

**ROYSTON AND DISTRICT COMMITTEE  
1 JULY 2020**

**\*PART 1 – PUBLIC DOCUMENT**

**TITLE OF REPORT: ANNUAL UPDATE ON S106 OBLIGATIONS FOR HITCHIN COMMITTEE**

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION MANAGER

EXECUTIVE MEMBER: PLANNING AND TRANSPORT

COUNCIL PRIORITY: ATTRACTIVE AND THRIVING

**1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report provides Members of the Royston and District Committee with the annual update on the details of progress made on all Section 106 Obligations within the Royston and District Committee area during the financial year 2019/20.
- 1.2 The format of the information presented reflects the diminishing role of discretionary Section 106 funds, that unilateral undertakings are very rarely received and changing restrictions around the collection and distribution of funds. The information provided in the associated tables reflects this. Tables 1 and 1a set out the details of all new Section 106 Obligations entered into between developers and the Council during the financial year 2019/20 within the Royston and District area. Table 2 sets out details of all payments received from developers relating to developments and earlier agreements and identifies which projects the money has been received for, again a record of the financial year 2019/20. Table 3 sets out details of remaining funds that have yet to be allocated for the Royston and District area (see appendix 1).
- 1.3 The report also sets out the current position with respect to changing legislation, how future planning policy may reflect this and outlines progress of a revised strategy to seek wider community and ward Member involvement in identifying relevant projects at the earliest possible stage in the planning process.

**2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 That Members note the content of this report.

- 2.2 That Members agree that a report shall continue to be presented on an annual basis to the Area Committee, which sets out full records of all Section 106 activity for the preceding financial year and which reflects changes in legislation and practice.
- 2.3 That, other than where a contribution has been negotiated for a specific purpose or project, Ward Members of the area where the Section 106 Obligation or Unilateral Undertaking funding is generated and the Area Committee be consulted prior to funding being allocated away from that area. Members must note that the discretionary funds are rapidly diminishing and will not be replaced under current legislation and practice, for reasons that are set out in this report.

### **3. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 3.1 To ensure that there is a robust system for negotiating and managing Section 106 Obligations and Unilateral Undertakings, that records activity for each financial year and is placed in the public domain.
- 3.2 To ensure that the process is kept under constant review and Member scrutiny and that the risk associated with this activity is managed in an appropriate manner.

### **4. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 It is not considered that an alternative viable option is available at this time for the Council to manage and maintain records of Section 106 agreements and Unilateral Undertakings.
- 4.2 Starting in December 2020 the Ministry for Housing Communities and Local Government will require each local authority in England to provide annual Infrastructure Funding Statements (IFS). Such statements will require a full annual audit of all S106 activity throughout the District and the information to be provided will be very similar to that which is presented to each Area Committee but will of course cover the whole District and cannot be differentiated into Area Committee records. Following the preparation and publication of the first IFS in December 2020 it will in my view be necessary to review how this information is reported to future Area Committees.

### **5. CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT MEMBERS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS**

- 5.1 This report is being presented to each Area Committee so that all Ward Members are fully aware of the progress and updated in relation this matter. No external organisations have been consulted.

### **6. FORWARD PLAN**

- 6.1 This report does not contain a recommendation on a key decision and has not been referred to in the Forward Plan.

## **7. BACKGROUND**

- 7.1 The Council introduced a Planning Obligations supplementary planning document (SPD) in 2006 giving a formula for developers to calculate what their Section 106 costs might be. Its introduction has led to the majority of sites within the District since 2006 contributing towards the cost of infrastructure. Unilateral undertakings are a particular type of obligation under Section 106 that are only signed by the developer, instead of bilaterally by both the Council, and the developer.
- 7.2 The main objective of the SPD was to ensure that the additional demands upon infrastructure, services and facilities from new development are provided for and are put in place at the right time to contribute to the Council's priorities and capital programme.
- 7.3 The Community Infrastructure levy (CIL) regulations came into force in April 2010. It is unlikely that the Council will adopt a Community Infrastructure Charging Schedule for the foreseeable future and certainly not for strategic sites and sites which have specific local infrastructure demands. A decision whether to adopt a CIL charging schedule will also depend on regulations at that time, bearing in mind that the government has revised CIL regulations every year since their inception in 2010 giving no consistency to how a local planning authority can plan its implementation.
- 7.4 The implementation of the changes to the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations introduced in April 2015 with regard to the pooling limits has meant that the 'tariff' system used to calculate contributions as set out in the SPD is now principally used only as a negotiating tool associated with a specific infrastructure project, otherwise it has little or no relevance. The pooling restriction was however lifted on 1 September 2019.
- 7.5 It has been agreed previously that annual reports on the status of the agreements be presented to the Area Committees so that Members are fully aware of the infrastructure projects the contributions are used towards in their particular area.

## **8. RELEVANT CONSIDERATIONS**

### **8.1 Current legislation**

- 8.1.1 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations set out three statutory tests which must be satisfied in order for planning obligations to be required. These tests are also set out within The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which came into force on 28 March 2012 and repeated in the latest version of the NPPF (February 2019). The three statutory which all S106 Obligations must comply with are as follows:

- **Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms;**
- **Directly related to the proposed development; and**
- **Fair and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development**

8.1.2 The pooling limit introduced in April 2015 applied to any obligation which was completed after 6 April 2010. From 6 April 2015, in the determination of a planning application after this date the local planning authority was not allowed to request S106 funding for an 'infrastructure project' or 'types of infrastructure' if more than 5 obligations since 6 April 2010 have already been committed to that project.

A 'type of infrastructure' relates to the categories set out in the Council's SPD and is as follows:-

- community centre/halls;
- leisure facilities;
- play space;
- pitch sport;
- informal open space;
- sustainable transport; and
- waste collection facilities and recycling.

There is also provision for contributions towards public realm from non-residential development.

8.1.3 The Housing White Paper (February 2017) indicated that CIL was to be reviewed in Autumn 2017 in preparation for the Budget which was to include reform of S106 Obligations. This review was completed in September 2018 and one of its key recommendations was to abolish the 'pooling' restriction as it has the effect of preventing local planning authorities from considering the cumulative effect of developments on key services and infrastructure. The government had indicated that it would introduce legislation to remove the pooling restrictions which would represent a positive reform by providing more scope for Section 106 Obligations but also less incentive to adopt a CIL tariff as a result. The limitation was finally lifted by revisions to relevant regulations on 1 September 2019. The implication for this loosening of restrictions are being considered by officers and will be reflected in the forthcoming new Supplementary Planning Document relating to Planning Obligations. The draft document was presented to Cabinet in January 2020 and following a consultation exercise the final version will be presented to Cabinet in July 2020. Due to the postponement of the 2011-2031 Local Plan, the new SPD cannot be adopted until the new Local Plan is adopted, so any resolution to adopt the SPD will need to await the completion of the new Local Plan.

## 8.2. Implications for the collecting of infrastructure contributions

8.2.1 The pooling restrictions related to the determination of planning applications after 6 April 2015 but it did not prevent:-

- i) the pooling of the contributions from more than 5 obligations which have been completed since 6 April 2010. This means that already collected S106 money from obligations after 6 April 2010 can still be pooled more than 5 times and spent after 6 April 2015. I would also confirm that this does not affect any funds that remain from prior to 2010 which to date have either not been allocated to a specific project or the implementation and spend is beyond 2015.
- ii) payments being collected after 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015 provided the obligations were before this date and they can be allocated as at present.

8.2.2 I can confirm that since 6 April 2010 more than 5 obligations have already been agreed breaching the pooling limit on each of the categories in the SPD and from April 2015 no further obligations have been agreed using the 'tariff system' within the SPD.

8.2.3 As the agreement to contributions now relate to specific infrastructure projects it is necessary for the Local Planning Authority to be a party to any agreement so the present and future use of Unilateral Undertakings will be limited and only used in exceptional circumstances.

8.2.4 Negotiations to seek contributions in accordance with the legislation and in particular the tests continue but, as reported in previous years, there have been more challenges by developers citing amongst other matters the viability of a scheme and the specific need for the contributions.

8.2.5 Over the last few years, since the changes to the regulations Officers have progressed a limited number of agreements for major developments with the emphasis being the justification in order that the authority are not open to challenge. The agreed heads of terms for any application are set out in reports to the Planning Control Committee or delegated file notes associated with each planning application.

8.2.6 Some Members may recall that in 2017 I advised at the Area Committee meeting that the government had updated and modified the Planning Practice Guidance as of the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2014 and it stated that no contributions should be sought from developments of 10 or less units and in certain designated rural areas the Council may apply a lower threshold of 5 units or less where no affordable housing or tariffs should be sought. This restriction remains in place. This means that in the vast majority of circumstances as well as the statutory restrictions outlined above the Council can only seek financial contributions from developments of more than 10 dwellings.

### 8.3 Use of existing funds

- 8.3.1 The three tests set out in paragraph 8.1.1 equally apply when allocating the monies received for the defined purpose. The applicant who has entered into a Section 106 Obligation or a unilateral undertaking has a right to seek a refund if these monies are not used for the appropriate purposes identified in either the specific agreement or the adopted SPD. Moreover, most Section 106 Obligations contain a 10 year pay back clause which the Council must meet if it has been unable to spend / allocate the funds to the identified project.
- 8.3.2 The important issue in this respect is that the spending of the contributions must be to **mitigate the effect of the development** i.e. that is the only reason for seeking contributions in the first instance.
- 8.3.3 An example of this would be an increased use and pressure on any play space within the vicinity of the site which may require additional equipment. There is no restriction for drawing down contributions from both Section 106 and UUs for a specific project subject to the recent changes in legislation.
- 8.3.4 To summarise the overall strategy for the spending of this money is principally by way of the Council's adopted capital projects and strategies e.g. the Greenspace Management Strategy which provides the background and justification for projects.
- 8.3.5 For infrastructure projects in Hitchin, outside of the control of this Council, where a commitment is shown and there is a justifiable need to improve the infrastructure, a project plan is required together with an order or receipt, before the contributions would be payable. Finally, other projects have been identified and come forward through local Councillors or the Community Development Officers.

### 8.4 SECTION 106 ACTIVITY FOR ROYSTON AND DISTRICT 2019/20

- 8.4.1 **Table 1:** All new Section 106 Obligations entered into for Royston and District during the financial year 2019/20 and up to now:

Area	Planning ref	Site Address and development	Date of Agreement
Royston	17/04419/FP	Land South Of 1A Lower Gower Road, Royston, Hertfordshire Demolition of existing buildings to facilitate the erection of 16 residential dwellings with associated access, parking, landscaping and amenity (design amended 16/11/2018).	27.09.19
Royston	17/00110/1	Land Surrounding Burloes Cottages Newmarket Road, Royston Outline application for up to 325 dwellings including single site access	28.02.20

		and temporary construction access, with all other matters reserved including landscaping (including open space, and pedestrian links), appearance, layout and scale.	
Ashwell	16/01797/1	Land Rear Of 4-14, Claybush Road Ashwell 30 dwellings together with associated access, parking, amenity and open space. (Site layout amended by amended plans received 29/01/17 , 23/03/17 and 22/08/17). (Please note plans received on 23/03/17 are only a minor site layout alteration).	15.08.19

8.4.2 **Table 1a:** Agreed Section 106 provisions within the Obligations referenced in table 1 (NHDC services only). Please note that these funds are only paid to the Council as development commences. If development does not go ahead these funds will not be paid.

Town	Planning Ref	Date of Agreement	Amount	Details
Royston	17/04419/FP	27.09.19	£1,136(index linked)	On site waste collection and recycling facilities. To be transferred to Waste Collection and Recycling Shared Service
Royston	17/00110/1	28.02.20	£123,027(index linked)	Health Contribution towards the proposed redevelopment of Royston Hospital
Royston	17/00110/1	28.02.20	£22,000(index linked)	Management and maintenance of on site play area
Royston	17/00110/1	28.02.20	£75,000(index linked)	Play space: New play equipment at Newmarket Road play area
Royston	17/00110/1	28.02.20	£165,000(index linked)	Play and Open Space: towards upgrade of open space at Newmarket Road
Royston	17/00110/1	28.02.20	£32,906(index linked)	On site waste collection and recycling facilities. To be transferred to Waste Collection and Recycling Shared Service
Ashwell	16/01797/1	15.08.19	£75,000(index linked)	Contribution towards proposed redevelopment of Ashwell Pavillion
Ashwell	16/01797/1	15.08.19	£2,130(index linked)	On site waste collection

			linked)	and recycling facilities. To be transferred to Waste Collection and Recycling Shared Service
--	--	--	---------	--

8.4.3 **Table 2:** Payments received during financial year 2019/20 in relation to NHDC services following earlier Section 106 Obligations:

<b>Town</b>	<b>Application details</b>	<b>Date of agreement</b>	<b>Benefits secured</b>	<b>Date received and amount</b>	<b>Payback date</b>	<b>details</b>
Royston	14/02485/1 Land east of Garden Walk and north of Newmarket Road, Garden Walk, Royston Residential development and community open space with new access onto the A505 (all matters landscaping, layout, access, scale, appearance reserved)	07.12.16	Community Open Space Management Contribution This shall be applied towards the on-going management and maintenance of the Community Open Space	26.11.19 £147,208.85	26.11.29	These funds cannot be spent until the land is transferred to NHDC as per the terms of the Agreement services
	14/02485/1 Land east of Garden Walk and north of Newmarket Road, Garden	07.12.16	Community Open Space The land which shall be restored as a chalk grassland and which	27.08.19 £73,604.43	27.08.29	To be applied towards cost of carrying out initial restoration works to the



	Walk, Royston Residential development and community open space with new access onto the A505 (all matters landscaping, layout, access, scale, appearance reserved)		shall thereafter be used for the purposes of an open space for the community. The sum of £66,500 (index linked)			Community Open Space and its establishment
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

8.4.4 **Table 3:** Current held funds for Royston and District area that remain to be allocated - see appendix 1.

8.4.5 From the tables set out in appendix 1 and for ease of reference I set out below a list of the remaining discretionary funds which have not been allocated under each category for the Royston and District area:

**Royston:**

**Community Centres:** £107,937.71

**Health:** £78,468.75

**Leisure Centres:** £108,913.17

**Open Space:** £117,696.55 (excludes Newmarket Road, Community Open Space funds listed above in table 2)

**Police Contribution:** £11,508.75

**Sustainable Transport:** £128,107.94 (The Council's Transport Policy Officer is examining the feasibility of projects which may draw on these funds)

**Ashwell:**

**Community Centres:** £6,355.79

**Informal Open Space:** £2,576.79

**Pitch Sport Provision:** £5,884.72

**Play Space:** £26,574.83

**Sustainable Transport:** £15,913.32

**Barley:**

**Leisure Centres:** £595.2  
**Informal Open Space:** £315.81  
**Pitch Sport:** £288.18  
**Play Space:** £584.25  
**Sustainable Transport:** £1,153.38

**Reed:**

**Community Centres:** £550.67

**Therfield:**

**Community Centres:** £1817.92  
**Informal Open Space:** £1,176.53  
**Leisure Centres:** £1,965.12  
**Pitch Sports:** £1,073.59  
**Play Space:** £2176,60  
**Sustainable Transport:** £3,153.38

8.4.6 As can be seen from these tables, as a result of CIL regulation restrictions, the number of new S106 Obligations entered into in the last financial year is very low. Also the discretionary pot and available funds where some discretion is allowed as to which projects can be funded is diminishing and will not be replaced without a significant loosening of the CIL regulations. As a result of these realities and without an adopted CIL tariff the Council must look at other strategies to maximise the return of S106 funding for the benefit of our communities.

**8.4.7 NEXT STEPS**

8.4.8 To maximise future returns from S106 Obligations focus must turn to identifying relevant projects before the grant of planning permission and it is this area where work is on-going to improve the level of Member and community involvement

8.4.9 Officers are working with relevant Executive Members to establish a more effective ward councillor consultation process for each qualifying planning application in their areas. A balance will need to be struck between enabling Councillors to remain neutral on the outcome of the planning application (importantly not fettering their discretion if they sit on the Planning Control Committee) whilst at the same time assisting officers in identifying local projects which may benefit from S106 funds.

8.4.10 For Parished areas and areas with Town Council representation this new process will also involve greater involvement with the Parish and Town Councils, again striking a balance between allowing Parish and Town Council's to express their opinion on the merits of an planning application proposal but also seeking their input both as identifiers of potential projects and the deliverers of those projects in many instances.

- 8.4.11 For the remaining but ever diminishing discretionary funds Community Development Officers will continue to work with the Development and Conservation Manager and S106 Monitoring and Compliance Officer to distribute these funds to relevant organisations who are able to deliver key infrastructure for the benefit of the wider community.

## **9. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 The Council requires Section 106 Agreements and Unilateral Undertakings where appropriate under the Town and Country Planning Acts where development involves matters which cannot be controlled by planning conditions. There are strict rules which govern the negotiation and implementation of matters covered by Section 106 Agreements and in essence these need to relate to the development proposed both in scale and kind. The Section 106 SPD has been formulated with those principles in mind and the implementation of the SPD is being undertaken in a satisfactory manner.

## **10. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 Interest accruing on S106 receipts is pooled corporately and included in the total income arising from investments. This is the case with all of the Council's 'reserves' and investment interest is then used to contribute towards General Fund revenue expenditure. Risk arising from interest rate fluctuations is considered in the Corporate Business Planning process and is a consideration when setting the level of balances. There may be occasions where the S106 agreement requires a refund with interest in the event that prescribed works are not acted upon.
- 10.2 The financial implications of a planning permission may be agreed but if the planning permission is not implemented the monies will not be received.
- 10.3 When negotiating monies for capital schemes there may be a delay in implementing those schemes which may result in a change of cost.

## **11. RISK IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 The work associated with the implementation of the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and the Section 106 SPD is currently contained within the existing work plans and resources. A review of the document has been incorporated within the work programme for the Local Plan following the resolution of Cabinet in July 2103 not to pursue a Community Infrastructure Levy for this Council for the time being.

## **12 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 12.1 The Equality Act 2010 came into force on the 1<sup>st</sup> October 2010, a major piece of legislation. The Act also created a new Public Sector Equality Duty, which came into force on the 5<sup>th</sup> April 2011. There is a General duty, described in 12.2, that public bodies must meet, underpinned by more specific duties which are designed to help meet them.

12.2 In line with the Public Sector Equality Duty, public bodies must, in the exercise of its functions, give **due regard** to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not.

12.3 There are not considered to be any direct equality issues arising from this report.

### **13. SOCIAL VALUE IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 As the recommendations made in this report do not constitute a public service contract, the measurement of 'social value' as required by the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 need not be applied, although equalities implications and opportunities are identified in the relevant section at paragraphs 12.

### **14. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 There are no known Environmental Implications associated with this report.

### **15 HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

15.1 There are no new human resource implications arising from the contents of this report as the monitoring of Section 106 and Unilateral Undertakings is currently undertaken using existing staff resources.

### **16. APPENDICES**

16.1 **Appendix 1 - Table 5:** Current held funds for Royston and District

### **17. CONTACT OFFICERS**

#### ***Report Author***

17.1 Simon Ellis, Development and Conservation Manager  
01462 474264 [simon.ellis@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:simon.ellis@north-herts.gov.uk)

#### ***Contributors***

17.2 Stephanie Blunt, Section 106 Monitoring and Compliance Officer  
01462 474308 [stephanie.blunt@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:stephanie.blunt@north-herts.gov.uk)

17.3 Dean Fury, Community Support Accountant  
01462 474509 [dean.fury@north-herts.gov.uk](mailto:dean.fury@north-herts.gov.uk)

**18. BACKGROUND PAPERS**

- 18.1 Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document adopted November 2006 and monitoring report.