

London Borough of Sutton

THE EXECUTIVE – 16 FEBRUARY 2009

REFERENCES FROM PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP

4. CORE PLANNING STRATEGY- REPRESENTATIONS FOLLOWING PUBLICATION & PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SUBMISSION

Ward Location: N/A	Executive Councillor: Lyn Gleeson
---------------------------	------------------------------------------

Extract from the Minutes of the meeting held on 10/2/09

“Further to Minutes 23/08, 36/08 and 60/08 the Advisory Group considered a summary of the main issues raised by respondents following the publication of the draft Core Planning Strategy (CPS). Members were reminded that, at this stage, the only issues that could be raised by respondents were in relation to the document’s ‘soundness’.

At the time the report had been written, 38 respondents had made 241 representations. Details of these were set out in a summary of responses, together with the officers’ comments and recommendations. 3 of the submissions had been received after the consultation had closed and were, therefore, not duly made. However, the Council could decide to consider these, if it wished, and it was recommended that they should be considered, for completeness.

22 respondents had raised substantive issues in response to the consultation, which would need to be resolved by the Inspector through the Examination process. The main issues raised were in respect of the proposed de-designation of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), Biodiversity, housing supply, housing density, affordable housing, employment land and town centres.

A supplementary report had been submitted on a further, late representation received in respect of the designation of the former Orchard Hill Hospital and BIBRA sites as ‘Major Developed Sites’, which was on the same grounds as one previously received from Mr Carl Brown. This further representation had been made to, and supported by, the Carshalton & Clockhouse Local Committee. The Advisory Group endorsed the officer’s recommendations that it should be considered, that no change should be made to the Draft Plan in response but it should be submitted to the Planning Inspector for consideration in relation to the forthcoming Examination. Sally Blomfield clarified that this late representation had been made by Mr Liffen as an individual and not on behalf of the Carshalton-on-the-Hill Residents’ Association. Mr Ray Liffen was present at the meeting, and was allowed by the Chair to comment and ask a question.

The GLA had submitted 17 representations, the majority of which related to issues of clarity. However, there were 2 areas where the GLA had indicated that the draft Strategy was not in general conformity with the London Plan. These were the strategic issues of the proposed loss of MOL and consequent impact on Biodiversity. These issues would have to be considered by the Inspector at Examination. The GLA had indicated that it wished to deal with these matters by appearing at the Hearings.

The GoL had said that there did not appear to be any critical soundness issues with the draft Strategy and considered that the Plan was ‘Justified’ and ‘Effective’. They had raised 5 issues in respect of the final test of ‘soundness’, i.e. whether the Plan was consistent with national policy, and identified some points where amendments would improve the understanding or clarity of the Plan.

A number of typographical errors, mapping and other minor changes had been identified which would help with the legibility of the Plan and also address some of the representations. These were set out in a schedule of proposed changes, which was tabled at the meeting. These types of minor changes could be made without consultation. Subject to approval, they would be listed in a schedule to accompany the DPD when it was submitted to the Planning Inspector, with a request that s/he consider recommending the changes as part of their report. It was noted that some additional, minor changes would be required to this schedule, prior to its submission.

5 respondents had indicated that they would wish to attend the Hearings to support their representations that the Plan was not sound, including the GLA. The remaining respondents had either said that their responses could be dealt with by way of written representations or had not indicated how they wished to progress.

Resolved: To note the responses received to the consultation on the draft Core planning Strategy – Submission Report and **RECOMMEND** The Executive:

(i) To not make any alterations to the Core Planning Strategy, Proposed Submission in respect of the representations by Mr Liffen regarding Green Belt/Major Developed sites issues;

(ii) To refer the Supplementary Report on the additional representation from Mr Liffen to the Carshalton & Clockhouse Local Committee for their consideration.

(iii) To delegate authority to the Executive Head of Planning, Transport & Highways, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Advisory Group, to make any further minor amendments to the draft Strategy prior to its submission to full Council for approval;

(iv) To **RECOMMEND** full Council:

- a. To refer the four representations that were not duly made within the consultation period to the Planning Inspector for consideration as part of the forthcoming Examination;
- b. To approve the draft Core Planning Strategy and Schedule of Minor Changes for submission;

The report of Executive Head of Planning, Transport & Highways, Supplementary report and the draft Schedule of Minor Changes referred to are attached as (ENCLOSURES)

The Schedule of comments received is available in the Members' Room and is also viewable on line.

The Executive is RECOMMENDED to concur
