

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

24 APRIL 2024

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AGENDA ITEM	ACTION	WARDS AFFECTED	PAGE NO
<u>UPDATE AGENDA</u>			
7.	CONSULTATION ON SPEEDING UP PLANNING DECISION MAKING	Decision	BOROUGHWIDE 5 - 14
9.	231190/FUL & 231191/LBC - 20-30 KINGS ROAD	Decision	ABBEY 15 - 16
11.	201766/FUL - 40 SILVER STREET	Decision	KATESGROVE 17 - 22

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Annex

UPDATE SHEET AND ORDER OF CONSIDERATION


Planning Applications Committee - 24 April 2024

Item 7 - Update Report on Consultation on Speeding up Planning Decision Making

Applications Without Public Speaking

Item No.	9 Page 47	Ward	Abbey
Application Number	23190/231191		
Application type	FUL/LBC		
Address	20-30 Kings Road, Reading		
Planning Officer presenting	Ethne Humphreys		*UPDATE*
Item No.	10 Page 61	Ward	Abbey
Application Number	240073		
Application type	REG3		
Address	George Street, Reading		
Planning Officer presenting	Marcie Rejwerska		
Item No.	11 Page 71	Ward	Katesgrove
Application Number	201766		
Application type	FUL		
Address	40 Silver Street, Reading		
Planning Officer presenting	Alison Amoah		*UPDATE*

This page is intentionally left blank

<p>Planning Applications Committee</p> <p>24 April 2024</p>	<div style="text-align: right;">  <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> <p style="font-size: 24pt; margin: 0;">Reading</p> <p style="margin: 0;">Borough Council</p> <p style="font-size: 14pt; margin: 0;">Working better with you</p> </div> </div>
Title	ITEM 07: CONSULTATION ON SPEEDING UP PLANNING DECISION MAKING – UPDATE REPORT
Purpose of the report	To make a decision
Report status	Public report
Report author	Julie Williams, Development Manager (Planning & Building Control)/ Steve Vigar, Planning Applications Team Leader.
Lead councillor	Councillor Micky Leng, Lead Councillor for Planning and Assets
Corporate priority	Inclusive Economy
Recommendations	<p>The Committee is asked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To agree that officers should provide the responses to the consultation questions at Appendix I as set out below.

Paragraph 1.3 of the main report explained that officers were preparing responses to the list of questions set out in Appendix I of the main report and that these were to be provided in an Update Report. The suggested responses are set out in bold text beneath each question as set out below.

Question 1. Do you agree with the proposal for an Accelerated Planning Service?

No. The proposal as drafted is flawed and does not take into account the realities of dealing with a planning application, the complexities that are involved and the resources required. This is expanded upon below.

Question 2. Do you agree with the initial scope of applications proposed for the Accelerated Planning Service (Non-EIA major commercial development)?

No. The scope is too broad. Realistically there may be scope for a more streamlined approach to Householder planning applications. Applications involving multiple consultees, complex issues and S106 legal agreements benefit from the possibility of Extensions of Time. This is in the interests of the applicant

as well as the LPA. There is little benefit in refusing an application arbitrarily if good progress is being made towards an approval.

Question 3. Do you consider there is scope for EIA development to also benefit from an Accelerated Planning Service?

No. Given the comments above, it follows that EIA development would not benefit due to the even greater complexity.

Question 4. Do you agree with the proposed exclusions from the Accelerated Planning Service – applications subject to Habitat Regulations Assessment, within the curtilage or area of listed buildings and other designated heritage assets, Scheduled Monuments and World Heritage Sites, and applications for retrospective development or minerals and waste development?

Yes. But on the grounds that other exclusions are also required. The scope is too broad.

Question 5. Do you agree that the Accelerated Planning Service should:

a) have an accelerated 10-week statutory time limit for the determination of eligible applications

No. It is unclear why large commercial development has been selected for this approach. This is likely to be a drain on resource and distract attention from other priority applications – those applications which include much-needed housing for instance. The few applications of this type received means that any increase in fees will be sporadic and it would not be possible to recruit additional officers to deal with an application at the point in time at which it is received.

b) encourage pre-application engagement

Yes. Pre-app should always be encouraged as a means of speeding up the formal application stage.

c) encourage notification of statutory consultees before the application is made

No. Unless through a pre-application enquiry process managed by the LPA. Simply notifying consultees ad hoc would be confusing, divert resources from dealing with formal applications, and would lack the planning balance applied by professional planning officers at pre-app stage.

Question 6. Do you consider that the fee for Accelerated Planning Service applications should be a percentage uplift on the existing planning application fee?

Yes, but on the basis that this the APS is a good proposal, which it is not.

Question 7. Do you consider that the refund of the planning fee should be:

- a. the whole fee at 10 weeks if the 10-week timeline is not met
- b. the premium part of the fee at 10 weeks if the 10-week timeline is not met, and the remainder of the fee at 13 weeks
- c. 50% of the whole fee at 10 weeks if the 10-week timeline is not met, and the remainder of the fee at 13 weeks
- d. none of the above (please specify an alternative option)
- e. don't know

Please give your reasons

None of the Above. This is a crude measure which does not actually address the underlying lack of resources which is a root cause of the perceived slowness of decision making in the first place. It is unlikely to encourage LPAs to divert resources to hit targets, or invest in additional staff, when the risk of financial penalty remains a possibility.

Question 8. Do you have views about how statutory consultees can best support the Accelerated Planning Service?

Please explain

Better staff resource for consultees and retention of experienced staff. We have witnessed a decline in capacity over recent years. This affects the existing Planning Service. Any "acceleration" will only serve to worsen this situation.

Question 9. Do you consider that the Accelerated Planning Service could be extended to:

- a. major infrastructure development

No. For the reasons given above, large complex proposals will not be capable of being dealt with in 10 weeks. This question suggests a fundamental misunderstanding of what is involved in effectively determining a planning application, even if staff resources were improved and obstacles to speedy determination (increased complexity, legal agreements etc) were removed. This also suggests a lack of regard for the democratic involvement of local residents and elected Councillors as 10 weeks gives little time for community engagement and the Committee approval process.

b. major residential development

No. For the reasons given above, large complex proposals are not capable of being dealt with in 10 weeks. This question suggests a fundamental misunderstanding of what is involved in determining a planning application, even if staff resource were improved and obstacles to speedy determination (increased complexity, legal agreements etc) were removed. This also suggests a lack of regard for the democratic involvement of local residents and elected Councillors as 10 weeks gives little time for community engagement and the Committee approval process.

c. any other development

No. This would divert resources and prevent a proper prioritisation of proposals. Chasing targets for targets' sake rather than based on sound professional Planning judgement.

If yes to any of the above, what do you consider would be an appropriate accelerated time limit?

N/A

Question 10. Do you prefer:

a. the discretionary option (which provides a choice for applicants between an Accelerated Planning Service or a standard planning application route)

b. the mandatory option (which provides a single Accelerated Planning Service for all applications within a given definition)

c. neither

d. don't know

Neither – see above

Question 11. In addition to a planning statement, is there any other additional statutory information you think should be provided by an applicant in order to opt-in to a discretionary Accelerated Planning Service?

The same detail as would be required with a “normal” application of the same type, plus evidence of pre-application engagement resulting in agreement over the proposals as well as the level and type of information required to be submitted at application stage.

Question 12. Do you agree with the introduction of a new performance measure for speed of decision-making for major and non-major applications based on the proportion of decisions made within the statutory time limit only?

No. The time taken and the use of Extensions of Time is often in order to resolve unacceptable aspects of a submitted scheme, improve the quality of the final proposal and ultimately avoid a larger number of refusals. The proposals would simply shift the delay from the LPA onto the Planning Inspectorate, who may also be under-resourced to deal with the increased workload. There seems to be an assumption that LPAs are simply “sitting” on applications whereas the reality is that a large amount of time is spent working to get them to an approvable state. There seems to be a tension here between the acceleration proposals on the one hand and the greater emphasis in the NPPF on design quality and beauty.

Question 13. Do you agree with the proposed performance thresholds for assessing the proportion of decisions made within the statutory time limit (50% or more for major applications and 60% or more for non-major applications)?

No. The current approach, with the possibility of Extensions of Time is a pragmatic one which balances speed with quality of decision making and avoids “planning by appeal”.

Question 14. Do you consider that the designation decisions in relation to performance for speed of decision-making should be made based on:

a) the new criteria only – i.e. the proportion of decisions made within the statutory time limit; or

b) both the current criteria (proportion of applications determined within the statutory time limit or an agreed extended time period) and the new criteria (proportion of decisions made within the statutory time limit) with a local planning authority at risk of designation if they do not meet the threshold for either or both criteria

c) neither of the above

d) don't know

Please give your reasons

Neither of the above. Both a and b appear to set the same target in practice. Regardless, the new criteria are likely to result in more refusals, Planning by appeal and greater frustration for applicants. It simply shifts the perceived “delay” from the LPA to the Planning Inspectorate. The current approach is pragmatic and a suitable balance. Any delays which do exist within the current approach are more likely due to under-resourcing of Planning departments. A ‘stick’ approach in these circumstances will not improve the quality or speed of decision making, it will only result in a target-driven, arbitrary approach with the associated undesirable, unintended, outcomes which typically accompany this type of management.

Question 16. Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements for the new measure for assessing speed of decision-making performance?

No. On the basis that the underlying proposals are also flawed.

Question 17. Do you agree that the measure and thresholds for assessing quality of decision-making performance should stay the same?

Yes. Although a more qualitative approach to assessing quality is preferable. Statistics on their own are unlikely to be a useful indicator of quality.

Question 18. Do you agree with the proposal to remove the ability to use extension of time agreements for householder applications?

No. Although this might be the only application type where the impact of this new approach might be manageable. However, it will inevitably result in a more frustrating process for individual homeowners with a greater number of refused or withdrawn applications and a perception of greater “red tape” and unnecessary bureaucracy. Extensions of time currently allow for issues to be resolved under a single application, managed by professional officers who work closely with members of the public to resolve matters of concern. A rushed application, a lack of opportunity to resolve problems and an arbitrary cut-off may achieve a good set of statistics, but is likely to leave a good deal of upset in its wake.

Question 19. What is your view on the use of repeat extension of time agreements for the same application? Is this something that should be prohibited?

No. Again this is a crude measure which does not actually address the underlying problems of under-resourcing and increased complexity.

Question 20. Do you agree with the proposals for the simplified written representation appeal route?

No. This would slow the process at earlier stages. Committee reports for when officers are recommending refusal would need to be approached with the sort of detail normally reserved for an appeal statement. This is in direct conflict with the desire to “accelerate” the process.

Question 21. Do you agree with the types of appeals that are proposed for inclusion through the simplified written representation appeal route? If not, which types of appeals should be excluded from the simplified written representation appeal route?

No. Exclude all those suggested, except those relating to approval of details reserved by condition.

Question 22. Are there any other types of appeals which should be included in a simplified written representation appeal route?

No. Maintaining flexibility for the LPA/Appellant to submit appropriate, proportional, amounts of information and additional reasoning would assist the Inspector in their decision.

Question 23. Would you raise any concern about removing the ability for additional representations, including those of third parties, to be made during the appeal stage on cases that would follow the simplified written representations procedure?

Yes. Concern would be that this is unnecessarily undemocratic and against the principles of public participation in Planning.

Question 24. Do you agree that there should be an option for written representation appeals to be determined under the current (non-simplified) process in cases where the Planning Inspectorate considers that the simplified process is not appropriate?

Yes. On the basis that the proposal for simplified appeals is flawed for the reasons set out above.

Question 25. Do you agree that the existing time limits for lodging appeals should remain as they currently are, should the proposed simplified procedure for determining written representation planning appeals be introduced?

Yes. But this is of limited relevance as the proposal is flawed for the reasons set out above.

Question 26. Do you agree that guidance should encourage clearer descriptors of development for planning permissions and section 73B to become the route to make general variations to planning permissions (rather than section 73)?

Simply relying on updated guidance might simply serve to confuse matters without corresponding legislative changes.

Question 27. Do you have any further comments on the scope of the guidance?

No. See above.

Question 28. Do you agree with the proposed approach for the procedural arrangements for a section 73B application?

The ability to vary an existing permission so that the scope of any change is clearly defined must be the key focus. The means by which this might be achieved is procedural and legislative. A clear, unambiguous procedure is needed. Incremental changes to guidance and existing legislation risks adding confusion and uncertainty.

Question 29. Do you agree that the application fee for a section 73B application should be the same as the fee for a section 73 application?

This is a matter of detail. The procedure isn't clear, so it is not possible to comment on the fee at this stage.

Question 30. Do you agree with the proposal for a 3 band application fee structure for section 73 and 73B applications?

See above.

Question 31. What should be the fee for section 73 and 73B applications for major development (providing evidence where possible)?

See above.

Question 32. Do you agree with this approach for section 73B permissions in relation to Community Infrastructure Levy?

See above.

Question 33. Can you provide evidence about the use of the 'drop in' permissions and the extent the Hillside judgment has affected development?

Not without further research.

Question 34. To what extent could the use of section 73B provide an alternative to the use of drop in permissions?

As above. The matter is within the government's gift to legislate for. It is unlikely to be capable of being achieved simply via update guidance.

Question 35. If section 73B cannot address all circumstances, do you have views about the use of a general development order to deal with overlapping permissions related to large scale development granted through outline planning permission?

No. Although this does sound like a workaround solution which might have its own unintended consequences and risk further legal challenge.

This page is intentionally left blank

24 April 2024



Title	PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE REPORT
Ward	Abbey
Planning Application Reference:	231190/FUL and 231191/FUL
Site Address:	20-30 Kings Road, Reading
Proposed Development	<p>231190/FUL Change of use from E(g)(i) to F1(g) Law Courts for both The Carbon Building and Highbridge House. Fitout of the buildings for use as a Law Court, installation of a new internal lift and new plant to existing roof plant enclosure. New gate and external ramped entrance to the rear of The Carbon Building. Streetscape security features including bollards to footpaths and obscuring film to windows.</p> <p>231191/LBC Listed building Consent for alterations to Highbridge House, re-opening of opening in rear wall at ground floor and new opening at first floor level to form connections to The Carbon Building</p>
Applicant	Ministry of Justice
Report author	Ethne Humphreys
Recommendation	As per main report
Conditions	<p>As per main report, with the following conditions re-worded or omitted where stated:</p> <p><i>231190/FUL</i> Condition 3 – Brick storage and re-use: re-worded to be in accordance with details submitted. Condition 4 – Privacy films: re-worded to be in accordance with details submitted. Shall be reversible. Condition 5 - CMS: remains as currently worded (pre-commencement) Condition 9 – Bollards: to be re-worded such that it is in accordance with submitted details (to include s177 licence) Condition 12 – BREEAM (design stage): Omitted.</p> <p><i>231191/LBC</i> Condition 3 – Brick storage and reuse: re-worded to be in accordance with details submitted. Condition 4 – Privacy films: re-worded to be in accordance with details submitted. Shall be reversible.</p>

Informatives	As per main report
---------------------	--------------------

1.0 231190/FUL

Condition 5 – CMS

1.1 Since the publication of the main agenda report, the applicant has submitted a Construction Method Statement which has been reviewed by the Council’s Transport officer. In this instance, further detail is required before the document can be considered acceptable and as such the condition remains as currently worded, requiring further details to be submitted and approved.

Condition 9 - Bollards

1.2 Since the publication of the main agenda report, the applicant has submitted drawings showing the position of all bollards to be installed within the footway. The Council’s Transport officer has confirmed that these details are acceptable. As such, this condition will become a compliance (in accordance with) condition that will also state that the works will require a S177 licence.

Condition 12 – BREEAM (Design Stage)

1.3 Since the publication of the main agenda report, the applicant has submitted details confirming that the project is targeting a score of 67.31% and a ‘Very Good’ rating. This aligns with (and indeed is greater than) the minimum Standard of 50% ‘Very Good’ rating required which is acceptable. As such, this condition will be omitted; however, a condition requiring a Final BREEAM Certificate to be submitted prior to first occupied which will remain to ensure the standard has been met.

2.0 231190/FUL and 231191/LBC

Conditions 3 – Brick storage and re-use

2.1 Since the publication of the main agenda report, the applicant has submitted details of brick methodology and risk assessment. The Council’s Conservation officer has reviewed these details and confirmed that the method statement for the general cleaning, re-using and storage of bricks is acceptable. There is some limited graffiti on the external face of the building which is proposed to be cleaned using a DOFF cleaning system (system to gently but thoroughly remove staining and discolouration). The Council’s Conservation officer has confirmed this is acceptable. Furthermore, the removal of graffiti is welcomed. The conditions will be re-worded to this effect.

Conditions 4 – Privacy films

2.2 Since the publication of the main agenda report, the applicant has submitted details of the privacy films. Whilst relatively dark in appearance, this is considered acceptable given the nature of the use and security requirements and the Conservation officer has raised no objection. The films should be applied in accordance with the design of the window, and the original design of the sash windows – glazing bars and lights – should be legible when perceived from the street. The conditions will be re-worded to this effect. The applicant has confirmed that the application of privacy films will be reversible, which is considered to be an appropriate approach.

Case Officer: Ethne Humphreys

24 April 2024



Title	PLANNING APPLICATION UPDATE REPORT
Ward	Katesgrove
Planning Application Reference:	201766/FUL
Site Address:	40-68 Silver Street, Reading
Proposed Development	Erection of 4 storey building to provide 23 private rental homes with associated communal facilities, surface parking, access and landscaping works. (amended)
Applicant	Silver Street Developments Ltd
Report author	Alison Amoah - Principal Planning Officer
Deadline:	Original deadline 20 th March 2021, but an extension of time has been agreed with the applicant until 24 th May 2024
Recommendation	<p>As per main report with amendment as in italics and bold:</p> <p>Delegate to the Assistant Director for Planning, Transport and Public Protection Services (AD PTPPS) to (i) GRANT full planning permission subject to the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 legal agreement and delegate to AD PTPPS to make such minor changes to the conditions, Heads of Terms and details of the legal agreement as may be reasonably required to issue the permission or (ii) to REFUSE permission should the Section 106 legal agreement not be completed by the 24th May 2024 (unless officers on behalf of the AD PTPPS agree to a later date for completion of the legal agreement).</p>
S106 Terms	<p>As per main report with amendment as in italics and bold.</p> <p><u>Affordable Private Rent Units</u></p> <p>To secure affordable housing on site consisting of six units (26% provision) comprising 4no. 2-bedroom 3 person units and 2no.</p>

3-bedroom 4 person units at Affordable Private Rent. The rent shall be no more than 80% of market rent and capped at Local Housing Allowance inclusive of service charge, and the nominations to these units will be via a Nominations Agreement via Reading Borough Council's Housing Team.

Affordable Private Rent Housing must be provided in perpetuity.

Deferred Payment Mechanism for Affordable Private Rent Units

Deferred Affordable Housing Contribution to secure payment towards provision of affordable housing elsewhere in the Borough equivalent to remaining 4% should profitability of the scheme improve. Mechanism calculation: NOT to take place until 6 months following the first occupation of 75% of all units (equating to 6 months after first occupation of the 17th unit in this case), but before the date 12 months after first occupation of the 17th unit in this case) with the following inputs fixed:

- Gross Development Value (GDV) determined as part of the assessment of viability at the time of planning permission to be granted: £6,267,329
- Total Build Costs determined as part of the assessment of viability at the time of planning permission to be granted: £5,052,521
- Benchmark Land Value (BLV) determined as part of the assessment of viability at the time of planning permission to be granted: £433,200
- Developer profit as a % of GDV determined at the time of planning permission to be granted: 17.5%
- Deficit determined at the time of planning permission to be granted: No deficit

In accordance with the formula within Appendix 4 of the Affordable Housing SPD.

'Clawback' Mechanism for the Sale of Affordable Private Rented Units

Following the Build to Rent covenant period of 20 years or in the event that a covenant is ceased within the 20-year period, all affected units to become Social Rent or Affordable Rent tenure with rents set no higher than LHA (or last published LHA increased by Consumer Price Index where LHA no longer exists). The affected Affordable Housing units to be offered for

sale to a Registered (affordable housing) Provider. In the event that a Registered (affordable Housing) Provider is not secured for the provision of Affordable Housing on site, the units are to be offered to the Council to be provided by the Council as Affordable Housing. In the event that neither a Registered Provider nor the Council can come forward to provide Affordable Housing on-site, the developer to pay to the Council an equivalent financial contribution to be agreed by the Council and not less than 50% of the Gross Development Value of the Affordable Housing unit/s for the provision of Affordable Housing elsewhere in the Borough. To be calculated (the mean average) from two independent RICS valuations to be submitted to and agreed by the Council prior to first occupation of any build to rent housing unit. In this event, the sum is to be paid prior to first occupation of any build to rent housing unit and index-linked from the date of valuation.

Subsequent Extension/Alterations to Create Further Units

Should the application site subsequently be extended/ altered to create further residential units then a contribution towards affordable housing would apply on a cumulative basis also taking into account this application.

'Clawback' Mechanism for the Sale of Market Rent Units

In the event that the owner of a build to rent development sells or otherwise transfers some or all of the units so that they no longer qualify as build to rent under some agreed variation to the terms of this agreement, the developer shall provide a valuation of the Build to Rent accommodation immediately prior to the sale/transfer and a valuation of the value following the change to non-Build to Rent. A financial contribution equal to 15% of the uplift in GDV shall be paid to the Council within 3 months of sale/transfer.

General Build-to-Rent Provisions

To meet the requirements as set out in Policy H4 of the Reading Borough Local Plan:

- *“Secured in single ownership providing solely for the rental market for a minimum 20-year term [from occupation] with provision for clawback of affordable housing contributions should the covenant not be met;*

- *Provide tenancies for private renters for a minimum of three years with a six-month break clause in the tenant's favour and structured and limited in-tenancy rent increases agreed in advance;*
- *Provide a high standard of professional on-site management and control of the accommodation;*
- *Provide a commitment to high-quality rental arrangements, through meeting Reading Borough Council's voluntary Rent with Confidence Standards or equivalent measures.*

Further detailed as follows:

- Single management company. Council to be notified of details.
- To provide and maintain the Communal Facilities as identified on the plan to be annexed to the S106 legal agreement. Rights of access to Communal Facilities, including charges and terms of use, to be the same for all residents regardless of tenure.
- Service charges – All rents to be inclusive of service charge but exclusive of utility bills and council tax. Service charges to be set as such a level as to cover the costs of services to which the charge relates and no more.
- At the end of the Build to Rent Covenant Period the Communal Facilities to continue to be provided and managed.

Employment, Skills and Training

Secure a construction phase Employment Skills and Training Plan or equivalent financial contribution of £4,080 towards local skills and labour training as calculated in accordance with the Council's Employment, Skills and Training SPD (2013). Contribution to be paid prior to commencement of the development.

Zero Carbon Offset – All Dwellings

Zero Carbon Offset as per SPD 2019 to provide a minimum improvement for each individual dwelling in regulated emissions over the Target Emissions Rate (TER) in the 2013 Building Regulations, plus a S106 contribution of £1,800 per remaining

tonne towards carbon offsetting within the Borough (calculated as £60 per tonne over a 30 year period).

As-built SAP calculation for each individual dwelling to be submitted for approval within 6 months following practical completion.

Contribution based on SPD formula below towards carbon offsetting projects calculated for each individual dwelling based on approved SAP calculation to be paid to the Council prior to the occupation of the first dwelling:

TER CO₂ m²/yr less 35% Co₂ m²/yr = 65% of TER

65% of TER x total square metres= total excess CO₂ emissions annually x £1,800 = S106 contribution

Transport

Applicant to enter into a S278 agreement in relation to amendments to car parking bays and loading bay, and the provision of 3 no. trees to be located within the public highway as shown on approved Drawing no: PL_101 Rev P, dated 13/3/24 - Ground Floor Plan, received 14th March 2024, to be provided prior to occupation.

The developer to provide and fund the provision of a car club bay, to include the procurement of a car club vehicle, for the bay on Silver Street, for a duration of 5 years. To be provided prior to occupation.

Contribution of £7,500 towards Traffic Regulation Orders necessary to provide a car club bay and to alter the existing waiting restrictions. To be paid prior to occupation.

Trees

A contribution of £1614 for the maintenance of the 3 no. street trees for a period of 5 years.

General

Contribution towards monitoring costs plus a separate commitment to pay the Council's reasonable legal costs in connection with the proposed S106 Agreement will be payable whether or not the Agreement is completed.

	All financial contributions Index-Linked from the date of permission.
Conditions	As per main report.
Informatives	As per main report.

1. ADDITIONAL WORDING ADDED TO THE RECOMMENDATION AND S106 HEADS OF TERMS

- 1.1 The recommendation wording is changed to delegate making minor changes to the conditions, heads of terms and details of the legal agreement to the Assistant Director for Planning, Transport and Public Protection Services.
- 1.2 An additional header has been included within the S106 Heads of Terms regarding subsequent changes to create further units.
- 1.3 The proposal is recommended for approval subject to the Section 106 terms, conditions and informatives are as set out in the main report.

Case Officer: Alison Amoah