COUNCILLORS

PRESENT
Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) and Ahmet Oykener (Cabinet Member for Housing)

ABSENT
Chris Bond (Cabinet Member for Environment) and Achilleas Georgiou (Deputy Leader)

CO-OPTED
Michael Lavender (Absent)

OFFICERS:
Paul Walker (Assistant Director, Regeneration, Planning & Programme Management), Joanne Woodward (Planning Policy Team Leader), Natalie Broughton (Planning Policy Officer) and Ken Bean (Principal Planning Officer), Metin Halil (Secretary)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bond and Georgiou. Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Oykener

2 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

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 and Meetings) (England) Regulations 2012, with the exception of the following reports:

Report No.2 – Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule
Report No.3 – Adoption of the Edmonton Ecopark Supplementary Planning document (SPD)
Report No.4 – Core Strategy Compliance with the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework

These requirements state that agendas and reports should be circulated at least 5 clear days in advance of meetings.
AGREED that the reports be considered at this Sub Committee meeting.

4
ORDER OF AGENDA

AGREED that members considered item 6 first, at this point of the meeting.
The minutes follow the order of the meeting.

5
CORE STRATEGY COMPLIANCE WITH THE GOVERNMENT’S NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Councillor Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration, Leisure and Culture (No.4). The report was an assessment of the Core Strategy (adopted in 2010) to ascertain the extent to which it complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy for Travellers Sites.

NOTED

1. that the report detailed findings of officer assessments to see if the Core Strategy complied with the NPPF and Planning Policy for Travellers sites.
2. the 12 month period, from the date of publication of the framework had now elapsed and officers would now give weight to relevant policies in existing plans for consistency with the framework.
3. the vast majority of the Core Strategy was conforming with the framework. However, one core principle was not adequately addressed in the Core Strategy: supporting high quality communications infrastructure. There were two core policies which were in partial conformity with the Framework Planning Policy for Traveller sites:
   - core policy 3: affordable housing.
   - core policy 6: meeting particular housing needs, with regards to provision for gypsy and travellers.
4. members were recommended to note that the high quality communications infrastructure would need a mechanism to progress further, in the absence of a policy on communications. It would need to be addressed by strategic policies and by area action plans for development. The Core strategy did not provide a policy on communications, however the London Plan does have a policy on encouraging a connected economy, as detailed in the report. Officers reported that they would consult other departments with a view to producing a policy.
The affordable housing policy had now been updated, through the proposed submission DMD to ensure compliance with the NPPF. The Communications Infrastructure and gypsy and traveller accommodation would be the subject of a future report and would be addressed through a review of the Local Development Scheme (LDS) at a future meeting of the Committee.
5. Officers also intended to brief Planning Committee about the Core Strategy compliance with the NPPF.

Alternative Options Considered: None. Now that the Framework’s first anniversary has passed, decision-takers, including Inspectors, are required to give due weight to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of conformity with the Framework. Clarification of the status of the Core Strategy is therefore required.

DECISION: Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee agreed to note and endorse, following an assessment

1. the Core Strategy (2010) is considered to be in general conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. the Core Policy 3: Affordable Housing has been updated through the Proposed Submission Development Management Document to ensure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. the arrangements to ensure full compliance, in respect of Government’s policies for gypsy and traveller accommodation and the provision of communications infrastructure, will be set out in a review of the Local Development Scheme.

Reason: For Members to note that the Core Strategy is considered in the main to be in general conformity with the National Planning policy Framework.

6 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY PRELIMINARY DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

Councillor Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration, Leisure and Culture (No.2). The report seeks the Local Plan Cabinet Sub Committee’s approval to publish the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for public consultation. The proposed charging rates are detailed in the Schedule attached in Annex 1 of the report.

NOTED

1. this was the agreed version of the report after extensive negotiations and was the first stage of introducing the preliminary draft charging schedule for approval. The CIL was introduced under the 2008 Planning Act and its requirements are detailed in Annex 2 of the report.
2. the CIL would replace Section 106 agreements as the main source of securing developer contributions.
3. the charging schedules, as detailed in tables 1 & 2 of the report, summarises the Council commissioned consultants recommendations.
4. the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), published in 2010, to support the Core Strategy, had been updated to reflect current plans and would be published alongside the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. The
IDP sets out emerging infrastructure requirements, costs and the identified funding gap as detailed in the report.

5. the key risks on preparing the CIL have been summarised within the report at paragraph 9.

6. once approved, the CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule would be published for a six week period, to commence in May/July 2013, as detailed at 5.1 of the report.

7. Members noted that CIL funding would be the subject of further discussion to establish what the funding would cover i.e. health centres, transport.

**Alternative Options Considered:** The intention to prepare a CIL charging schedule is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme and adopted Core strategy. To solely continue with section 106 as the main source of developer contribution after the imposition of section 106 pooling restrictions, in April 2014, will significantly reduce the revenues that can be raised to help deliver the growth and regeneration objectives proposed in the Borough, as contained within the Local Plan.

**DECISION:** Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee

1. approved the Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule for consultation.
2. approved the revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan for consultation.
3. noted the Council’s intention to review the Community Infrastructure Levy in 2016.

**Reason:** Significant investment in infrastructure is needed to support the regeneration and growth planned in the Core Strategy. With the introduction of restrictions on the pooling of contributions collected via section 106 agreements, CIL will become the main source of securing developer contributions for rail and other infrastructure improvements. Publication of the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule is crucial to advancing CIL and maintaining developer contributions. The proposed CIL rates have been developed with appropriate regard to planning policy and the need to ensure the continued viability of development in the borough.

*(Key Decision – reference number 3610)*

7 **ADOPTION OF THE EDMONTON ECOPARK SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)**

Councillor Del Goddard (Cabinet Member for Business and Regeneration) introduced the report of the Director of Regeneration, Leisure and Culture (No.2). The report seeks the adoption of the Edmonton EcoPark Planning Brief as a Supplementary Planning Document to Enfield’s Local Plan.
NOTED

1. this report was post consultation on the draft planning brief which had been published for 6 weeks from 4th February to 18th March 2013.
2. there were 13 responses to the consultation and comments received included the North London Waste Authority (NLWA), the London boroughs of Haringey and Waltham Forest, the GLA, Highways Agency and local residents. There had been strong support from the GLA and its future role. Concern was raised by the NLWA about the safeguarding of the site and what the requirements will be for planning consideration on the remainder of the site. That the primary process should be waste processing and heating.
3. Members discussed the need to make changes to the language used at paragraphs 5.5 and 5.6 of the report. The respondents comments to the SPD (5.5) and the reasons given on the basis of the comments (5.6), should be more detailed and more robust. The Committee made the following points in response to comments made by respondents at 5.5:
   • evidence provided in the brief, gave reassurance and weight for planning considerations for the site.
   • getting further information out for consultation may be difficult to do.
   • where respondents objected to the consultation, legal advice had been sought, providing more weight to the brief.
   • reasoned opposing comments had been responded to with reasoned changes.

Alternative Options Considered:
1. None considered. Preparation of a Local Plan is a statutory requirement. The Council’s Local Development Scheme (LDS) summarises the content of Enfield’s Local Plan and sets out a programme for its production. Edmonton EcoPark Planning Brief SPD has been identified in the LDS.
2. It is imperative that the Edmonton EcoPark Planning Brief is prepared to inform planning decisions on waste planning applications and is essential to support the Council’s Regeneration Programmes.

DECISION: Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee

1. agreed to adopt the Edmonton EcoPark Planning Brief Supplementary Planning Document listed as Annex A of the report.

Reason: The Edmonton EcoPark Planning Brief is required to inform planning decisions on waste planning applications and to support the Council’s Regeneration Programmes.

(Key Decision – reference number 3691)
8  MINUTES

AGREED that the minutes of the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee held on 18 March 2013, be confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

9  DATE OF NEXT MEETING

AGREED that the next meeting of the Local Plan Cabinet Sub-Committee be re-scheduled to take place on Tuesday 11 June 2013 at 07:00pm.