

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY, 14 JULY 2011**

COUNCILLORS

PRESENT Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Improving Localities (Chairman)), Ahmet Oykener (Cabinet Member for Housing and Area Improvements) and Chris Bond (Cabinet Member for Environment)

CO-OPTED Michael Lavender (Non-voting member)

OFFICERS: Neil Rousell (Director of Regeneration, Leisure & Culture), Joanne Woodward (Planning Policy Team Leader), Natalie Broughton (Planning Policy Officer), Neil Hook (Principal Planning and Regeneration Officer) and Neeru Kareer (Planning Policy Officer), Jacqui Hurst (Secretary)

**1
APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**2
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3
URGENT ITEMS**

NOTED that the reports listed on the agenda had been circulated in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution and the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Amendment Regulations 2002. These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear days in advance of meetings.

**4
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - REVISED DRAFT SECTION 106
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Councillor Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration, Leisure and Culture (No.48) seeking approval of a revised draft Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document for public consultation.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.7.2011

NOTED

1. that a complete set of the appendices had been sent to Members of the Sub-Committee under separate cover to the agenda;
2. that a number of amendments had been made to the initial draft Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document following consultation. Members were advised of the three key areas of change as detailed below:

- (a) Section 6 – Contributions – 6.1 Affordable Housing

The initial draft had included the average market value for housing units. This has now been amended to use the actual market values for the units in response to issues raised during consultation. This was felt to be the fairest approach. It was anticipated that this would not result in any loss of income. Members recognised the difficulties which could arise in fluctuating market values and the willingness of developers to work within the Borough. Members supported the changes which had been made to the document.

- (b) Section 6 – Contributions – 6.3 Learning and Skills Facilities

Amendments had been made with regard to the calculation of child yield and the cost of new school provision. A revised child yield data source was now being used which was more robust and would result in the Council seeking a higher level of contribution for Education in line with other local authorities. Members noted that the change was in line with neighbouring local authorities and supported the changes which had been made.

- (c) Section 6 – Contributions – 6.9 Business and Employment Initiatives

This section had been strengthened with regard to local labour initiatives including local labour in construction. This was based on the Notting Hill Trust training initiative. The document set out the relevant contributions which would apply. Members supported the amendments which had been made.

3. that other amendments to the revised draft S106 Supplementary Planning Document were of a minor nature. Members noted the proposed timescale for the final adoption of the document. Further consultation would take place over the summer with the final document being brought to the October meeting of the Cabinet Sub-Committee for final adoption. Following adoption, the requirements would be applied to all planning applications received by the Council. Members asked that the process be completed as expeditiously as possible.

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.7.2011

4. that "Local" had been defined as comprising of the boroughs of Enfield, Haringey and Waltham Forest. Members discussed the areas adjoining the Borough and agreed that the definition should include the Upper Lee Valley Corridor.

Alternative Options Considered: In order to ensure the delivery of infrastructure to support new homes and businesses it was necessary to seek developer contributions. The alternative mechanism for doing this was through a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Council was proceeding with work to develop a CIL tariff. In the interim the S106 Supplementary Planning Document would act as the vehicle for maximising contributions having regard to viability and the tests referred to in paragraph 3.3 of the report. The alternative option of not producing an S106 Supplementary Planning Document, would mean that there was less potential to secure contributions.

DECISION: The Local Development Framework Cabinet Sub-Committee noted the comments raised during consultation on the initial draft Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and approved the revised draft S106 SPD and Sustainability Report for a further stage of public consultation.

Reason: To seek approval of the draft revised Section 106 Supplementary Planning Document for consultation, in accordance with the decision making powers detailed in the Local Development Framework's Local Development Scheme.

5

DRAFT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

Councillor Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration, Leisure and Culture (No.49) seeking endorsement for the draft Local Development Scheme 2011-2014 for submission to the Greater London Authority (GLA).

NOTED

1. that the Council was required to maintain a three year rolling production programme and to update the Local Development Scheme annually. Members received a draft Local Development Scheme for the period 2011-2014; this had been drafted to take account of the Council's regeneration priorities and Local Development Framework document programming;
2. Members considered in detail the draft Local Development Scheme Schedule 2011-2014 setting out the processes and timetable for each of the identified projects. Any significant changes were brought to Members' attention;
3. that elements of the timetable reflected external pressures and planning requirements. Councillor Bond expressed concern regarding

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.7.2011

the timetabling of projects to begin in 2013 and asked whether the starting date could be earlier. Members were advised of the resource implications of moving projects forward. Councillor Goddard and Neil Rousell would consider the resource implications in greater detail and make amendments to the proposed schedule if felt to be viable. If the changes were felt to be of a significant nature they would be brought back to a future meeting of the Cabinet Sub-Committee. Members did not want to delay the submission of the draft Local Development Scheme 2011-2014. It was recognised that projects could span more than one Council administration term of office.

Alternative Options Considered: Preparation of the Local Development Scheme was a statutory requirement.

DECISION: The Local Development Framework Cabinet Sub-Committee

1. endorsed the draft Local Development Scheme 2011-2014 for submission to the Greater London Authority (GLA);
2. agreed that in the event that the GLA did not recommend any changes or only changes of a minor nature to the draft Local Development Scheme, the Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration to formally bring the Local Development Scheme into effect. Changes of a substantive nature would be reported back to the Local Development Framework Cabinet Sub-Committee for consideration.

Reason: Progress on preparing an up to date plan was monitored through national performance indicators, and Council progress on the delivery of the Local Development Scheme was monitored annually through Service and Delivery Plans.

6

MERIDIAN WATER MASTERPLAN OPTIONS AND FIRST PHASE CONSULTATION PAPER

Councillor Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration, Leisure and Culture (No.50) seeking approval of the Meridian Water Masterplan Consultation Document for informal public consultation.

NOTED

1. that the draft consultation paper had been circulated under separate cover as a "to follow" item;
2. Neil Hook provided a verbal update and presentation on the progress and preparation of the Meridian Water Master plan and timetable moving forward. Extensive informal consultation would take place initially, following feedback the proposals would be re-shaped and considered by the October meeting of the Cabinet Sub-Committee. It

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CABINET SUB-COMMITTEE - 14.7.2011

was then intended to undertake a further period of consultation in October/November with final adoption anticipated for early in 2012;

3. that the proposed consultation period had been changed to 25 July to 5 September 2011. The relevant documents would be amended accordingly;
4. the proposed Meridian Water Masterplan consultation and the key stakeholders which would be included together with the consultation methods to be used;
5. in response to the concerns raised by Councillor Bond regarding the long-term planning implications and the significant changes which could take place over a long period of time, Neil Hook stated that the masterplan would be a living document which would be revised and adjusted as necessary over time. The proposals would enable particular projects to be phased with some aspects being completed within a shorter-term period;
6. in considering the potential timespan of the masterplan, Members reiterated the importance of fully engaging with stakeholders including utility companies, and any successor organisations, to ensure that they were fully on board with the development proposals;
7. that whilst it was recognised that the informal consultation was taking place over the summer period, a number of discussions had already taken place. As part of the consultation it was suggested that the proposed timetable should also be made available to the consultees;
8. that Members would forward any individual comments on the draft consultation document to Neil Hook by 18 July 2011.

Alternative Options Considered: The Masterplan outlined a proposal for the development of the area. The potential existed for the Council to look at alternatives to this option, or to consult on more than the proposed options. Following initial concept plans for three options, the proposal was to move forward with a single option for development as at this stage this was the most appropriate and deliverable option for the development of Meridian Water.

DECISION: The Local Development Framework Cabinet Sub-Committee agreed to approve the Meridian Water Masterplan Consultation Document for informal public consultation.

Reason: To seek approval of the Meridian Water Masterplan proposal for consultation, in accordance with the decision making powers detailed in the Local Development Framework's Local Development Scheme.

7

MINUTES

AGREED that the minutes of the previous meeting of the Local Development Framework Cabinet Sub-Committee held on 30 June 2011 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

8

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

NOTED that the next meeting of the Local Development Framework Cabinet Sub-Committee was scheduled to take place on Tuesday 6 September 2011 at 7.00pm.