

Public Document Pack



Chairman and Members of the
Development Management
Committee

Your contact: Peter Mannings
Tel: 01279 502174
Date: 13th August 2025

cc. All other recipients of the
Development Management
Committee agenda

Dear Councillor,

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 13 AUGUST 2025

Please find attached the Additional Representations Summary and
Updates in respect of the following application:

3/24/2147/VAR – Land at Marshgate Drive (HERT2), Hertford, SG13 7AQ
(Pages 2 – 7).

Please review these documents prior to and during the meeting this
evening.

Yours faithfully,

Peter Mannings
Committee Support Officer
East Herts Council
peter.mannings@eastherts.gov.uk

MEETING	:	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
VENUE	:	COUNCIL CHAMBER, WALLFIELDS, HERTFORD
DATE	:	WEDNESDAY 13 AUGUST 2025
TIME	:	7.00 PM

East Herts Council: Development Management Committee

Date: 13th August 2025

Summary of additional representations received after completion of reports submitted to the committee, but received by 5pm on the date of the meeting.

Agenda No	Summary of representations	Officer comments
5a	<p>A joint statement has been received from Hertford Civic Society and Kingsmead Residents Association raising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposal would more than double the site allocation figure.• Regard should be had to the timber yard potentially coming forward for development in the future.	<p>The principle of development, including consideration of the proposed uplift in dwellings, has been addressed in paragraphs 9.15 – 9.20 of the committee report. The housing allocation figure from the District Plan is out of date, in light of the 2020 appeal decision.</p> <p>There is no current application or proposal for redevelopment of the timber yard site. This current application can only be assessed on its own merits.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal should not have been brought forward as a Section 73 application. • Regard should be had to the Design Officer comments. • Increased traffic generation would result in a severe impact on the local highway network. • There would be an impact on local services and infrastructure. 	<p>The justification for the application coming forward as a Section 73 application is set out at paragraphs 9.4 - 9.14 of the committee report.</p> <p>The comments from the Design Officer are considered in paragraphs 9.50 – 9.84 of the committee report. The amendments to the consented scheme would not detract from the quality of the overall development and would provide a good quality of accommodation for the future residents.</p> <p>Traffic generation is addressed in paragraphs 9.107 – 9.117 of the committee report. The uplift in vehicular trips resulting from the increase in dwellings on the site would be limited, when compared with consented scheme. Therefore, a severe impact on the local highway network would not occur. The Highway Authority have not objected to the proposal.</p> <p>The scheme would make significant financial contributions to mitigate the impact on local infrastructure and services. None of the statutory bodies responsible for services and infrastructure have objected to the proposals.</p>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse impacts on adjacent businesses have been ignored. • There is insufficient parking, which would result in new residents parking on local roads. • The type of housing proposed does not meet identified needs. 	<p>The impact on adjacent businesses has been fully considered in the committee report at paragraphs 9.100, 9.101, 9.117, 9.125 and 9.173 – 9.176. It is not considered that the proposal would adversely impact the operations of adjacent businesses.</p> <p>The proposed parking provision has been considered at paragraphs 9.120 – 9.126 of the committee report. It is considered that the development has struck an appropriate balance between meeting the parking demand arising from the development and limiting parking, in the interests of discouraging car usage.</p> <p>The suitability of the proposed housing mix has been considered at paragraphs 9.25 – 9.28 of the committee report. A development delivering a high proportion of flats was accepted by the Inspector at the appeal. This scheme only proposes amendments to the consented</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposals do not provide adequate affordable housing.• The units would provide poor quality living accommodation.	<p>apartment blocks, therefore it is only possible to secure additional flats.</p> <p>The affordable housing provision is considered at paragraphs 9.31 – 9.45 of the committee report. The constrained viability position of the scheme means that the potential to deliver affordable housing is limited. Nonetheless, the proposals still aims to deliver 56 affordable units.</p> <p>The quality of the accommodation is considered at paragraphs 9.78 – 9.84 of the committee report. The development would deliver a good quality of accommodation. All of the units would comfortably exceed the nationally described space standards, while the flats would all pass the daylight and sunlight tests. In addition, the majority of the units would be provided with inset terraces. Those minimal number of units that do not have an inset terrace would be served by juliet balconies.</p>
--	--	--

Table of errata and updates to reports submitted to Committee.

Agenda No	Paragraph No	Updates
5a	1.8	It is not proposed to deliver an uplift in affordable housing on the site, due to viability constraints, as discussed later in this report. Therefore, the applicant intends that in total the development would continue to provide 56 affordable dwellings. This equates to <u>approximately</u> 13% affordable housing.
5a	9.36	Securing these 56 affordable units, as part of this revised proposal, means that affordable housing provision across the development would total <u>approximately</u> 13%.
5a	10.5	In addition to the above, this amended proposal aims to deliver 56 affordable units on the site, which equates to <u>approximately</u> 13% affordable housing.
5a	Heads of Terms to be secured in Section 106 Legal Agreement	Sustainable, Accessible and Active Travel Contribution – £650,826 index linked by SPONS from March 2024. To go towards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) improvement works to Mead Lane level crossing; b) public realm improvements on Mill Road and Railway Street across the frontage of Hertford East Station, including an improved pedestrian

		<p>crossing environment and works at the Mill Road and Railway Street junction, including the provision of tactile paving;</p> <p>c) improvement works to the Hertford to Ware canal towpath to enhance access between the development, Hartham Common, Hertford Town Centre and Ware; and</p> <p>d) extending and re-routing existing bus services, <u>and/or the provision of new bus services</u>, to serve the development and connect it to other key locations <u>in Hertford</u>.</p>
--	--	--