

**PLANNING ADVISORY GROUP****7 June 2011 at 7.30 pm**

**MEMBERS:** Councillor Jayne McCoy (Chair), and Councillors Colin Hall, John Leach, Richard Clifton and Graham Whitham

**27. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE & NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES**

The Chair welcomed Councillor Richard Clifton to his first meeting of the Planning Advisory Group and introductions were made.

**28. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 April were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**Resolved:** Further to Minute 23/11 it was agreed that the draft letter, to be sent to owners of properties added to the Local List, be shared with all members of the Planning Advisory Group before it is sent out.

**29. PLANNING FOR TRAVELLER SITES – CLG CONSULTATION**

Members considered a report which summarised the consultation paper from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) entitled 'Planning for Traveller Sites'. The consultation period ends on 6 July 2011 and responses were being sought from local planning authorities, Travellers and their representative bodies as well as community representatives. The consultation was part of a broader review of planning policy which aimed to decentralise the planning policy system. The DCLG paper 'Planning for Traveller Sites' was intended to replace the current two separate Planning Policy Statements for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites and for Travelling Showpeople.

Members discussed in detail the key changes and made comments on the consultation questions. These comments would feed into the response from the Council to the consultation and included the following:

- a) It was felt that Sutton should deal with its own Traveller needs as proposed in the consultation which were well documented both locally and via a survey conducted by the Mayor of London. In this regard Members expressed concerns about the Panel Report into the Mayor's Replacement London Plan (not part of this consultation) which was recommending addressing such needs on a sub-regional basis and that this could result in some councils having to meet other council's needs.
- b) It should be a local decision whether there was a need to work with neighbouring boroughs which Sutton would do if there was a need. It should be clear what the needs of Sutton were and the benefits of any partnership before pursuing such arrangements.
- c) There was concern that the duty in the Localism Bill to require cross-borough working would put the onus to provide pitches on the outer London boroughs due to lack of space in inner boroughs.
- d) It was recognised that there were equality issues between settled and non-settled community, especially in relation to allowing Gypsy and Travellers' sites on green belt land as well as differences within the traveller community which made site identification challenging.
- e) The effect of the DCLG proposals would make both permanent housing and Travellers' site inappropriate development in the green belt. Members

**Planning Advisory Group  
7 June 2011**

considered that it would be difficult to meet Travellers' targets as sites suitable for housing would be unaffordable to Travellers and would be purchased by housing developers. Therefore some flexibility might be desirable in expanding any existing sites in the green belt (both existing Sutton sites are in the green belt).

- f) If an unsuitable traveller site planning application within a residential area was refused permission, there was concern that it would be approved on appeal if the Council could not demonstrate a 5 year supply of Travellers' sites.
- g) Members were not convinced that the DCLG proposals would help the situation with the lack of traveller sites in London or the equality issues raised in the paper.
- h) The six months given to local planning authorities to demonstrate an up to date five year supply of deliverable sites was unachievable.
- i) There was a general criticism of the Localism Bill which was aimed at freeing local councils but then prescribed what they should do.
- j) Whilst it was acknowledged that identifying sites would be a sensitive issue and that there was an unmet need in Sutton, the problem should be dealt with.

**Resolved:** (i) That the following views/information be sent to members for information:

- Responses from London Councils, housing officers and travellers, to the proposals.
- A link to the actual consultation document.

(ii) That an initial draft response, to the consultation, be prepared and sent to all members of Planning Advisory Group for comment before it is made final.

(iii) To note the proposals for planning reforms outlined in the report.

### **30. DRAFT REPLACEMENT LONDON PLAN - PANEL REPORT**

Members considered a report which outlined the main conclusions and recommendations made by the London Plan Panel and outlined any impacts in the context of Sutton. The Mayor of London had published the Panel Report on the draft Replacement London Plan, following the Examination in Public that was conducted between 28 June and 8 December 2010. The Panel Report concluded that the draft Replacement London Plan provided a sound basis for planning in Greater London over the plan period. Subject to ministerial approval, the final plan, which would be more focused than the current adopted version, would be published in late 2011.

Following a member query it was confirmed that parking policy was unchanged. The Chair also refuted that a 500m<sup>2</sup> store would have no impact on smaller centres and that they could have a large impact on traffic with lorry deliveries.

Members were very concerned about the back garden land proposals and requested that the Chair lobby the GLA member, Steve O'Connell, and/or the GLA Planning Member, Edward Lister.

**Resolved:** (i) That the findings of the draft Replacement London Plan Panel Report were noted.

(ii) That the Chair would write to the Steve O'Connell and/or Edward Lister stating Sutton's concerns regarding the back garden land proposals.

### **31. SITE DEVELOPMENT POLICIES DPD - REPRESENTATIONS FOLLOWING PUBLICATION OF ADDITIONAL SUTTON TOWN CENTRE AND UPDATED CLIMATE CHANGE POLICIES AND PROPOSALS, AND, APPROVAL OF PROPOSED MINOR CHANGES FOR SUBMISSION PURPOSES**

Members considered a report which summarised the main issues raised by the respondents following the publication of the Site Development Policies Development Plan Document: Additional Sutton Town Centre and Updated Climate Change Policies and Proposals – Proposed Submission. The report also suggested a number of Proposed Minor Changes to help with the legibility of the Plan, which might be made pending further discussions with stakeholders.

Three further papers were tabled which included:

- STC N1: Crown Road/High Street Sites
- STC PMC 7: Proposed Minor Change to Capacities – Factual Change
- STC PMC 6: Proposed Minor Change Regarding Site Allocations

Members discussed, in detail, the justifications for each of the Council's responses to representations received.

There was a discussion about the lack of hotel space in Sutton and that whilst sites had been identified for hotel use there maybe need for minor factual changes if it was shown that particular sites identified were not able to be developed for hotel use.

Representations to the Climate Change Mitigation Policy were also discussed and any amendments needed to it, as a result of those representations, were noted.

**Resolved:** (i) That all representations made in response to the publication were considered and the Council's proposed responses to them were approved.

(ii) That the Proposed Minor Changes, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report and those contained within the tabled papers, were approved for purposes of discussions with stakeholders and submission to the Secretary of State along with all other Development Plan documentation.

(iii) That the next stages in the preparation of the Sites Development Policies were noted.

(iv) That any further Minor Factual Changes be made by the Executive Head of Planning and Transportation in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Advisory Group.

### **32. DRAFT INTERIM PLANNING GUIDANCE ON CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION – RESPONSE TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Members considered a report which set out the main issues raised by respondents arising from public consultation on the draft Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) on Climate Change Mitigation between 17 March and 28 April 2011. It was explained that due to the lower than expected responses to the consultation, in order to meet relevant Local Development Scheme (LDS) targets and continuing uncertainties around the Government's 'allowable solutions' framework, optimal carbon pricing for purposes of the proposed carbon offset fund and the future role of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), it was now proposed to take the draft IPG and consultation responses forward as part of the initial stages of preparing the Council's draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Climate Change.

Members discussed each of the council's responses to representation made the following comments/amendments to them:

**Planning Advisory Group  
7 June 2011**

Decentralised Energy Networks – This response should be expanded to include the need to get as much out of waste before it goes to landfill. Also, to ensure that the stated conflict of between energy from waste and recycling does not apply.

Flue Gas Residues – That industry accepted terminology to replace ‘air pollution residues’ be used in the response.

Carbon Offset Fund – That the council ‘partly agree’. Members agreed that clarity was needed on how the council were to price carbon offsetting and that the Government needed to be quick in publishing the guidance. It was agreed that the next step would be to continue to have a draft SPG, rather than a final IPG, and that haste was of the essence as the South West London Partnership Programme Bids were currently being discussed.

**Resolved:** (i) That representation made in response to the consultation were considered and amendments as listed above be made to the council’s responses.

(ii) That the draft IPG and consultation responses be taken forward as part of the initial stage of preparing the Council’s draft Supplementary Planning Document on Climate Change.

**33. ANY URGENT ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD AT THE DIRECTION OF THE CHAIR, WHO HAS AGREED THE REASON FOR URGENCY**

There were no urgent items.

**34. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**Resolved:** That the next meeting would be held on 5 July 2011.

The meeting ended at 10.18 pm

Chair: .....

Date: .....