

TECHNICAL NOTE				VELOCITY	
Client	Kitewood			Page No.	1 of 10
Project	Dacorum Local Plan & St Albans City and District Local Plan - Examination in Public			Project No.	24/293
Subject	Response to Inspectors Matters, Issues and Questions			Document No	TN01
Prepared By	MD	Checked and Authorised By	MK	Date	September 2025

DACORUM LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION:

STAGE 2 MATTER 4

ST ALBANS CITY AND DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION:

STAGE 2, MATTER 6 & MATTER 10

HEMEL GARDEN COMMUNITIES STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF KITEWOOD ESTATES LIMITED

VELOCITY

KITEWOOD



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	2 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

1.1 INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

- 1.1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Velocity on behalf of Kitewood Estates Limited ('Kitewood'), the owner and promoter of land at Holtsmere End Farm (HEFL), in response to Matter 4 of the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions dated 29 August 2025, concerning the Hemel Garden Communities ('HGC'), as part of the Examination into the Dacorum Borough Council ('DBC') Local Plan. As the HGC straddles both Dacorum and St Albans, this statement also relates to Matter 6 and Matter 10 of the St Albans City & District ('SADC') Local Plan Examination.
- 1.1.2 Kitewood is the owner and promoter of the land at Holtsmere End Farm which is part of the emerging DBC Local Plan allocation HM01, North Hemel Hempstead which is part of the wider Growth Area
- 1.1.3 The Growth Area to the north and east of Hemel Hempstead is part of the HGC programme area awarded Garden Town Status by the government in 2019 which lies between the SADC and DBC administrative areas. HGC is allocated within both draft Local Plans for each Council's administrative area.
- 1.1.4 Kitewood is engaging with the Stage 2 Examination in support of support of DBC's and SADC's commitment to the HGC proposed Growth Area, and in particular the emerging DBC Local Plan allocation HM01 in helping to meet the future residential needs within the plan period to 2041 and beyond. The allocation for HEFL represents a key residential development which aligns with the objectives of both the Local Plans and the Spatial Vision for HGC.
- 1.1.5 Velocity Hearing Statements provide clarification of our client's position to assist the Inspectors in consideration of their questions posed to the Council in the Matters, Issues and Questions for Stage 2.



TECHNICAL NOTE				VELOCITY			
Page No.	3 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

1.2 MATTER 4 (DBC) AND MATTER 6 (SADC) – HEMEL GARDEN COMMUNITIES ISSUE 3 – HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT

Q1. Is the strategic modelling an appropriate tool for assessing likely impacts of growth at HGC on the strategic road network, and, for determining necessary mitigation?

- 1.2.1 The Strategic model tested a range of scenarios to take account of options, and the COMET model was used, which is the default transport planning tool to inform current and future transport patterns and demand across Hertfordshire (Core Document TRA4.1). This comprises a highway assignment model, a public transport model, and a variable demand model. COMET provides a multi-purpose transport modelling tool to test a range of potential transport schemes and policies.
- 1.2.2 A base year review of the COMET model was undertaken for SADC and DBC to ensure it provided a robust basis for forecasting. The review concluded that the model's performance on the Strategic Road Network ('SRN') was adequate for assessing the Local Plans. Following the review, network and matrix improvements were made to enhance its performance. WSP, on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council ('HCC'), has also developed a more detailed local microsimulation model for Hemel Hempstead (the HHPM) using Paramics software, which complements the strategic analysis from COMET, particularly for detailed analysis of local junctions and corridors. This dual-model approach aligns with DfT's Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG).
- 1.2.3 The model allows for completed or committed developments and transport infrastructure across Hertfordshire over the period 2014-2041. However, the HGC Transport Vision & Strategy document (Core Document HGC 04.2) assumes a delivery up to 2050 future year where the Local Plan only considers up to 2041, it is not clear to us how this discrepancy will be addressed.
- Q2. What are the implications of the growth proposed at HGC on the strategic road network, having particular regard to Junction 8 of the M1?***
- 1.2.4 A review of the 'St Albans Local Plan Traffic Modelling Report (dated May 2025)' (Core Document SADC/ED76C.vii) and the 'Dacorum Local Plan Traffic Modelling Report (dated November 2024)' (Core Document TRA 04.1) shows that the North Hemel development increases traffic flows on the nearby network particularly on the M1 Junction 8 for all scenarios.
- 1.2.5 M1 Junction 8 has been identified as a critical location requiring intervention and National Highways ('NH') have identified that development in the Local Plans areas will potentially impact M1 Junction 8, 9, and 10, as well as M25 Junction 20. The strategic modelling undertaken in collaboration with NH and HCC has been specifically designed to quantify these impacts and test mitigation options. Modelling shows that without mitigation, new developments are likely to increase delays at M1 Junction 8, particularly in the PM Peak.
- 1.2.6 The proposed mitigation package, which includes a major reconfiguration of the M1 Junction 8 to provide direct access into Maylands (as part of the Maylands Growth Corridor option), has been designed to accommodate the additional traffic whilst maintaining acceptable operational performance based on the current modelling assumptions.
- 1.2.7 A review of the 'St Albans and Dacorum Combined Local Plans to 2041 (dated May 2025)' modelling report (Core Document SADC/ED76A) indicates in the 'Option 4a' scenario (which includes Local Plan growth and mitigation but not the M1 Junction 8 upgrade) shows significant traffic flow increases on all slip roads at M1 Junction 8 compared to the 2041 baseline.



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	4 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

- 1.2.8 The 'Option 4b' scenario, which includes a proposed upgrade to the M1 Junction 8 (an overbridge providing a direct link into the East Hemel employment site), shows that this new layout relieves pressure on the A414/Green Lane junction. However, it also creates new delays on the circulatory links of the new M1 Junction 8 roundabout due to insufficient capacity at the southbound on-slip. A sensitivity test indicated that widening the circulatory to two lanes could relieve this delay. More detailed local modelling using the HHPM confirms that while the M1 Junction 8 improvement is not required within the plan period to 2041, it is likely to be necessary beyond 2041 with the full build-out of HGC to protect the operation of the SRN.

Q3. Can any significant highways impacts (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree, consistent with paragraph 114 of the Framework? How have the need for highways improvements been costed, and will the sites proposed for allocation at HGC remain viable?

- 1.2.9 At this stage it is not clear to us if it is possible to confirm if highways impacts/highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. This is partly due to the vast number of variables and uncertainty of what would be required to support the proposals which come forward by each allocation and by each developer. It is assumed as each plot is brought forward to planning, each developer would be required to provide sufficient mitigation for the impacts of each plot which would in part form a financial contribution to strategic highway improvements.

- 1.2.10 The strategic transport modelling confirms that a comprehensive package of multi-modal transport solutions is required which has been identified through a collaborative process involving NH, HCC, and local planning authorities within the respective IDPs (DBC Core Document IDV01.2 and SADC Core Document INF 01.01 and 01.02). This package includes targeted interventions, from strategic highway improvements such as major reconfiguration of the M1 Junction 8 and improvements to the A414 corridor, and new infrastructure like the Northern Sustainable Transport Corridor ('STC'), to significant investment in sustainable transport designed to achieve a meaningful modal shift.

- 1.2.11 It is not clear to us that the required mitigation can be fully funded through mechanisms such as Section 106 agreements, Section 278 agreements, and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), although we do appreciate that further evidence is emerging. Similarly, the timescales for the mitigation to come forward is not clear for the whole Growth Area.

- 1.2.12 The Council's Viability Assessment (DBC Core Document IDV03.4 and SADC Core Documents INF 10.01 to 10.13) indicates that the required infrastructure costs do not render the proposed allocations unviable. However, it is not clear to us how robust the costings are or that respective IDPs are consistent in relation to the HGC.

Q4. Where mitigation is required, is it sufficiently clear to users of the Plan what is required, and where and when it will be delivered as required by policy?

- 1.2.13 High level options have been suggested and the design and delivery of HGC Growth Areas within the HGC Programme Area are required to adhere to various measures. At this stage it is not clear to us that there is certainty as to what mitigation is required and when it will be delivered. This will be significantly impacted by the modelling assumptions made for car mode share which assumed 60% of all journeys starting, ending or within the HGC growth areas, and 40% of all journeys starting, ending or within the existing town of Hemel Hempstead, to be undertaken by active and sustainable modes by 2050 (non-car modes).



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	5 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

- 1.2.14 The east and north Hemel Hempstead Growth Area STC must be delivered in a coherent and integrated approach to facilitate the mode share targets and provide appropriate priority to active and sustainable modes over the private car and provide public transport links along its length (e.g. bus). Details are provided in Policy TC3, and it is noted that new developments will be required to contribute proportionately towards service improvements so that the frequency and availability to travel to key destinations is enhanced and made more attractive to users, subject to viability and the existing bus network in the vicinity of the site. However, more clarity is needed in relation to the STC which is integral to linking the proposed allocation to the east to the North Hemel allocation (HM01).
- 1.2.15 The IDPs (DBC Core Document IDV01.2 and SADC Core Document INF 01.01 and 01.02) set out the overall phasing and timing for all infrastructure items across the HGC programme and Section 106 agreements will provide the legal mechanism to link the delivery of specific works to defined development triggers to ensure mitigation is provided at the appropriate time. However, whilst we appreciate further detail is emerging, it is not yet clear to us exactly when and how these critical infrastructure items will be secured cross-boundary.
- Q5. What is the justification for the sensitivity testing which looks at a reduced number of jobs at East Hemel Hempstead (Central)? How does this correlate to the allocation in the St Albans Local Plan and the mix of uses proposed?***
- 1.2.16 It is not clear to us how this has been considered, and it is anticipated that this question will be addressed by the Planning Authority, as the detailed justification for the sensitivity tests is contained within their evidence base.
- Q6. What are the implications of the growth proposed at HGC on the local road network, having particular regard to the consequences of additional congestion and delays on the M1?***
- 1.2.17 The growth at HGC will increase traffic on the local road network, and congestion on the M1 can exacerbate this by causing traffic to divert onto local routes. Modelling (TRA4.1, SADC/ED76C.vii and SADC/ED76A). shows that without mitigation, HGC traffic leads to increased delays on key local corridors like the A4147, A5183, and B487.
- 1.2.18 If the car mode share assumed in the COMET model (40% of all trips from/to/within Hemel Hempstead and 60% of all trips from/to/within new HGC neighbourhoods to be undertaken by sustainable modes by 2050) is not realised, there is likely to be significant impacts on the M1 Junction 8. The reduced car mode share is assumed from day one assuming the STC is provided from day one, which is required to facilitate the mode share targets and provide appropriate priority to active and sustainable modes over the private car and provide public transport links along its length. However, it is not yet clear to us what the STC will comprise of, what the route is, and when it will come forward in full or in part to ensure all the developable parcels can be delivered without delay. It is also not clear to us if any sensitivity testing has been undertaken which allows for a higher car mode share.
- 1.2.19 For the east and north of the HGC Growth Area, the STC must be delivered in a coherent and integrated approach at an early stage to facilitate the mode share targets and provide appropriate priority to active and sustainable modes over the private car.
- Q7. In assessing the impacts of cumulative growth at HGC, how does the evidence take into account the likelihood of modal shift away from private car use? Has this been applied consistently and is it justified?***



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	6 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

- 1.2.20 The assessment of cumulative impacts is based on achieving a significant modal shift away from the private car, with a target of 40% of all trips from/to/within Hemel Hempstead and 60% of all trips from/to/within new HGC neighbourhoods to be undertaken by sustainable modes by 2050. This is a fundamental objective of the HGC strategy. Whilst various infrastructure improvements are proposed to assist in this mode share target, it is not clear to us how this can occur from day one when it will take some time for the reliance on private car to be reduced. The mode share relies primarily on the STC and it is not yet clear to us how and when the STC will be introduced, what this will look like i.e. will it be a bus route or guided bus way, will it facilitate delivery vehicles or cars to use it, how will it be funded, and at what point will the route be fixed to allow planning applications to come forward.

ISSUE 4 – INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION

St Albans Local Plan Policy LG2 states that all development in the HGC Programme Area must follow a planned and coordinated approach to growth and infrastructure and is expected to be in accordance with Infrastructure Delivery Plans ('IDPs'). A similar requirement is set out in Dacorum Local Plan Policy HGC1.

Q1. Is there sufficient certainty regarding the total quantum, timing and cost of infrastructure necessary to facilitate the HGC in line with the Councils' expectations?

- 1.2.21 This is covered in the CarneySweeney Statement.

Q2. Is there appropriate evidence as to how different forms of infrastructure (including schools and open space) have been apportioned to different HGC allocations?

- 1.2.22 This is covered in the CarneySweeney Statement.

Q3. What is the justification for requiring accordance with the IDP, which is a non-statutory document intended to be updated regularly by each Council?

- 1.2.23 This is covered in the CarneySweeney Statement.

Q4. What is the purpose, role and function of the Transformation Supplementary Planning Document ('SPD') and the HGC Framework Plan? How do they relate to policies within each Plan?

- 1.2.24 This is covered in the CarneySweeney Statement.

ISSUE 6 – VIABILITY AND DELIVERABILITY

Q4. How do the lead-in times and build-out rates take into account the need for necessary strategic infrastructure requirements, especially strategic highway improvements?

- 1.2.25 At this stage it is not clear to us how it is possible to provide reliable build out rates (or costs) which would require strategic highway and infrastructure improvements. This is due to the vast number of variables and uncertainty of what would be required to support the proposals which are due to come forward by various developers. It is assumed as each plot is brought forward to planning each developer would be required to provide sufficient mitigation for the impacts of each plot which would in part form a financial contribution to strategic highway improvements.

- 1.2.26 Within the Local Plans it states that developers and promoters in the HGC Growth Areas must work together and closely with the Councils to ensure an integrated and seamless approach across site boundaries. Critical infrastructure necessary to support development must be delivered ahead of occupation. Proposals must not prejudice or impede the provision of wider infrastructure required within the HGC Programme Area.



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	7 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

1.3 MATTER 10 (SADC) – TRANSPORT

ISSUE 1 – TRANSPORT STRATEGY - POLICIES SP8 AND TRA1

Q1. Is it sufficiently clear when proposals will be required to submit Travel Plans, assess air quality impacts and provide mobility hubs under Policy SP8? Is it effective?

1.3.1 Strategic Policy SP8 within the SADC Local Plan 2041 requires all high trip generating uses generating trips in excess of the thresholds set in Hertfordshire County Council’s Travel Plan Guidance, to prepare, submit and implement Travel Plans to embed sustainable and active travel at an early stage. Draft Travel Plans are one of the main transport related documents prepared to support planning applications to assist in mitigating transport impacts. It is not clear to us what is classified as a high trip generating use and the policy should make it clearer what the thresholds are to ensure Travel Plans are submitted and ensure they are implemented.

1.3.2 Strategic Policy SP8 requires new development to assess future air quality impacts from transport, where necessary, including funding contributions to wider schemes that will mitigate the impact of the scheme being proposed where appropriate. The policy should make it clearer what the thresholds are to ensure air quality impacts are assessed to ensure impacts are sufficiently mitigated.

1.3.3 Regarding Mobility Hubs, Strategic Policy SP8 states a network of mobility hubs at suitable locations such as railway stations and co-located in city, town and district centres where appropriate will be supported. Mobility Hubs should support sustainable travel and can include: a local bus service, car club facilities, bike repair service, e-bike charging, bike share facilities, ride hailing & ride sharing stop, real time and digital travel information, Wi-Fi and phone charging, parcel delivery storage lockers and public realm improvements. Mobility hubs should be supported by online presence and digital functionality. The policy should make it clearer what the thresholds are to provide a Mobility Hub thereby ensuring they are brought forward appropriately as the policy intends.

Q2. What is the justification for the separate requirements under Policy TRA1 based on size?

1.3.4 Policy TRA1 sets out the transport considerations for new developments and sets out additional requirements for major developments. Many of the requirements for major proposals are also appropriate for developments of all scales and therefore this policy should be re-worded to make it clear the principles of Policy TRA1 apply to all scales of development where appropriate.

1.3.5 Policy TRA1(a) sets out foundational requirements for all proposals, and Policy TRA1(b) introduces more comprehensive and detailed requirements for major proposals defined in the Local Plan as 100+ homes or 1,000+ sqm floorspace. Larger developments have a greater cumulative impact on the transport network and present more significant opportunities to deliver sustainable transport infrastructure. Therefore, it is justified to require them to demonstrate how they will reduce car dependency, provide early delivery of active travel connections, integrate with public transport, and provide for electric vehicle charging and travel plans. However, introducing a threshold at 100 plus homes for large developments could incentivise smaller developments to be delivered under this threshold to avoid the extra requirements.

Q3. Are the requirements under Policy TRA1 consistent with the Framework, which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe?



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	8 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

1.3.6 The principle of Paragraph 111 of the NPPF is to ensure that development is only refused when absolutely necessary once all mitigation has been considered. This does not contradict the requirements of Policy TRA1 which is deemed to align well with the principles of the NPPF. The policy framework, including the key test of 'severe' impact from the NPPF, is central to the entire transport evidence base for the Local Plan.

1.3.7 Therefore, Policy TRA1 does not set a higher bar for refusal than the NPPF. Instead, it establishes a positive framework for ensuring that development mitigates its impacts to an acceptable degree, so that the 'severe' threshold is not reached. The policy's requirements for sustainable transport measures, travel plans, and contributions to infrastructure are all mechanisms to ensure that impacts are cost-effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree, consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF.

ISSUE 2 – MAJOR TRANSPORT SCHEMES - POLICIES TRA2 AND TRA3

Q1. Is it sufficiently clear what the 'package of measures' are for the M1 Junction 8 improvements and how they will be delivered under Policy TRA2? Is the policy effective?

1.3.8 Policy TRA2 does not provide any details regarding the 'package of measures' for the M1 Junction 8 improvements and how they will be delivered, but the list of measures is set out within the IDP and accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. However, it is considered that it is not possible to confirm with any certainty what these are at this stage as the measures/improvements would be dependent on what development impacts require mitigating, which will not be known until planning applications are submitted/developments come forward and impacts are known.

1.3.9 Delivery is clarified within the IDP which sets out the timescales, with Phases 1 and 2 deliverable within the Local Plan period and funded through developer contributions. Phase 3 is identified as a post-2041 requirement, subject to a 'monitor and manage' approach, with funding likely to come from a mix of developer contributions and potential government sources.

Q2. What are the transport schemes 'identified in the IDP' for the purposes of Policy TRA2? If a major transport scheme is necessary to support the growth proposed in the Plan, should it be listed in the policy?

1.3.10 Section 7 to Section 9 of the IDP (SADC Core Document INF 01.01 and 01.02) provides a summary of the transport infrastructure, physical infrastructure and the HGC Infrastructure Assessment required across SADC. Information on the highway infrastructure schemes required to support the preferred growth strategy for SADC is provided in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. These range in scale and complexity and include the M1 Junction 8 enhancements across 3 phases, A414 Park Street roundabout improvements, London Colney High Street 20mph speed limit, train/station improvements to Harpenden and St Albans Stations with various active travel interventions.

1.3.11 It is appropriate for the policy to refer to the IDP rather than listing every scheme. The IDP is a "living document" designed to be updated regularly as schemes evolve, costs are refined, and funding is secured. By referencing the IDP, Policy TRA2 ensures that development is supported by a comprehensive and up-to-date infrastructure programme without making the policy overly prescriptive. The most significant strategic schemes, like the M1 Junction 8 package, are explicitly listed in Policy TRA2, which is a reasonable approach for schemes critical to the Plan's overall strategy.

1.3.12 Given there are numerous transport schemes, and they are still at the early stages of development it is not deemed appropriate to list them all given not all may come forward within the lifetime of the Local Plan.

Q3. What is the justification for Policy TRA2(d)? What does it require from development proposals?



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	9 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

- 1.3.13 Policy TRA2(d) states that “as the options for the transport schemes progress, the impact of the delivery of the major transport schemes will be subject to assessment in accordance with policies in the Plan such as archaeological assessment, environment assessment and flood risk.” It is not clear to us what the justification is or what is required from development proposals.

ISSUE 3 – PARKING STANDARDS - POLICY TRA4 AND APPENDIX 1

Q1. How has the Council considered accessibility, the type, mix and use of development, the availability and opportunities for public transport, local car ownership levels and the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles when determining the car parking standards in Policy TRA4 and Appendix 1.

- 1.3.14 The HCC Local Transport Plan 2018-2031 (LTP4) (SADC Core Document INF 14.01) seeks to achieve a modal shift away from car use to more sustainable modes such as passenger transport, walking and cycling. For significant new developments, including those on sites allocated under Policy LG1 (Broad Locations), there is scope to prioritise sustainable modes of transport in line with the aims of national policy and LTP4.
- 1.3.15 The standards in Appendix 1 of the SADC Local Plan are broken down by land use (e.g., residential, office, retail), providing specific requirements for each. For residential development, standards vary by the number of bedrooms, reflecting different household sizes and needs.
- 1.3.16 Building Regulations (Approved Document Part S) include various requirements for provision of charge points and cable routes for new homes and new non-residential buildings, and there is also HCC policy and guidance in this regard (Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy). For planning purposes, the operation of the car parking standards is based on a zonal approach, with a degree of parking restraint imposed in locations that are most accessible to services, community facilities and public transport.
- 1.3.17 Policy TRA4 also references the need for car clubs, bike and e-bike share schemes and electric vehicle parking.
- 1.3.18 It is not clear to us how the car parking standards will align with the car mode share assumed in the COMET model (40% of all trips from/to/within Hemel Hempstead and 60% of all trips from/to/within new HGC neighbourhoods to be undertaken by sustainable modes by 2050). Although it is noted that Appendix 1 of the SADC Local Plan advises that a bespoke parking strategy with lower than standard parking requirements should be developed, in accordance with Policy TRA4(e).

Q2. What is the justification for taking a different approach with the ‘broad locations’ under Policy TRA4? Are the policy requirements justified and effective?

- 1.3.19 ‘Broad Locations’ are identified as large urban extensions of 250 or more homes or strategic scale employment. The most significant ‘Broad Locations’ are the four comprising HGC which is planned to the east and north of Hemel Hempstead on Green Belt land and will provide a large contribution to meeting growth requirements.
- 1.3.20 The ‘Broad Locations’ are areas of significant urban extension, and 12 ‘Broad Locations’ are identified, and these are slower to assemble and build out than smaller scale developments and therefore require a different approach.



TECHNICAL NOTE					VELOCITY		
Page No.	10 of 10	Project No.	24/293	Document No.	TN01	Date	September 2025

- 1.3.21 Masterplans at 'Broad Locations' are to include implementation of sustainable travel infrastructure, including for bus services, at the earliest reasonable opportunity in order that sustainable travel patterns become embedded at an early stage.
- 1.3.22 The effectiveness of these policy requirements remains to be seen and will only be realised as and when developments come forward which are required to adhere to this policy.
- Q3. What is the justification for referring to Hertfordshire County Council guidance in Policy TRA4(h) and (i)? To be effective, should any requirements be contained in the Plan?***
- 1.3.23 The justification for referring to HCC guidance for electric vehicle charging (TRA4(h)) and parking layout (TRA4(i)) is that HCC is the Local Highway Authority and holds the technical expertise in these matters.
- 1.3.24 Technical standards and best practice in these areas evolve rapidly, particularly concerning electric vehicle technology and highway design safety standards. Referencing external guidance, such as HCC's 'Roads in Hertfordshire' design guide or their developer contributions guide, allows the Local Plan to remain up to date without needing a formal review every time technical standards change. This is a deemed to be an acceptable approach.
- 1.3.25 The core principles are established within the Local Plan itself, for instance, the requirement to provide EV charging and ensure safe layouts. The detailed technical specifications are appropriately signposted to the authority's most current guidance, and this ensures both strategic direction and technical robustness.

