

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 MARCH 2024 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.20 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: David Cornish (Chair), Andrew Mickleburgh (Vice-Chair), Alistair Neal, Wayne Smith, Michael Firmager, Stuart Munro, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Tony Skuse and Bill Soane

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Charles Margetts

Officers Present

Brian Conlon, Operational Lead - Development Management
Connor Corrigan, Head of Strategic Development
Rachel Lucas, Senior Lawyer
Liam Oliff, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Madeleine Shopland, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Alan Lewis, Highways Development Manager

Case Officers Present

Andrew Chugg
Emy Circuit
Connie Davis
Christopher Howard

70. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

71. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 February 2024 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

72. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Cornish declared a prejudicial interest as he had contributed to Finchampstead Parish Council Neighbourhood plan, which made reference to this location.

73. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

There were no items to be deferred or withdrawn.

**74. APPLICATION NO 232995 LAND SOUTH OF CUTBUSH LANE EAST,
SHINFIELD. RG2 9AA**

Proposal: Full planning permission for the construction of an extension to the Thames Valley Science Park spine road to provide access to a proposed new building for the Natural History Museum, landscaping, surface water attenuation and other associated works. Application is a potential departure from Local Plan.

Applicant: University of Reading

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 17 to 68.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Reasons for lack of Environmental Impact Assessment
- Added plans for condition 2.
- Change to condition 7.

Christopher Howard, case officer, explained that he would present item 74 and 75 together as the items were co-dependent.

All members of the committee had attended a site visit except Councillor Smith.

Dave Green, resident, spoke in objection to the application. He told the committee that this application was on a site that was designated as greenfield in the Local Plan and beyond the boundary of the Sustainable Development Location (SDL). He added that this was the third major extension to the science park. He argued that the proposed access was more extensive than needed to access the site and might be designed to provide access to possible development sites beyond. He explained that further sites were not featured in any Council documents. He told Members that he believed the Council were ignoring the Local Plan and the SDL.

Phil Brown, agent, spoke in support of the application. He told the committee that the University of Reading (UoR) and Natural History Museum (NHM) had worked in partnership on this application. He explained that the new access road would provide the infrastructure needed to provide the main NHM building and that this route had been chosen for minimal impact. He added that the access was essential for the economic, social, and environmental benefits of the building. The road had been designed to encourage walking and cycling and there were suitable bus routes. He mentioned that there would be a biodiversity net gain of 20% and that the road would be of high quality. He said that Cutbush Lane East would remain cut off to the site for vehicles. He also mentioned that the development would provide 35 construction jobs in addition to more local employment, as well as safeguarding highway corridor land. The Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) Highways team had deemed this an acceptable form of development.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey questioned the number of apprenticeships that would be provided from the scheme. The case officer confirmed that there would be 21 apprenticeships arising from the scheme.

Councillor Mickleburgh asked why this development was permitted when it was not featured in the Council's Local Plan. The case officer explained that the Local Plan was devised at a certain moment in time and could evolve. Councillor Mickleburgh sought clarity on a point raised by Dave Green regarding further applications in the future that could arise from the new access road. The case officer told Members that they should consider plans on their merits and planning policy.

Councillor Neal questioned officers on the connection from the cycle path from the motorway bridge and asked for assurance that the cycle route would not be blocked by barriers. Alan Lewis, Highways Development Manager, explained the current route had barriers to limit motor-vehicle access and assured Members that they would provide a continuous cycling route.

It was proposed by Councillor Skuse and seconded by Councillor Shepherd-Dubey that the application be approved.

RESOLVED: That application 232995 be approved subject to

- A) Completion of a S106 agreement and;
- B) Conditions as set out in the report and amended in the members update (if required);
- C) Should the S106 agreement not be signed by the applicant by six months of the committee resolution, delegate to the Assistant Director of Planning to refuse the application unless a longer timeframe is agreed with the Chair of Planning Committee in consultation with the Assistant Director of Planning.

75. APPLICATION NO 232833 LAND SOUTH OF CUTBUSH LANE EAST, SHINFIELD. RG2 9AA

Proposal: Full application for the proposed Construction of a Collections, Digitisation & Research Centre with associated infrastructure and external works including car parking, SUDS basin and landscaping. Application is a potential departure from the Local Plan.

Applicant: Natural History Museum

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 69 to 148.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Withdrawal of objection from Shinfield Parish Council
- Additional representation from Councillor Gary Cowan
- Changes to condition 7 regarding Public Art Community Engagement & Consultation
- Change to condition 26 regarding Community Engagement Strategy

All members of the committee attended a site visit except Councillor Smith.

Tim Littlewood, Director of Science, Natural History Museum, spoke in support of the application. He told the committee that this would bring the flagship research centre to the Borough and that the NHM had a statutory duty to make collections accessible to current and future generations. He added that a Community Engagement plan would be developed with the Parish Council. He also said that the application would provide 150 jobs at the site. The building would be zero carbon which exceeded local policy requirements under Core Strategy Policy CP1, with carbon savings of 21%, as well as reducing energy and water use. Solar Panels on the roof would produce 22% of energy demand for the building which exceeded the 10% policy requirement. He explained that despite the development not complying with the Local Plan's countryside policies in terms of planning balance, any adverse impacts on the countryside were outweighed by the economic, social, and sustainable benefits of the facility.

Councillor Mickleburgh thanked officers for addressing the issues from Shinfield Parish Council, which had led to the Parish Council withdrawing their objection.

Councillor Mickleburgh questioned the change in condition 26 on page 110, that was referenced in the supplementary agenda, specifically querying the Community Engagement Strategy and who would be responsible for updating the strategy every five years as referenced. Connor Corrigan, Head of Strategic Development, explained that this responsibility would be imposed on NHM, and added that other stakeholders such as UOR, the British Museum and local schools would be engaged in the process.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey asked for the biodiversity net gain figures from the site. The case officer reiterated that it would be 20%.

Councillor Neal explained for clarity that committee members had previously received a presentation from NHM which addressed many of the members concerns.

It was proposed by Councillor Mickleburgh and seconded by Councillor Shepherd-Dubey that the application be approved.

RESOLVED: That Application 232833 be approved subject to

- A) Completion of a S106 agreement and;
- B) Conditions as set out in the report and amended in the members update (if required);
- C) Should the S106 agreement not be signed by the applicant by six months of the committee resolution, delegate to the Assistant Director of Planning to refuse the application unless a longer timeframe is agreed with the Chair of Planning Committee in consultation with the Assistant Director of Planning.

76. APPLICATION NO 223528 33 BARKHAM RIDE FINCHAMPSTEAD WOKINGHAM RG40 4EX

Having declared a prejudicial interest in this item Councillor Cornish left the room for this item and did not participate in the debate or vote. This item was chaired by the Vice Chair Councillor Mickleburgh

Proposal: Outline application for the proposed erection of 56 residential dwellings with associated access, following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings. Access only to be considered (with Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale to be reserved)

Applicant: Mr Nathan Craker

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 149 to 234.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- Update to the recommendation- time limit on Section 106 agreement.
- Clarity on the ownership Victoria Gardens.
- Information regarding local Badger population.

Connie Davis, case officer provided clarity over a request for an additional condition from the British Horse Society but as the request to reinstate the historic bridleway was still under consideration by WBC, and therefore the condition was not required to make the application acceptable.

Roger Marshallsay, Finchampstead Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He mentioned that more notice had been taken regarding Finchampstead's Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) compared to other recent applications, especially policy ES1 which related to carbon neutral housing. He told the committee that originally the application had been for both 31 and 33 Barkham Ride which the NDP accepted, with 70 houses, but this had now been split into two sites which had 56 and 26 houses, taking the total to 82, over the 70 that was considered acceptable in the NDP. He asked whether the sites could be considered together.

Hugh Reid, resident, spoke in objection to the application. He highlighted traffic as a key concern for the residents, explaining that peak time traffic in the mornings was already high with 1060 peak two-way flows measured in the morning, 28% higher than the WBC report. He also mentioned speeding, disregard for the 6ft6 limit and the safety issues near Bohunt School as key issues. He told Members that there were a large number of T-Junctions in the area, which caused frequent accidents. He said that these were concerns because of the lack of opportunity for alternative transport options. He was of the view that this development would be the start of turning the western end of the settlement on Barkham Ride into a higher housing density area. The proposed 56 dwellings on 29 hectares, the next most dense area on Barkham Ride contained only 42 dwellings, this was a 33% increase.

Nathan Craker, applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He referenced a good partnership between the applicants and the officers. He cited figure 1 on page 159 of the agenda which he said showed the site in its context, surrounded on three sides by existing development. He mentioned good transport links, specifically the number 3 Leopard bus that ran nearby. He told the committee that the development was sustainably located and adhered to the growth strategy and NDP. He mentioned some key benefits which were 40% affordable housing being provided and the tenure mix including 70% social rented housing, improvement to sustainable transport and Biodiversity net gain.

Councillor Charles Margetts, ward member, spoke in objection to the application. He said that the site was outside the settlement boundary and explained that the combined site of 31 and 33 Barkham Ride was in the draft Local Plan update as 66 houses. He commented that if all proposed developments went ahead, then there would be 112 houses built in the area. He told the committee that he had asked officers to bring both sites together to committee but that this had been ignored and that the sites were brought separately to exploit planning. He pointed out that the application was contrary to policies CP9 and CP11. He added that there was no access to Barkham on foot, inadequate bus services and the bus did not go near the closest railway station. He also referenced the width of the road and the fact that buses and vans passed less than a metre away when walking on the pavement. The NHS Primary Care network had advised that local GPs were overcapacity with no plans for expansion. Councillor Margetts told Members that the

application did not comply with policies CP6 or CP3. He referenced many future plans within the area for development and how there would be a large cumulative effect. Councillor Margetts referenced local wildlife and drew Members' attention to a video of a badger travelling along the site boundary.

All members of the committee attended a site visit except Councillors Cornish and Soane.

Councillor Mickleburgh explained that this was an outline application which would fix the number of dwellings at a maximum of 56. He indicated that he wanted to exercise the right to bring the application back to Planning Committee at the reserved matters stage, were it to be accepted at the outline stage. He said that although the application was contrary to policy CP11, because of the Council's lack of a 5 Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS), the harms must significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits for the application to be refused. He pointed out the positives of 22 affordable homes on the site.

Councillor Firmager sought comment on the traffic levels along Barkham Ride and possible increases as a result of the application. Alan Lewis explained that the Highways team had looked into this at length. He added that daily levels had a significant range and there were roughly 8000 traffic flows per day, 4% of which were HGVs. 63 per week were the larger HGVs which may be connected with adjacent commercial uses which have a legitimate right of access to properties within the 6'6" restriction. He explained that due to the scale of current flows, the estimated increase in traffic from development would only be 2% which would largely be light traffic and that this was considered sufficiently low. He added points regarding limitations of land and highway drainage, that the new solar farm development would improve land drainage and therefore reduce pressure on highway drainage, and that an extension of the speed limit would ease lots of areas of concern.

Councillor Firmager asked whether the 22 affordable houses could possibly be reduced by the applicant, referencing previous applications where he had been disappointed to see this occur. The case officer explained that accepting this application would fix the maximum number of overall dwellings to 56. However, the overall number of dwellings could be reduced at reserved matters stage, which due to the number of affordable houses being a percentage, would in turn decrease the number of affordable homes, However, in order for the applicant to deviate away from the 40% affordable housing required, a viability assessment would have to be provided.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey mentioned that the committee had to consider this application on tilted balance due to the lack of a 5YHLS and asked the case officer to explain titled balance for the benefit of the public. She also reiterated that the committee must look at this application on its own merit. The case officer explained that if other applications do come in then this application, if approved, would be a material consideration but not the other way around as it would be speculative to do so. She then explained the concept of titled balance.

Councillor Skuse asked at what point the speed limit change would come into effect. Alan Lewis indicated that although there was no need to relocate the speed limit, it was being looked at and that it potentially would be moved to the edge of the 31 Barkham Ride site.

Councillor Smith focused on the cumulative effect of the application, he explained that the Local Plan allowed for 70 houses across the 2 sites and that there would now potentially be 108 because the original number had not envisaged the mobile homes. The case officer explained that the 66 net increase in the revised growth strategy was above and

beyond the mobile homes on Victoria Gardens. Councillor Smith then questioned officers on the lack of an updated 5YHLS number and stated that the last number given was from April 2022. He also mentioned that from the site visit, the traffic flows were very high and the predicted 2.4 cars per dwelling coming in and out of one entrance would cause issues. Brian Conlon, Operational Lead - Development Management, clarified there had been an updated 5YHLS position which was the Council's position as of 31 March 2023, this position was 3.2 years, down from the previous figure of 3.95 years which was referenced in paragraph 3.15 of the report. Alan Lewis provided clarity on the traffic movements, explaining that there would be approximately 28 peak movements in and out of the site which could potentially lead to a 1.8% increase in traffic.

Councillor Neal referenced paragraph 10.3.3 on page 181 of the agenda. He mentioned that the My Journey quiet cycle link from Finchampstead to Wokingham Town Centre at Blagrove Drive had been blocked off by the landowner so was no longer accessible. He also mentioned paragraph 10.2.9, which referred to the historic bridleway and asked if there was any chance of this being reinstated. The case officer confirmed that the application relating to this was still pending.

Councillor Munro questioned the differences between the housing densities in the report and the ones presented by the resident in their presentation. The case officer explained that it was difficult to know where the discrepancies stemmed from without knowing the methods behind their calculations, but referred to the agenda which showed the density at 31 Barkham Ride as 17.6 dwellings per hectare and 33 Barkham Ride as 19.3 dwellings per hectare.

Councillor Smith questioned why the 5YHLS number was going down when the committee had approved sites in the past. Councillor Mickleburgh suggested that the conversation regarding the 5YHLS was continued outside of the meeting.

Councillor Mickleburgh said that the main reason cited by Councillor Margetts for listing this application was due to the fact the location was unsustainable. He was of the view that from the site visit and the evidence in the report, that this was not the case. He added that pages 196-198 of the agenda were of concern which referenced the relationship between this site and others on Barkham Ride. He mentioned that a Project Board had been proposed to discuss the possibility of multiple applications in the area. He asked officers whether it was permissible to add a condition relating to a project board to manage the large number of developments on Barkham Ride. Brian Conlon told Members that the activities of the Council wider than planning covered many different statutory roles and explained that the Executive had priorities and could discuss cumulative impact of developments. He added that the cumulative impact could be considered if it was material, but each application must be considered on its own merit. He said that even though officers could not request applicants to resolve a problem that was unrelated to them, if the cumulative effect was going to lead to an issue, then they could pool mitigation. This could be done through a section 106 agreement. He informed Members that activities the Council undertook at a higher level to coordinate with developers would require an overarching role of Local Government and would not be in the remit or control of, nor meet the test of an individual planning permission.

Councillor Smith questioned how a Neighbourhood Plan was insufficient to protect the local area from development. The case officer indicated that this was referenced in paragraph 3.24 of the agenda where it discussed what happened if tilted balance was combined with a Neighbourhood Plan. She referred to paragraph 14 of the National

Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and explained that point B from paragraph 14 of the NPPF was not complied with because the Finchampstead NDP did not feature any housing allocation sites. The application would have been assessed differently if that was not the case.

It was proposed by Councillor Neal and seconded by Councillor Skuse that this application be approved. Due to an equal number of votes for and against the proposal, Councillor Mickleburgh was given casting vote as Chair of the Committee and the application was approved.

RESOLVED: That application 223528 be approved subject to conditions and informatives set out in pages 202 to 218, and the following obligations

1. **Roads** - Details of road status – either to remain as private or to be adopted by the Council
2. **Affordable Housing** - 40% on site affordable housing
3. **My Journey/ Travel Plan** - Contribution of £30,240 (£540 per dwelling) towards My Journey or Travel Plan to be provided
4. **Bus Services** - Contribution of £ 72,688 (£1298 per dwelling) (indexed linked) to contribute towards the Arborfield bus strategy
5. **SANG/ SAIMM** – Contribution to be calculated following Reserved Matters as it is dependent on number of bed spaces per dwelling.
6. **Employment and Skills Plan** - Employment and Skills Plan or in lieu contribution to be provided – this is determined by floorspace and so will be calculated at Reserved Matters
7. **Establishment of Management Company** – to be responsible for open spaces, play equipment, drainage, roads (the latter if not adopted by the Council)
8. **Public Open Space** - Financial contribution towards public open space types (outdoor sports provision / allotments) if there is a shortfall on-site at Reserved Matters. If an off-site contribution is to be provided, £38,445.00 would be required for allotments and a contribution of £131,432 (£2,347 per dwelling) indexed linked to 2015 towards Outdoor Sports Provision.
9. **Biodiversity Net Gain** - 10% Biodiversity Net Gain plan to be submitted with details of on-site provision or off-site off-setting

At this point in the meeting Councillor Cornish returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.

77. APPLICATION NO 232560 WHITEHOUSE FARM, BEECH HILL ROAD, SPENCERS WOOD, WOKINGHAM, RG7 1HR

Proposal: Full application for the change of use of land from Agricultural, residential, light industrial and storage to an Arboretum with ancillary support facilities to include storage, laboratory, offices and auditorium, re-location of poly tunnels and creation of irrigation pond, swale and attenuation pond, following demolition of hardstanding areas and various buildings including workshop, Mobile home, store, container, Nissan hut and sheds.

Applicant: Bartlett Tree Experts

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 235 to 296.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- The Applicant's name added.

Neil Davis, agent, spoke in favour of the application. He told committee members that this use of the site should be welcomed by the Council. The location of the site with the land around it to accommodate the arboretum was essential to its success. He explained that Bartlett Tree Experts currently operated from the site leased from UoR but that this lease was set to terminate, and that this development was fundamental for future plans for the applicant. He added that the current space did not provide necessary space for the arboretum. He mentioned that the site was private, and therefore external visits would be controlled by a private company. He added some key benefits included protection of the countryside, high quality buildings, and an excellent BREEAM rating. There were no objections from internal or external consultees.

Councillor Smith asked how issues with the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ), referenced on page 270 of the agenda as item 7, had been resolved. Andrew Chugg, case officer, explained that conversations had taken place with the Emergency Planning team and the view was that new housing would not be suitable, however as a business, this was an acceptable use of the site as there was a net loss of homes which gives a lower risk.

Councillor Firmager sought clarity on the traffic flow on Beech Hill Road and whether this would lead to an increase in flows. Alan Lewis clarified that the traffic flows were modest, and that the daily variation was typically +/-7%, he added that there could be a slight increase or decrease in traffic but that it was expected to be neutral.

Councillor Neal asked whether any issues with tree disease could spread outside the arboretum. The case officer explained that the Ecology Officer had looked at that matter, and that the applicants were specialists in the field. Brian Conlon added that the planning system was not the regime that would regulate biosecurity.

Councillor Soane questioned where the access would be for event parking and what the number of parking spaces would be. The case officer clarified that access for the event parking would be on the most southerly access on Beech Hill Road and that 15 parking spaces had been proposed, compared to the current 5 spaces.

Councillor Cornish mentioned that this application was full of benefits.

It was proposed by Councillor Smith and seconded by Councillor Soane that this application be approved.

RESOLVED: That application 232560 be approved subject to conditions and informatives detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.

78. APPLICATION NOS 190914, 191068 & 192325 SOUTH WOKINGHAM STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT LOCATION (SDL)

Proposal: Application No 190914: Outline application with all matters reserved except for principal means of access to the highways, for up to 215 dwellings, public open space, play areas, associated infrastructure and landscaping. To be read in conjunction with applications 190900 & 191068.

Application No 191068: Hybrid planning application (part outline/part detailed) comprising an outline application with all matters reserved except principal means of access to the highways, for a mixed use development of up to 1,434 dwellings, a two-form entry primary school, local centre (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and D1 including community building D1/D2), public open space, play areas and associated infrastructure and landscaping; and a full application for the proposed Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), associated landscaping and temporary car park. – To be read in conjunction with applications 190900 & 190914.

Application No 192325: Hybrid Planning application (part outline/part full) comprising outline application with all matters reserved for up to 171 no. dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure and full application for Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG).

Applicant: Kingacre Estates Ltd, Keir Ventures Ltd and Miller Homes Ltd and Charles Church Developments Ltd

The Committee considered a report on this application, set out in agenda pages 297 to 310 and the update Item No 78- Supplementary Agenda.

The Committee were advised that updates contained within the Supplementary Planning Agenda included:

- A change to the recommendations following legal advice.

Emy Circuit, case officer, explained to Members that following legal advice, the recommendations had been changed to making a formal decision, as opposed to noting an update.

Councillor Smith sought clarity on the delivery of the school and asked whether that would now be paid for by developers rather than by the Council. The case officer confirmed that this was the case. Councillor Smith urged the building to commence as quickly as possible. Connor Corrigan told Members that the plan was to be building houses in a years' time.

Councillor Skuse queried how the negotiations took place to allow the developers to pay for parts of the development that were originally going to be paid for by the Council. The case officer explained that the developer's interest was such that they were dependent on the delivery of the road to start the building.

Councillor Shepherd-Dubey asked that the school and the community facility be made as separate entities. Connor Corrigan assured Members that they would be two separate buildings and lessons had been learnt from the past.

Councillor Cornish urged developers to start development as soon as possible.

It was proposed by Councillor Cornish and seconded by Councillor Shepherd-Dubey to approve the officer recommendations.

RESOLVED: That recommendations for applications 190914, 191068 and 192325 be approved subject to:

RECOMMENDATION 190914

1. In addition to the resolution to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION on the 18th May 2021 for application 190914 that the committee authorise that the existing GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION is also subject to the following:

- A. The revised terms and mechanism as set out in this report for securing delivery of the school (including triggers and scale), community facility (including triggers and scale) and allotments in the s106 agreement; and
- B. AUTHORISE the Assistant Director – Place and Growth to agree revisions to conditions and informatives as set out in this report and to any further required additions, revisions and updates to conditions and informatives between the resolution of the Planning Committee on 18 May 2021 and issue of the decision under delegated powers.

2. That the committee authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission in the event of an S106 agreement not being completed to secure the services and infrastructure within six months of the date of the committee resolution (unless a longer period is agreed by the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee) due to failure to secure the necessary infrastructure impact mitigation.

RECOMMENDATION 191068

1. In addition to the resolution to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION on the 18th May 2021 for application 191068 that the committee authorise that the existing GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION is also subject to the following:

- A. The revised terms and mechanism as set out in this report for securing delivery of the school (including triggers and scale), community facility (including triggers and scale) and allotments in the s106 agreement; and
- B. AUTHORISE the Assistant Director – Place and Growth to agree revisions to conditions and informatives as set out in this report and to any further required additions, revisions and updates to conditions and informatives between the resolution of the Planning Committee on 18 May 2021 and issue of the decision under delegated powers.

2. The committee authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission in the event of an S106 agreement not being completed to secure the services and infrastructure within six months of the date of the committee resolution (unless a longer period is agreed by the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee) due to failure to secure the necessary infrastructure impact mitigation.

RECOMMENDATION 192325

1. In addition to the resolution to GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION on the 9th March 2022 for application 192325 that the committee authorise that the existing GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION is also subject to the following:

- A. The revised terms and mechanism as set out in this report for securing delivery of the school (including triggers and scale), community facility (including triggers and scale) and allotments in the s106 agreement; and

B. AUTHORISE the Assistant Director – Place and Growth to agree revisions to conditions and informatives as set out in this report and to any further required additions, revisions and updates to conditions and informatives between the resolution of the Planning Committee on 9 March 2022 and issue of the decision under delegated powers.

2. The committee authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission in the event of an S106 agreement not being completed to secure the services and infrastructure within six months of the date of the committee resolution (unless a longer period is agreed by the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee) due to failure to secure the necessary infrastructure impact mitigation.