

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL

\* Reporting to Cabinet

Minutes of a meeting of the WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL CABINET PLANNING AND PARKING PANEL held on Tuesday 18 February 2025 at 7.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, The Campus, Welwyn Garden City, Herts, AL8 6AE.

PRESENT: Councillors R.Platt (Chair)  
L.Gilbert (Vice-Chairman)  
  
K.Thorpe, S.Bonfante, T.Kingsbury, G.Michaelides,  
L.Musk, P.Shah, M.Hobbs, M.Short, J.Quinton and  
A.Nix

OFFICIALS G.Gnanamoorthy, Assistant Director (Planning)  
PRESENT: Planning  
G.Sampson, Assistant Director (Regeneration and Economic  
Development)  
E.Robova, Parking & Playground Services Manager  
M.Pyecroft, Principal Planner (Implementation)  
B.Compton, Democratic Services Officer

---

159. APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTIONS

Cllr Nix attended as a substitute.

160. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2025 were approved as a correct record.

161. NOTIFICATION OR URGENT BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER ITEM 11

No notifications for urgent business were received.

162. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY MEMBERS

Councillor Tony Kingsbury declared an interest as a County Councillor.

163. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND PETITIONS

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

The following question from a member of the public was asked of the Committee:

Bradshaws has parking issues, due to the fact that the majority of housing does not have a driveway. Therefore, parking permits are not a resolution to reduce the parking issue. Essentially taxing people for not having the privilege of a driveway. Can the council not suggest an alternative way to improve parking?

**Answer:** *During the initial survey, 11 respondents from Bradshaw highlighted non-resident parking, in particular commercial vehicle parking, being an issue in the area and this was also reported by ward councillors. Whilst permit parking cannot create extra parking capacity, it reduces non-resident parking and consequently frees up spaces for residents.*

*Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council do not own the carriageway, or highway verges in this road and as such are not able to consider expansion of the highway to increase parking capacity in Bradshaws. Such schemes fall under the remit of the highway authority, Hertfordshire County Council. Whilst the Borough Council do own three non-verge grassed areas in the road, these are not directly accessible from the public highway and/or contain mature trees which significantly contribute to both the visual amenity and biodiversity in the area. As such they are not suitable for conversion to parking.*

*There are 95 residential properties in Bradshaws and 10 objections were received to the scheme in Bradshaws. Permit area is being proposed to be introduced in 13 roads including Bradshaws and the scheme aims to improve parking availability for residents across these roads as it has been designed to eliminate non-residential parking. Were Bradshaws to be removed from the scheme there is a significant risk of displacement parking, which would further reduce the ability of residents to park near to their homes.*

164. NORTH WEST HATFIELD SPD ADOPTION

The Committee received a report from the Principal Planner on the North West Hatfield Masterplan SPD Adoption. Policy SP 22 of the Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan states that a masterplan for the site will form the basis of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and that any application for development should be preceded by and consistent with the masterplan.

1.2 A Development Framework SPD, containing a masterplan for North West Hatfield has been prepared by the landowner, in collaboration with officers from Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council and Hertfordshire County Council to ensure the site is planned comprehensively to create a new sustainable community. The document has been prepared in line with the Council's Approach to Master Planning Guidance note which was endorsed by the Council in March 2024.

The Draft SPD was consulted on for a period of six weeks between 08 November and 20 December 2024. Following consideration of the responses, some changes were made to the consultation draft.

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- A member asked regarding the mineral extraction and possible controversy particularly as some of it will be going on while houses are being built.
- The Principal Planner responded that the mineral application is a county matter which has been consented. There has perhaps been a lack of understanding from the community between the two separate issues. The Principal Planner confirmed that the minerals extraction will take place prior to development and the landowner has been asked to be clear on their website about this so that people can better understand the process. She went on to say there have been concerns about traffic congestion regarding both the minerals and construction and the landowner has confirmed that the bulk of the mineral will be taken away by a belt system rather than heavy vehicles.
- A member asked a question regarding the sound barrier and whether there is any clarity over whether the sound barrier is going to be constructed.
- The Principal Planner responded that there are set standards that will need to be met and there is obvious noise levels from the A1M. Dependent on when that phase of development comes forward, and that there will be employment on the most sensitive part of the site rather than residential development taking place because probably the noise levels there would unlikely be suitable for residential development. There will need to be more detailed design work undertaken as part of a detailed application and this will aid understanding of what the employment building will look like and the ability of this to act as a sound barrier. As part of the planning application process there will need to be further studies into sound levels.
- The member then asked for clarification that the employment buildings may provide some of that barrier to the motorway.
- The Principal Planner responded that they would expect some level of landscaping and trees where certain species do act as sound barriers better than others. The employment building itself would likely act as a sound barrier although the detailed design of the building would be determined at a later stage.
- A member asked if officers knew what renewable energy there would be.
- The Principal Planner responded that it is not known at this stage. A commitment to a sustainable development strategy is required within the SPD. It is something that could be looked at as part of a design code or as part of a full planning application. She added that by the time the latter stage of development comes forward there could be a revised local plan that could have different standards for future development than the current policy regime.
- A Member asked a question regarding the 25% affordable housing within the report and whether it could show how much should be social housing.
- The Principal Planner responded that it's a bit of a moving target. Studies are being commissioned at the moment for housing need within the borough and they would have to meet the target within a revised local plan.

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

- The Assistant Director for Planning added that in current local plan it is 25% of total housing that would need to be affordable, and of that quantum, just over half should be social rent so would normally expect 51% of thereabouts to be social rent and the remaining 49 to be made up of other affordable housing products. By the time this application comes, there could be a new local plan which could take a different stance depending on the identified need.
- A Member asked if the concerns that came back from residents regarding traffic congestion have been resolved.
- The Principal Planner responded that for a development of this size there is always going to be concerns around traffic congestion. Officers have been working closely with the County Council in terms of highways requirements and the Landowner has done further work with regards to traffic modelling. The details of that will be submitted as part of a detailed planning application.
- The Member added that it is an area that already suffers from congestion at peak times and if there is going to be another secondary school this will pull in traffic.
- The Principal Planner responded that the site proposes new bus routes through the site and additional active travel links through Stanborough and the south of the site to enable walking and cycling. At this stage of the process, it is not possible to give exact details regarding levels of traffic because this will be dependent upon the types of homes delivered on site. For example, a scheme for 1,750 one-bed flats would probably generate a very different amount of trips that a scheme for 1,750 five-bed homes.
- The Assistant Director for Planning added that the SPD is very high level and at this point is very much about principles. The principle of a development of up to 1,750 homes and school and all the other uses could be acceptable, although much of the detail won't be known until an actual planning application is received.
- A Member commented regarding affordable housing, there is a genuine fear and concern from residents that the 25% affordable homes are going to be one-bedroom flats and not family homes with gardens as is what is needed in the borough and wanted to put on record that they are quite concerned that that 25% needs to be across all types of homes and not just the lower end of what developers deem they can deliver.
- The Principal Officer responded that it was a very good point and will take it into consideration. A housing needs assessment is being commissioned at the moment and there will be some up-to-date information when the application comes forward.
- A Member commented that the connectivity with Hatfield and Welwyn Garden City is important and all forms of transport - walking, cycling and cars should fit in with the rest of the area.
- The Principal Planner responded that there had been discussions with landowner and the highways authority as part of the masterplanning process. The A1M was noted as a barrier so how can that be overcome and maintain existing rights of way, particularly the underpass at Stanborough whilst making it for user-friendly is an important consideration. Also, access from

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

the south of the site to Hatfield and particularly the train station was important.

**RESOLVED: Unanimous**

- a) That Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel (CPPP) recommend to Cabinet that the North West Hatfield Masterplan, as detailed in Appendix A, be adopted.
- b) Delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Planning), in consultation with Executive Member for planning, for any necessary further minor editorial changes to the SPD if necessary.

165. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) ADOPTION

Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced a report setting out the outcomes of the examination of the council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and seeking to formally approve and publish the Council's CIL Charging Schedule, in accordance with Regulation 25 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). The report advised that, subject to council adoption on 12 March 2025, the Welwyn Hatfield CIL Charging Schedule will take effect on the 01 October 2025. This date is informed by an ongoing programme of work to set up all necessary guidance, administrative and financial systems and processes for CIL implementation.

The report summarised the preparation process that was required to produce the CIL Charging Schedule and the stages of consultation and formal examination that were involved. It set out how formal adoption by the council is now required in order to commence and implement CIL.

The report provided Members with an update as to the consideration of governance arrangements and a commitment for this to be the subject of a future committee report within the next 12 months.

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- A Member asked a question regarding spending of the strategic pot of CIL and what the process was going to be and if it would be coming back to this committee.
- Principal Planning Policy Officer responded it would come to this committee in the first instance. It is about governance arrangements, about how money has been accrued and how decisions are made on how it might be spent.
- A Member asked if the minutia of detail will come to this committee or would it be driven by governance and officers.
- Principal Planning Policy Officer responded that what would be brought to this committee in the first instance is a process for deciding spend. For

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

example, bodies that wish to provide infrastructure would need to go through an application process and Members will see the principles of how that application process would work, how any such application is assessed and how a decision is taken.

- A Member commented that it is a welcome decision by the council to set the neighbourhood portion equally to Parish authorities regardless of whether they have a neighbourhood plan or not.
- A Member commented that it is nice to see this coming to fruition. It's been in various parts through this panel from the charging schedule to minor amendments to do with charities and the town centre.

**RESOLVED: Unanimous**

That Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel recommends to Cabinet and Council that:

- a) The Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (Appendix A) is adopted with a target implementation date of 01 October 2025.
- b) The Instalment Policy (Appendix B) is adopted with a target implementation date of 01 October 2025.
- c) Delegate authority to the Assistant Director (Planning), in consultation with Executive Member, for any necessary further minor editorial changes to the Charging Schedule or Instalment Policy and a change to the implementation date if necessary.
- d) Governance options and arrangements for the priorities and spending of 'Strategic CIL' receipts be brought to CPPP and Cabinet in the next 12 months.
- e) The 'Neighbourhood Proportion' of CIL be set at 25% (uncapped) for all Parish and Town Councils regardless of whether a Neighbourhood Plan is in place.

166. SUSTAINABILITY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) - ADOPTION

Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced the report presenting the Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Panel's consideration following public consultation at the end of 2024.

**RESOLVED: Unanimous**

That the Panel recommends to Cabinet that:

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

- a) The Sustainability SPD (Appendix A) be adopted.
- b) That providing a completed checklist be encouraged for major applications and that the information required should form part of any pre-application discussions.
- c) That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director (Planning) in association with the Executive Member for Planning to make any minor modifications in the future to reflect changes to legislation, best practice or technological developments, provided that the changes do not materially affect the approach or requirements of the SPD.

167. INTRODUCTION OF RESIDENT PERMIT PARKING SCHEMES, AND OTHER WAITING RESTRICTIONS, IN VARIOUS ROADS, HATFIELD SOUTH AND EAST

The Parking & Playground Services Manager introduced a report setting out the results of the consultation survey, and feedback received pertaining to Hatfield South and East that commenced in June 2023, the statutory consultation including objections.

The report also set out the results of the review period, and feedback received pertaining to High Dells and Hilltop parking restrictions, the statutory consultation including objections and the recommended course of action.

A total of fifty-one objections were received relating to the proposed orders. These objections include forty-four from the Hatfield South and East consultation area (total of 1,882 properties) and four from the High Dells and Hilltop parking restrictions review. Three objections were from the same households and one objection came from outside of the consultation area.

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- A Member asked for confirmation of the numbers of objections to properties.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager responded there were 51 objections in total. 44 in relation to Hatfield and Southeast consultation area and 4 from Hilltop and High Dells parking restrictions. Section 7 shows the objection points where objections made on the same grounds were consolidated in one objection point.
- The Member then asked how many properties.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager answered 1,882 properties.
- The Member commented this is testament of how needed this has been and it's been a difficult journey with parking in this part of Hatfield. Travellers Lane is heavily damaged and in need of care and this is the first step in order to repair this and make South Hatfield feel the love that other places in our borough has felt for decades. The member went on to thank the councillors of all three wards for their contribution.

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

- A Member asked a question regarding stopping commercial vehicles parking and whether this related to resident's commercial vehicles.
- The Assistant Director (Regeneration & Economic Development) responded that there would be some commercial vehicles that don't qualify for a resident permit depending on size, for example a HGV would not qualify for a resident permit.
- A Member wanted to thank the officers for including all ward councillors in these negotiations. Not everyone will respond to surveys but will talk to councillors on the doorstep to help make more informed decisions.
- A Member commented that a number of residents in Roe Green had said that parking had worsened in their road and asked if it could be included in the scheme.
- The Assistant Director (Regeneration & Economic Development) responded that it would not be able to be included in this scheme but there would be potential for CPPP the next time the parking works program is set to instruct to carry out a consultation there.
- A Member commented that a High Dells resident had complained of parking on High Dell's garage forecourt and a decision was made to restrict the parking there with double yellow lines, whereas a resident of Indells did the same thing and there wasn't a proposal to put double yellow lines and asked why there would be a difference.
- The Assistant Director (Regeneration & Economic Development) responded that the garage forecourts are not part of the public highway but qualify as privately owned land albeit is owned by the council but as such parking services don't have the ability to implement double yellow lines without the permission of the landowner. In this instance the landowner would be the managing department at the council, and they would assess that based on commercial considerations and that would mainly be based on whether they feel that double yellow lines would aid in letting the garages or hinder in letting them.
- The Member then asked what a resident could do if someone parks in front of their garage.
- The Assistant Director (Regeneration & Economic Development) responded they can call police if they are being restricted from accessing private property however, police response will depend on resources and may not rank as high priority.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager added that if a vehicle is reported to the council they will try to establish if the vehicle is known as someone renting the garage but if it is an obstruction it is something the police have powers to deal with.
- A Member asked for clarification of figures within the report that suggested there had been 237 responses from 1 household, Page 327 – section 3.2.
- The Assistant Director (Regeneration & Economic Development) replied that this figure was from the same households as other registered comments so effectively duplicate comments. Only one is taken per household to avoid giving more weight but it could have been phrased better in the report.
- A Member spoke about the problems that are anticipated by residents in other parts of the borough with the imminent implantation of the general



Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

Footway Prohibition Orders, making it impossible for some of them to park and asked for reassurance that similar problems are not going to be caused by this scheme. There are going to be situations where this acts against the ability of people to park near their homes and the Member asked if that has been cleared in this case so that residents won't be asking where they are going to be able to park their car.

- The Assistant Director (Regeneration & Economic Development) responded saying the reduction in non-resident parking will increase the parking capacity for residents rather than decrease it. If there are issues there is a review period in which to look at minor amendments to the scheme to accommodate any unanticipated issues.

RESOLVED:

**The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Hatfield South and East, Hatfield) (Restriction of Waiting and Permit Parking Zones) Order 202X**

That the Panel considers the objections received in Section 7 in addition to the issues raised in Section 18 around equalities and diversity and recommends to Cabinet to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised; and to note the delegated powers conferred to Executive Member for Environment to sign an executive member decision to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised, subject to unanimous recommendation of the Panel. - **Unanimous**

**The Borough of Welwyn Hatfield (Various Roads, Hatfield South and East, Hatfield) (Prohibition of Stopping and Waiting on Verge or Footway) Order 202X**

That the Panel considers the objections received in Section 7 in addition to the issues raised in Section 18 around equalities and diversity and recommends to Cabinet to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised; and to note the delegated powers conferred to Executive Member for Environment to sign an executive member decision to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order as advertised, subject to unanimous recommendation of the Panel. - **Unanimous**

168. INTRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC CHARGING ONLY BAYS IN VARIOUS CAR PARKS, WELWYN GARDEN CITY AND HATFIELD

The Parking & Playground Services Manager introduced a report recommending the implementation of parking restrictions that would limit the maximum stay to 4 hours with no return within 4 hours between the hours of 8am and 6pm, Monday to Sunday and for the bays to be restricted to electric vehicles only. This was in relation to the following sites: Aldbury Grove, Birchwood Leisure Centre, King George V Playing Fields, Longmead, Moneyhole Car Park, Russett House and

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

Thundridge Close. It set out the statutory consultation and the recommended course of action.

Parking restrictions are being introduced only in two bays at each of these locations initially. Should they wish to increase this, officers will again consult with councillors.

During the discussion the following points were raised:

- A Member asked for clarification regarding the restricted hours between 8am – 6pm, would be four hours but then people can leave to charge for longer after 6pm and overnight.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager confirmed that was the case.
- A Member asked if there was a report of where the most popular charging spots are and the most used and how much EV chargers are used.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager responded that they have nothing to advise on at this time, but it was something they could look into.

#### **ACTION**

- A Member commented that the borough has been ahead in terms of EV charging for some years and asked for confirmation that these parking restrictions only affected the EV charging sites and not the other parking spaces in the area.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager confirmed that it did just relate to the EV charging spaces.
- A Member commented that there had been nothing in the report stating that this only related to two bays in each location and asked that it was noted in the minutes. She added that four of these locations are in Panshanger and it is unfortunate as a ward councillor for Panshanger that she hadn't been given the opportunity to engage with these installation plans at any point.
- A Member followed on the point about the specifics of two bays per parking area and asked if it is a TRO should it not have to show where the bays are on the documents because it doesn't at the moment.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager responded that the Traffic Regulation Order sets out that any bays within the area marked on the plan as an EV charging bay, once the bay is marked it is compliant with the TRO.
- The Member went on to ask in that scenario what is there to stop the council putting all EV charging bays in the whole of that area because the TRO would cover the whole of that area.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager confirmed they were only looking for two bays.
- The Chair asked that this be minuted as it appears too loose.
- A Member asked what sort of governance was in place regarding chargers that were not working, who can residents complain to and if there was a way that this could be monitored.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager responded that these chargers are not owned by the council and therefore any issues should be reported to the company. The chargers have QR codes as well as other contact information where issues can be reported.

Cabinet Planning and Parking Panel  
18 February 2025

- The Member went on to ask if the council has any data available that shows how many chargers have been reported not working.
- The Parking & Playground Services Manager offered to request this information and provide after the meeting

**ACTION**

RESOLVED **Unanimous**

**THE BOROUGH OF WELWYN HATFIELD (ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING)  
(OFFSTREET PARKING PLACES) ORDER 202X**

That the Panel considers the objections received in Section 5 in addition to the issues raised in Section 16 around equalities and diversity and recommends to Cabinet to proceed with creation of the advertised traffic regulation order as set in Sections 3 of this report; and to note the delegated powers conferred to Executive Member for Environment to sign an executive member decision to proceed with the creation of the traffic regulation order, subject to unanimous recommendation of the Panel.

Meeting ended at 8.35 pm