



<b>REPORT OF:</b>	Head of Corporate Policy, Performance & Parking
<b>AUTHORS:</b>	Gavin Handford
<b>TELEPHONE:</b>	01737 276027
<b>E-MAIL:</b>	<a href="mailto:Gavin.handford@reigate-banstead.gov.uk">Gavin.handford@reigate-banstead.gov.uk</a>
<b>TO:</b>	OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY
<b>DATE:</b>	20 OCTOBER 2016

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<b>Local Development Framework Panel</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b> <p>(i) that the minutes of the LDF Panel meeting on 20 September be considered and noted; and</p> <p>(ii) that the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee make any observations for consideration.</p>	
<b>SUMMARY:</b> Attached at <b>Annex 1</b> are the approved minutes of the LDF Panel meeting on 20 September, setting out their conclusions. Attached at <b>Annex 2</b> is the Agenda for the meeting on 20 September.	

**REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL**

**20 September 2016**

**Held at 6:00 p.m. in the Front Committee Room at the Town Hall, Reigate**

Present: Councillor M.A. Brunt (Chairman)  
Councillors K. Foreman, S. McKenna and M.J. Selby.

Also present: Councillors J. King (*named substitute*), J. Essex and T. Schofield

Officers: Luci Mould, Planning Policy & Economic Prosperity Manager;  
Cath Rose, Senior Policy Development Officer  
Ashleigh Pearson, Executive Officer

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor M. Blacker.

**2. ROLE OF THE SCRUTINY PANEL**

The scope of the LDF Scrutiny Panel was agreed.

The focus of the meeting was agreed as being scrutiny of the Regulation 18 consultation document and decisions that had been made by the Executive in respect of it.

**3. INTRODUCTION TO THE REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION DOCUMENT**

4. The Panel received a presentation introducing the Regulation 18 Development Management Plan (DMP) consultation document.

5. The Panel was advised that around 100 responses had been received so far via email and the online survey and the interactive map had received around 20 comments so far. In addition to the delivery of postcards to inform residents of the consultation, social media had also been used to communicate with residents, along with direct mail to those registered on the Local Plan consultation database. The Borough News, due to be circulated shortly, includes a centrefold article about the consultation. It was agreed that this approach would have informed as many residents as possible.

6. The Panel was pleased to hear that there had been a positive attendance at drop-in sessions, with sessions in Merstham attracting an average of 20-25 people and sessions in Banstead attracting an average of 30 people, together with general interest in the displays.

7. Responses received will be analysed once the consultation period has ended and it is intended to publish the statutory consultation statement to accompany the Regulation 19 draft Plan.
8. The Panel noted that the RBBC Regulation 18 Consultation Document was focused on proposals that were likely to be considered acceptable and these would inform the development of the draft Plan at the Regulation 19 stage. The Regulation 19 document would be presented to full Council to be voted upon for submission to the Secretary of State, following which there would be a further round of consultation. Prior to final adoption by the Council, the draft Plan would need to be sound and this would be achieved by a public examination of the document by a Planning Inspector at the Town Hall.
9. The submission of the Regulation 19 draft Plan to the Secretary of State is effectively a statement that the Council considers the Plan to be sound. The Panel was advised that the examination would be approached in a positive fashion, as dictated by national planning policy.
10. The Panel was advised that the timetable for plan preparation going forward had to be caveated by response numbers. The Panel noted that it was anticipated that the Regulation 19 consultation would occur in spring 2017 and the Inspector's report would be received in late 2017 or early 2018, and finally the Council would adopt the plan in spring 2018. This timetable would also be subject to the Planning Inspector's timetable, which would not be within RBBC's control.

## 11. OBJECTIVES

The Panel was advised that the objectives in the Regulation 18 Consultation Document were based upon Core Strategy objectives and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Panel was satisfied with the objectives and had no additional objectives to recommend (however see detailed observations below).

## 12. REVIEW OF REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

### **Theme 1: Growing a prosperous economy**

#### **Section 1: Economic Development**

13. The Panel was advised that EMP5 and EMP6 explained that previous Borough Local Plan designations were not being pursued due to national policy changes, in particular changes to permitted development rules (making it difficult to resist change of use from business to residential land). The Government's policy was flexibility of use and permitted development rights were beyond the control of RBBC. Office development within town centres is an acceptable town centre use so the Town Centre was proposed for removal as it was no longer required.
14. The Panel was reassured that RBBC intended to control development where possible and would keep under review the need for Article 4 directions. The Panel noted that it was unlikely to be acceptable to use Article 4 to circumvent Government policies and that the use of Article 4 would be reserved only for very strong cases.

15. The Panel suggested that opportunities for live-work accommodation should be considered further, although it was noted that there appeared currently to be little appetite from developers to deliver this kind of development.

## Section 2: Town and Local Centres

16. The Panel was advised that the policy approaches RET2 and RET3 would replace the existing policies SH7, SH9 and SH11. The new approach moved away from individual frontage retail percentages to centre-wide percentages and focused on the ability of RBBC to respond more flexibly when applications were received.
17. The new policies proposed are intended to be able to respond to the different characters, needs and situations of the different towns in the borough.
18. The Panel expressed concern that economic viability of local shopping parades could be manipulated by landlords that wished to convert them to residential use. The Panel was reassured that the requirements for information from developers about marketing periods would be clearly explained which assist in preventing such scenarios (recognising that permitted development rights may take some changes of use out of the Council's control).
19. The Panel queried how areas of Redhill (specifically Brighton Road) were proposed to be treated within the proposed policies RET2 and RET4. It was clarified that the potential to expand the definition of the town centre further out in respect of Redhill had been examined but was not considered appropriate at present, rather the core of Redhill would be the primary focus over this plan period. Once regeneration objectives were achieved, consideration could be given to extending the town centre boundary outwards to include Brighton Road. The Panel requested clarity on how first floor retail uses would be monitored.
20. The purpose of RET7 was clarified for the Panel as a means of controlling out of town warehouses by designation. There was a desire for warehousing close to Redhill town centre and Reading Arch Road lent itself as a suitable location. The Panel expressed concern that trade warehouses could become a masquerade for retail, as had occurred on the Holmethorpe Industrial Estate. This was a difficult issue and officers were continuing to review appeal decisions and court judgments to ensure that a tight definition of retail warehousing is included in the Plan that could be used to protect against this.

## Theme 2: Building self reliant communities

### Section 1: Design, character and amenity

21. The Panel noted that there was a distinction between design guidance, which would not be appropriate for inclusion in the DMP due to the level of detail, and design policy. It was clarified that the consultation document included proposed standards for the provision of amenity space in large developments. The Panel was concerned that amenity space should be provided in developments of flats and that those spaces would not become parking spaces. The Panel was reassured that those expectations would be explained in supplementary planning guidance. Such guidance would recognise that one size did not fit all and provide scenarios rather than rules. The supplementary planning guidance would be drafted after the submission and approval of the DMP.

22. In relation to Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) officers confirmed that these sites would only be released if the Council could not demonstrate a five year supply of other housing land. Detailed master plans for SUEs would be prepared.
23. The Panel recommended that design guidance should be reviewed to be clearer on the preservation of local character and respecting the plot size of neighbouring homes.
24. The Panel sought clarification regarding DES4: Tall buildings and how these were defined. The Panel noted that floor numbers, whilst a good starting point, were not a perfect measure and it was accepted that building height could also be used. The issue was that a tall building needed to be quantified. There was an acceptance that tall buildings would be acceptable in Redhill in the right locations but such buildings would not necessarily be appropriate elsewhere. Topography and landscape were major factors in the suitability of a tall building.

#### Section 2: Open space and recreation

25. The Panel expressed concern whether DES5 and DES6 would offer greater control over the definition and maintenance of character of large housing schemes. Whilst the intention to master plan SUE sites was welcomed by the Panel, it was also suggested that the DMP should include policy requiring schemes of a certain size to adhere to agreed design codes.
26. The Panel was reassured that the importance of considering existing recreation sites and their impact (such as floodlighting) is captured under OSR3 for outdoor sport and recreation areas.
27. The provision of open spaces had been emphasised in circumstances of urban expansion. The Panel expressed concern that “encourage” in Objective SC5 was weak and it was agreed that the possibility of changing the wording to “require” would be examined since national policy recognised the importance of amenity greenspace.
28. It was clarified that when determining the value of urban open spaces, ecology, visual contribution and heritage are amongst the factors considered so that inaccessible land could still have value as an open space. The Panel noted that this was slightly different to the national Local Green Space designation, which was felt to require a greater emphasis on accessibility.
29. The Panel received clarification that occasionally, development on urban open space may be acceptable to deliver improved opportunities or facilities for the local population. The proposed policy would allow such development only in exceptional circumstances. It was clarified that school playing fields would be protected as open urban space.
30. The Panel queried responsibility for planning in respect of the extension of schools and it was clarified that this was SCC’s responsibility but that they would have regard to the planning policy of RBBC where appropriate and would be required to consult with Sports England in respect of any loss of playing fields. The extension of schools into their own open areas would be permitted only where the need could be demonstrated to outweigh the interests of preservation.

### Section 3: Transport, access and parking

31. The Panel were reassured that TAP1 incorporated additional information regarding accessibility for pedestrians, emergency and service vehicles. It was agreed to explore whether a requirement for developers to integrate parking design into schemes at an early stage could be included.
32. It was clarified that Objective SC7 did not directly address consideration of public transport schemes, however RBBC works closely with SCC regarding both the road network and public transport. The proposal to master plan large schemes would ensure that public transport considerations were incorporated.

### Section 4: Climate change resilience and flooding

33. The Panel considered the wording of SC8 to be too weak and asked officers to consider alternative language for this objective. The possibility of incorporating air pollution considerations under CCF1 was considered but it was noted that reference to air quality was included at DES9, and other aspects of air pollution fell under the remit of Environmental Health. It was agreed that this was a concern better addressed by way of detailed response by individual councillors to the consultation.
34. The Panel noted that flooding was a significant issue in areas of the borough and CCF2 was only part of the picture, there were other strategic schemes being explored as well.

### Section 5: Protecting the natural and historic environment

35. The Panel were pleased to hear that the NHE1, NHE2 and NHE3 policies built on the provisions already found in the Core Strategy. There was further detail on tree protection and additional requirements for the incorporation of green spaces in new developments. Officers confirmed that whilst there was no formal requirement for provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs), RBBC policies - in conjunction with activities being carried out by the Greenspace team - aimed to divert development and recreational pressures away from sensitive habitat recreation areas.
36. The Panel asked about provision for ancient or veteran trees that were not protected individually by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). It was agreed to consider adding this item to NHE1, perhaps by way of an additional subsection NHE1(3)(g).
37. The Panel also noted that the AGLV boundaries were being retained. This was because Natural England is due to review the AONB boundaries in 2016/17 and this process may continue beyond completion of the DMP. The local AGLV designation would be reviewed once AONB boundaries have been finalised, probably together with Tandridge District Council and Mole Valley District Council.
38. The Panel noted that the Core Strategy CS3 recognised landscape features and that this was simply a question of terminology and did not mean that landscape character would be disregarded. It was noted also that local landscape designation could provide protection.

39. The Panel noted that the keeping of horses was particularly addressed by NHE6 – this policy was considered important due to the potential degradation of environment and landscape. It was agreed to consider whether it would be appropriate add to NHE6 the risk of degradation of biodiversity from equestrian activities.
40. The Panel noted when considering objective SC13 that RBBC was unusual in having an up to date local list of heritage assets, which was independent of statutory listing. The Panel also noted that the designation of conservation areas would properly fall to the planning committee, not the DMP consultation, for consideration.

### **Theme 3: Place Shaping**

#### **Section 1: Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople**

41. The Panel noted that the consultation sought views on potential sources of supply of sites for traveller sites. At present, the authorisation of currently unauthorised sites was being investigated along with various other options. A target for traveller pitches/plots would need to be included in the DMP as the Core Strategy did not set a required number of sites (in contrast to housing requirements, which had been specified). It was noted that the Government had recently changed the definition of “traveller”, which needed to be considered. It was intended to hold a workshop on this issue with Members.

#### **Section 2: Cemeteries and Crematoria**

42. The Panel was advised that there was no proposal to allocate sites for crematoriums or cemeteries.

#### **Section 3: Potential development sites**

43. It was suggested by the Panel that an introductory section “setting the scene” should be added to section 3. There was some supplementary planning guidance listed, which would be reviewed once the DMP had been adopted.
44. The Panel agreed that its role was to comment generally on the sites identified and to reserve for the consultation process detailed comments by Ward councillors. The Panel were advised that the sites had been selected from suggestions received from developers, but also other sources (including councillors), and an assessment of brownfield sites. Deliverability needed to be considered in allocating sites, but the main consideration was the planning merits of different sites.
45. The Panel hoped that more sites could be identified in the urban area. Where SUEs are required, the Panel agreed that the intention was not to create new communities but to extend and incorporate new development within existing communities.
46. The Panel raised the question of population density and was advised that a density map was not available, however, the ‘working’ density parameters for an urban extension area were: Low - under 20; Medium – 30; High – 40. The density target was a considered a blunt instrument and the benefits of master planning would be a

more appropriate method to control house numbers and to consider their impact upon local schools.

47. The Panel queried the identification of only a limited number of sites in the north of the borough for development and was advised that most residential development in the north of the borough was not by way of allocation but by way of “back garden development”, or else by building between two homes (“infill”). The Panel recognised that it would not be appropriate to include a large number of very small development sites in the DMP, and that ten units seemed an appropriate threshold. The Panel noted that back garden developments were not considered windfalls until they had been completed. The Council’s windfall assumptions were artificially low, constrained by Government policy. The Panel noted that in the event that urban extensions were not required in the current plan period, they would be carried forward to the next.

#### Section 4: Infrastructure to support growth

48. The Panel noted that this was not a policy as such but was intended to provide context as to how RBBC could secure infrastructure development. It was agreed to clarify whether energy resources would fall within Utilities or Waste management (INF1) when considering the future needs of the borough.

#### Section 5: Managing Land Supply

49. The Panel noted that this section would set out the approach to the phasing of urban extension sites and the safeguarding land. The relevant sites had yet to be identified but once done they would be listed and ordered by priority, following discussion with Members. The safeguarding of land would be influenced by several factors such as the awaited decision about expansion of Gatwick Airport and further assessment of planning constraints.
50. The Panel queried the position of allotments and were advised that allotments fell within open space designations (unless the allotment fell within the green belt). Allotments could - in certain circumstances - be acceptable in the Green Belt.
51. The Panel noted that prior to the Regulation 19 Consultation, Sustainable Urban Extension site allocations would be finalised. The Panel were advised that if less employment land was required than anticipated it would be possible to use that land for residential uses but that that would constitute windfall development.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

52. The Panel thanked the Officers for the presentation and for responding to their questions.
53. The Panel requested that the following comments be referred to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for consideration on 20 October:

Theme 1: Growing a prosperous economy  
Section 1: Economic Development



- Further consideration of opportunities for live-work accommodation (paragraph 15 above)

#### Section 2: Town and Local Centres

- Clarity on how first floor retail uses would be monitored (paragraph 19 above)

#### Theme 2: Building self reliant communities

##### Section 2: Open space and recreation

- Inclusion in the DMP of a policy requiring schemes of a certain size to adhere to agreed design codes (paragraph 25 above)
- Consider changing Objective SC5 to read “require” to provision of open space (paragraph 27 above)
- Include clarification that school playing fields would be protected as open urban space (paragraph 29 above)

##### Section 3: Transport, access and parking

- Consider whether a requirement for developers to integrate parking design into schemes at an early stage could be included (paragraph 31 above)

##### Section 4: Climate change resilience and flooding

- Consider stronger wording for SC8 (“Encourage new development to incorporate passive and active energy efficient measures...”) (paragraph 33 above)
- Encourage detailed individual responses regarding pollution considerations (paragraph 33 above)

##### Section 5: Protecting the natural and historic environment

- Consider addition of a subsection (3)(g) to NHE1 addressing protection for ancient or veteran trees that were not protected by TPOs (paragraph 36 above)
- Consider addition to NHE6 of the risk of degradation of biodiversity from equestrian activities (paragraph 39 above)

#### Theme 3: Place Shaping

##### Section 3: Potential development sites

- Inclusion of an introductory section to “set the scene” (paragraph 43 above)

##### Section 4: Infrastructure to support growth

- Clarify whether energy resources would fall within Utilities or Waste management (INF1) (paragraph 48 above)

The response of the O&S Committee would be considered by the Executive in due course alongside the draft Regulation 19 DMP (anticipated to be May 2017).

#### **51. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

52. None.

#### **53. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE PANEL**

54. The Panel noted that the Executive would consider the LDF’s comments. Further all member workshops would be arranged over the coming months and the next LDF Panel meeting would be convened immediately before the Regulation 19 Draft Consultation Document was submitted to the Executive.

**The meeting closed at 20:48**



**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL**

**20 September 2016**

**To the Members of the Panel:**

Councillor M.A. Brunt (Chairman)

Councillors M. Blacker, K. Foreman, S. McKenna, and M.J. Selby.

*And named substitute: Councillor J. King*

15 September 2016

Contact Officer: Natalie Lennon – Democratic Services Officer - 01737 276386 or email: [Natalie.lennon@reigate-banstead.gov.uk](mailto:Natalie.lennon@reigate-banstead.gov.uk)

**AGENDA**

For a meeting of the **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL** to be held on **20 September 2016 at 6.00pm** in the Front Committee Room at the Town Hall, Reigate.

John Jory  
Chief Executive

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor M. Blacker will be substituted by Councillor J. King.

**2. ROLE OF THE SCRUTINY PANEL**

**Page 3**

To note the scope of the LDF Scrutiny Review Panel and the focus for this meeting.

### 3. INTRODUCTION TO THE REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

Planning Policy Officers will outline the status of the document and its place in the DMP plan making process.

### 4. OBJECTIVES

Page 5

To consider the draft DMP objectives within the Regulation 18 document.

### 5. REVIEW OF REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

Planning Policy Officers will provide a brief summary of each theme within the Regulation 18 Consultation Document in turn,

To consider whether the proposed policies, designations and potential sites set out within each theme:

- Are clear, focused, achievable, realistic and based on sound practices;
- Have clear linkages with corporate and other plans that form the Policy Framework and are designed to improve services in the Council's priority areas; and
- Are applied in a way that enables the Council's goals, standards and priorities to be achieved.

All Members have previously been provided with a copy of the Regulation 18 Consultation Document. Due to the size of this document, it is not re-provided with this Agenda, but a copy can be provided upon request with reasonable notice. The document is also available online at: [http://www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk/info/20270/development\\_management\\_plan](http://www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk/info/20270/development_management_plan)

### 6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### 7. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS OF THE PANEL

It is anticipated that the Panel will be required to meet again in early April 2017 to consult on the draft Regulation 19 document, before Executive approval is sought for public consultation and submission for examination.



## Summary of 'Growing a prosperous economy' objectives and proposed policy approaches

	DMP objective	Proposed Policy Approach
<b>Section 1: Economic Development</b>	Objective PE1: Safeguard existing employment land and premises to ensure that there is adequate space for businesses to locate in the borough; Objective PE2: Provide flexibility for local businesses to start up, grow, diversify and prosper	EMP1: Principal employment areas EMP2: Local employment areas EMP3: Employment development outside of employment areas EMP4: Safeguard employment land and premises where there is a realistic prospect of continued use EMP5: Do not continue with the Areas for Small Businesses designation EMP6: Do not continue with the Town Centre Business Area designation EMP7: Support access to electronic communication networks
	Objective PE3: Help new development to deliver jobs and skills benefits for local people	EMP8: Secure local skills and training opportunities
<b>Section 2: Town and Local Centres</b>	Objective PE4: Protect the vitality and viability of our town centre shopping areas; Objective PE5: Protect the viability of smaller scale but vital local shopping areas; Objective PE6: Ensure that both town and local centres are resilient and able to respond to future changes	RET1: Managing development within identified retail frontages RET2: Ensuring a mix of uses within town centre frontages RET3: Ensuring continued viability and vitality of Local Centres RET4: Development proposals in smaller centres and for isolated shops RET5: Temporary uses in vacant units RET6: Managing the development of town centre uses outside town and local centres RET 7: Retail Warehousing

## Theme 2 Building self reliant communities



### Summary of 'Building self reliant communities' objectives and proposed policy approaches

	DMP objective	Proposed policy approach
<b>Section 1: Design, character and amenity</b>	Objective SC1: To ensure that new development makes the best use of land whilst also being well designed and protecting and enhancing local character and distinctiveness	DES1: The design of new development DES2: Back garden land development DES3: Residential Areas of Special Character DES4: Tall Buildings
	Objective SC2: To ensure an appropriate mix of housing types and sizes, offering a good standard of living to future occupants	DES5: Housing mix DES6: Delivering high quality homes
	Objective SC3: To minimise the impacts of development, and the development process on local residents and local amenity	DES7: Self and custom build DES8: Construction management DES9: Safeguarding against the effects of noise, air and light pollution, and remediating contaminated land DES10: Control of advertisements & shop front design
<b>Section 2: Open space and recreation</b>	Objective SC4: Protect the most valuable open space within the urban areas Objective SC5: Encourage the provision of open space as part of new developments, and where appropriate new outdoor sport and recreation provision	OSR1: Urban Open Space OSR2: Open space in new developments OSR3: Outdoor sport and recreation
<b>Section 3: Transport, access and parking</b>	Objective SC6: Require new developments to provide adequate parking, whilst recognising the need to encourage sustainable transport choices, particularly in the most accessible locations Objective SC7: Ensure new developments are served by safe and well designed access for vehicle, pedestrians and cyclists	TAP1: Access, Parking and Servicing TAP2: Airport car parking

	<b>DMP objective</b>	<b>Proposed policy approach</b>
<b>Section 4: Climate change resilience and flooding</b>	Objective SC8: Encourage new development to incorporate passive and active energy efficiency measures and climate change resilience measures and where appropriate incorporate renewable energy technologies; Objective SC9: Direct development away from areas at risk of flooding, and ensure all developments are safe from flood risk and do not increase flood risk elsewhere or result in a reduction in water quality.	CCF1: Climate change CCF2: Flood risk
<b>Section 5: Protecting the natural and historic environment</b>	Objective SC10: Ensure new development protects, and enhances wherever possible, the borough's landscapes and biodiversity interest features, providing the highest degree of protection to internationally and nationally designated areas.	NHE1: Landscape protection NHE2: Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and areas of geological importance NHE3: Protecting trees and woodland areas
	Objective SC11: Maximise the contribution of new development to a comprehensive green infrastructure network across the borough.	NHE4: Green Infrastructure
	Objective SC12: Control development in the Green Belt to safeguard its openness, and where possible enhance its beneficial use.	NHE5: Development within the Green Belt NHE6: Horse keeping and equestrian development
	Objective SC13: Conserve and enhance heritage assets across the borough, supporting their continued viable use and cultural benefits	NHE7: Protecting and enhancing Conservation Areas NHE8: Sustaining and enhancing buildings of Special and Local Architectural or Historic Interest NHE9: Protecting and enhancing Historic Parks and Gardens NHE10: Scheduled Monuments and Archaeology

## Theme 3 Place Shaping



### Summary of 'Place Shaping' objectives and proposed policy approaches

	DMP objective	Proposed Policy Approach
<b>Section 1: Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople</b>	Objective PS1: Identify a local target for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites and allocate sites to achieve this target	GTT1: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation
<b>Section 2: Cemetery and crematorium provision</b>	Objective PS2: Allocate site(s) for cemetery and/or crematorium provision consistent with sustainability principles	CEM1: Cemetery and/or crematorium provision
<b>Section 3: Potential development sites</b>		
<b>Section 3A: Area 1 - the North Downs</b>	Objective PS3: Allocate sites for development across the borough consistent with the Core Strategy and sustainability principles	Banstead Town Centre potential development sites
<b>Section 3B: Area 2a - Wealden Greensand Ridge - Redhill and Merstham</b>		Redhill Town Centre potential development sites Potential urban housing development sites Potential development sites beyond the current urban area
<b>Section 3C: Area 2b - Wealden Greensand Ridge - Reigate</b>		Reigate Town Centre potential development sites Potential urban housing development sites Potential development sites beyond the current urban area
<b>Section 3D: Area 3 - The Low Weald</b>		Horley Town Centre potential development sites Potential urban housing development sites Potential development sites beyond the current urban area Potential strategic employment provision Rural surrounds of Horley
<b>Section 4: Infrastructure to support growth</b>		Objective PS4: Plan for improvements to existing infrastructure and services and/or the provision of new infrastructure and services to meet the needs created by new development
<b>Section 5: Managing land supply</b>		MLS1: Phasing of Urban Extension sites MLS2: Safeguarding land for development beyond the plan period

# Briefing Note - Role of the Local Development Framework Scrutiny Review Panel and focus of the meeting

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

## Local Development Framework Scrutiny Review Panel

20 September 2016 (6:30 p.m.)

### Agenda item 2

#### 1. Scope

- 1.1 The scope of the LDF Scrutiny Review Panel is as follows:
- i) The main objective of the Panel is to examine the principles and processes that underlie the preparation of planning policy documents.
  - ii) In general the Panel's aim should be to establish planning policy documents:
    - Are clear, focused, achievable, realistic and based on sound practices;
    - Have clear linkages with corporate and other plans that form the Policy Framework and are designed to improve services in the Council's priority areas; and
    - Are applied in a way that enables the Council's goals, standards and priorities to be achieved.
- 1.2 The LDF Panel reports to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee will consider all reports of the LDF Panel at its meetings, and make any comments for consideration by the Executive in line with the Council's Policy Framework.
- 1.3 The LDF Panel's comments on the Regulation 18 consultation document will be taken into account as the draft Plan is developed between the close of consultation and Spring 2017.

#### 2. Focus for this meeting

- 2.1 The focus of this meeting is for the Panel to consider the principles and processes that underlie the preparation of the Development Management Plan.
- 2.2 Given the extensive member engagement undertaken by officers during the preparation of the Regulation 18 consultation document, the Agenda will be focused specifically on:
- i) The scope of the DMP as defined by the proposed objectives
  - ii) Whether the proposed policies, designations and potential development sites are achievable and realistic and based on sound practices
  - iii) Whether the proposed policies, designations and potential development sites are consistent with the corporate plan and the council's policy framework



- 2.3 Officers have a record of all comments previously raised by members, therefore it will not be necessary for members to reiterate comments already made. Members are reminded that they can also make representations as part of the consultation.

CONFIDENTIAL