

MINUTES

CABINET

22 JULY 2014

Present:

Members:

Councillors:

Margaret Griffiths	Portfolio Holder for Housing
Julie Laws	Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services and Sustainability
Nick Tiley	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources
Andrew Williams (Chairman)	Leader of the Council/Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration

Officers:

Sally Marshall	Chief Executive
Mark Gaynor	Corporate Director Housing and Regeneration
Martin Hone	Corporate Director Finance and Operations
Steven Baker	Assistant Director Chief Executive's Unit
James Deane	Assistant Director Finance and Resources
James Doe	Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration
Sarah Churchard	Strategic Planning and Regeneration Officer
Claire Covington	Strategic Planning and Regeneration Officer (Green Space)
Claire McKnight	Consultation Officer
Laura Wood	Strategic Planning and Regeneration Team Leader
Pat Duff	Member Support Officer

Councillors F Guest and G Sutton also attended.

The meeting began at 7.30 pm.

CA/088/14 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2014 and reconvened on 9 July 2014 were agreed by the members present and signed by the Chairman.

CA/089/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor N Harden, Portfolio Holder for Residents and Regulatory Services.

CA/090/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

CA/091/14 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

CA/092/14 REFERRALS TO CABINET

There were no referrals to Cabinet.

CA/093/14 CABINET FORWARD PLAN

Decision

That the Cabinet Forward Plan be noted.

CA/094/14 JELlicOE WATER GARDENS RESTORATION: UPDATE ON PARKS FOR PEOPLE APPLICATION AND DELIVERY PROJECT

Decision

1. That the successful outcome of the second round Parks for People application for funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund to restore the Jellicoe Water Gardens be noted.
2. That the delivery of the restoration project, as set out in the stage D designs, activity plan, management plan and second round application documents be approved.
3. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration, to approve further design, planning and implementation decisions on recommendation 2 above.
4. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration for the appointment of consultants and contractors to deliver the restoration project as set out under recommendation 2 above.
5. **That Council be recommended to reprofile the approved budget of £3,251,827 within the Capital Programme for the delivery of the restoration of the Jellicoe Water Gardens following the second round pass from the Heritage Lottery Fund / Big Lottery Fund as set out in Appendix 2 of the report.**
6. **That Council be recommended to increase the revenue budget by £190k and approve a revenue budget of £548,249 profiled to 2020/21 to support the delivery of the Jellicoe Water Gardens Activity Plan and Management Plan as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, with £276,364 funded from the Dacorum Development Reserve and the balance being grant funded.**
7. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration and the Assistant Director Chief Executive's Unit to conclude contractual arrangements with the Heritage Lottery Fund / Big Lottery Fund for the award of the grant.

8. That the use of a traditional contract approach for the procurement of the main construction contract be approved.
9. That the continued governance of the Jellicoe Water Gardens Restoration project through the Hemel Evolution Programme governance structure be approved.

Reason for Decision

1. To update Members on the outcome of the second round Parks for People application to restore the Jellicoe Water Gardens through funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund/ Big Lottery Fund.
2. To deliver the restoration project, as set out in the design proposals, activity plan, management plan and application documents, and to confirm the financial contribution from Dacorum Borough Council.

Implications

Financial

In December 2012, Capital Strategy Steering Group approved funding of £997,500 to support the capital project costs for developing and delivering the Jellicoe Water Gardens restoration project.

In December 2012 the Jellicoe Water Gardens was granted a first round pass by the Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund to develop a restoration project of £3.3 million, including an award of £106,000 towards the development of the second round application. The development phase was completed in February 2014 at a cost of:

Capital	£151,936
Revenue	£12,005
Total	£163,941

The costs were financed through a £106,000 grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund / Big Lottery Fund with DBC contributing £57,941.

In December 2013, Cabinet approved the submission of a second round application at a maximum total project costs of up to £3.611 million.

The scope, specification and risk attached to proposed works were scrutinised through the development phase to ensure the second application made in February 2014 will be robust and deliverable. With approval from the Assistant Director (Finance and Resources) and Assistant Director (Planning, Development and Regeneration) the project costs and funding request was submitted as follows:

Dacorum Borough Council	£1,057,929
Volunteer time	£23,100
Increased management and maintenance	£64,048
(funded by Dacorum Borough Council)	
Parks for People Grant Request	£2,465,700
Total project costs	£3,610,777

The total project costs are within the £3.611 million approved by Cabinet in December 2013. The £309,227 difference between the proposed delivery costs of £3,301,550

submitted as the first round bid in August 2012 and the final project costs at the second round were divided equally between Dacorum Borough Council and the Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund, setting Dacorum Borough Council's contribution at 31.1%.

The second round bid included revenue costs of £548,249 for the delivery of the project. Through the Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund grant, £271,885 of this cost will be funded, leaving a balance of £276,364 as Dacorum Borough Council's contribution. It is recommended that this be funded from the Dacorum Development Reserve.

The second round submission of £3,610,777 included capital costs of £3,251,827, as approved in the Capital Programme at Council on 26 February 2014.

The capital / revenue split for the delivery phase is detailed below, with a profiled summary shown in Appendix 2 of the report.

	Total	DBC contribution	HLF/BIG award
Capital	£3,251,827	£1,054,262	£2,197,565
Revenue*	£548,249	£276,364	£271,885

*The revenue costs include costs 5 years post completion which are not all in the bid but are committed to as part of it.

Value for Money

Dacorum Borough Council's contribution is set at 31.1% with the majority of funding provided by the Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund. This is a great opportunity to lever in grant funding, enabling the restoration of one of Dacorum Borough Council's significant assets within Hemel Hempstead town centre to proceed and to deliver a key objective of the Hemel Evolution programme.

Economies of scale benefits for the construction phase are anticipated following Cabinet's approval in June 2014 to combine the Water Gardens works with the new Access and Movement Improvement Project (to the area surrounding the Water Gardens).

The Access and Movement Project is entirely separate to the Heritage Lottery Fund/Big Lottery Fund bid and is funded through a £560,000 allocation within the capital programme, plus an additional £400,000 for the improvement works to the Water Gardens (North) car park.

Risk Implications

A risk assessment has been prepared as part of the PID for the Water Gardens projects.

Corporate Objectives

The Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan supports the Council's vision and in particular the corporate objective of Regeneration.

Advice

The Assistant Director Planning, Redevelopment and Regeneration introduced the report and advised that the Council had been awarded the funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund. This was good news for Dacorum.

The final financial arrangements for the Council's contribution for the project needed to be confirmed and delegations put in place to enable officers to take the project forward.

Paragraph 6 of the report detailed the total project costs which were the final figures submitted in February for the bid. This followed consultation with Cabinet and Portfolio Holders.

The Assistant Director Planning, Redevelopment and Regeneration drew attention to an error in table 3, paragraph 15 of the report which should be amended to:

	Total Cost	DBC Contribution	HLF/Big Award
Revenue	£548,249	£276,364	£271,885

The architect's contract is likely to be extended to cover the project management of the scheme and the final proposals would be discussed. The Council was meeting with the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) on 25 July 2014 regarding the inception letter for the contract.

The Leader of the Council said the Council needed to confirm its acceptance of the offer from HLF and that the Council's offer to the scheme was as agreed.

The Leader of the Council thanked the team involved in the bid process, particularly Claire Covington. This was a very important project for the town and he congratulated everybody involved.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability said this was a very exciting project and confirmation was given that this would run alongside the refurbishment of the Water Gardens North car park.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

James Deane, Assistant Director for Finance and Resources;
Richard Baker, Group Manager for Financial Services;
James Stammers, Transformation Programme Manager for DBC, V4 Services

Voting

None.

CA/095/14 DACORUM LOCAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK – LOCAL ALLOCATION MASTER PLANS

Decision

1. That key issues arising from work on the master plans be noted.
2. That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration to finalise the master plans for the Local Allocations LA1 to LA6, and to make any factual or non-substantive changes and amendments to the Local Allocation master plans prior to consultation commencing.
3. That the use of a single indicative layout showing Option 2 for LA5 West of Tring, as shown in the Site Allocations DPD, for inclusion in the consultation draft be agreed and the draft master plan be amended accordingly.
4. That the Local Allocation master plans be approved for publication and consultation alongside the recently agreed Pre-Submission Site Allocations Development Plan Document.
5. That the use of the draft Local Allocation master plans be approved as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications until superseded by the final adopted versions.

Reason for Decision

To agree the content of the draft master plans for the Local Allocations LA1 to LA6 identified in the Core Strategy, and arrangements for consultation.

Implications

Financial

The process of preparing the Local Allocation master plans as part of the Site Allocations DPD has financial implications. The Council has created a 'Local Planning Framework' earmarked reserve to support expenditure. Money is drawn down from this reserve to provide an annual budget to support LPF-related work. The financial impact of preparing master plans has been significantly reduced through joint working with site boundaries and developers.

Having an up-to-date planning policy framework helps reduce the incidence of planning appeals (and thus costs associated with those). It will also be the most effective way of ensuring the optimum level of developer contributions to infrastructure and in mitigation of development impacts can be achieved.

Equalities

Equality Impact Assessment carried out for the Core Strategy which sets the framework for the Site Allocations DPD and the master plans. The Sustainability Report for the Core Strategy concludes that the plan avoids any discrimination on the

basis of disability, gender or ethnic minority. The Site Allocations builds on the requirements of the Core Strategy with regard to issues such as affordable housing and homes for minority groups, accessibility of facilities and local employment. The Sustainability Appraisal Report which accompanies the Site Allocations, and which covers the Local Allocation sites, found no specific issues with regards to disability, gender or ethnic minority.

Risk Implications

A full risk assessment has been carried out as part of the PID for the Local Planning Framework, which includes the Local Allocations. These risks are reviewed monthly through CORVU and reported each year through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Identified risks include failure of external agencies or consultants to deliver on time, change in Government policy and team capacity. If the Council were to decide not to progress the master plans additional risks would arise, as there would be a lack of detail upon which to base discussions on future planning applications and provide clear advice re issues such as phasing and infrastructure delivery.

Corporate Objectives

The Site Allocations DPD is part of the Council's Local Planning Framework and the Local Allocations contribute to the overall housing target and strategy. Overall, the LPF helps support all 5 corporate objectives:

- *Safe and clean environment:* e.g. contains policies relating to the design and layout of new development at the Local Allocation sites that promote security and safe access.
- *Community Capacity:* e.g. provide certainty to local communities regarding the proposed development at each Allocation
- *Affordable housing:* e.g. sets the practical housing numbers for each site and the proportion of new homes that must be affordable.
- *Dacorum delivers:* e.g. provides a clear framework upon which planning decisions can be made.
- *Regeneration:* e.g. sets the planning framework for the Local Allocations, with a wider aim of supporting nearby Local Centres and providing financial contributions towards education and community services

Advice

The Leader of the Council invited Councillor Guest to make a statement.

Councillor Guest made the following statement.

The role of the Site Allocation DPD is to make the changes to the Green Belt necessary to enable LA3 and other sites to be brought forward for development. That is why I spoke and voted against the submission of the Site Allocations document. I have been fighting to save the Green belt at what is now known as LA3 since 1996. I could not vote for the submission of a document that would take it out of the Green Belt.

The master plans are not part of the statutory development plan but will be endorsed by Council when the Site Allocations DPD is adopted. Although this report does not

recommend the master plans to full Council they do need to be looked at and voted on by full Council. Is there a timescale for the master plans to come before full Council?

Statements of common ground were drawn up in the early stages of meetings between this Council and developers and landowners. Has this process involved just developers and landowners or have other stakeholders been involved?

The Parkwood Drive GP practice is keen to expand rather than set up a branch surgery at LA3, to gain economies of scale. However, there is a possibility that another GP practice could be established there. What are the views of NHS England?

It is recommended that consultation on the master plans is held at the same time as that on the pre-submission Site Allocations DPD. There will be staffed exhibitions in areas near the Las. Will the manned exhibition in Chaulden or Warners End include the master plan for LA3 as well as the Site Allocation?

As estimate of site capacity was established through the Core Strategy. Will this prevent developers increasing the numbers of dwellings per hectare with resultant crowding?

In assessing sites for gypsy and traveller pitches, highway capacity and accessibility have been considerations. Chaulden Lane and Pouchen End Lane are narrow. Have they been assessed for the ability to take caravans?

Core Strategy Policy CS3 places controls on the timing of the delivery of the LAs. It states that the LAs will be delivered from 2021 unless specified criteria are met. What are these criteria?

The proposed spatial layout for LA3 has been finalised for this Cabinet meeting. At the Cabinet meeting of 24 June 2014 in response to a question, it was said that, although the spatial layout is being prepared by consultants working for the developers, it would be brought to full Council. Will it come before full Council as part of the master plan?

The open space at LA3 will include significant wildlife corridors. Have these corridors been assessed as being wide enough by appropriate experts?

It is recommended that the draft master plans be approved as material planning considerations. If they are approved how much weight would they be given in determining applications?

How can we as a Council prevent speculative and predatory applications being granted at the Las before the specified release date? If a developer put in an applications at LA3 tomorrow, what could we as a Council do to stop it?

The Team Leader Strategic Planning and Regeneration said the report follows on from that of the June Cabinet, when Members approved the Pre-Submission Site Allocations document (which was ratified by full Council on 9th July).

The Site Allocations is the principal document that will help deliver the Council's Core Strategy. It includes guidance on the delivery of the 6 green belt housing sites (called Local Allocations), plus a wide range of other sites and designations.

The Site Allocations is a statutory document and forms part of the Council's new 'Local Plan.'

The report seeks approval for draft master plans for the 6 Local Allocations. These master plans elaborate on the requirements set out in the Site Allocations document.

These master plans are not part of the statutory Local Plan, but will help ensure that the sites deliver what they should, where they should, and, as far as possible, reflect the concerns and aspirations of local residents.

They will be subject to a 6 week public consultation alongside the main Site Allocations document.

Following the close of this consultation, Officers will report back to Cabinet on the feedback received and whether or not any changes to the master plans are required prior to being finalised. We hope they will be formally adopted alongside the Site Allocations DPD, as they relate closely to this. This final approval will be via Full Council.

The master plans will be important material considerations when considering planning applications for the sites. The weight they can be accorded will increase following the forthcoming consultation and then increase again once formally adopted by the Council.

Regarding LA3 – West Hemel Hempstead, this site was subject to some discussion at the last Cabinet as part of the Site Allocations document itself.

The master plan had been drawn up with these concerns in mind. Its content had been shaped through the Task and Finish Group process and the indicative layout closely reflected that drawn up by the independent urban designer, Richard Eastham, following the consultation workshop last May.

The development principles within the masterplan also reflected feedback from public consultation on this site held last July – particularly with regard to issues such as drainage and highways.

In terms of Cllr Guest's specific points:

- Council has worked closely with specialist urban designers (Vincent and Gorbing) in drawing up the master plan. This has been a very constructive partnership and there is nothing in the draft master plan that Officers disagree with. Changes we have asked for have been made and Officers have written much of the text.
- Statements of Common Ground were drawn up between Council and developers to inform the Core Strategy examination. Such documents are not subject to public consultation – but are based on the facts of the site. Consultation has been undertaken separately – through the May 2013 workshop and July 2013 consultation on the master plan principles referred to above.

- The manned exhibitions will cover the Site Allocations document and the master plans(s) relevant to the area i.e. the exhibition at Warners End Community centre will cover the main Site Allocations document and the LA3 draft master plan.
- In terms of timing of release of the site, this is governed by policies in the Core Strategy and Site Allocations – not by the master plans. The criteria Cllr Guest asks about are in Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy and predominantly relate to the availability of a 5 year housing land supply.
- In terms of the details of the scheme, the scale and location of wildlife corridors reflects discussions with our Ecological adviser at HCC and the local highway authority are happy with the access points for the site as a whole and for the Gypsy and Traveller site in particular. The text on GP surgery provision reflects Officer discussions with the NHS. It is flexible enough to allow a number of options, inclusion on-site provision for a new GP surgery, or off-site expansion for Parkwood Drive.

Finally, as explained at the June Cabinet, Officers would continue to advise that having a Site Allocations document and associated master plans in place is the best way to:

- (a) guard against speculative green belt applications on other sites not allocated for development; and
- (b) ensure the Local Allocations are delivered as programmed and not before.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing asked if the Council could insist a GP surgery be provided on LA3.

The Team Leader Strategic Planning and Regeneration said this was difficult. The Council had had ongoing discussions with Parkwood Drive. The best the Council could do was ensure the master plan included the provision of a site where a GP surgery could go or ensure there were developer contributions that could fund it either on or off site. The Council was also partly dependent on what the NHS advised was needed. Mixed messages were being received at the moment. It was hoped the consultation would force the NHS to decide what their preferred option was and the final document could be more explicit regarding requirements.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said if a GP surgery was located on the site, a pharmacy would also be needed.

The Team Leader Strategic Planning and Regeneration said there was a requirement for a community hub but the Council could not insist on the occupiers of this. The requirements would be set out so that the necessary planning applications could go in when appropriate.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability asked if policy CS3 was strong enough to resist developers.

The Team Leader Strategic Planning and Regeneration said policy CS3 was in the Core Strategy and generated considerable debate at the examination as developers

were opposed to this policy that could hold back sites. The policy referred to the release date as set out in the allocations document. For 5 out of the 6 sites, it was assumed that would be post 2021.

The LA5 site could be brought forward. The criteria for considering whether there needed to be an earlier release related to the need to maintain a 5 year land supply. The Council had to deliver on other sites to hold back on the green belt sites and was confident it could robustly defend the release date as set out.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability asked if unexpected builds went towards the 5 year supply target.

The Team Leader Strategic Planning and Regeneration confirmed that was factored in. Assumptions had been made regarding windfall sites and there would always be sites that came forward unexpectedly and delays with others. The Council was in a good position provided it could deliver on the housing targets.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability referred to LA5 and the suggestion that only option 2 should be consulted on which she supported.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation on the Site Allocations DPD and the master plans to date has been carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), adopted by the Council in June 2006.

Advice from key stakeholders, such as the Local Education Authority, Thames Water and the local Highway Authority, has been sought where appropriate. Feedback on the Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan has also been significant in developing a clear understanding of local infrastructure needs. This advice is referred to within the relevant Background Issues paper that form part of the Site Allocations DPD evidence base and have informed the content of the master plans.

To help inform the master plans, workshops and/or meetings with local residents and other stakeholders were held in May 2013. For LA3, this was followed by public consultation (including a manned exhibition) in Jul 2013, to seek feedback on development principles for the site.

The Consultation Reports relating to the Core Strategy (Volumes 1-7) are also relevant.

In terms of internal processes, a task and finish group have advised on the preparation of the master plans. There have been reports to Cabinet at key stages in the preparation of the Local Planning Framework and the Planning and Regeneration Portfolio Holder has been kept apprised of progress.

Voting

None.

CA/096/14 STRATEGIC RISK REGISTER - REFRESH

Decision

That the revised approach to developing and managing the Strategic Risk Register set out in part three of the background report be approved.

Reason for Decision

To agree changes to the way in which the Council's Strategic Risk Register is compiled and managed in order to strengthen the links between risk management, the Corporate Plan, the Medium Term Financial Strategy and other strategic plans.

Implications

Financial

Effective strategic risk management reduces the time and associated costs of dealing with unforeseen events. It is therefore essential to have regard to risk management in maintain the Council's medium-term financial strategy.

Value for Money

Effective strategic risk management is a key tool in ensuring that services are provided as effectively, efficiently and economically as possible. By anticipating and mitigating risk, costly short term urgent actions are avoided as far as possible in delivering services.

Risk Implications

Risk Assessment completed on 5 July 2014.

Corporate Objectives

Corporate Governance.

Advice

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources said he had nothing to add to the report except to add that the Portfolio Holder for R3 – Disclosure of personal data in breach of the Data Protection Act was Councillor N Harden.

The Corporate Director Finance and Operations said the report was asking to make changes in the way the strategic risk register was compiled and managed. Risk management at operational level was fine but there was room for improvement at strategic level. The strategic risk register needed to be broadened in order to support the Corporate Plan.

Currently the focus was on risk exposure. The first proposal was to make it a risk and opportunity register to enable the focus to be on the risk of failing to achieve on the opportunities. The Council needed to ensure risk forecasting was extended to fit in with the medium term financial planning.

The Corporate Director said he was content with the way the Overview and Scrutiny Committees dealt with risk but the way risks were signed on and off the register needed to be looked at.

The first quarterly report of the new risk register would be going to Overview and Scrutiny Committees in September and all risks currently on the register would be reviewed.

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Sustainability said currently none of the risks on the register were allocated to her or to the Portfolio Holder for Housing.

The Corporate Director Finance and Operations said he had concerns that the risks on the register had not been refreshed quickly enough. The Council needed to keep on top of this in order not to miss opportunities. The risk assessment at strategic level was not so good. There was a separate operational risk register.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:
Linda Dargue, Insurance and Risk Manager;
The Budget Review Group; and
The Corporate Management Team.

Voting

None.

CA/097/14 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Decision

That, under s.100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 Schedule 12A Part 1, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, the public be excluded during the items in Part II of the Agenda for the meeting, because it was likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted, that, if members of the public were present during those items, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). Minutes CA/098/14 and CA099/14.

Local Government Act 1972, Schedule 12A, Part 1, Paragraph 3.

CA/098/14 THE BURY MUSEUM AND ART GALLERY PROJECT, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD

Decision

That the decision as detailed in the report be approved.

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Reason for Decision

To consider proposals for the use of The Bury by the Dacorum Heritage Trust as a new museum for the Borough and to seek approval for the Council's participation in a bid for funding to implement the project.

Implications

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Risk Implications

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Corporate Objectives

Community Capacity;
Regeneration.

Advice

The Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration introduced the report.

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Chris Taylor, Group Manager, Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Fiona Webb, Assistant Team Leader, Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Mike Evans, Group Manager, Commercial Assets and Property Management
Sue Lea, Tourism Officer
Shelly Ford, Town Centre Manager
Roger Hands, Chairman, Dacorum Heritage Trust Ltd.

Voting

None.

CA/099/14 MAYLANDS GATEWAY LAND DEVELOPMENT

Decision

That the decision as detailed in the report be approved.

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Reason for Decision

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Implications

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Risk Implications

Full details are in the part minute.

Corporate Objectives

The disposal of the land for commercial purposes will support the corporate objective of delivering regeneration in the borough.

Advice

The Assistant Director Planning, Development and Regeneration introduced the report.

Full details are in the part 2 minute.

Options and Why Options Rejected

No alternative options were considered.

Consultation

Consultation took place with:

Mark Gaynor, Corporate Director, Housing and Regeneration;
Martin Hone, Corporate Director, Finance and Operations;
James Deane, Assistant Director, Finance and Resources;
Ben Hosier, Group Manager, Commissioning, Procurement and Compliance;
Mark Brookes, Group Manager, Legal Governance;
Chris Taylor, Group Manager, Strategic Planning and Regeneration; and
Alex Chrusciak, Group Manager, Development Management and Planning.

Voting

None.

The meeting ended at 8.20 pm.