

REIGATE AND BANSTEAD BOROUGH COUNCIL

COUNCIL: 26 JULY 2018

Questions by Members

Question by:	To be answered by:	Subject:
Cllr S. McKenna	Cllr K Foreman, Executive Member, Planning Policy	Garden Village Principles / National Planning Policy Framework
Cllr H. Brown	Cllr K Foreman, Executive Member, Planning Policy	Redhill Aerodrome
Cllr J.C.S. Essex	Councillor M.A. Brunt, Leader of the Council (The Leader nominated Cllr T. Schofield, Executive Member, Finance, to respond)	Pathway for Care

Council Meeting: 26 July 2018

Councillor S. McKenna will ask the **Executive Member for Planning Policy**, **Councillor K. Foreman** the following question:

Garden Village Principles and the National Planning Policy Framework

In the response to the National Planning Policy Framework consultation, which is attached to the letter to the Planning Inspector concerning the Council's Development Management Plan, the Council stated the following; "we would like to see the previous commitment to garden village principles being reinstated" and ..."a commitment to garden city principles is not set out anywhere else in government". This was shared to all councillors as a public document but we understand that there is intention to place this on the Council's website.

Why is the Conservative leadership of this Council pushing for this change to the National Planning Policy Framework, which will encourage large scale development of housing in the Green Belt, amongst other places?

Also, why does the Council refer to a garden city as opposed to a garden village, which sounds like an endorsement of large-scale development in the countryside?

Observations

The Council responds to many government consultations, including technical consultations such as the recent one in relation to the revised draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The role of national policy is to set the framework for local plan making and decisions.

The draft NPPF that was the subject of consultation advocated the development of new settlements and significant extensions to towns and villages; but it did not provide any commentary about how these should be considered or planned.

We merely requested reinstatement - in the new NPPF - of the clarification that was in the old NPPF that these should be planned following the principles of 'Garden Cities'. For the avoidance of doubt, our consultation response did not request any greater level of support in national policy for garden villages than has previously been in place.

Garden City principles and Garden Village principles are essentially the same thing. The terms are 'planning shorthand' for a range of design and planning elements advocated by the Town and Country Planning Association that are applicable to all large scale new developments.

These Principles include that such new development should be genuinely sustainable, with genuinely affordable homes, community stewardship, integrated

transport systems, employment opportunities for local people, and that development should respond to the local landscape setting including public open space for people to enjoy.

I would like to make it clear that the Council's response to the NPPF was prior to the new administration being in place, however I expect most people would agree that a set of design principles within national policy is a good thing.

Council Meeting: 26 July 2018

Councillor H. Brown will ask the **Executive Member for Planning Policy**, **Councillor K. Foreman** the following question:

Redhill Aerodrome

Local Conservative councillors recently stated their opposition to plans to build on and around Redhill Aerodrome, yet last time they had an opportunity to vote on this issue, in December 2017, the vast majority of Conservatives voted in favour of the plans to safeguard this land to be built on for houses after 2026 as part of the Council's Development Management Plan. More recently, the Council's ruling Executive supported minor changes to the Development Management Plan but no changes to plans to safeguard the land around the Aerodrome as the only proposed location beyond the plan period. Can you clarify whether the position of the Conservative administration has changed since the plan was voted upon in December?

Observations

The Development Management Plan was agreed for submission to the Secretary of State by this Council in December. Members will recall that whilst a number of motions were moved in relation to the item, the Council agreed the plan for submission without a recorded vote.

The draft Development Management Plan proposes that Redhill Aerodrome be safeguarded. If agreed by the Planning Inspector, this means that no development on the site can be considered until after 2027. Whether or not the site should be allocated for development in the future would need to be considered in more detail by this Council the next time we review our Local Plan.

This is explained in the draft DMP, which says (in para 4.10.21) that when we review our Plan we will need consider other alternative available land as well as the Aerodrome.

The draft DMP also explains (at para 4.10.22) that if (for example) the required access to the site cannot be secured or Tandridge District Council is not supportive in the future, safeguarded land may be returned to the Green Belt

The plan-making process is such that the Council can recommend minor amendments to the DMP to the Planning Inspector during the Examination. This is what the Executive supported in June.

However, only the Planning Inspector is able to recommend what the regulations call 'main modifications' such as the inclusion of a new policy or removal of a proposed policy.

We hope to receive the Planning Inspector's list of Issues and Matters imminently which will shape the discussions that take place at the hearing sessions in October.

In the meantime, (and in his absence) I would refer you to previous statements that the Leader has made with respect of Redhill Aerodrome, which is that he does not support development on the site.

Council Meeting: 26 July 2018

Councillor J.C.S. Essex will ask the **Leader of the Council, Councillor M. A. Brunt** the following question:

Pathway for Care

The Council's interest in the Pathway for Care company has changed over the past few months from a 1.1 million loan to a 1.1 million stake in shares of two companies, which may be redeemed in 5 years' time. Please can you provide a breakdown of the total amount that the Council has invested in Pathway for Care to date, the number of people that have taken up each of the services offered by the company so far, and what the expected return on that investment will be until these shares are redeemed?

Observations

The Leader of the Council nominated Cllr Schofield, Executive Member for Finance, to respond.

Thank you Madam Mayor and thank you Cllr Essex for your question.

Let me answer each element of your question.

1. £1.1M is the full extent that RBBC has invested in Pathway and which is now converted into redeemable preference shares in the new Pathway for Care Company. This will be exercised when PFC meets its business targets in some 5 years' time or so.
2. The new company is making good progress in pursuing its business plan. As we are minority shareholders in this private company it is not possible at this stage to communicate patient information at this stage. The leader had met with the CEO of PFC and is confident with the progress being made. Regular update reports will be provided by PFC which will be shared with both O&S and council members.
3. The policy of PFC is to distribute 50% of profits in dividends so RBBC will be receiving future returns commensurate with out 10% shareholding.