

From: [James Chettleburgh](#)
To: colincampbell@hill.co.uk
Cc: [Zayd Al-Jawad](#); [Ailsa Davis](#)
Subject: FW: RE:- CIL Statement - Land West of Lytton Way, Stevenage
Date: 19 May 2022 09:13:49
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Colin,

Please see confirmation from HCC Highways with respect to the Highways obligations. These will no longer be sought other than what is set out in the SoCG. As such, officers will incorporate this response into the CIL & S.106 Statement.

Kind regards,

James

James Chettleburgh | Development Manager | Development Management | Planning and Regulation | Stevenage Borough Council | Daneshill House | Danestrete | Stevenage | SG1 1HN

Tel: 01438 242266 | Mob: 07593 528253 | Email:

james.chettleburgh@stevenage.gov.uk

cid:image003.png@01CFAA4B.45F580A0



Our Privacy Policy has been updated to reflect changes to data protection legislation and can be viewed at the following link <http://www.stevenage.gov.uk/privacy-policy>

From: James Dale [mailto:James.Dale@hertfordshire.gov.uk]

Sent: 19 May 2022 05:41

To: James Chettleburgh

Subject: [External] RE: RE:- CIL Statement - Land West of Lytton Way, Stevenage

James,

In relation to the 'highways' matters...

1. We have provided instruction to delete the previous Sustainable Transport Contribution of £266,075 from the draft s106 agreement.

The previous Inspector's assessment of the planning application considered our request for a Sustainable Transport Contribution in detail. The Inspector summarised its removal with the following conclusion...

107. I conclude that the financial contributions sought in relation to the HCC's second strand of its approach to planning obligations would not be necessary to make the development acceptable, nor would it be related to the development either directly or reasonably in scale and kind. Although I take account of the planning obligation's provision in relation to travel plan monitoring and car club, I take no account of the sustainable transport contribution.

We do not believe the second Appeal process (as a result of SBC challenge on an unrelated matter) is an opportunity re-examine the previous judgement on this particular issue. The Inspector came to their judgement and we have no reason to believe a different Inspector's assessment will arrive at a different conclusion. Therefore, the removal of this contribution is in line with the Inspector's decision. It was on this basis we have no objection to removing it from the amended S106.

2. Highways Improvements – the following wording has been removed:

- (c) a new pedestrian and cycle connection to the subway to the north of the existing stairs
- (d) stairs improvements as agreed between the parties or determined pursuant to dispute resolution under clause 12; and
- (e) upgrading of the two nearest bus stops in Lytton Way (Real time information screens).

In relation to the first 2 points, I'm advised by the SBC removal of pedestrian/cycle connections listed in this clause is because it is impossible to achieve the link in question and an alternative provided elsewhere/nearby. In relation to the 3rd point, the Inspector notes that this item has already been implemented therefore no longer required.

In summary, the deletions listed in the revised S106 are in line with the previous Inspector's decision therefore I have no objection to the amendments.

I hope that clarifies HCC Highways matters in relation to the Appeal.

James



James Dale
Development Management
Whole Client Service, Environment & Infrastructure Department
Hertfordshire County Council

County Hall, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8DE, Postal Point:ch0242

T: 01992 556120

E: james.dale@hertfordshire.gov.uk



For service information relating to Coronavirus please visit

www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/covid19