



Planning and Transportation Committee

Addenda

Date: TUESDAY, 19 JULY 2022
Time: 10.30 am
Venue: LIVERY HALL - GUILDHALL

4. **BOUNDARY HOUSE, 7-17 JEWRY STREET, LONDON EC3N 2EX – SECOND ADDENDUM**

Report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director

For Decision
(Pages 3 - 6)

5. **347 CRESCENT HOUSE, GOLDEN LANE ESTATE, EC1Y 0SN - ADDENDUM**

Report of the Chief Planning Officer and Development Director

For Decision
(Pages 7 - 22)

John Barradell
Town Clerk and Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 4

Committee: Planning and Transportation	Date: 19 July 2022
Subject: Addendum Report no.2 for Agenda item 4 Boundary House 7 - 17 Jewry Street London EC3N 2EX Application Ref. 21/00826/FULMAJ	Public

Additional Representation

1. A representation has been received today (18th July 2022) in support of the application, and a copy of this has been appended to this report.

Comments for Planning Application 21/00826/FULMAJ

Application Summary

Application Number: 21/00826/FULMAJ

Address: Boundary House 7 - 17 Jewry Street London EC3N 2EX

Proposal: Demolition of the building and the erection of a basement, ground plus part 14 storey and part six storey building plus plant comprising of a 311 bedroom hotel with a ground floor cafe/bar and roof top restaurant (Use Class C1) and office floorspace (Use Class E) at part ground and part first floor with ancillary community uses, hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking and associated works. |cr|

Case Officer: Pearl Figueira

Customer Details

Name: Karen Cook

Address: 76 Burton Court London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer made comments in support of the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I have spoken to the Architect Dan Burr at Sheppard Robson about his architectural proposal for Boundary House, Jewry Street.

I am familiar with the area as the practice I co-founded and where I have worked for most of the last decade has offices nearby, and I would often walk along Jewry Street to my own site, 22 Bishopsgate. Recently, I have served as Vice Chair to the Aldgate BID, whose four focus areas are to make this area more appealing, to keep everyone protected, create a stronger community, and be more welcoming.

This hotel proposal aligns with those objectives.

* Hotel use will enliven the street and the neighbourhood.

* The inclusion of a cultural and event space will help small businesses and the residents in the local community.

* Additional amenity and trees at roof level will give new public access to outdoor space.

* Jobs will be created to work in the hotel, and affordable rents in the ground floor space will help small businesses.

* A sensible embodied carbon balance of partial old stock retention and partial new build has been studied. The additional area requires additional foundations, at the same time making it feasible for the owner to offer public amenity space.

* I am personally familiar with the owner's two hotels in Prague, both of which operate with similar small business access and public café space, and enliven the pavement in a welcoming way.

* The architectural design gracefully treats the massing by introducing a gentle curve on Jewry

Street. The ground level adds strong character at the base in a pedestrian scale, with sculptural pre-cast vaulted arches, seating, and greenery. The brick and glazed brick fit well with the Lloyd Avenue Conservation Area, with textured details giving an intriguing light and shadow reading. The hotel rooms are on a clear span floor, making easier the future adaptability to other uses.

* In sum, the Boundary House design proposal would be a welcome addition to Jewry Street and to the City.

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning and Transportation Committee – 19 July 2022

Addendum for Agenda Items 5 and 5a – Planning application 22/00322/FULL, Listed building consent application 22/00332/LBC in respect of 347 Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate EC1Y 0SN

Amendments to the report

Under paragraph 143, delete all after ‘controllable and background ventilation through trickle vents.’

Additional representations

Statutory Consultee Representations

	Historic England
Comments	Remain of the view that this application for the pilot project would cause ‘less than substantial harm’ in the context of the NPPF, but at lower end of the scale. Whilst there is some risk of loss of historic fabric, note that consent is for a two-year period and there is provision to reverse the changes at the end of the pilot project. Reiterated that it is important that performance issues are addressed as a holistic approach to the repair of the building. Supports the application on heritage grounds and consider the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, particularly paras 200 and 202.
Officer Response	Noted.

Additional representations (objection)

6no. additional objections were received:

- 11.07.2022 David Henderson
- 14.07.2022 Patric Dickinson
- 15.07.2022 Benedict Langlands and Nikki Bell
- 17.07.2022 Barbican Association

These letters do not raise any new issues.

The following letters raised additional concerns as outlined herein:

- 09.07.2022 Nigel Smith

11.07.2022 Dr Philippe Rogueda

- 'Unbearable financial debt put on stakeholders'
- 'Legal implications relating to the City's leases of removal of walls'
- 'No mention in the Etude Energy Strategy of; main roof thermal insulation, undercroft soffit thermal insulation, mechanical ventilation outlets, flues penetrating external facades, considerations of upgrading flat heating and hot water'.

In response, the cost of the future project to stakeholders and the impact on the City's leases are not material planning considerations. With regards the Etude Energy Strategy, the considerations outlined in the representation do not form part of this application for window replacement, and would form part of a wider project for the Estate which would require further applications to be made.

Applicant and objector presentations to Members - 11 July 2022

Members' briefings from both the Applicant and Objectors took place on 11 July 2022. The following documents have been uploaded to Public Access and are available here: <https://www.planning2.cityoflondon.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=RAWKLHFHHO500>

- Objector presentation (organised under the Golden Lane Estate Residents Association)
- Applicant presentation
- Transcript of Applicant presentation
- Transcript of Objector presentation

Regulation 64(2) Handling Note

- Attached to this addendum and uploaded to Public Access



Ms Amy Williams
City of London Corporation
Guildhall, PO Box 270
London
EC2P 2EJ

Direct Dial: 020 7973 3765

Our ref: L01497273

12 July 2022

Dear Ms Williams

Arrangements for Handling Heritage Applications Direction 2021

347 CRESCENT HOUSE GOLDEN LANE ESTATE LONDON EC1Y 0SN Application No. 22/00323/LBC

Thank you for your letter of 1 July regarding further information on the above application for listed building consent. On the basis of the information available to date, we offer the following advice to assist your Authority in determining the application.

Historic England Advice

Historic England provided advice on this application on 26th May.

I note that additional information has been submitted as part of your reconsultation on these proposals. I have reviewed the revised Heritage Statement, revised Design Statement together with the additional drawings and Energy Strategy.

I remain of the view that this application for the pilot project would cause 'less than substantial harm' in the context of the NPPF.

Whilst there is some risk that some historic fabric will be lost in this flat, I recognise that application seeks to reduce this risk as far as possible. I also note that the consent is for a two year period and that there is provision to reverse the changes at the end of the pilot project. On this basis, any harm that would be caused by these works would be limited and at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial harm.

As I set out in my earlier letter, it is important that performance issues such as heating and ventilation are addressed as part of an holistic approach to the repair of the building as supported by the submitted Energy Strategy. I look forward to discussing this further as part of the on-review of the pilot as we seek to find a solution for the II* listed building as a whole that both respects the spirits of the CPB design and provides a sustainable future for the building and its residents.

Recommendation



4TH FLOOR, CANNON BRIDGE HOUSE, 25 DOWGATE HILL, LONDON EC4R 2YA

Telephone 020 7973 3700
HistoricEngland.org.uk





Historic England supports the application on heritage grounds.

We consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 200 and 202.

This response relates to designated heritage assets only. If the proposals meet the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service's published consultation criteria we recommend that you seek their view as specialist archaeological adviser to the local planning authority.

The full GLAAS consultation criteria are on our webpage at the following link:

<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/greater-london-archaeology-advisory-service/our-advice/>

Yours sincerely

Breda Daly

Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas

E-mail: [REDACTED]



Comments for Planning Application 22/00322/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00322/FULL

Address: 347 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SN

Proposal: Alterations to and replacement of existing single-glazed windows and framing structure for a temporary period of 2 years to sequentially test double and triple glazing options.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Henderson

Address: 324 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: I am objecting to this application on the following grounds.

- Historic and protected building fabric will be destroyed in the investigation of options which will leave 347 as an anomalous and unsympathetic frontage, for any other option than triple glazing.

- Triple glazed options are inappropriate in heritage terms and would constitute significant harm being done to the 2* listed facade.

- This seems to pre-empt any other solution than triple glazing. Other credible options including at least partial refurbishment of frames and replacement of glass with more lightweight, historically sympathetic yet thermally efficient alternatives.

I hope that officers will recommend refusal due to the risk of irreparable damage to heritage as well as the take a fully rounded and objective view of what should be the most appropriate solutions for restoration and improvement of the building fabric and its performance.

Yours Sincerely

David Henderson

324 Crescent House

Comments for Planning Application 22/00322/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00322/FULL

Address: 347 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SN

Proposal: Alterations to and replacement of existing single-glazed windows and framing structure for a temporary period of 2 years to sequentially test double and triple glazing options.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Patric Dickinson

Address: 239 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Other

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: The triple-glazed solution to the problem would be unnecessarily invasive and radical, injurious to the building's Grade 2* status and ruinously expensive for many of the Crescent House leaseholders who would have to bear the cost. It would also extend the timescale for the project to an unacceptable degree (a ludicrous amount of time has already passed since the matter was first considered). I have lived here for 25 years and it was entirely obvious in 1997 that work needed to be done on the windows (particularly on the Goswell side of the building). It is disgraceful that the Corporation has taken so long to address the problem - and absurd that it has taken so many years to reach this point. It would be a waste of time and resources putting triple-glazed windows into 347 Crescent House and altering the fabric of the internal walls (a process which is surely irreversible) when a simpler, less expensive and less time-consuming alternative (in the form of sophisticated double-glazing) is available. The City would be well advised to concentrate its efforts on a plan that can be put into effect in the immediate future - and one that finds favour with the people who actually live in Crescent House.

Comments for Planning Application 22/00322/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00322/FULL

Address: 347 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SN

Proposal: Alterations to and replacement of existing single-glazed windows and framing structure for a temporary period of 2 years to sequentially test double and triple glazing options.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Mr Benedict Langlands & Nikki Bell

Address: 119 Crescent House Goswell Road London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: We agree with the huge majority of other residents of Crescent House that the triple-glazed option proposed by The City is unnecessary. It is invasive, and will be radically, injurious to the building's heritage Grade 2* status. It will also be ruinously expensive for many of the Crescent House leaseholders who would have to bear the cost and it will extend the timescale for the project to a completely unacceptable degree. An extraordinary amount of time has already passed since the matter was first considered. It has been obvious for at least 30 years that work would be needed to the windows, particularly on the Goswell Road side of the building, and it is completely unacceptable that the Corporation has taken so long to address the problem. (It is precisely for reason of City's long delay in addressing this matter in an effective and responsible manner that in the meantime the original windows to our flat at 119 were of necessity, sensitively and effectively restored and fitted discretely with appropriate double glazing units).

It would be a waste of time and resources to install triple-glazed windows at 347 Crescent House and thereby altering the fabric of the internal walls and making an intervention that is effectively irreversible, when a simpler, less expensive and less time-consuming alternative (in the form of sophisticated double-glazing) is available and can be deployed where necessary and appropriate.

We object that a "one size fits all" solution is being proposed by the City and we ask the City to concentrate on a plan that respects the specific requirements and wishes of individual tenants and leaseholders pro-rata, on a flat by flat basis. After all this time the City should be proposing a plan that can be put into effect in the immediate future, that is supported by the overwhelming majority

of the people who actually live in Crescent House.



ASSOCIATION

THE RECOGNISED ASSOCIATION REPRESENTING THE INTERESTS OF
BARBICAN RESIDENTS

Gwyn Richards
Director of Development
and Chief Planning Officer
Environment Department
City of London Corporation
Box 270
Guildhall
EC2P 2EJ

16 July 2022

Dear Mr Richards,

22/00322/FULL and 22/00323/LBC

347 Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, EC1Y 0SN

Alterations to and replacement of existing single-glazed windows and framing structure for a temporary period of 2 years to sequentially test double and triple glazing options

First of all, apologies for its lateness but, despite these applications affecting a heritage asset within the Barbican and Golden Lane Conservation Area and adjoining the Barbican Estate, the Barbican Association (BA) – an RTA representing the owners and residents of over 2,000 flats - was not formally consulted. In any event, please accept this letter as BA's formal objection to the proposal and request that the applications be refused.

However, BA fully supports the proposals set out in the Crescent House Objectors' P&TC Members' briefing (Briefing). It is unfortunate that the officer's report to Committee (Report) doesn't specifically address the proposal's set out in the Briefing, in particular the use of vacuum double glazing and refurbishment of the woodwork.

It is now over 20 years since a schedule of refurbishment for the Golden Lane Estate (GLE) was approved by City Corporation. Since then, Great Arthur House has undergone extensive refurbishment but very little has been done to the other blocks, apart from the installation of condensing boilers with function taking precedence over form.

From my own experience of visiting flats in Crescent House over the last five years, it is more than obvious that the failure of City Corporation to address the problems of draughts, damp and mould, as well as pollution, has led to both illness and fuel poverty for residents. Proposing an experiment which may, or may not, produce a satisfactory solution in three or four years' time seems to be a gross abrogation of duty on the part of City Corporation both as a residential landlord and the custodian of its Grade II* listed building. The fact that the proposals have only been in development for two years (Report para 13) underlines that abrogation but, even worse, it only references the City of London Climate Action Strategy as the driver.

A number of residents have not only objected to the proposals but have provided the well thought out alternative Briefing. Although this was presented to P&TC Members and there are transcripts of the discussions, there is no indication of who attended, so many Members may well not even be aware of it, let alone its contents.



As the Briefing clearly states: “There is no evidence to suggest that the design of the windows has led them to become defective”. Indeed, the COL’s own commissioned survey concludes 90% of the facade is sound and 85% could be retained. The survey makes it clear that the main issue is lack of regular maintenance and that “the defects identified internally were minor and could be easily repaired by easing and adjusting or replacing handles for example”.

The proposal in the Briefing would deliver an almost immediate solution for all of the 159 flats and would be cheaper and more sustainable than City Corporation’s tentative proposals. As many of the 159 flats are held by leaseholders who will, no doubt, have to contribute financially to the proposals, surely, in the interests of transparency and respect to the resident community, their views should be properly considered.

It is also difficult to appreciate what will be achieved by making applications in respect of a single flat. Certainly the experience of Great Arthur House was that there were considerable differences in the concrete superstructure under the original cladding, which, of course, led to the refusal of the Supreme Court to refuse City Corporation’s attempt to overturn the Court of Appeal’s decision in favour of leaseholders. Surely, no one wants a repetition of that case.

In addition, even if successful, there would have to be further applications, planning permissions and listed building consents for the other flats, as well as renewing the current applications. Having significantly altered one Grade II* listed flat, how does City Corporation intend to address changes in policy, whether by government, the Mayor or City Corporation itself, which may prevent similar treatment of the other flats?

The need for the importation of tropical timber being one obvious problem, the availability of more satisfactory alternatives being another. The Briefing refers to City Corporation’s intention to increase carbon emissions despite its 2027 Scope 1 net zero target. Whilst perhaps not significant with one flat, this will not be the case with the whole block.

However, if the proposal is unsuccessful, what then? Historic England’s approach seems rather blasé and contradicts the opinion of one resident objector which demands proper consideration. It is vital that “something is done” but that has to be now and in a way which won’t harm the Grade II* building at all, certainly when a more sustainable and economic alternative, which won’t cause any harm and can be delivered now, is available.

Best regards,



Fred Rodgers
Planning and Licensing sub-Committee
The Barbican Association



100 Breton House, Barbican EC2Y 8PQ

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Williams, Amy](#)
Subject: Further Objection re Planning Application 22/00323/FULL & 22/00323/LBC Flat 347, Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate EC1Y 0SL
Date: 09 July 2022 12:44:51

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL

Attention Amy Williams

FW: FURTHER OBJECTION Planning Application 22/00323/FULL & 22/00323/LBC Flat 347, Crescent House, Golden

I have previously lodged my objection in my letter to you dated 15 June

Recently the applicants have submitted revised and additional information

I have perused same and had no wish to alter or withdraw my previous letter of objection. That letter of objection stands

However the applicants have now submitted an **Energy Report prepared by Etude**

I have read the report and the Conclusion concerns itself wholly and solely with Façade Refurbishment

Within the body of the report there is some passing reference to planned upgrades (of the nature list below) but no mention or recommendation of these is contained in the Conclusion

It solely discusses façade refurbishment
No mention of the following

1. Main roof thermal insulation
- 2 Undercroft soffit thermal insulation
3. Mechanical ventilation outlets required for internal kitchens and bathrooms
4. Flue ways penetrating the external façades (both existing and proposed)
- 5 Consideration or comment regarding the City of Londons, proposals for upgrading flat heating and hot water

Without full consideration of these major elements the value of ETUDE's contribution is severely limited

Any proposed upgrading of the Crescent House building envelope to minimise heat loss and address energy sustainability **has to include consideration of the above elements**

In considering this application therefore you cannot give serious credence to the severely limited and consequently flawed nature of this report

For these reasons I urge you to reject this application

Nigel Smith

[Nigel Smith](#)
[Chartered Surveyor & Chartered Architect](#)
[MSc Dip\(Arch\) FRICS RIBA](#)
[Late of 338 Crescent House](#)
[Now of 56 Basterfield House](#)
[Golden Lane Estate](#)

Comments for Planning Application 22/00322/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 22/00322/FULL

Address: 347 Crescent House Golden Lane Estate London EC1Y 0SN

Proposal: Alterations to and replacement of existing single-glazed windows and framing structure for a temporary period of 2 years to sequentially test double and triple glazing options.

Case Officer: Amy Williams

Customer Details

Name: Dr Philippe Rogueda

Address: 342 Crescent House London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: On behalf of the Crescent House Stakeholders.

The stakeholders (tenants, residents, leaseholders) of Crescent House (CH) object to the planning application for the pilot project and urge the planning committee to reject it. We want to alert the planning committee of many flaws in the application.

We agree that the windows need refurbishment but not replacement.

We object to: the need for a pilot project that will delay the project roll out to the rest of CH; the unjustified conclusion that triple glazing is the best option to meet low carbon target; the fraught justifications for new frames when 85% them are sound; the lack of a cost-benefits analysis; the overestimated energy benefits; the absence of an estimate of the carbon footprint of the frames replacement and triple glazing; the wonton destruction of the fabric of this Grade II* building; the failure to follow the City Listed Building Management Guideline 2013; the unbearable financial debt it will put on all Stakeholders; the severe disruption to residents' lives; and to the misrepresentation that this project is a windows project when its final aim is to replace the facades of CH. Destroying the walls has legal implications and risks regarding the City's leases which is not commented upon.

The stakeholders ask for the application to be rejected or limited to the first part of the proposed work: repairs. We favour a repair scheme with the installation of a double or vacuum glass. This is the least disruptive and costly option: financially, environmentally, socially and will preserve this Grade II* heritage.

CITY OF LONDON CORPORATION

TEMPLATE FOR REGULATION 64(2) HANDLING NOTE

Application Reference: 22/00322/FULL

Site Address: 347 Crescent House, Golden Lane Estate, London, EC1Y 0SN

Proposal “(the Proposal)”: Replacement of existing single-glazed windows to Flat 347 with triple glazed windows, together with installation of insulation to internal walls of flat. Temporary planning permission for 2 years.

1. Background

- 1.1. Regulation 64(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (“the EIA Regulations”) requires that where a proposal for EIA development is brought forward by the City of London Corporation and the City of London Corporation will also be responsible for determining that application for planning permission, they must make appropriate administrative arrangements to ensure that there is a functional separation, when performing any duty under the EIA Regulations, between the persons bringing forward the proposal for development and the persons responsible for determining that proposal.
- 1.2. This note sets out the arrangements which must be adopted to ensure compliance with the EIA Regulations.
- 1.3. This note also applies to applications for planning permission for development which is not EIA development made by the City of London Corporation as Applicant to the City of London Corporation as Local Planning Authority.

2. Overarching Principles to be observed in handling the Proposal

- 2.1. The Local Planning Authority must assess the Proposal in the same way as if it was submitted by any other applicant. It will be assessed and determined solely on the material planning considerations, disregarding any financial or other benefits to the City of London Corporation as Applicant. If more information is required it will be sought from the Applicant notwithstanding potential delay or cost consequences for the Applicant.
- 2.2. The Local Planning Authority function will be undertaken wholly independently of the Applicant/Promoter functions, acting impartially and objectively.
- 2.3. There will be no discussion or communication about the Proposal between the officers and members carrying out the Local Planning Authority function in respect of the Proposal and the officers and members carrying out the Applicant/Promoter functions in respect of the Proposal, other than formal communications appropriate to the application process such as would occur with any other Applicant.

2.4. No officer or member carrying out the Applicant/Promoter function in relation to the Proposal may give any instructions to or put any pressure whether direct or indirect upon any person acting or assisting in the discharge of the Local Planning Authority function.

3. Arrangements for handling the Proposal

3.1. Local Planning Authority Functions

Gwyn Richards (Interim Development Director and Chief Planning Officer) is the lead officer responsible for undertaking the Local Planning Authority functions arising in respect of the determination of the planning application including pre-application advice.

He is (or has been) assisted by the following officer team:

Department	Officers
Planning (Including Access)	Amy Williams Joanna Parker David Horkan Ben Ely Kurt Gagen
Transportation and Highways	
City Public Realm	
Open Spaces	
Culture	
Legal	Fleur Francis
Sustainability Planning officer	Kerstin Kane
Planning Policy	

The Local Planning Authority officer team will report to the Planning and Transportation Committee which will be responsible for making the decision on the planning application. No member of a committee with responsibility for promoting the Proposal should sit on Planning and Transportation Committee nor be a member of any sub-committee when it is considering the planning application for the Proposal. The

members of the Planning and Transportation Committee who are to sit on that committee or any sub-committee when determining the planning application shall be identified as soon as is practicable following receipt of the planning application.

3.2. Applicant/Promoter (non-Local Planning Authority) Functions

The officers, consultants and Committees who are (or have been) involved in the promotion of the Proposal are as follows:

Departments	Officers
Property Projects Group	Jason Hayes (Head of Major Works) Dawn Harris (Project Manager) Jason Crawford (Asset Manager) Peter Smith (no longer employed by City Corporation)
Open Spaces	N/A
Culture	N/A
Legal	Andrew Cusack Laura Goddard
Communications	External - Thorncliffe ‘Your Shout’ Internal - Snr Communications Officer Sandra Brown

Committees	Community and Children’s Services
Consultants/Agent	Ben Rogers (Grade Planning) Studio Partington (Architect)

	Keegans (Quantity Surveyor) Thorncliffe ‘Your Shout’(Communication Consultant)
--	---

3.3. Implementation of Arrangements

- 3.3.1. The persons identified at 3.1 and 3.2 will be reviewed regularly and updated to reflect any changes in responsibilities or roles, and any such changes shall be noted on an updated Handling Note.
- 3.3.2. The officers identified at paragraph 3.1 and any members of the Planning and Transportation Committee identified as those who will sit on the committee or any sub-committee to determine the planning application shall not engage in any discussion or communication in relation to the planning application with other officers or members save that the officers identified in paragraph 3.1 shall be entitled to communicate with the officer/s identified in paragraph 3.2 as the agent for the planning application and only in the same way as those officers identified in paragraph 3.1 would communicate with any person acting as an agent in relation to planning applications in general, and save when officers identified in paragraph 3.1 are conducting formal consultation on the planning application.
- 3.3.3. Persons identified at 3.2 must not engage in any discussion or communication in relation to the planning application with the persons identified in paragraph 3.1, save that person/s identified as the agent in paragraph 3.2 may communicate with the officers identified in paragraph 3.1 in the same way and on the same basis as the agent in relation to planning applications in general.
- 3.3.4. The Handling Arrangements will be published and will be included within the publicly available planning application documents both in hard copy and electronically.
- 3.3.5. The Handling Arrangements will be circulated to all persons identified at 3.1 and 3.2, and recirculated to them following any amendments.
- 3.3.6. Any communications, documents or other information generated by those exercising the Local Planning Authority function which would not normally be shared with an Applicant should be marked “CONFIDENTIAL: LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY ONLY”, and should not be stored on file space accessible to any person other than those exercising the Local Planning Authority function (unless this is authorised by the Interim Development Director and Chief Planner and he has satisfied himself that, where applicable, such disclosure would be compliant with the EIA Regulations).