appendix D).¹ Though the Design Review Panel feedback was based on the 2024 version of the NPPF, the principles of good design remain the same.

The comments of the Urban Designer are not reproduced here to prevent unnecessary repetition. However, in summary, HBC raise a number of concerns with the proposed site layout; the delineation of public versus private amenity space; wayfinding and circulation; insufficient support for active travel; the form and scale of the proposed buildings; appearance and materiality; internal amenity, privacy, and outlook; landscaping and external amenity; servicing; and external amenity.

Officers have raised concerns with the retention of the two storey car parking structure to the north-east of the site throughout the pre-application process and this concern remains. It is acknowledged that it reduces the requirement for surface-level car parking, although this was presented to officers as providing an opportunity for greater quantum of private amenity space and public open space, and soft landscaping. However, as currently shown, the public open space is very limited and landscaping is offered almost entirely for the exclusive use of future residents. The applicant has considered the north-south road as being within the public open space offer. It is unlikely that this would offer opportunities beyond vehicular movements and therefore it should not be included in the public open space calculations.

The carbon savings made through the retention of the two storey car park were also cited as a benefit by the applicant. On a related point, the Design Review Panel asked the applicant whether the existing buildings on site could be retained and repurposed to further carbon savings. At the time of pre-application this was not part of the proposals and reasons of poor building quality and viability were cited by the applicant for demolishing the existing buildings. Officers considered that demolition of the existing buildings would be preferable. Whilst Canada Life House does benefit from deemed consent and Full Planning Permission for conversion to residential use, it is considered by officers to present a constraint to the site-wide redevelopment. The fragmented approach arising from the retained car parking structure and Canada Life House prevents a successful and comprehensive redevelopment.

It is acknowledged that, per NPPF policy CC2 1.d. the retention and reuse of existing structures is encouraged as part of climate change mitigation and the transition to net zero. However, this should not be at the expense of good design. A balanced view is necessary.

¹ Per the confidentiality clause of the Design Review Panel report: *'Unless previously agreed, pre-application reports will be made publicly available if the scheme becomes the subject of a planning application or public inquiry.'* Given that this scheme has progressed to planning application stage, the report can be shared with the Inspector as a material consideration. This was confirmed with the authors of the report, Design South East.

Whilst the principle of taller buildings is accepted on this site, the design and massing of these buildings are critical to the success of the development. The development would be visible in a range of close and longer-range views as shown in the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment. Pre-application design feedback made clear the need for high quality expression and finishes, and well-articulated building crowns with particular regard to Block A. This block is currently proposed in a different brick colour to the rest of the development which risks it appearing as an unrelated standalone tower in all views. The applicant's position is that the crown of Block A has been improved in response to pre-application feedback. However, the design is still considered to be of insufficient quality for the detailed reasons set out in the Urban Designer's appended comments.

The Council's view is that the design fails to comply with NPPF policy DP3 by virtue of poorly integrating with and failing to enhance its surroundings. The scheme does not contribute to the creation of well-designed places, and fails to comply with DP3 paragraph 2. c – g. This is considered to contribute substantial harm to the planning balance.

Townscape Impacts

Comments have been received from the Council's Landscape and Townscape consultants at Place Services, attached at Appendix E. The townscape impacts of the development are related to the aims and objectives of NPPF policy DP3. Development Plan policy SADM11 states that development will be managed to help conserve, enhance and/or restore the character of the wider landscape across the borough.

The applicant's Townscape and Visual Impact Appraisal has been reviewed by the Council's consultant. In summary, they are unsupportive of the scheme on landscape grounds and key concerns include, but are not limited to:

- *New public open spaces appear constrained by the retained layout and service roads. Opportunities to open up to the high street and adjacent public areas have been missed.*
- *Accepted that views to the existing tall town centre buildings and mast are very prominent in the skyline from the surrounding landscape and Potters Bar fringe, the proposed redevelopment scheme features greater mass and height of built form within views. This would merit greater scrutiny in assessment than other less visually prominent developments in the local landscape. We are disappointed that views from the west of the A1(M) have not been considered.*
- *Of particular landscape concern is the level of landscape and visual effects of the proposed Potters Bar town centre redevelopment on the visual and*

landscape resource. The TVIA results give an overall minor visual effect on receptors using the rural landscape and open parkland. Given their medium to high sensitivity this seems underestimated. We would judge the magnitude of change in the view as higher than 'low'. The tall buildings in the centre of the town appear as a focal point, as the TVIA states, 'reinforcing wayfinding and the visual relationship between the town and its rural hinterland'. The increase in massing and scale with the additional height of Maple House and taller blocks next to it would give a greater magnitude of change with more visual prominence.

- The proposed redevelopment scheme at the town centre site is evidently impactful on the Potters Bar townscape due to the increase in height of the replacement Maple House and taller blocks around it. This is compounded by the loss of site trees and reduced visual amenity in the streetscene. Street trees have not been incorporated into the scheme that would have greatly improved the design. The application presents a comprehensive landscape design package which is commendable, but the landscaped spaces lack cohesion and connectivity with limited visual amenity benefits from outside the side. Opportunities to bring meaningful landscape and trees into the street scene in this central Potters Bar location have been missed.*
- With the level of visual effects on distant views in the surrounding rural landscape, as demonstrated in the TVIA VP 10 and 12 to the south, and VP 11 to the north and with views evident from PRowS to the west within LCA24: Catherine Bourne Valley, we cannot support the scheme in its current form from a landscape perspective.*

A photograph was provided by the Council's consultant, taken from PRow 023 South Mimms from elevated land on opposite side of the Catherine Bourne Valley (west of A1(M) looking east toward Potters Bar. It was noted that this view is more distant than the study area assessed within the applicant's TVIA, but it was considered that the buildings and mast are prominent features on the skyline and changes to this outline with new buildings will increase the level of effect on views from this area. It was provided to illustrate the comments made in respect of views from LCA24: Catherine Bourne Valley. The photograph has been provided at Appendix F.

Officers consider the above concerns to relate closely to the urban design concerns set out, and that this contributes further harm to the planning balance with respect to the development's visual impact on its setting.

Affordable Housing

Per NPPF policy HO7, substantial weight should be given to the benefit of providing homes which will contribute towards meeting the evidenced accommodation needs of the community. Hertsmere Core Strategy policy CS4 sets out the requirement for affordable housing in the borough and the proposed development is liable to provide 35% affordable housing.

The applicant has provided a Financial Viability Assessment setting out that the development cannot viably support any affordable housing contribution. There is a pressing need for affordable housing in the borough and the Council would only accept a nil contribution where an independent review of the scheme's viability confirmed that a contribution would not be possible.

As notified to the Inspectorate, the Council reviewed the S62A guidance notes on the Government's website and were satisfied that the responsibility to independently review Financial Viability Assessments sat with the Inspectorate. However, the Council was requested to carry out this review as part of its response. As such, the Council has sought an extension of time to carry out the review and awaits confirmation before instructing its consultants.

A review mechanism to secure future financial contributions towards affordable housing if the scheme's viability improves, as set out in the draft Unilateral Undertaking is agreed by the Council in principle.

Parking

The council has received comments from its Parking Operations team and this is provided at Appendix G. These comments set out that occupiers of the development would not be eligible for resident or visitor parking permits per existing Council strategy.

As set out in the Committee report, officers are satisfied that a suitable quantum of car and cycle parking spaces are proposed, notwithstanding design concerns in relation to the retention of the existing car parking structure and the poor location of cycle storage for Block D.

Previous uncertainty around electric vehicle charging points has been clarified by the applicant and it is noted that all car parking spaces (with the exception of the car club space) will have access to an EV charging point which is welcomed.

Landscaping, Trees and Ecology

NPPF policies N2 and N3 are relevant. Furthermore, policy CS12 of the Core Strategy states that all development proposals must conserve and enhance the natural environment of the Borough. Policy SADM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan states that Planning permission will be refused for development which would result in the loss, or likely loss, of healthy, high

quality trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order; or any healthy, high quality trees and/or hedgerows that make a valuable contribution to the amenity or environment of the area in which they are located. If development is approved which would result in the removal of trees and/or hedgerows, equivalent and appropriate replacement planting will be required.

Since the Committee meeting of 3 September 2026, the Council has received comments from Place Services Arboriculture and HCC Ecology.

In terms of arboricultural impacts, officers welcome the retention of protected trees and other mature trees and hedgerow around the site boundary. Proposed landscaping is welcomed. At pre-application stage the loss of the mature trees located to the south-eastern corner of the site near the junction of Mutton Lane and High Street was discussed. It was agreed that a balance was required between the need for tree retention and the appropriate location of built form and open space. It was agreed that this corner of the site was not an appropriate location for public open space given its noisy environment, and therefore built form was proposed to front this location.

The comments from the Council's arboricultural consultant are attached at Appendix H. Concerns have been raised that the extent of tree losses is not supported and that the site layout should be re-considered to achieve maximum retention of the existing tree stock. Insufficient arboricultural justification has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed tree losses are unavoidable, specifically with regard to trees T15 -26. Furthermore, it is noted that only part of the tree root radar investigations have been provided with respect to T90 and T91 and it is suggested that the full survey be provided to make a fully informed assessment of the potential impact on these trees. The Inspector may wish to request this.

The Council's consultant concludes that a holding objection is issued pending the submission of the full tree root radar investigation report and a further assessment exploring opportunities for the retention of additional existing trees as part of the proposed development. Officers would encourage the Inspector to fully scrutinise the site layout decisions and whether amendments could secure further tree retentions, noting the ecological and amenity contributions that existing mature trees make in this location where soft landscaping is already limited.

Comments from HCC Ecology (Appendix I) confirm that the application can be determined with conditions and informatives as suggested by them. No further surveys are required with regards to protected species, and there is sufficient BNG information for determination. The proposed BNG enhancements are significant and a LEMP is advised, together with a mitigation and enhancement compliance condition. Suggested conditions are included within the Council's list at the end of this letter.

Waste Storage Provision

As set out in the Committee report, the relevant policies are SADM19 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan as well as the Council's Waste Storage Provision Requirements for New Residential Development guidance document.

Since the meeting, comments have been received from the Council's waste management team as follows (Appendix J):

Street Scene Services requires further information relating to the split of refuse and recycling bins in each proposed storage area as well as, the vehicle stop point and walking distance to each storage area, this information is not clearly defined within the waste management plan.

The waste management plan also references paper collections which does not align to current information with the Street Scene Services planning guidance.

The Inspector may wish to request clarification as above.

Environmental Considerations (Noise, pollution and contamination)

Comments have been received from the Council's Environmental Health team with regards to the above (Appendix K).

With regards to noise, this is assessed in terms of noise from traffic and existing commercial premises on future occupiers of the development, as well as noise from the proposed commercial premises. Conditions are required in relation to sound insulation and ventilation noting the high existing noise levels and impacts on certain facades.

No concerns are raised with regards to air quality. It is also noted that the Phase 1 contamination report provided recommends that a ground investigation should take place and therefore the recommended conditions have been included as set out.

Community Infrastructure Levy and Planning Obligations

The Council has provided comments and suggested amendments to the applicant's Unilateral Undertaking. It should be noted that other consultees, including those at Herefordshire County Council, may suggest required obligations.

The Council has had sight of a response from HCC Growth and Infrastructure, which has also been sent directly to the Inspectorate together with 18 appendices. Their response (without appendices) is included in this response pack (Appendix L). It is noted that they have requested financial contributions towards education (secondary and SEND) and waste infrastructure, together with their monitoring fee.

Other comments

For completeness, comments received to the Council from Cadent Gas (Appendix M), Herts Fire and Rescue (Appendix N), and Active Travel England (Appendix O) are also provided with this letter.

Conclusion

It is not possible for the Council to carry out a planning balance exercise in the absence of all the key issues, including any that may be raised by statutory consultees. However, a number of issues have identified in this report which are considered to contribute potentially substantial harm to the planning balance. These are the poor design of the scheme and its associated harm to townscape character; heritage harms (which may or may not be outweighed by public benefits); and the loss of mature trees which could be prevented in the course of design amendments.

The Council also raises concerns with the lack of affordable housing, noting the borough's substantial need for it and the site's sustainable location which presents a good opportunity for a range of tenures. This harm remains to be fully assessed pending the outcome of an independent review of the applicant's Financial Viability Assessment.

The Council respectfully invites the Inspector to consider the above comments in their assessment. Should the Inspector be minded to grant planning permission, a list of suggested conditions is set out below. These conditions relate only to matters within the Council's remit; additional conditions may be required if requested by statutory consultees.

Suggested Conditions

1	The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision. Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2	The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents. Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3	No development shall take place until samples of external materials have been provided to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Reason: In order to secure the satisfactory development of the site and in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policies SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and Policy CS22 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy 2013.
4	No fences, walls, or other means of enclosure (including any permanent security enclosures) shall be erected without their details first being submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Reason: In order to secure the satisfactory development of the site and in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policies SADM11 and SADM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and Policy CS22 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy 2013.
5	Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted, a Landscape Management Plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules and periods for all soft landscape areas together with a timetable for the implementation of the landscape management plan, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable. Reason: To ensure the long-term viability of approved planting in the interests of the visual amenities of the area. To comply with Policy SADM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and Policy SP1 and CS12 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy 2013.

6	No development shall take place until a detailed scheme of hard and soft landscaping for the site is submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme which shall include any proposed changes in ground levels and also accurately identify spread, girth and species of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and indicate any to be retained, together with measures for their protection which shall comply with the recommendations set out in the British Standards Institute publication BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction. The soft landscaping plan should include plant species, number, density, location and sizes of the proposed planting. The planting specification should provide details of tree planting pits, green roofs, planting preparation and establishment operations. We would recommend an alternative to plastic guards, such as the use of perimeter protective fencing where appropriate, or guards manufactured from 100% biodegradable materials. The hard landscaping plan should include details of specific materials, colours and finishes of paved or otherwise hard surfaces, built features and street furniture. The plans should clearly show the position of any new fencing and hard surfaces in relation to existing and proposed planting. The approved scheme of soft landscaping works shall be implemented not later than the first planting season following commencement of the development (or within such extended period as may first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority). Any planting removed, dying or becoming seriously damaged or diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the first available planting season thereafter with planting of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for any variation. Reason: To assimilate the development into its surroundings and protect the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policies SP1 and CS12 of the Hertsmere Local Plan.
7	Prior to first use or occupation of the development, the internal access roads and car parking areas shown on the approved plan(s) shall be completed and thereafter permanently retained for parking and manoeuvring purposes. Reason: To ensure that appropriate access and parking is provided to the new development. To comply with CS25 and SADM40.
8	Prior to any above ground development, the applicant shall submit to, for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority, details relating to a

	scheme to protect the proposed development from noise due to transport sources which shall be implemented before any part of the accommodation hereby approved is occupied, unless the Local Planning Authority otherwise agrees in writing. The scheme shall ensure that indoor ambient noise levels in living rooms and bedrooms meet the standards within BS 8233:2014. Internal LA_{max} levels should not exceed 45dB more than ten times a night in bedrooms. Good acoustic design should be implemented throughout the development to reduce façade noise levels as much as possible. Where opening windows raises the internal noise levels above those within BS8233, other methods of ventilation/attenuation will have to be implemented. To assess overheating with windows closed, a CIBSE TM59 (Fixed Temperature method -CIBSE Guide A (2015a)) overheating assessment must be undertaken and submitted for review and approval. If mechanical ventilation is going to be installed, details of the system being installed must be provided such as the ventilation rates that the system can deliver. Ventilation rates for the development must comply with the latest building regulation requirements. Reason: To protect the occupants of the new development from noise disturbance.
9	Prior to any above ground development the applicant shall submit to, for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority, details relating to a scheme to protect the proposed development from noise due to the commercial properties in the area which shall be implemented before any part of the accommodation hereby approved is occupied, unless the Local Planning Authority otherwise agrees in writing. The sound insulation scheme must be informed through the results of a BS4142 assessment (and internal noise measurements) along with the impact of discreet events during daytime hours in terms of LA_{max}. Where significant noise levels are found through the BS4142 assessment, and where opening windows raises the likelihood of complaints to be made, other methods of ventilation/attenuation will have to be implemented so that they can be kept closed. To assess overheating with windows closed, a CIBSE TM59 (Fixed Temperature method -CIBSE Guide A (2015a)) overheating assessment must be undertaken and submitted for review and approval. If mechanical ventilation is going to be installed, details of the system being

	installed must be provided such as the ventilation rates that the system can deliver. Ventilation rates for the development must at least comply with the latest building regulation requirements. Reason: To protect the occupants of the new development from noise disturbance.
10	Noise from plant and equipment associated with the development shall be 10dB (LAeq) below the background noise level (LA90) at the nearest residential properties (5dB below the background noise level if evidence is provided which shows that no tonality or other character is present). Reason: To protect the amenity of residents in the locality.
11	NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE BEFORE an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, is completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include: i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination; ii) an assessment of the potential risks to: human health, property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes, adjoining land, groundwaters and surface waters, ecological systems, archaeological sites and ancient monuments; iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposals of the preferred option(s). This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and Environment Agency's 'Land Condition and Risk Management (LCRM). Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
12	NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE BEFORE a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended

	use by removing any unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historic environment identified in the investigation and risk assessment, submitted in accordance with Condition 11, has been submitted to and approved in writing of the Local Planning Authority, if required. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation. Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
13	NO DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE BEFORE the remediation scheme approved under condition 12, if required, is carried out in accordance with its terms, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (referred to in PPS23 as a validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be submitted PRIOR TO FIRST OCCUPATION and is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
14	In the event contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, which was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

	Authority. Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
15	In the event soil is imported from an outside site, a scheme shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, verifying that any imported topsoil, is certified as suitable for use, prior to the first site usage. Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
16	Where polyethylene, ductile iron, steel or copper pipes are to be laid on land potentially affected by contamination (whether or not it has been remediated) and where the concentrations exceed the generic guideline values set out in Table 3.1 within the UKWIR Guidance for the selection of water supply pipes to be used in brownfield sites, Report Ref: 10/WM/03/21 (1) the developer shall provide either: a) a robust risk assessment to show how any contaminants will not significantly impact on proposed water supplies or buried assets over the lifetime of the assets; or b) more suitable pipe materials, for example Barrier Pipe; or c) an engineering solution to protect the pipe work backed up by an adequate assessment of the risk. When designing pipe routes on land potentially affected by contamination, new preferential contamination pathways along the route of new water pipes shall not be created. Particular measures may be required to prevent the possible migration of contamination through pipe bedding and into controlled waters. Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to

	workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.
17	The developer shall provide and install fire hydrants at no cost to the County Council or the Fire and Rescue Service. Reason: To ensure there are adequate water supplies available for use in an emergency at all times.
18	No development shall take place until a full Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. All approved tree protection measures must be installed on site prior to the commencement of development and retained until the construction of the development has completed. Reason: To ensure adequate protection of retained trees in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and SAMD12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.
19	The proposed public open space as shown on the approved plans must be completed and provided for public use prior to first occupation of the development, or another appropriate trigger as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Reason: To ensure that public open space is provided at the earliest opportunity for the benefit of local residents, including active travel routes.
20	No occupation of any relevant block shall take place until the cycle and refuse stores for that block have been constructed and/or installed and are fully operational. Reason: To ensure that future occupiers have access to cycle parking in accordance with policy SADM30 and to appropriate refuse storage in accordance with policy SADM19 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.
21	Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, a car parking management scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall detail how the car parking spaces will be allocated to residential units and how the car club space will be managed. Reason: To comply with policy CS25 of the Core Strategy and SADM40 of

	the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan.
22	The development shall be completed in strict accordance with the mitigation and enhancements measures within the ecological reports as submitted with the planning application. All the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures shall be implemented in full according to the specified timescales, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, and all mitigation features shall thereafter be permanently retained for the stated purposes of biodiversity conservation. Reason: To comply with the Environment Act 2021.
23	“No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The LEMP should include the following: a. A description and evaluation of the features to be managed b. Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management. c. Aims and objectives of management. d. Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives. e. Prescriptions for management options. f. Preparation of a works schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five year period). g. Details of the body or organisation responsible for the implementation of the plan. h. Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures. The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme. The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details. Reason: To ensure that the ecological impacts of the habitats and species present are properly addressed on this site.

Schedule of Appendices

Appendix A	HBC Committee report
Appendix B	Place Services Heritage comments
Appendix C	HBC Principal Urban Designer comments
Appendix D	Design South East – Design Review Panel report (November 2025)
Appendix E	Place Services Landscape comments
Appendix F	Viewpoint photograph provided by Place Services Landscape (for illustrative purposes only)
Appendix G	HBC Parking comments
Appendix H	Place Services Arboriculture comments
Appendix I	HCC Ecology comments
Appendix J	HBC Waste Management Service comments
Appendix K	HBC Environmental Health comments
Appendix L	HCC Growth and Infrastructure comments
Appendix M	Cadent Gas comments (maps provided in a second file)
Appendix N	HCC Fire and Rescue comments
Appendix O	Active Travel England comments