

## MINUTES

of the

### DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

held on 26<sup>th</sup> February 2007

Present:

Councillor D Ashford (Chairman)

Councillors, I. Gale, J Galley, N. Gulliver, W.G. Horslen, D.A. Lumley,  
F.B. Mountain, R. A. Ride, T E Roper, C.A. Rycroft, A.B. Sosin,  
R.J. Shepherd and R.T. Whitehead

The Chairman noted that this would be the last meeting of the Committee before the Local Elections. He expressed his appreciation to officers for their valuable service to the Committee and thanked Members of all the Groups for their efficient and effective work whilst he had been Chairman.

1. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor A Wilkins and T.N. Willis.

2. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2006 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. **Public Question Time**

No questions were asked or statements made

4. **Announcements**

There were no announcements.

5. **The Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the Draft Revision of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England**

The Committee considered a report outlining the content of the Secretary of State's proposed changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England which had been published for public consultation. It was noted that responses needed to be back by 9<sup>th</sup> March, 2007.

Whilst the Secretary of State had supported many of the Panel's recommendations it had proposed the following changes:

- Green Belt reviews to identify capacity to 2031 with an emphasis on compensatory Green Belt extensions which would have the effect of increasing the overall amount of Green Belt in the region.
- A stronger emphasis on Harlow as a major growth location with a consequential increase in the regional housing target from 505,000 to 508,000
- The need for Local Planning Authorities to regard individual housing targets as minima if more can be delivered through brownfield capacity and where appropriate through increased densities.
- Priority areas identified for further work to determine the measures needed to tackle congestion and support growth.
- The monitoring framework should develop carbon performance trajectories for new development and to encourage the definition of the proportion of their energy supply from renewable or low carbon sources.

In addition the Secretary of State had also agreed the need for greater housing growth on areas close to London.

The Committee also considered the recommendations made to the policies that had particular relevance to the Borough and Officer comments on those recommendations. These related to:

- Policy SS3: Key regional centres for development
- Policy E1: Job Growth 2001-2021
- Policy H1: Regional Housing Provision 2001 to 2021
- Policy ENV8: Renewable energy and energy efficiency
- Policy E5: Regional Structure of Town Centres
- Policy CH1: Chelmsford as a Key Centre for Development and Change
- Policy T14: Parking
- Appendix A: Strategic Transport Infrastructure Priorities

Concern was expressed that officer comment with regard to securing provision for the funding of necessary infrastructure was not robust enough as it did not appear to give any certainty. Whilst concern was also expressed about adequate parking provision it was agreed that the Council's own parking standards in the Core Strategy Document were sufficient.

It was generally agreed that recent developments in the Borough were well designed and overcame problems of on street parking etc. It was also agreed that the Council should reinforce its decision to retain the Green Belt.

**RESOLVED** that;

- (a) officer comments as set out in the report before the Committee be agreed and sent to the appropriate Government department as this Council's formal response to the Proposed Changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England, subject to the addition of more robust comments concerning provision of infrastructure; and
- (b) any further comments from Members to be passed to Officers within 7 days of the meeting, with, if necessary, any further wording to be agreed by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Councillors C.A. Rycroft and W. G. Horslen.

6. **Draft Planning Contributions – Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

The Committee considered a report updating it on the preparation of the Planning Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which would support and supplement the relevant policies of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The document contained general principles and the detailed scope of the SPD that Officers were recommending should be taken forward, in consultation with the Council's key partners into the final consultation draft SPD.

It was noted that the proposed Local Delivery Mechanism (LDM) would comprise an informal partnership of key partners including Essex County Council, the East of England Development Agency, the Environment Agency and the Mid-Essex Primary Care Trust.

The Committee was reminded that the proposed planning obligations framework would comprise of three policy mechanisms to secure infrastructure, these would be grouped into three broad infrastructure types within three geographical areas. It was noted that the Chelmsford Town Centre Area Action Plan area would be extended to cover the entire Chelmsford Urban area.

The proposed time frame for contributions to was proposed to be the entire plan period of the Core Strategy DPD up to 2021.

**RESOLVED** that;

- (a) the general principles contained within the Planning Contributions SPD be agreed in order to enable further operational detail of the SPD to be finalised in conjunction with the Council's key delivery partners and other stakeholders with the final Consultation Draft SPD to be reported back for Members approval, and
- (b) any further wording to be agreed by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Councillors C.A. Rycroft and W. G. Horslen.

## 7. Planning Gain Supplement Consultation

The Committee considered a report to assess the content of three Government consultation papers on the potential future introduction of Planning Gain Supplement (PGS) which included a schedule of proposed responses to the consultation papers. The three consultation papers were as follows:

- Changes to Planning Obligations: a Planning Gain Supplement Consultation - Department for Communities and Local Government
- Valuing Planning Gain: a Planning-gain Supplement Consultation - HM Revenue and Customs
- Paying PGS: a Planning-gain Supplement Technical Consultation - HM Revenue and Customs

It was noted that the Pre-Budget report had stated that PGS would not be introduced earlier than 2009. In essence PGS would be designed to collect a modest portion of the uplift in land value as a result of the grant of planning permission. As part of the introduction of PGS existing planning obligations (s106 agreements) would be scaled back to cover direct impacts of development and affordable housing. PGS would also fund more strategic types of infrastructure. The Pre-Budget report stated that at least 70% of the money collected would be returned to the Local Authority.

It was agreed that although the consultations gave more detail to procedural processes, they did not adequately address how the infrastructure would actually be delivered. Whilst the current s106 system needed to be reviewed there was no guarantee that PGS would be capable of ensuring that the needed infrastructure/facilities could be funded and provided in the right place at the right time. It was also agreed that if PGS was implemented the Local Authority should receive 100% of the money collected.

### **RESOLVED** that;

- (a) The consultation responses, as set out at paragraphs 20-23 of the report before the Committee and the Appendices A, B and C, be agreed and sent to the appropriate Government department as the Council's formal consultation responses, subject to the following amendments;

Pg10 Answer - No  
Q3

Pg10 Answer – No  
Q6

Pg12 Answer – Yes  
Q4

Pg12 Answer – No information at this stage  
Q5

- (b) any further comments from Members to be passed to Officers by 5pm on 27<sup>th</sup> February, with, if necessary, any further wording to be agreed by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Councillors C.A. Rycroft and W. G. Horslen.

8. **Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business brought before the Committee.

9. **Reports to Council**

There were no reports referred to Council.

The meeting closed at 7:51pm

Chairman