



Mark Youngman
Development Management Group Manager
Hertfordshire County Council
Postal Point CHN115
Farnham House
Six Hills Way
Stevenage
SG1 2ST

Response to Planning application from Hertfordshire County Council (T and CP GDP Order 2015)

Director of Planning

East Herts District Council
Wallfields
Pegs Lane
Hertford
Hertfordshire
SG13 8EQ

District ref: 3/24/1255/OUT
HCC ref: EH/21612/2024
HCC received: 12 March 2026
Area manager: Roger Flowerday
Case officer: Adrian McHale

Location

Land South Of A507, West Of A10 Buntingford

Application type

Outline

Proposal

AMENDED PROPOSAL

Outline planning application for development of employment land (flexible use B2, B8, E(c) and E(g)), informal open space, associated works and infrastructure including a new access from A507, with all matters reserved except for access

Recommendation

Notice is given under article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority recommends that permission be refused for the following reasons:

REASONS AND COMMENTS

Initially, LTN 1/20 considers that in the current environment an at grade crossing of the A10 is inappropriate. A high quality pedestrian/ cycle route to the proposal site is required however, to unlock the proposal site and overcome the A10 barrier.

Table 10-2: Crossing design suitability

Speed Limit	Total traffic flow to be crossed (pcu)	Maximum number of lanes to be crossed in one movement	Uncontrolled	Cycle Priority	Parallel	Signal	Grade separated
≥ 60mph	Any	Any					
40 mph and 30 mph	> 10000	Any					
	6000 to 10000	2 or more					
	0-6000	2					
	0-10000	1					
≤ 30mph	> 8000	> 2					
	> 8000	2					
	4000-8000	2					
	0-4000	2					
	0-4000	1					

	Provision suitable for most people
	Provision not suitable for all people and will exclude some potential users and/or have safety concerns
	Provision suitable for few people and will exclude most potential users and/or have safety concerns

Notes:

1. If the actual 85th percentile speed is more than 10% above the speed limit the next highest speed limit should be applied
2. The recommended provision assumes that the peak hour motor traffic flow is no more than 10% of the 24 hour flow

As per the previous response it is not considered either by HCC Highways that the junction of the key movement corridors of the A10 and A507 will present the correct environment for an at-grade crossing in the future either.

Toucan Crossing of the A10

As stated previously in the 27 February 2026 response by HCC Highways a signal controlled crossing positioned very close to the A10 roundabout entries and exits remains a fundamental safety concern. On the exit side in particular, a red phase would risk queues forming back onto the circulatory carriageway, with the associated blockage and collision risks. On the entry side, the proximity also interacts with the “constant green” behaviour that has been raised before. Drivers travelling eastbound on the A507 naturally are focused on vehicles to their right as they enter the roundabout and not a proposed crossing on their left.

As per the previous response, these points would need very careful consideration in the Road Safety Audit (RSA) and through supporting queue modelling. It is not considered the the current RSA correctly identifies problems nor does it propose solutions as per the standards and it is not addressed in the 11 March 2026 RIDGE response either which contains no supporting queue modelling.

The two examples quoted by RIDGE are also considered non representative of the current situation at the roundabout junction of the A507 and A10. Initially, the two examples are prior to the government adoption of LTN1/20 and do not represent good or safe practice in the current situation.

Furthermore, the A10 / A121 Winston Churchill Way / B198 Lieutenant Way roundabout is considerably larger and the crossing is circa 45m east of the roundabout exit within the 40mph and as a result drivers have at least 100m to see the crossing. Whereas, at the more compact A507/A10 roundabout the crossing is only 15m north of the roundabout and the visibility to it would only be 30-40m. Whilst proposals would see it also in a 40mph as per the previous response and reiterated below it is not considered that the road alignment proposed would naturally enforce the proposed speed limit.

Whilst the Cattlemarket roundabout at Newark on Trent has a crossing situated closer to the exit as proposed at Buntingford, in addition to the layout being pre LTN1/20 and in an entirely different part of the county; the major west to north flow on the A617 (Kelham Road) does not turn immediately left onto the A46 north (its two entries before the exit); drivers exiting Kelham Road have at least 50m to see the crossing there. Traffic congestion at this location means effective speeds are low. The Cattlemarket roundabout has partially signalisation which reduces vehicle speeds further. The crossing has substandard approaches also and appears to be lightly used. Whereas, only a standard approach to the proposal site would be acceptable. Furthermore, the Cattlemarket roundabout is a collision 'hot spot' and therefore not a good example at all.

Proposed extension of the 40mph limit

The proposal to move the 40mph limit roughly 1.1km north of Neale Drive, together with a crossing warning sign, also raises issues. There is currently and no proposed active frontage or meaningful change in roadside environment along this section of the A10, so it isn't clear how the reduced limit would be interpreted consistently by all road users or how it would remain logically justified.

We have seen on other routes that long, isolated 40mph sections in areas with limited frontage can lead to overtaking issues, greater speed variability, and in some cases a general disregard for subsequent speed limits further along a journey. When the environment does not reinforce the posted limit, predictable behaviour becomes harder to achieve, which has implications for every road user. This is presented in HCC Highways adopted Speed Management Strategy (Nov 2020).

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/media-library/documents/highways/transport-planning/local-transport-plan-live/speed-management-strategy.pdf>

The applicant quotes two developments along the east side of the corridor. These are 500m north of the roundabout and the more immediate approach to the roundabout will have an unchanged environment.



Furthermore, when examined the two future developments (3/25/1921/REM & 3/25/1494/CPO) do not have a substantial frontage onto the A10 that will substantially alter the environment of the A10. The latter development (3/25/1494/CPO) whilst non committed doesn't even have a vehicle access onto the A10. Additionally, there is no committed development on the western side of the A10 either which would substantially alter the environment of the road corridor.

Interaction between the two issues

To reiterate the previous response although these are distinct matters (the A10 crossing itself and the proposed extension of the 40mph limit), they do interact. The combination of a signal controlled crossing positioned close to a roundabout, alongside a long and isolated 40mph section without supporting frontage, introduces inconsistency in how the corridor will be interpreted. That inconsistency increases risk and needs to be understood and addressed through the RSA and any further design work.

Summary

Therefore, HCC Highways considers there is no new information that alters our original (27 February 2026) response and recommendation of refusal contained therein.

Signed
Adrian McHale

26 March 2026