

HACKBRIDGE AND BEDDINGTON CORNER NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT GROUP

MONTHLY MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2015 - NOTES

Attendees: Helena Barrowclough (chair), Lysanne Horrox, Tony Killaspy, Sue Riddlestone (note taker), Danielle Reid, David Goymour, Hanna Zuchowska and Norman Jones

Apologies received from Julia Armstrong, Bob Steel, Jason Reynolds and Francesca Bellucci

The purpose of the meeting was to review comments and feedback from members and to prepare a brief to accompany the submission of our draft plan to Planning Aid England (PAE).

Minutes of the last meeting were approved with no comments.

Helena explained that consultation on our draft plan is delayed by Sutton Council requirements to have another external review by a qualified planner at this stage in the process. PAE has agreed to do this.

Group members either sent in, or brought along their comments to the meeting this evening. Lysanne agreed to add remaining policy points. David will incorporate typos and proof read at a later stage.

The following elements of the plan remain to be finalised:

1. Baseline map. Lysanne has sent a detailed email to LB Sutton. The page 14 baseline map is correct. This now needs to form the basis of all the other maps we need. This map was changed in time to go up on the Felnax hoardings. There is some more work to do on the movement section maps, one for cycling which Tom drafted, one for pedestrian ways, public transport, yellow lines, links.
2. Policies supporting energy waste and water and policy H&BEP2 were we have previously said we would add back in the point about making a plan for enabling one planet living.
3. Projects section is incomplete. But this is not the task for PAE.
4. Appendices have been produced but not as yet converted into the same format as the rest of the plan. A Word document containing the current version of the appendices will be sent to PAE with this version of our draft plan.

As agreed at our meeting in early January, this latest version of our neighbourhood plan will now be sent to PAE for external review. In late February a workshop will be arranged to review with PAE any questions or queries they/we may have, allowing PAE to go away and complete their review.

Following some initial comments and capture of changes to the latest version of our draft plan, the meeting moved on to outline a number of questions and comments for PAE. As agreed at the January meeting, these questions and comments would be collated into a brief, which would be sent to PAE, with a copy of the latest draft plan. For ease of reference, the brief is included with these notes and can be found at Annex A.

The next monthly meeting is scheduled to take place on Wednesday 11 March 2015. This meeting will focus on three items:

1. AGM – all posts will be reviewed and elected/re-elected and the bank account will be checked
2. Feedback from PAE will be reviewed and the draft plan will be revised as appropriate.
3. Ideas for consultation and how best to get the draft plan out to the community of Hackbridge and Beddington Corner and other interested stakeholders.

Papers supporting (1) and (3) above will be issued in advance of the next meeting, to give all members a chance to comment and contribute.

The meeting ended at 9.30pm.

ANNEX A

**HACKBRIDGE AND BC NDG
MEETING NOTES**

4 FEBRUARY 2015

**BRIEF FOR PLANNING AID ENGLAND TO SUPPORT THEIR REVIEW OF
DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**SUBMITTED BY HACKBRIDGE AND BEDDINGTON CORNER
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT GROUP**

9 FEBRUARY 2015

BACKGROUND

1. Hackbridge and Beddington Corner Neighbourhood Development Group (H&BC NDG) received formal designation as a neighbourhood forum in September 2012. This included confirmation of an agreed designated boundary.
2. Several versions of our draft plan have been produced and we have spent much time reviewing, revising and rewriting the contents. Our biggest challenge has been in trying to pull together 'planning policies'. Indeed, this has taken up much of the last two years!
3. In July 2013, H&BC NDG produced a version of our draft plan we felt was ready for pre – submission consultation. Efforts to undertake this next stage of our neighbourhood planning 'journey' were thwarted by Sutton Council, due to concerns over our proposals for development sites and planning policies. As a result, the NDG experienced a significant dip in energy and commitment.
4. Our attention and energy was instead diverted to a number of pressing issues, including approval of an incinerator in Beddington, planning permission for Felnax, saving a Victorian lodge, consultation on the location of a new school and the fall out of concerns about the 'heart of Hackbridge' project, to name but a few.
5. At the end of 2013, the NDG sought help from PAE and Locality, specifically to address the rather arduous task of writing planning policies to inform our plan. During the early part of 2014, the NDG worked with Locality to hone our planning policies. We took on board feedback and attempted to fill in gaps in our draft plan. Time had moved on and we found ourselves having to update and rewrite sections of our plan to take into account changes.
6. Following an extended summer break, the NDG reinstated monthly meetings and ran three workshop evenings, focused on reviewing and revising our planning policies. This proved productive and helped to reenergise the commitment of the group.
7. The start of 2015 has seen the latest version of our draft plan reviewed by NDG

members at both the January and February monthly meetings. A timeline was agreed at the January 2015 meeting, incorporating a 4 week external review period with PAE. This brief has been produced to aid PAE in their review.

ASSISTANCE REQUIRED FROM PAE

8. After a number of years and much commitment from a small but dedicated group of local residents in Hackbridge and Beddington Corner, we believe that this current version of our draft neighbourhood plan is ready to proceed to pre-submission consultation and publicity, in accordance with Part 5 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Please see extract from the aforementioned document below.

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

PART 5 - Neighbourhood development plans

Pre-submission consultation and publicity

14. Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must:

(a) publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area:

- (i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;
- (ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;
- (iii) details of how to make representations; and
- (iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;

(b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and

(c) send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.

9. In order to ensure that our local authority can offer full support to the NDG as it continues on its neighbourhood planning journey, we have been advised to put this version of our plan out for external review. To assist in the process of an external review of our plan, we have produced a table of comments and questions, which PAE may find helpful. In particular, we would like clarification on whether our planning policies are appropriately worded to give them 'weight' as a planning policy, while at the same time ensuring they are likely to deliver what local people have asked for.

PLANNING POLICIES

10. During the process of trying to compile and write up our planning policies, we have been frustrated by the requirement to almost force our planning policies to 'fit' with our local authority's existing planning policy or be sanitised to such an extent that we might as well have just rebadged our local authority's plan and presented it as our own.

11. We are concerned about a number of aspects of what is or isn't being provided/planned

for in Hackbridge but have found this very difficult to articulate (in acceptable planning policy speak) in our draft plan. During the compilation of our draft plan, we have experienced a number of poor planning decisions in Hackbridge, taken by our local authority it is assumed using their extant planning policies. Do we really feel comfortable providing reinforcement to policies that have failed to deliver improvements in Hackbridge? Is that what neighbourhood planning is all about?

12. In reviewing planning policies in our plan, we would value advice on the following two points:

- a) How do we produce a planning policy that retains the feeling that it contains the voice of the community? If we already have a wealth of local authority planning speak in many documents which our plan will sit along-side, (once it has passed a referendum) shouldn't our plan seek to provide an easier access for ALL residents, allowing them to feel and know they have been involved in determining what happens in Hackbridge? If we fill our plan with local authority planning speak, then it seems likely that residents will just switch off, as they already do in respect of what our local authority produces. This then becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy and we get monstrosities like Centrale. Local authority policy + confused and uninformed residents = poor design and planning done to us not with us. Advice please.
- b) Our local authority has long since designated the majority of sites across Hackbridge and Beddington Corner and as a result, we have struggled to understand how our plan is able to make a difference in respect of a number of these sites. We have received a quite contradictory advice in terms of exactly what 'power/influence' our plan is likely to have. To this extent, our draft plan no longer has a site specific section. All reference to sites is now covered under a number of planning policies: land north of BedZED covered by Environment policy, land north of Hackbridge railway station cover by Local Employment policy. Does this work? How will a developer use this? We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further as our experience with the developer for the Felnax site has taught us a few lessons and it seems wise to ensure we build this into our draft plan. Advice please.

13. The rest of this brief is presented in the form of a table, as a list of comments and questions. You may find it helpful to use this list as you work through the draft plan.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS	PAE RESPONSE
<p>Local Development Plan (LDP) - Sutton Council has recently begun consulting on the new LDP, which will be used to inform development in Sutton over the next 10-15 years. There are some key sites in Hackbridge which we would appreciate some guidance on wording in our draft plan, to ensure that the voice of the local community is being reflected in both our plan and by default, Sutton's proposed new LDP. We are particularly concerned about the land beside and in front of Hackbridge railway station, the designation of the community field at BedZED and the area of MOL north of BedZED.</p>	

Housing needs for Hackbridge residents - H&BEP4. Can PAE advise on policy wording for this? Increasing the mixture of tenure and affordable housing tenure, expanding on social rent, any new development must have a mixture of housing types so people can move between them. Building for low rent.

Hackbridge is currently experiencing increasing pressure on local housing resources that is, whilst not unique to London, is nonetheless adding to affordability issues that already exist. Immigration from other parts of London where rents and housing prices are more expensive, as well as a general increase in the population of London, is resulting in local families living in smaller accommodation than typical only a few years ago.

This is evident in the child yield for our local area. Whilst we are trying to gain some Hackbridge specific evidence, some evidence already exists in relation to local school places. Hackbridge Primary School was recently expanded to allow for the planned extra homes to be built in our area however this has already been filled up in key stage one before any of the planned development has commenced. Therefore the original child yield calculations made by Sutton Council were wrong. Sutton is now in the process of building a new school to address the increase in the local child population. Our understanding is that the original assumption made by Sutton was that families would occupy three bedroom terrace houses. The reality is now different.

It is our concern the the current Sutton Council policy for affordable housing is not enough to address the growing problem. Many people experiencing affordable housing pressures and do not qualify to be on the council housing list.

We wish for our housing needs policy to address this issue by encouraging a greater variety of tenure and we would appreciate some suggestions and assistance on how this can be done.

Health – CCWI3 - is this within the direct control of our local authority or NHS England? We wish to see our current medical practice (located on London Road) given the opportunity to expand its facilities. We would like to see it moved from London Road to Felnax. We are aware that the 106 agreement for Felnax makes provision for a medical centre. How can we best see this happen with any wording in our neighbourhood plan. For example the rent for the building should not be unaffordably high.

Education – CCWI3 - we recently agreed that part of the MOL land north of Bedzed could be used for a new school. As a caveat we stated that we wished to sterilise the remaining land for environmental uses such as an ecology park/visitors centre. How can this been done? Were advised by Sutton Council that this could/should be raised/discussed as part of the review of the Local Development Plan.

Air pollution objective 5.3 and policy MP3 - we would like advice on how we can say more to get air pollution under control. We will get additional traffic with additional development and residents, the incinerator coming soon will add 1% to pollution in the area. The through traffic and heavy lorry traffic to the adjacent trading estates is creating increased levels of air pollution. We are not aware that any monitoring of air pollution in Hackbridge is actually taking place. How do we address this in our neighbourhood plan?

Could we add wording for new developments not to add to air pollution in the area. We want air quality monitoring to see how we are performing against the EU standard. Could we have an ultra clean air zone? Can we change the status of the road from an A road to a B road? How can we best achieve our objective in our plan? In addition to developers, does our plan have powers over TFL and our local authority in this matter?

Maps - Can PAE draw up the maps we need, now that we have the base map? We have been relying on our local authority to do this and it is not proving that successful. It would probably be helpful to work with an individual to get our thoughts, aspirations and ideas in respect of a number of our themes represented on a number of maps.

Environment EP4 - improve quality of and access to the land north of BedZED. Page 39. Review wording to make it stronger. A general point is what can we put in our plan about sites like these go into the new Local Development Plan.

Policies that aren't policies! EP4 want to safeguard the land.

<p>Rules/regulations/policies - How often do we have to mention the NPPF or LB Sutton policies or London Plan? We need to demonstrate we have looked at them. Is that best practice? Would it make more sense to say this early on? Can we add a small reference number that links to the references in the back?</p>	
--	--