
POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE**MINUTES**

of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Northway, Rickmansworth on Monday 5 December 2022 from 7.30pm to 9.20pm.

Councillors present:

Sarah Nelmes (Chair)	Paul Rainbow (Economic Development and Transport)
Stephen Cox	Reena Ranger
Philip Hearn	Ciaran Reed
Steve Drury (for Cllr Chris Lloyd)	Andrew Scarth
Keith Martin (Resources and Shared Services)	Phil Williams (Environment, Climate Change and Sustainability)
Abbas Merali	Roger Seabourne (Community Safety and Partnerships)

Officers Present: Geof Muggeridge, Director of Community and Environmental Services
Alison Scott, Director of Finance
Kimberley Grout, Executive Head of Service
Kimberley Rowley, Head of Regulatory Services
Justin Wingfield, Head of Property and Major Projects
Marko Kalik, Head of Planning Policy and Conservation
Sarah Haythorpe, Principal Committee Manager

PR67/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chris Lloyd and Philip Hearn with the substitute Members being Councillors Steve Drury and Rue Grewal and also an apology for absence from Councillor Abbas Merali.

PR68/22 MINUTES

The minutes of the Policy and Resources Committee meeting held on 7 November 2022 were confirmed as a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

PR69/22 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS

None received.

PR70/22 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Rue Grewal declared a prejudicial interest in the Part II item 2 as a Member of the Moor Park Golf Club and would leave the meeting for this item of business.

Councillor Reena Ranger declared a non prejudicial interest in the Part II item 2 as the Council representative on the Moor Park Mansion Heritage Foundation Trust but could stay and vote on the item.

POLICY

PR71/22 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (LDS)

This report sought Members approval of a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) to incorporate a Regulation 18 'Additional Sites for Potential Allocation' consultation in place of the previously agreed further Regulation 18 consultation. This change is being proposed so as to ensure the Local Plan remains on course for 2025 Adoption as currently set out in the Council's extant LDS (January 2022).

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised there had been one minor amendment to the scheme which was an additional R18 consultation in November/December that had moved to January/February. There had also been a change of approach to what had been agreed for the previous LDS which was to go out and do a full R18 consultation on all the policies and all the sites again. Officer's opinion was that you don't need re-consult if you have already consulted and you can go onto the next stage which would be the R19. What was proposed was to consult on the additional sites which had been submitted as part of the R18 consultation last year as they had not yet been consulted on. Officer opinion was this helped keep on track with the Local Plan. If we were to do a full R18 consultation again that would cause further delay and this way we keep to the timetable so that the R19 stage would still be scheduled for the end of next year.

The Lead Member advised that the amendment would allow for the consultation in January/February on the sites which had been discussed and agreed unanimously at the Local Plan sub-committee for a further consultation. It would also allow the Council to inform members of the public on the sites which had been put forward but had been rejected as part of the original R18 consultation in due course. We have yet to complete the review of the consultee responses on all the policy items but details would come forward to the sub-committee later this week. There was the option to wait until we had completed all the considerations and comments on the policies and then re-consult again but that would mean we would not be in a position to consult on the additional sites until May at the earliest due to the pre-election period in March. Officers do not believe they could get the policy documents ready for the consultation prior to the March cut off. There had been some leaked announcements from Government that there will be a consultation on the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which may lead to a review of the targets set by Local Authorities and various other changes. Once we have the detail of that consultation, it may affect the timescales on our Local Plan. We do not wish to delay consulting on these potential additional sites as to do so would inevitably push everything back 6 months. It is possible, depending on what the Government says, we may have to push it back depending on consultation results, and whatever becomes Government policy.

The following points were made:

Q - Clarification on what a R19 stage is?

R – The R19 stage would be the draft plan that Three Rivers would like to submit to the Inspectorate. Having done the R18 consultation we would make the changes and put together our draft version of the plan that we would want to put forward for examination which would be tested against legal soundness rather than the details of the policies.

Q - Why are we looking to still put all the sites in to try and hit a target which we have been united in saying is too high? By putting all the sites into the mix it could potentially open up to legal challenges by a number of site owners who want to see their sites go forward. Is it not prudent to think of a number that we feel is suitable for TRDC and put that site plan together? On the visibility of the LDS to find the previous one you have to trawl through documents to see what has changed on the timeline. Can this be looked into by officers?

R - On the website details were very easily accessible and can be found [here](#). In terms of the original R18 consultation it was made quite clear the figures do not comply with the Government target. Members of the public will see after 13 December that this will still be the case in terms of what we go out for consultation on. Officers will be looking at the policies, procedures, consultation responses on the sites and evidence. Having rejected 230 sites this is evidence we have to put forward to the Planning Inspectorate.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that in terms of the housing numbers officer advice is to follow what is national policy and legislation as set out in the NPPF. We can look at an alternative figure in exceptional circumstances but there needs to be robust evidence to back up why we are looking at a different figure and having looked at the previous Local Plan examinations the argument of being a Green Belt authority is not an exceptional circumstance and had not worked so far although this may change in the future.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke in support of the recommendation and two members of the public spoke against (having split the 3 minutes time available) at the Chairs discretion.

The Lead Member advised that we have undertaken the R18 consultation and this was a further consultation on new sites which had come out from the original R18 consultation. It would be remiss of the authority to not consult on those sites. There is no statutory requirement to consult again on the policies. Given the change in thinking by the Government today we may need to reflect on this and there may well be a further development plan. The policies have not finished being updated in line with changes in Government legislation, statutory consultee responses and resident's responses and if we consult on that we then have another set of responses and if we keep consulting it would not end. There has to be an end to a consultation. It is not legally required to re-consult on the policies and looking at other LAs they have not done repeated consultations.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised officer's opinion was that having done the R18 consultation in full it is standard practise to go onto the R19 stage once you have taken the responses into consideration and built into your plan. Looking at a neighbouring authority approach, Watford BC, they have successfully just completed their examination.

A Member said they had argued consistently for a TRDC local plan on locally acceptable numbers instead of having the huge number of sites in the original R18 consultation that were unacceptable. If we had stuck to an earlier timetable we would have a Plan ready to go instead of delaying the process to 2025.

A Member said when we started going through the sites we agreed we did not have sufficient housing numbers. We were working towards a standard methodology, which some did or did not agree to. We need to have a recheck of what our housing numbers should be, how we look at all the sites, the hierarchy we judge them on, which are a priority and a plan which protects our District.

The Lead Member said the current rules still stand. There is no change and any Local Authority is required to use the standard methodology in the NPPF in order to do its Local Plan. Another Local Authority had tried to do something

completely different and were told by the Inspector to think again. The Government may change the target, make it advisory or may allow us to do some things differently but until those changes become statute the Planning Inspector is told to reject plans which do not meet the standard methodology. We unanimously agreed at Full Council in October to have an alternative Local Plan which officers will work up in terms of the background to that the plan and that will be the reduced figure if we are allowed to do so and get it accepted by the Planning Inspector and the Government. The R18 is a consultation process seeking resident's views in this instance on a small number of additional sites whilst also rejecting some and can be used as one of our arguments why we are not able to meet the housing numbers. The sites only become agreed in the Developers pot once the Planning Inspectorate agrees to the Local Plan and sends it back to us. Had we completed a Local Plan last year we would have had to submit it for 12,624 houses and we are not prepared to do that.

A Member said today's announcement provided time to build proper evidence and consult with residents which feeds into the evidence base.

On the question raised by the Joint Residents' Association the Lead Member advised that we will have the right figure for Three Rivers irrespective of what the Government does. When we come up with a different figure it would be incumbent upon us to consult. Once we go out for consultation on a small number of sites we should be able to report back in May given the timeframes to this Committee on what we are then doing in terms of other consultations including on our own local figure.

A Member said but we have to get on with this and make steps forward. If the Government wants to say things have changed we could change this quickly. We are not hitting the existing target which may provide some difficulty as Local Authorities are beholden to the existing Government targets.

Councillor Keith Martin moved, seconded by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst the recommendations as outlined in the report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 9 For, 0 Against and 3 Abstentions.

RECOMMEND:

1. The Local Development Scheme as set out in Appendix 1.
2. That the further Regulation 18 consultation be focussed on new sites submitted as a result of the 2021 Regulation 18 consultation.

PR72/22 REQUEST TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE PENSIONER FORUM

The Committee received a report to change the name of the Pensioner Forum to Seniors Forum.

Councillor Keith Martin moved the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Andrew Scarth, that the name be changed to Seniors Forum. The Council had been made aware that the current name was a barrier to being able to advertise the meetings on social media and in the local newspaper. It was advised that the attendees at the November meeting had been provided with some suggested names but the overwhelming choice of them was Seniors Forum.

There had been a lot of positive feedback on the meetings and Members thanked officers for all their work.

On being to the Committee the new name of Seniors Forum was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being by general assent.

RECOMMEND:

To approve the change of name of the Pensioner Forum to Seniors Forum

PR73/22 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION – PUBLICATION SCHEME

This report sought approval of the revised Freedom of Information Publication Scheme.

The Data Protection Officer advised that the current Publication Scheme had been reviewed by the Corporate Management Team and the following new information/data has been added:

- Business Rates data
- Housing and Homelessness data
- Public Health funeral data

A Member asked about previously requested information and the answers given and whether details could be provided on the website.

The Shared Director of Finance said the policy does pick up on frequently asked questions. The website was currently undergoing development and sessions had been organised for Members to view the work but so far Councillors had not attended to provide any feedback.

The Data Protection Officer said the matter had come up before but there were issues around Disclosure. There is no legal requirement to have this but the issue would be around redacting the requesters contact details but it was something we can look at and with the new website it might make it easier.

On being put to the Committee the recommendations were declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

Approved the updated FOI Publication Scheme.

To Delegate authority to the Executive Head of Services, in consultation with the Lead Member for Resources and Shared Services to implement any minor amendments to the Publication Scheme

PR74/22 REVIEW OF STRATEGIC RISKS

This report gave details of progress against the Risk Treatment Plans for the Strategic Risks relating to the priorities identified in the Corporate Framework 2020-2023

The Emergency Planning and Risk Manager reported that the Council's Risk Management Strategy was approved by the Policy and Resources Committee at its meeting on 5 November 2018 and was last reviewed by the Audit Committee at its meeting on 29 September 2022. In accordance with the Strategy, the Policy and Resources Committee determines which of the Council's risks are 'strategic' and receives progress reports on their treatment. A strategic risk is defined as one that would seriously prejudice the achievement of the objectives of the Corporate Framework.

A Member thought there was a column missing as it did not provide details on the consequences and mitigations of the risk within the register.

A Member advised that what the risk register was doing was providing details of what the risk is, what the consequences of that risk are, the likelihood of it happening in the next 12 months, the impact, what controls are in place and the impact of it happening if there are no controls. If a Councillor was unsure of what the risk is it was their responsibility to ask questions.

A Member said on staff retention we had put in place measure to mitigate the risk but are the controls adequate.

The Emergency Planning and Risk Manager advised that sometimes you can put mitigation in but it may not reduce the situation happening or the impact were it to happen. Around staffing the strategic risk was added about a year ago where previously it was an operational risk. The recruitment of staff is across all services and we have some mitigation which in some cases will work but not in all cases.

A Member was pleased to see the climate change risk included and if Councillors had any interest in any of subjects they should look into the detail at a lower level on the risk registers for each department.

The Shared Director of Finance advised that the Audit Committee do a lot of work on this and it would be a really good place to have this debate at one of their meetings and will take forward that proposal to the Committee.

A Member said these were strategic risks for the strategy which is achieving the objectives of the Council. You will make a risk register unworkable by putting too much information into it but do need to provide a summary of what the risk is. If you add more detail you end up with a register full of risks as opposed to a risk register where you can pull things together providing a summing up of the risks. There are different set of financial risks looked at by the Audit Committee.

The Chair moved the recommendation as set out in the report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

Noted the updated Strategic Risk Register.

PR75/22 BUSINESS RATES POOLING

To seek approval to enter into a business rates pool with Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) and a number of other Districts within the County for 2023/24.

The Shared Director of Finance advised this was a recommendation to full Council. For a number of years we had been part of the Business Rates Pool and this report would allow Hertfordshire and selected Districts in Hertfordshire to retain 75% of business rates growth rather than 50%.

The Chair moved the recommendations, seconded by Councillor Andrew Scarth.

On being put to the Committee the recommendation was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RECOMMEND:

That Council agrees that, subject to a final review following the Local Government Settlement for 2022/23, Three Rivers District Council enters into the Hertfordshire Business Rates Pool.

That Council Delegate authority to the Chief Executive and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Policy and Resources Committee to sign up to the Hertfordshire Business Rates Pool, within 28 days of the Local Government Finance Settlement.

PR76/22 CIL SPENDING APPLICATIONS

The report sought to allocate a 25% uplift on 2 previously approved leisure projects. Total uplift of £180,500 is needed to cover the increase in the supply chain for materials and labour since funding was first agreed (February 2022) and is for local infrastructure projects to support growth in Three Rivers.

The report had been presented to this Committee, ahead of the budget setting process, to avoid further price increases and delays in project mobilisation.

This uplift is required in order to offset current shortfalls in materials and labour. These are market force driven and it has been reported to Officers from a number of suppliers in the leisure equipment industry that another predicted price rise is due in December 2022/January 2023. Officers are keen to secure the current costs before these widely reported market price increases.

The Shared Director of Finance reported that the two schemes had previously come forward to the Committee and were agreed to be funded from CIL. Due to the current climate costs had gone up and they had come back for additional money but this would not impact on the rest of the capital programme as the funding will be provided by CIL.

A Member said if the application is submitted long before you can spend the money how accurate is the application. The requests were for huge uplifts and if we said no there would have been a lot of wasted work. Why was there such a mismatch on timing?

The Shared Director of Finance advised when the schemes were agreed prices were fairly stable which had now changed in the current climate. We are looking at having some contingency so we don't have to come back to the Committee. We are advised if we don't place the order soon there could be further costs.

The Head of Regulatory Services advised that officers need the certainty of funding early in the project conception and once they have agreement the projects can move forward. With these two projects they went out for consultation and to stakeholders as part of the project process and had to go out to tender. They are coming back to the Committee as a result of the tender documents and the money available for the projects. They are not able to implement the projects as they currently stand with the funding and would have to be on a reduced scale and quality of scheme. Members may recall in other recent applications for CIL funding we have put in the recommendations reference to contingencies to enable a more rapid response to market conditions.

A Member pointed out that Section E of the Denham project stated it was due to commence works in April 2022 so why did this not happen? The Shared Director of Finance agreed to come back with a written response.

A Member further advised that the cost of Denham Way project was only going to increase in the current climate but if started in April it would have been different. How much had the delay ended up costing the Council out of the CIL funding

compared to what it would of spent. The uplift is significant for a project which should have been delivered before the current inflationary spiral. Section E of the Denham Way project distinguishes between pre works on planning and works to have started in April but they had not started on the timescale this Committee agreed. Who was the Lead Member overseeing this. It was advised the project came under the Lead Member for Leisure but was sure they were fully aware of the situation but could provide some information following the meeting.

The Head of Regulatory Services would obtain more information from the department overseeing the project. The project did commence in April 2022 as part of the new financial year. The specification developed during April and in May consultation work took place for both projects and tenders documents were issued in May for Denham Way and evaluated in June. The increase in costs was started to be noted at that point. Further public consultation took place in June on the South Oxhey project and further evaluation in October so had been part of that tender process and was how we had got to this stage. We can only move forward on capital projects where the funding is available. If they did all this work and there were no monies available that would be a waste of work and resource. We are in an economic climate where costs are high but we have to secure funding before taking a project forward. We are now looking to have contingency funding included in any request for CIL funding but with costs increasing as much as they are we are not able to guarantee we can deliver with the funding identified due to the costs going up on a project.

Post meeting note: Officers acknowledge the wording may not have been clear to everyone reading the submission but to clarify the Denham Way leisure project has followed the agreed project timeline commencing in April 2022. This has included public consultation, a tender process, planning permission and ongoing work with the contractor to finalise designs and costs. The CIL uplift is purely as a result of unprecedented rises in construction costs, which could not have been predicted.

A Member said we have been in a low inflation environment for so long but this had now changed. Was this something which could have been brought to the Committees attention earlier? There are issues around rising costs and because these projects seem to take a long time do we need to think about some sort of reporting back to the Committee.

The Shared Director of Finance advised that is one of the key risks identified in budget monitoring. When the project was started in April it was before the acute spike in inflation so we were not building in the levels of contingency we would do now for projects. We are looking in more detail at contingencies and bringing projects within budget. There will be a big budget risk when we come to set the budget with the high inflation but are building this into our forecasts. We are expecting the level of inflation not to drop until the end of next year at the earliest in line with the Bank of England's forecast.

The Head of Regulatory Services said we are looking at our processes and being able to compare schemes coming in, reviewing the application process and focus around the P&R Committees which are available each year and will have a new criteria as we go forward.

The Shared Director of Finance said to build in a contingency is the way forward but if we do over predict inflation the contingency can be returned to the pot and does not allow for the scheme to be changed to use up the money. Processes we used will be tightened up.

On being put to the Committee the recommendation was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RECOMMEND:

That Members approve CIL funding for the following schemes detailed in Table 1 of this report and summarised in the table below for 2022/2023:

Applicant & Project Name	Infrastructure	CIL Amount
TRDC Leisure Team Denham Way Play Area/ Maple Cross Playing Fields (Appendix 1)	New play area Community pavilion, 3 floodlight tennis courts Outdoor fitness zone MUGA Playing pitch improvements Access pathways Seating formal garden	£86,750.
TRDC Leisure Team South Oxhey Playing Fields (Appendix 2)	Tennis Courts AGP Basketball Court Skate/BMX Park Outdoor Gym Pathways	£93,750.

PR77/22 DISCRETIONARY FEES AND CHARGES 2023/24

The Council regularly reviews the level of fees and charges set for discretionary services and services where charges are set locally. Fees and Charges were last reviewed in autumn 2021 with the latest charges introduced from 1 April 2022.

Where the Council has discretion over the fee or charge, the Council aims to recover the full cost of delivering the service. As such, fees will usually increase in line with cost pressures.

A schedule of proposed fees and charges effective from 1 January 2023 is set out in Appendix 1 and a schedule of fees and charges effective from 1 April 2023 is set out in Appendix 2.

The Shared Director of Finance reported the recommendations the Committee agree need to go to Council. It was proposed to increase discretionary fees and charges for 2023/24 and having full cost recovery following increases in Council costs and due to the high cost of inflation. It is proposed that the increases would take effect from 1 January 2023 which is why these are coming ahead of the budget setting process. There is £1m of additional pressure on the budget due to cost of inflation and post covid.

In response to a question on property investment, the Shared Director of Finance advised that the Council continue to keep our property investments under review and would come back to the Committee if an investment was no longer fit for purpose or didn't provide the returns to support the budget. If the investments were sold that money would be a capital receipt.

A Member asked if the Council had looked at the consequences of increased fees and how this impacts on the Council in other strategies particularly on potential flytipping and bonfires. On some of venue hire charges we should be mindful some people have no choice but to go to that venue. On pest control were Watford BC experiencing higher staff costs and sought clarification on the increased cost for memorial benches and trees.

The Shared Director of Finance said on the increase in garden waste charges the Council do keep a close watch on the demand for the service but every time we put the cost up demand increases and we are not being pushed

outside the market. On pest control Watford BC staff were also receiving the same pay award as us. On Memorial trees and benches there are increased costs in maintaining them as well as buying them but we will continue to monitor the demand. We are experiencing high fuel costs and due to the difficulty in recruiting HGV drivers a market supplement was currently provided.

A Member was not minded to agree with the taxi vehicles and drivers proposed increase due to the reduced taxis on the rank in South Oxhey and did not feel this was the way forward at this time. It was advised the increase was around having cost recovery and the account balancing as we are not able to subsidise it.

A Member said if we did not have the investment income coming in the increases would have been significantly higher and our money would not be earning what it is doing from our investments in a bank account.

A Member understood that pest control was not a statutory duty and wondered what our duty was on this, was the service viable for us to continue to offer it and could officers look into that. On the CPZ permits given that Hertsmere's staff costs have increased and the renewal of the contract was due maybe we need to look at this again. On some of the fees, highlighting pre applications fees, could explanations be provided on why the increase is proposed to be zero?

The Shared Director of Finance advised that we are looking at parking reserves as a whole. The CPZ income is not able to support the more general revenue budget so we will be undertaking a separate review. On pest control we have a contract with Watford BC until the end of 2023/24 but we do have some statutory duties that will remain.

A Member asked about the increase in street naming and numbering and asked if the 7% increase was around cost recovery. The Head of Regulatory Services advised that some of the charges were around new sites but there were still elements around change of addresses/house names by private individuals. The service is costs recovery and there is limitation on what we can include in terms of the elements we can charge for.

The Shared Director of Finance advised they would check before Full Council and if the Council are constrained by legislation we will make sure that is clear in the description.

The Chair moved, duly seconded, the recommendations set out in the report.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being 8 For, 0 Against and 4 Abstentions.

RECOMMEND:

Council is recommended to approve the Fees and Charges set out in the schedule at Appendix 1 to be effective from 1 January 2023

Council is recommended to approve the Fees and Charges set out in the schedule at Appendix 2 to be effective from 1 April 2023

PR78/22

MEMBERSHIP OF THE LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE

The Chair advised that Councillor Jon Tankard was to be replaced on the sub-committee but at this time it was not possible to say who by. The Chair agreed to provide details to the Committee in January on the replacement.

RESOLVED:

The name of the new appointment to be provided to the Committee at the January meeting.

PR79/22 WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee's received their work programme.

RESOLVED:

That the work programme be agreed.

PR80/22 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

The Chair moved, duly seconded, that if the Committee wished to consider the remaining items in private, it will be appropriate for a resolution to be passed in the following terms:-

“that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined under Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Act. It has been decided by the Council that in all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.”

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee move into Part II confidential business.

PR81/22 TO RECEIVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee received the recommendations from the Local Plan sub-committee from its meeting on 7 November.

Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst moved, duly seconded, the recommendations as set out in the report with some minor amendments on some sites to be included in the appendices to be presented to Full Council for ratification.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RECOMMEND:

- Approved and recommends to Full Council the Local Plan Regulation 18: Part Three: Additional Sites for Potential Allocation document as set out in Appendix 1 for public consultation in accordance with the regulations and the Local Development Scheme
- That the following amendments be agreed:

NSS4 - Cedars Village, Chorleywood to be removed as the promoters are now going down the planning application route.

CFS8d Notley Farm, Bedmond Road – subject to suitable access arrangements and allocation of eastern fields to East Lane as an extension to Leavesden Country Park and allotment improvements will be required.

CFS26e - Land to the south west of Kings Langley Estate, Abbots Langley – to ensure the remainder of area south of the M25 should be dedicated open space and woodland.

NSS13 - Land to the rear of The Shires High Elms Lane - Section 106 obligation to provide parkland and woodland in perpetuity would restrict any alternative form of use on site.

That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning Policy & Conservation and the Director of Community and Environmental Services in consultation with the Lead Member for the Local Plan to make any minor changes that are required before the documents are published for consultation

That public access to the report be denied until after Full Council (13 December 2022)

That public access to the decision be denied until after Full Council (13 December 2022)

PR82/22 PROPERTY MATTER - MOOR PARK

The Head of Property and Major Projects advised that this report had been prepared in order to obtain approval from the Policy & Resources Committee to agree to a proposed discharge of a legal charge in favour of the Council from the title of Moor Park Golf Club and to approve consent for the grant of an easement to Cadent Gas over part of the Moor Park Golf Course.

It is understood that MPGCL intend to undertake works to replace their existing irrigation system with a more sustainable and water efficient system which is intended to reclaim and recycle grey water (harvest rainwater) and become less dependent on mains water. The financing will be in part dependant on a loan from National Westminster Bank which will require security and as such the removal of the Legal Charge will enable such lending to be secured.

The recommendations on being put to the Committee were declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

Approved the discharge of the Legal Charge from the title of Moor Park Golf Club, by confirming that the state and condition of the buildings presently complies with clause 7.2 of the Transfer (subject to fair wear and tear in relation to works which may have been carried out prior to 2014 in compliance with the 20 year period) – the discharge will be subject to the payment of the Council's reasonable professional fees.

That consent be given to the grant of a Gas pipe easement (The Easement) to Cadent Gas in relation to pre-existing gas pipes and apparatus, this approval will regularise a situation that has been in place for a number of years.

That public access to the report be denied until the issue is resolved.

That public access to the decision be denied until Committee minutes publication.

CHAIR