
From: Ben Glover

Sent: 27 May 2025 16:28

To: Simmonds, Louise

Cc: Kirkham, Alice; [Sam Dicocco](#); [Sohanna Srinivasan](#); [Glass, Michael](#)

Subject: *EXTERNAL:DK3 - Masterplan Compliance Update

=====
THIS EMAIL ORIGINATED FROM AN EXTERNAL SOURCE.
CHECK THE EMAIL ADDRESS, AS IT MAY BE SPAM!
=====

Hi Louise,

Hope you are well.

I have today held a meeting with Sam and Shaun (the DM manager) to discuss how the site could progress with associated requirements to amend the parent permission. We are eager to progress this allocated site as quickly as possible. Below is our suggested approach and how we recommend we proceed.

Our recommendation is to add a new condition to the outline permission using the current S73 application. This new condition would require the submission of a Masterplan Compliance Statement that would be submitted and approved in writing prior to or concurrently with an application for reserved matters. The compliance statement would set out where the proposed scheme does and does not accord with the masterplan. Where the proposal does not accord with the masterplan, robust justification for the departure should be provided. This new condition will list masterplan documents appropriate for back-referencing in the submission of the compliance statement (to be discussed).

As part of the S73 application, we would also vary the wording of Condition 3 to reduce the documents to those which are required to be secured wholly in accordance with. The condition would remain "wholly in accordance with" but would reference those plans and documents that do need to be wholly complied with, such as the location plan and technical access drawings.

We feel that the above is the most efficient way forward towards getting a future RM application determined and the site moving.

The current RM application should be withdrawn with a new submission following the determination of the S73 application. There are questions legally as to whether the current RM application can be determined. We do not support the approach of amending the RM, submitted prior to the S73, to refer to the S73 permission as this would, in our opinion, create a legal inconsistency, which may be difficult to defend if challenged.

I can provide the wording of the newly proposed condition so that we can progress the S73 application.

Whether the RM application is withdrawn or not, we will need to discuss resourcing to continue to work with you towards agreeable amendments of the details reserved and other processes.

Kind regards,
Ben



Ben Glover
Senior Planning Officer
Major Projects

www.north-herts.gov.uk