

Council
25 February 2019

LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON

MINUTES

**of the meeting of the Council
held on 25 February 2019
starting at 7.00 pm**

Members

**The Worshipful the Mayor
(Councillor Steve Cook)**

**The Deputy Mayor
(Councillor Chris Williams)**

Councillors:

Manuel Abellan	Jed Dwight	Jayne McCoy
Eric Allen	Trish Fivey	James McDermott-Hill
Martina Allen	Tim Foster	Annie Moral
Ben Andrew	Vincent Galligan	Param Nandha
Lily Bande	Neil Garratt	Jane Pascoe
David Bartolucci	Peter Geiringer	Nali Patel
Jenny Batt	Martin Gonzalez	Steve Penneck
Kevin Burke	Sunita Gordon	Holly Ramsey
Moira Butt	Catherine Gray	Muhammad Sadiq
Richard Clare	Jillian Green	Mo Saqib
Richard Clifton	Amy Haldane	Tony Shields
Elliot Colburn	Drew Heffernan	Jake Short
Jean Crossby	David Hicks	Colin Stears
Tim Crowley	Marian James	Sam Weatherlake
Ruth Dombey	Edward Joyce	Jill Whitehead
Tom Drummond	Nick Matthey	Hanna Zuchowska
	Jayne McCoy	

ABSENT Councillors Marlene Heron, Ali Mirhashem and Ryan Stoneman

PART 'A'

31. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 January 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

32. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors: Marlene Heron, Ali Mirhashem and Ryan Stoneman.

Council
25 February 2019

The Mayor made the following announcements:

The Mayor had attended numerous events across the borough and throughout London, which had included: The Jack Petchey Awards, Sutton Green Café opening, The UK Asian Curry Awards, the Sutton Community Awards, Sutton Christmas Lights Switch On, Tri-borough Police Commendation Awards and the Sutton Wind Orchestra concert at All Saints. Plus the Wallington Christmas Festival, Carshalton Frost Fair, Sutton Music Festival, attending the switching-on of the Oslo tree lights in Trafalgar Square, the Banstead Yulefest, Sutton Air cadets review, several London Mayoral Association events and was invited to the Hong Kong Trade delegation Chinese New Year celebration.

He had also attended Holocaust memorial Services at City Hall and Sutton Grammar School and several citizenship ceremonies.

The Mayor sent best wishes to former Cllr Melican who had recently resigned due to ill health. The Mayor announced the passing of former Councillor Alan Salter and announced that he had attended the funeral of late former Councillor Janet Lowne at All Saints Benhilton Church.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

34. ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

(a) Questions from Members of the Public

There were six questions from six members of the public; the supplementary questions and answers are set out at Appendix A to the minutes. A procedural motion was moved, seconded and duly carried to allow the time limit for public questions to be extended and all questions to be taken.

(b) Questions from Councillors

There were twenty three questions from eleven councillors, the supplementary questions and answers are set out at Appendix B to the minutes.

35. PETITIONS

Councillor Shields submitted a petition on behalf of residents relating to parking strategy consultation, the Chief Executive advised that the petition would be referred to the Environment and Neighbourhood Committee.

36. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND NOTICES OF MOTION

(a) Commissioning & Financial Planning 2019-20 to 2022-23

Councillor Sunita Gordon, Lead Member for Resources moved the updated recommendation.

Following debate, and in accordance with government regulations, a recorded vote was taken on the updated recommendation (see below):

RESOLVED:-

That the recommendations from Strategy and Resources Committee and the attached revised Appendix G3 (table), Appendix H (Part 2: Appendix A - Allowances: Rates), and Appendix K (paragraph 2 ii).be agreed as follows:

Commissioning Intentions

1. Agree the Outcomes Based Commissioning Plan at Appendix A;

Revenue Budget 2019/20

2. Agree the proposed General Fund Net Budget Requirement of £144.178m summarised at Appendix B;
3. Agree the base budget changes set out in section 12 and summarised in Appendix C;
4. Approve the Council's pay policy statement for 2019/20 in Appendix D;
5. Agree growth items proposed in Appendix E;
6. Agree the 2019/20 savings proposed in Appendix F;

HRA

7. Note the rent reduction of 1% as mandated by Government and agree the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget 2019/20 including the proposed savings (Appendices G1, G2, and G3 which is revised);

Other

8. Approve the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2019/20 (Appendix H - revised).

Capital Programme

9. Approve the new Capital Strategy (Appendix I1) including the detailed Capital Programme (Appendix I2) for 2019/20 to 2022/23 with a total spend of £163.362m, including the proposed funding arrangements and policies.
10. Authorise expenditure to be incurred of £7.944m for the 2019/20 planned works to Council dwellings (Appendix I3) and £0.759m for Expenditure on Corporate Operational Buildings (Appendix I4);

Reserves

Council
25 February 2019

11. Agree the policy on reserves as set out in section 12;

Treasury Management

12. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy 2019/20 including the Annual Investment Strategy, prudential indicators, Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy and borrowing limits as set out in Appendix J;

Council Tax

13. Agree the Sutton element of the 2019/20 Council Tax £1,373.81 for a Band D property, an increase of £26.17 (2.00%) for the Adult Social Care Precept and £39.12 (2.99%) for the general increase;

14. Approve the formal resolution at Appendix K (revised), including the Council Tax Requirement of £100.626m;

15. Note the proposed GLA precept of £320.51, increased from £294.23 in 2018/19 (an increase of 51p a week);

In accordance with standing order 27.6, as the recommendation of the Strategy and Resources Committee had been amended, the Leader of the Council confirmed she had no objection to resolution.

Commissioning & Financial Planning 2019-20 to 2022-23 (Committee Report)	
Councillor Manuel Abellan	For
Councillor Eric Allen	Against
Councillor Martina Allen	Against
Councillor Ben Andrew	For
Councillor Lily Bande	Against
Councillor David Bartolucci	For
Councillor Jenny Batt	For
Councillor Kevin Burke	For
Councillor Moira Butt	Against
Councillor Richard Clare	For
Councillor Richard Clifton	For
Councillor Elliot Colburn	Against
Councillor Steve Cook	Abstain
Councillor Jean Crosby	For
Councillor Tim Crowley	Against
Councillor Ruth Dombey	For
Councillor Tom Drummond	Against
Councillor Jed Dwight	Against
Councillor Trish Fivey	For
Councillor Tim Foster	Abstain
Councillor Vincent Galligan	For
Councillor Neil Garratt	Against
Councillor Peter Geiringer	Against

Council
25 February 2019

Councillor Martin Gonzalez	For
Councillor Sunita Gordon	For
Councillor Catherine Gray	Against
Councillor Jillian Green	Abstain
Councillor Amy Haldane	For
Councillor Drew Heffernan	For
Councillor David Hicks	Against
Councillor Marian James	For
Councillor Edward Joyce	For
Councillor Nick Matthey	Abstain
Councillor Jayne McCoy	For
Councillor James McDermott-Hill	Against
Councillor Annie Moral	For
Councillor Param Nandha	Against
Councillor Jane Pascoe	Against
Councillor Nali Patel	For
Councillor Steve Penneck	For
Councillor Holly Ramsey	Against
Councillor Muhammad Sadiq	For
Councillor Mo Saqib	For
Councillor Tony Shields	Against
Councillor Jake Short	For
Councillor Colin Stears	For
Councillor Sam Weatherlake	For
Councillor Jill Whitehead	For
Councillor Chris Williams	For
Councillor Hanna Zuchowska	For
Agreed	

37. CLOSURE MOTION

Councillor Ruth Dombey, moved the closure motion which was seconded by Councillor Jayne McCoy.

RESOLVED:-

That, in accordance with Standing Order 12.8, all items remaining to be dealt with at this Council meeting be approved or noted as set out in their recommendations, subject to the leaders of the opposition groups being able to express dissent on them.

The following items were adopted or noted, without dissent:

- Treasury Management Quarterly Report
- Appointment of Head of Paid Service and Interim Section 151 Officer.

The meeting ended at 10.21 pm

Council
25 February 2019

Mayor:
Date:

**London Borough of Sutton
Council: 25 February 2019
Questions under Standing Order 8.7
from Members of the Public**

1. Question asked by Wendy Clark to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

The council has stated that most of their budget is now allocated to care for the elderly and disabled.

Given that a high number of disabled and elderly are cared for by friends and family, who attend for anything between a few minutes to several days, and that these people relieve the Council of any further financial support, how are the council going to ensure a parking space is available where and when it is needed by these carers?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you, I think it's important to start by noting that the Council cannot ensure that parking space is available where and when it's needed because all road users have different requirements and there is simply too many cars for the amount of spaces we have on the road.

In areas where we don't have parking controls, as its common practice everywhere, it works on a first come first served basis and that will continue to be the case. And in areas where you have parking controls, like a CPZ, the Council offers is obviously restricted to Permit Holders but you also have Care Permits so we have two different types of Care Permits. All the details are on the Council Website, and we've made sure we keep them quite low because we know the important work that Carers do for their loved ones and for residents.

So if you had in mind a specific suggestion or there's more to that question I am more than happy to hear it and to consider it.

Supplementary question asked by Wendy Clarke

I am aware that permits are available but they do not address the problem because they are restricted for 3 hours in a bay that is not guaranteed. What response will you give if I suggest that it would be more prudent for the Carers to have access to parking similar to the Blue Badge Scheme but being restricted to the address of the person in the care?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

We would have to look at the details but I'm more than happy to have a conversation and look. I know when we met with Miss Ackland we did discuss different options with Councillor

Dombey and myself so I think it premature to make announcements in this forum without looking at the detail but we can certainly sit down and look at options.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey

As much as we can have toing and froing, the rights the wrongs, the bays... The Carers are absolutely are primo important, you touched upon it, you could have gone a bit further, and I hope I know you will, you said you can look at the Carers Permits.

When Carers Permits are issued, they're issued just to the specific road where the person receiving care lives. In the case of St. Helier Estate, there are some of the little places, I think, only have about four parking spaces anyway, so the chances of getting a bay in a restricted road for a specific carer are scant and far away.

You said you would look at the detail, I am offering your my time and service to look at the detail with you so we can get this right. Will you take me up on the offer to try and get the Carers Permit System sorted for the people that are doing a wonderful service for our residents?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes.

2. Question asked by Colin Keene to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

In the official written reply to a question accepted, but unable to be heard at the Council meeting on 28 January, Councillor Abellan stated that, at Stage 3 all residents will be provided with a more in-depth design for their street and will have the opportunity to consider formally the revised proposals and either accept or reject them, yet at the Scrutiny Meeting on 6 February he stated that a street-by-street 'referendum' would be out of the question - so what WILL be the precise process at Stage 3 and how will it be communicated to the residents?

Reply by Councillor Abellan

Thank you Mr Keene for your question and for the recent exchanges of emails over the past couple of weeks.

The Stage 3 process is essentially the statutory consultation that is required by law. It has a bit of a prescriptive format that happens in the world of traffic engineers but, at that stage, residents will have the opportunity to look at more, potentially an amended version, after looking at the results of the recent consultation and look at an even more in-depth design for the road, and then they will be able to respond in a similar way to the previous two consultations whether they support or reject the proposals. I believe that it has to be done in

APPENDIX A

writing, and it will be done online mostly, it's just the normal format that we use for those consultations.

And just to touch on another point from your question, what I meant on scrutiny was that whilst we are consulting on a road by road basis, we really need to be careful to balance between making sure that as much as possible, we deliver what each road wants but have a strategic view as well of each scheme and each area.

What I wouldn't want to have, is a sort of 'each road decides their own' scheme and then you have a mis-match of different schemes and it would be very difficult to administer that, so I think it needs to be a balance of common sense using the expertise from our engineers and then look at the results from the consultation.

Supplementary question asked by Mr Keene

Yes, I am slightly re-assured when I hear that Councillor Abellan.

What I would like to know is, can you give us some time frames? Could you be a little more precise on how that Stage 3 consultation will actually occur, and the manner in which replies will actually be considered? Possibly will you accept, say a representative from a particular street, to cut down on numbers of replies?

I happen to live in a street where we are very close people. We've known one another for many years. I am sure one or two of us would only be too pleased to act for that street to cut down on time. We are all living in a state of limbo and I think the clock is quite important to us and we're rather concerned that something might just slip under the radar and we will be lumbered with something that nobody really wanted.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Sure, the normal way a statutory consultation of this nature would work is that I believe there has to be a notice in the local papers and there are notices on the lamp posts and sometimes letters to residents. Then I think its 21 days that the consultation lasts.

What we are quite keen to do is to have an engagement plan in the lead-up to that so that we do a bit more - it's what we've done since the start of the processes: do more than what's required, so make sure that we have a solid communications plan so that as many people as possible are aware that there is consultation and they just don't have to look at a lamp post.

We're going to look at many other things that we've done in the last 12 months from maybe additional leaflets, extra letters, using the press, using drop-in public meetings, so on and so forth.

Timing: it's always been the end of March but what I think the point I would like to stress is: that for me, the most important thing is that we get it right, and that we don't want to rush anything and then realise later that it wasn't a good scheme. So if it means that we need to

take a tiny bit more time to make sure that we engage with more people and we discuss it with more residents and we digest it properly and make the necessary changes, we will do that.

We don't want to rush it and if I think there is a bit more flexibility then maybe some residents think, in terms of when we're going to do the formal consultation, we're not talking three or four months extra, but you know a few weeks could be... we could look at that.

I am quite keen to give everyone the chance to respond themselves. I think it's important that each individual has - it doesn't take that long. I think we would like to encourage everyone to respond and give their views so I would be more inclined to leaving it open as possible but if you have specific ideas in mind in terms of what you meant by one representative doing it on behalf of someone else, I guess if you were to write that within the consultation response that would be taken as a response for another resident I guess. I don't know - we are more than happy to look at that in more detail as well.

Reply by Mr Keene

Could you just briefly say when we are likely to see the new plan for a particular street - say ours for instance?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Sure, we haven't seen the results yet, so the process will probably be: I will see the results, then colleagues will see the results, then we are going to brief ward Members over the affected wards, then we will have a communications plan - I would imagine in the next 4 to 6 weeks.

I know it's a bit stressful because we're in between two consultations but there is a lot of work being done by our officers to make sure that we look at the responses from residents and make any necessary changes in areas where we need to - then present something that we have to also continue the consultation and the conversations with the residents. Presenting something that we are comfortable with as close as possible to what residents want.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Jillian Green

Thank you Mr. Mayor. Councillor Abellan, you said very early on in your response that it's mainly done online. I think most of the people here that sit on committees with me know I am extremely concerned about those that do not have access to computers, especially the elderly. How are you going to address this problem?

It's a constant problem that comes up and it concerns me so much. So how do you envisage getting all this parking information from people that don't have computers? Thank you.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you, I think you raise a very good point and it's a point that you have made at different meetings and I think I am still waiting for a couple of your suggestions as well.

We will accept written responses as we have with previous consultations, I think we will need to try and reach out to those more vulnerable residents using as many different channels as we can - that's why I think leaflet dropping and letters is probably the best way.

But we often rely on residents telling other residents and working with key community activists and key community leaders to spread the word and that's why the work that the Facebook group and other residents have put in has been quite useful. We don't always agree on some of the issues, but what we all agree on is that if we can spread the word so that people have a say we will do that. Again, if you have ideas, send them my way and we can discuss them.

3. Question asked by Charlie Mansell to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

The current Council Parking consultation had led to an interesting public debate over a range of issues including:

- Formal types of consultation that could operate
- Level of publicity for early stages of this process
- Applicability of purdah during single ward by-elections
- Scheduling and length of consultation periods
- Council engagement with residents through more fully utilising its various types of meetings
- Choice of venues the Council uses for meetings
- Utilising Council Meeting amendments to give an update on the current position in a consultation process

As a result of that debate the simple question to pose here is what lessons has the Council learned from its current Parking consultation as to how it engages residents on this issue in future?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes, we have learned some lessons and we're continuing to learn some lessons from the exercise and we are very keen to incorporate those lessons into future consultations on parking and other consultations as well.

I think some of the points you make are probably for officers and other Councillors, in terms of for example, choice of venues so on, but I on that one I agree the last venue was probably not the most adequate.

In terms of some of the lessons we've learned, I think things like the website is something we've been discussing - making sure that, for example, simple things like having no glitches when you're looking for a road, that those are checked before hand seems like an obvious one.

I think we can definitely improve the frequently asked questions (FAQs). There was some discussion on maybe adding a bit more detail in terms of the explanation of different schemes and how they work, which I accept. Things like a couple of more descriptions on the sheets when you are just about to download your map for your road would be helpful...

Again, more engagement, and early, on social media, can help in terms of the length of consultations. We can probably do a bit better at maybe keeping residents updated in between the first informal consultation and the second one - I think that is something that we agree, that maybe there was a bit too much of a gap in between the two.

I would be pushing for keeping the length of the second informal consultation as long as it was after we extended it, so giving residents a bit more time - which I think was appreciated. Many more lessons, but these are some of the lessons, just to give you a bit of a flavour of the discussions we've had in the last couple of weeks.

Supplementary question asked by Mr Mansell

I would like to thank Councillor Abellan for his response, and I would also like to thank Mr Mayor for your very helpful update on the purdah rules for by-elections because of course I was a bit worried from the previous one, that the whole of Brexit could be delayed by a parliamentary by-election.

What I wanted to ask and this is really my chance to try and get a second Labour comment in Councillor McCoy's blog, is to ask Councillor Abellan -

Would he consider the following good practice in future:

- obviously defining things as pre-consultation rather than consultation,
- a 75% response rate from rose before someone proceeds rather than 12% response rates,
- a plain English guide to CPZ operation, and
- a Council Facebook page on CPZs that the Council sets up rather than having to force residents to actually create their own Facebook group?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes, just picking up on the points you made, I think the Council Facebook page idea is exactly what I meant by earlier engagement and more engagement on social media it's definitely something we've discussed.

The guide on the CPZ yes, that's exactly what I meant by more details online and in other forms about the types of schemes. I have looked at the schemes for hours and hours like

APPENDIX A

many others and we still have sometimes some questions so I can understand how for other people, that don't look at it in as much detail as we do, they can be confusing.

The main pre-consultation I spoke to officers about that and we had an interesting conversation. I'm not sure I think an informal consultation... a consultation is a consultation... I think the term pre-consultation was not the right one if you're consulting already so I'm not sure if would agree on that one.

75% response rate - I think the Brexit vote was the biggest democratic exercise we've had in our generation, at least we got a turn out of 72%, so I think you're quite ambitious if you think were going to get 75% of people responding on a very exciting parking consultation. From speaking to officers we've never had anything more than 20% on consultations on this scale, and I think it would cost a lot of money to get to that point. It's more being comfortable that we have a good enough sample that the margin of error is correct and the statistical reliability bit is important so more than actual numbers. I think it's just the quality of the substance and feeling comfortable that the proposal is a good one so yeah... Do you have a magical formula to get to 75% please share it.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Abellan. Touching on the answer to this and also to the previous question, you mentioned about the extending consultations and when they're going to come in and when they're not coming in.

There seems to be an element of confusion in regards to the consultation that were in now going into Stage 3 and it's being said by various of your colleagues on social media sites that it has already been agreed to extend that into May, and that's being said on Facebook and on Twitter and other various media outlets.

Can you now confirm that, because Members on this side have not been informed of that, or is that just something that you're hoping to do rather than is actually happening?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I haven't seen those comments so I can't comment on those specifics.

What we are keen to do is give ourselves enough flexibility to consult residents properly in the run up to the Stage 3 consultation and we want to leave ourselves a bit of flexibility too if we need to take a bit more time to do so.

We have been asked by many, many people to either stop it or pause it or and so I think giving ourselves a bit more room to manoeuvre is good and it means that it's our intention to continue to engage, as opposed to passing something quickly behind closed doors that no-one notices.

We will take the time we need to get it right, and we will give residents a chance to see everything on the website once the changes have been made to the schemes - I know there will be some - and then in due course, we will have the Stage 3 consultation, as we know that that's the statutory one, and then we go into the implementation phase. I think it's just common sense.

4. Question asked by Dave Triphook to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

I would like clarity and again raise the question of in my opinion, following a 'junk mail' parking consultation leaflet drop, via the Post Office, to 43000 households in Sutton (with a return rate of 12%) why Mr Abellan feels this is a true reflection of a 'consultation'?

Surely this return figure alone is not what was expected and should have raised his concerns as to why the return rate was so low?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Yes - I mean I think this touches a bit from the supplementary from Mr Mansell in the previous question.

I don't agree with the characterisation that you've made of the consultation process, I think we've done a lot more than what normally local authorities do in terms of consultation. It's an 18 month process with two informal consultations, one formal consultation, lots of engagement and so I've mentioned that in many meetings already so I won't repeat that.

From speaking to council officers that have done this here and in other authorities and other Councillors and officers from across London, it's not uncommon to get this type of response to a traffic highway related consultation. What we are keen to... and that's hopefully the message that you'll pick up from all these questions... is that we're keen to consult and to hear from as many people as possible on the run up to Stage 3, that's why I am working with my colleagues so that they get out on the door steps and they have as many discussions as they can with residents and they continue the conversation and I think the upcoming weeks are going to be really important to make sure that we have those more calm 'on the door steps conversations' with residents to answer some of the questions they might have and hopefully, the best design possible.

Again, if the question had a specific number like the 75% figure we heard... but if that's the case, it would be very unlikely we would reach it and it would cost us a lot of money...

Supplementary question asked by Mr Triphook

I do [have a supplementary question] actually Mr Mayor and if you could just extend me a little latitude here:

APPENDIX A

Mr Abellan, the census back in 2011 - 95% of the United Kingdom completed and returned the letter that dropped through their letter[box] that day. Just a normal letter.

I will paraphrase on the front of it "not a circular important document sign here and return". You opened the letter, he completed it... the people who replied to that was 95% - that happens to be 23.5 million out of 25 million households.

Here's my question: had you used the same approach (letter through the door) and not a circular - complete and return the pre-paid envelope - now let's not forget you had already used the Post Office for Stage 1 and Stage 2... you got a 12% return and you think that's a reasonable return. I personally do not... had you adopted that process, do you not feel you would have a decent and better data set for analysis for your parking scheme? Because I feel that would have fallen at the first hurdle in that case.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I mean if we had a lot more money and we could get pre-paid envelopes and stuff like that we would definitely do it. We unfortunately... we don't have as much money as people might think in terms of austerity.

So yes, I would love for us to get more money to spend on pre-paid envelopes and so on and so forth. I don't know the specifics of the letter you are referring to. Again, if we had more money we would do all of those things.

On the letter.... the letter specifically said "Official decisions are being made on your street" - we did two of them and we put countless amount of leaflets mentioning the parking strategy, lots of engagements on social media and so on... of course we can improve.

Supplementary asked by Councillor Nick Matthey

Mr Mayor and Councillor Abellan my supplementary question is this:

The fact is, with these consultations, the Council knows the answer it wants to get and it works on the basis that if the questions are clouded and not clear it will get answers and it can then proceed with the way it wants.

Bearing in mind the impact that this is going to have on so many people, I would like to suggest that we do go for the pre-paid envelope solution and we stop using examples like Brexit and 12% and we go for a proper consultation.

It's going to cost some money, it may not give the answers that the Council want, but that's what the people want. Can we adopt that please? Thank you.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I think that was more your opinion than a question, so my response is exactly the same as I gave.

Thank you, in between you giving your opinion, just a further comment on the previous question. The reason that it got to 95% is because you could get a fine of a £1,000 because it's compulsory to fill in the census.

So we can't... I think it would be nonsensical to start fining residents if they don't reply to consultation. So the response to Councillor Matthey's opinion is exactly the same as I gave to the last resident.

5. Question asked by Steve Alvarez to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

At the last Scrutiny Committee meeting you advised that 15 company registered N1 van renewal permits were denied within the current CPZ zones since 2016. You also said that you will wait for the results of Stage 2 to see how many residents have raised the issue before rethinking the policy. Did you make any effort at all to find out what negative impact these denials had on those 15 people and if so do you think it acceptable to deny someone their job?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

Thank you Mr Alvarez for the question and for the exchanges we've had over the last couple of weeks on this issue.

Just to clarify, at the Scrutiny meeting after speaking to officers, it was between 10-15 people affected. They've looked into it in more detail and the actual number was 10 - so just to put that on the record.

So 10 applications refused since November 2017 in the existing parking controls areas. In answer to your question: one of the first things I did when this issue was raised with me by both Councillors and members of the public like yourself, was to speak to officers to get the numbers on how many people had been refused in the existing parking controlled areas, and what the issues were. And then, if residents were able to find alternatives - and in the overwhelming majority of cases, residents were able to work with officers to get alternative solutions to park their N1 van close to their home.

Supplementary question asked by Mr Alvarez

As I have told you before: the van, my van, and whoever else drives a van - they have to take it home. If they don't take it home... if I don't take my van home, I will lose my job.

When my boss sees the tracker or the van isn't outside my house, he will take the van off me. What have you got in place for everyone who loses their job so their bills are paid, mortgages are paid and food is on the table?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

As I have said to you for the last couple of weeks, that is exactly the issues that we are discussing with officers.

As we expand, it's what I said at Scrutiny... as we expand any policy for areas we need to look at the detail and see the impact it might have in other areas because it is different circumstances so we're looking at different options and I have read carefully the letter you sent to the leader of the Council - so I know your specific case quite closely, and we have exchanged emails already and as I've said, I've offered, once we have had a chance to look at the details with our officers, to meet with you and continue the discussion.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Neil Garrett

Thank you very much Mr Mayor. This is not a low budget exercise, this is nearly £2 million that's going on this parking consultation, and two years have been spent and I can't quite understand why, what is quite an obvious point that Mr Alvarez has made, hasn't already been thought about during those two years.

Why has that not already been thought about, isn't it obvious that if you ban certain types of van from quite a wide area all the people in that area are not going to be able to keep their job which involves a van?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

The very simple answer as I said earlier is it hasn't been an issue in the existing zone, he doesn't live in the existing zone. As we move forward if it becomes an issue and there is no alternative solutions, we're looking at options and will make changes if it has a massive impact on people.

6. Question asked by Robert Ede to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee

This question is in regards to current parking consultations which are in progress throughout the London Borough of Sutton.

During the last Scrutiny Committee meeting, you admitted that the current plans will reduce the number of parking spaces in certain areas. You also said that you are currently doing street surveys road by road.

Who is carrying out these street surveys and why were they not done before you started Stage 2 so you could see whether the agencies plans at Stage 1 were workable or not before you sent the residents the plans?

You could have altered things at Stage 2 yourselves so that we could have our opinion but instead, you will be leaving it until Stage 3 where we will not be allowed to have an opinion at all?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

So just to clarify a few points from your question during the Scrutiny meeting: I did say that in some cases, during the hours of operation, there might be roads that have less spaces but that would not be affected for overnight parking.

It's also worth remembering that commuters and non-residents will in the majority of cases not be allowed in those zones, which will mean less cars parking on those roads during the day. In your question you say you won't be able to have an opinion at Stage 3 - as I've said many times tonight there will be a formal consultation where residents will be able to formally give their opinion on whether they reject or support the proposals.

Supplementary question by Robert Ede

Can I just say that's a traffic management order isn't it? So that is an order that essentially says either yes or no is that correct?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

People will be able to respond on the road whether they support or reject the proposals.

Reply by Robert Ede

So we don't get a say in how it's working or any other options in that case....sorry this wasn't my supplementary so I will listen to your full answer.

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

So yes, so you will be consulted formally and properly at Stage 3. Officers have used comments from the different phases too and will use those comments to shape what will come to Stage 3, and this is not only... you know this exercise did not start in January 2018 - this is conversation, an initiative, that has been going on for many many years, that residents and Councillors have discussed for many many years, it's not something that just came out of nowhere.

So there is a lot of historical knowledge, there's a lot of complaints and a lot of expertise already within the Council, that's already been taken into account in the designs... so on the specific point on who carried the parking surveys it's a consultancy called Traffic Data Centre.

So you asked why we didn't go for the very detailed proposals at Stage 2. The logic of the consultation is that we start with a general question "did you have parking problems on your

APPENDIX A

road?" then we moved onto looking at area per area with specific schemes, and now we're going to look at... after doing all the street surveys, is at the impact on the specific roads.

What I suspect might happen is that some roads will be taken out if there's a clear majority of people that don't want schemes on the road or in their area. I think it's a bit of a waste of time and money to do detailed street surveys on those roads if they are going to be taken out at Stage 3.

So what we'll look at now is whether the types of schemes are the correct ones for each area and the size of each scheme and that might change depending on the results from the Stage 2 consultation.

Supplementary question asked by Robert Ede

Thank you for your answer, and can I just say thank you for doing the last two questions as well it was the right thing to do. I just wanted to recap a little bit to a supplementary question that I had last time, the two questions that I put in at the meeting on the 28 January - we haven't had a response yet so... that's about two and a half weeks.

Now essentially, there's other schemes that don't take away parking space on the road - they keep money from the permits coming in. They're more cost effective to actually put in, it's a parking scheme which is a PPA which is without bays and yellow lines - that's a lot better for the residents.

Epsom zone M is 1.5 miles of road. Councillor Abellan was saying a small zone is ok which he's referring to Wallington North which is 1.3 miles. My question to him, now that there is a proven alternative that is better for the residents, in places that need a permit parking area, will that be considered for Stage 3? It's been done by Epsom Council... it's been done by Kingston Council very recently.

So would at Stage 3 level... would a PPA without bays and yellow lines be put forward as a proposal?

Reply by Councillor Manuel Abellan

I've seen your email and the content of it which has been passed to our officers, as you can imagine there's lots and lots of things that they're doing at the moment - analysing 5,000 responses.

I asked them specifically to look at the Epsom scheme to see if they could be replicated and when I mentioned that we are looking at each scheme, whether it's the right one and the size of the schemes, these are exactly the type of discussions that we are having.

It appears in discussions with officers... it appears like it's a very simple solution to throw a PPA at a specific road or area but there's a lot of issues around enforcement and getting challenges at appeal and it's a tiny bit more complicated but I'd be more than happy in a

better setting to have a discussion with you in due course once I get a full detailed response from our officers, but those are the things we are looking at so it's... all of that is on the table.

**London Borough of Sutton
Council: 25 February 2019
Questions Under Standing Order 8.6
from Members**

1. Question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Last year the council made a provision of £1.2 million to repay tenants commissions taken by the council in relation to water charges. This money has still not been repaid. Could the council explain why this is still the case and when those affected can expect to be reimbursed?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you Mr Mayor. As Councillor Crowley has previously been advised on this matter, and as is set out in the Housing Economy and Business Committee Report of January 2017, this particular provision relates to a successful legal case against Southwark Council.

This case is currently under legal challenge by a number of local authorities working through the LGA Local Government Association and a test case has been listed for trial in October and the use of the provision will depend on the outcome of that case.

The case is under challenge because it rests on a legal technicality of whether the boroughs were acting as agents on behalf of the water companies. But we have been very clear in Sutton that tenants have paid no more for their water and sewerage than they would have done if they had been billed directly by the water companies and the provision is simply a prudent estimate in the event of a worse case scenario.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley

Couple of things really, if the Council are that confident that it's just a prudent provision why did they make it in the first place if they're so confident in their own case? And secondly, with this 1.2 million which has been set aside now for around about 4 years, and if the Council are found to be having to pay this money back, will the people who have paid it in the first place get it with interest?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you, well a provision is in case of a worse case scenario. And also I'm sure that Southwark did not think they were going to get the case ruled against them because they were quite confident and because the LGA is actually acting on behalf of Councils they're

fairly confident that ... there is room for challenge but as I say Southwark probably thought they would win and they didn't and they had to pay out.

So we are just being prudent and putting that money aside, we don't know what the outcome will be it could go the same way as Southwark or it could be successfully challenged.

In terms of interest I think the interest charges are included in the provision, but one thing that's worth noting is actually if we do have to pay out, the tenants will be more negatively impacted because that money is going to be taken out of the HRA account which is money set aside for repairs and maintenance of the properties, so it actually depletes the HRA account - it's a bit of a shame but that's what we have to do we have to make a provision.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey

First point, If you owe money to people because you've been overcharging them you do not take it back from them in another way because otherwise you haven't given them it back. That's the first point.

Let us go over what really happened... What happened was that in 2009 the Council produced a report that said there were sectors of housing, including SHP, where the people were suffering financially, so officers from SHP went along to the water company and they asked for the administrative fee to be increased and that money was going to be passed on to the people in SHP - it never happened.

So that money... my question is... when will the Council hand back the money? Because if you take money from companies saying you're going to give it back to people and you keep it yourself you are not acting legally or honestly, that's my question.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Councillor Matthey - that's a complete misrepresentation of the situation. The situation originates back from when most Councils owned their own housing stock and it was an arrangement lots of boroughs made, or the water companies asked the boroughs to make, that they would collect the water charges and sewerage charges directly from residents because they were already collecting the rent and other charges so it was easiest basically for the Councils to collect alongside that and for the water companies to bill them directly.

In return for that, they received an admin fee. Now in Sutton, the admin fee that was charged doesn't actually cover the administration cost of recovering that, so it's just that because of the legal definition in the Southwark case, they were seen as an agent rather than just acting through responsibility, they determined that the admin fee was a discount but that's what the point is in case.

So there is no extra being paid by the tenants for their charges, I am just saying that a provision has to be made out of the HRA account because how the HRA account works is that it's a ring fenced account so that's the fact of the case.

2. Question asked by Councillor Tim Foster to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

It is now nearly 12 months since the last minuted meeting of the CAMC which means that there has been no oversight of activity by Viridor in the implementation of the Conservation Management Scheme and therefore no attempt by the London Borough of Sutton to enforce a clear breach of the terms of the Section 106 Agreement.

Why have the London Borough of Sutton not enforced these terms and when do they intend to re-establish the CAMC's operational brief within the terms of its Constitution?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you. So this is about the Conservation and Access Management Committee and thank you Councillor Foster, for your question.

There does appear to be some confusion about the remit of the Conservation and Access Management Committee. The Section 106 Agreement requires that this committee is set up to oversee the conservation management activities and objectives contained in the Conservation and Management Scheme, and the Conservation and Management Scheme only comes into play after restoration of the landfill site, and as that restoration is not yet complete, the allegation of the new breach in respect of this matter is therefore incorrect.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tim Foster

There was a meeting in January, 8th January, and Viridor accepted that there had been delays in restoration but gave a firm commitment that steps would be taken to ensure restoration can be completed.

Viridor are considering other alternatives to the previous administration of the Conservation and Access Committee. You're saying it didn't exist - it has its own constitution. We have... Viridor themselves tried to change the terms of that constitution. We will be in contact when we have Viridor's programme of work - so we don't even have Viridor's programme of work, there's been no member oversight of any of this process and no progress, and as lead member of planning why have you allowed this situation to come about?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you - again there still is a bit of confusion here. The restoration of the landfill site is one process, but that is not the remit of the CAMC to oversee that.

The remit of the CAMC is... the Conservation Management Scheme wants the management of the landfill site once it's been restored. So that part... It's not your responsibility to oversee the restoration of the site, and I know that there has been oversight of the restoration because I have been asking questions about it, and there has been some delays but then

the whole process has been delayed because the planning process was delayed but it is going on and there have been meetings with the Conservation Science Group and officers in respect of progress towards restoration, so that has been ongoing and has been reviewed and there are reasons for the delays.

The CAMC is in the process of being set up... you've been appointed Chair, but that's not to oversee the restoration it's the management of it once it's restored. As Chair of that committee it's down to you, you can make sure that everything is in place - you dictate what the constitution should be. Check the terms of reference according to the section 106 Agreement, it doesn't seem to matter what Viridor thinks - it's what you think is in the terms of reference in accordance to the Section 106 Agreement, so you've got the power to do that.

Reply by Councillor Tim Foster

Can I just come back on that Mr Mayor. Number One, I have not been appointed Chair because there hasn't been an AGM because it has been prevented from happening.

The CAMC has been running under the Chairmanship of previous Councillor Nighat Piracha. So if it didn't exist, the minutes of those meetings and its existence don't make any sense.

The Council has agreed for an extension of the landfill to the end of 2019, it's not up to me Councillor it's up to the Council, the Chief Executive and the Head of Planning to give us the tools to fulfill the constitutional requirements, and if you would like a copy of the constitution I'm quite happy to give it to you because you clearly haven't got a grasp of it.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

I didn't say it doesn't exist I'm saying the purpose of the CAMC is not quite what you're saying. The constitution of it and all that can go on and it's been set up and I'm aware it has been set up but the actual work it needs to do can't take place yet officially, that's the point I'm making so you know, once that kicks in then you can make sure that's the case. Yes that's it.

3. Question asked by Councillor Lily Bande to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

The borders of the existing Landseer Road Conservation Area is of concern to the local residents in my ward. As you know, the gateway to conservation areas form an integral part of the overall quality of the vicinity. Can the council please put in place a process whereby the existing Landseer Conservation Area can be extended to include properties and carriageway up to the Grove Road railway bridge, to prevent the nature of this residential area being further eroded for future generations?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

APPENDIX B

Ok thank you Councillor Bande. Really pleased you raised this because the need for the review of conservation areas in the borough was raised during the preparation of the new local plan.

It was something that residents were very keen to see progressed, and the Council has therefore been working through a review of conservation areas in order of greatest priority, and at the Housing Economy a Business Committee we have already reviewed and agreed character appraisals for the Beddington Village Conservation area, the South Cheam Area of Special Local Character and we've got two more coming to the March committee which is for the Sutton Town Centre and Carshalton Village conservation areas.

I know that Planning Office have therefore be very happy to consider timescales for reviewing the Landseer Road conservation area as part of its programme of work. I would like to draw your attention... that we've had some excellent examples of working with the community and the Council to bring forward character appraisals in this work and that really has been helpful, and I would specifically reference the work of the Belmont and South Cheam Residents Association.

So I would invite you to ask your residents to get in touch with the Planning Department so that we can explore ways in which we can work together on the Landseer Road one. Thank you.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Lily Bande

Thank you - I'm glad that the Council is actually looking at how to conserve areas that need to be conserved. I have a supplementary question - clearly from what you have said a lot has been done, I just want to know if you'll be having any models that your going to apply to protect the Landseer conservation area.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

The model that I suggested at the Belmont and South Cheam Residents Association - that is a model that I would suggest and there are some... yes, our Planning Officers can take you through - there's a way of doing it and also a way of getting the community involved, so yes we do have some models.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor David Hicks

Thank you Mr Mayor. I welcome your links to the Belmont South Cheam Residents Association but I think Councillor Bande's question was actually about an extension of a conservation area. The work being done in Belmont is not to do with a conservation area.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

We had a character appraisal from South Sutton and Belmont so that was a character appraisal which is part of the conservation area, but it's a way of working with the Council.

Its part of the neighbourhood Planning. It was an area of Special of Local Character sorry, it did say Special Area of Local Character but similar principles work but I know that there are actually some really lovely houses in Landseer Road that I'm sure are of risk of conversion, so I very much support your proposal to try and look at that and I say if we can work with officers to move on with that.

4. Question asked by Councillor Tony Shields to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

Sutton Nightwatch is a brilliant Sutton local charity currently occupying the Secombe Theatre.

They provide food and mental sustenance for Sutton's homeless and rough sleepers, numbers of service users are growing yet there has been no forward planning to assist them in getting another suitable property once inevitably the time comes to sell or re-use the Secombe.

Sutton should be grateful for such volunteers, how do we help this charity going forward?

Reply by Councillor Marian James

Thank you Mr Mayor, thank you Councillor Shields. Sutton Nightwatch does not provide a service that's commissioned by the Council, but as you know, the charity is using part of the Secombe Theatre for three nights a week and that's under a temporary arrangement.

But the Council's policy on how it supports voluntary organisations was set out in the Strategy & Resources Committee way back in 2013, so the most appropriate way for Sutton Nightwatch to make a request for permanent premises is to take it through that committee.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tony Shields

I thank Councillor James for her answer. But it's almost as if I've had a crystal ball which I considering what's gone on in the last 24 hours, was there ever more of a claxon call to wake up this administration to the horror of rough sleeping than the bucketing of a sleeping man caught on video outside Sutton Station it's now gone viral?

Will this authority wake up and actually work with Sutton Nightwatch to get them an empty building so they can carry on the good work in the most positive way?

When Councillor James concerns herself with the 2013 S&R Report, never was there a discount for EcoLocal in that report of 1 million pounds in that report so I think we can make an exception for Sutton Nightwatch and help these people instead of telling them to join the queue. We have a homeless problem and it's serious.

Reply by Councillor Marian James

APPENDIX B

Thank you Councillor Shields, you mentioned the incident that has happened today and I think along with everybody else in this room, what happened to that vulnerable person was an absolute disgrace and I do know that Tom Brake the MP has been in touch. So I am aware that the staff who carried out that terrible act have been suspended.

But just to say the Council already works in partnership with an organisation that delivers housing support services to people who are sleeping rough or at risk of sleeping rough in the borough and that is SPEAR - so that is the Single Persons Emergency Accommodation. It's been established for over 20 years. You might be aware that in April a newly commissioned contract will commence with St. Mungos and they are a very established charity that has been at the forefront of efforts to tackle homelessness for nearly 50 years and that service will provide housing support to vulnerable adults including those who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Tim Crowley

Thank you Mr Mayor. I thank Councillor James for her response but obviously the MP for Sutton is Paul Scully and he did get involved and now the Secretary of State for MHCRG has also got involved today, I'm pleased to see, and is in conversations with this Council I gather.

I would also like to know why consistently, when Sutton Nightwatch have tried to contact the Council through their Asset Management Department, that our Asset Management Department has singularly failed and it isn't the first time our Asset Management Department has failed it's failed at Hackbridge School, it failed with the CPO at the road going up to the new Stanley Park School, and it's failed at Victoria House at achieving anything.

Therefore, the people at Sutton Nightwatch who haven't got access to the main whole collegiate way of working that SPEAR have, who are a small organisation, get pushed back.

Why are we not doing more to help them? It seems to me that you will only do stuff to help your friends - you won't do stuff with people who are out on the street day in and night out who are helping these vulnerable people. Please, please, help them - we had to plead with you 18 months ago to get the Secombe Centre and all they're asking for is some help with some land... some old land... We've got to ensure that they can put up modular units for the homeless, that is surely not too much to ask - please Councillor James will you help them?

Reply by Councillor Marian James

Thank you Councillor Crowley. I can say to you that Nightwatch have met with Council officers and they have put some ideas forward and there have been some reasons why it hasn't been able, you know, to go forward.

And what I will say to you, I've already said that Sutton Nightwatch is not a service that's commissioned by the Council and so I would encourage you to advise Sutton Nightwatch to

contact Community Action Sutton who would be able to help them put a very valid business case forward and help them with funding and help them find accommodation.

**5.Question asked by Councillor Holly Ramsey to Councillor Jayne McCoy,
Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee**

How many unresolved cases of planning enforcement are currently being undertaken?
What is the average length of time these are taking and what are the figures for the last 4 years?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you Councillor Ramsey for your question which is about planning enforcement. Over the last calendar year, the Council has undertaken 395 cases of planning enforcement with 74 still remaining open as at the 31st December 2018, and the average number of days to resolve these cases is 47 days.

Unfortunately, we do not have accurate figures for previous years because of the replacement of our IT System and it's not something that we're required to keep track of.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Ramsey

Thank you Councillor McCoy, could you please give me a timeline of when these 74 cases might be resolved? Outstanding non-resolution planning matters are becoming a cause for concern and residents are losing faith in the Planning Department.

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

I can't give you a timeline for those 74 because the problem with enforcement cases is they vary dramatically in their complexity. Some can be turned over within a week with just a visit from a Planning Officer to the site to explain to the people in question what they're doing wrong and what they need to do to put it right - it can be as simple as that.

Others are far more complex and need a lot more work - enforcement notices being served, time given and things like that, and also there's a right of appeal to planning enforcement notices and what we're finding at the moment is that the planning inspectorate can take as long as 12 months to decide some enforcement appeals. So you know those that are outstanding might be due to external sources so everyone varies.

But what I would do is, I would refer you to the Planning Enforcement Protocol - I think it's on the Council website under the Planning pages - and it tells you the steps that can be taken in response to breaches of planning rules. What I can say is this Council's actually got a very good reputation for its enforcement service.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Neil Garrett

APPENDIX B

In terms of Planning Enforcement one of the big ones is everyone's favourite building on Beddington Lane - the incinerator - and the deal there was that Viridor get their incinerator and we the residents are supposed to get a wildlife reserve and public open space and local environment campaigners are distraught that ecosystem and local habit has been lost through apparent negligence. I am curious to understand why Viridor have been given such an easy ride in terms of us just allowing them to get away with not doing all the environment mitigation that they promised us?

Reply by Councillor Jayne McCoy

Thank you Councillor Garrett, as I said in response to the earlier question, that's not actually the case.

The time scales - there has been monitoring of them and they're doing things in time... slight delays for some slight reasons but they're doing things according to the proper... as they're required to do, and there has been no breach of that, so there is no enforcement case, there has been no breach.

The key thing is that the site cannot be restored until we stop using it for landfill. There are parts of it that are being restored... until the ERF is operational it's not going to be fully restored.

6. Question asked by Councillor Jed Dwight to Councillor Ruth Dombey, Leader of the Council

What discussions have Sutton Borough Council had with Merton Council in relation to the licence for the EElectrics Music Festival due to take place in Morden Park in 2019?"

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey

Thank you Mr Mayor and thank you Councillor Dwight for your question. This clearly follows on from the question that Councillor Nandha asked a few months ago. I have to admit that I am not an expert on heavy metal rock concerts so I was very surprised, I'm sure you're surprised, but there you go - not my expertise! So I was very surprised when I went on their website because it looks suspiciously to me that the concert being planned for this August is very similar to what happened last year, and we're all aware of the negative impact it had, not just on the surrounding area but from properties quite some distance away.

As you know, at the time, a few months ago, I had a conversation with the leader of Merton Council who assured me that they would work closely with us, so I'm very disappointed to see that the licence application went ahead and they made no effort whatsoever to contact us. It's true they had no legal duty to do so but in the spirit of good neighbourliness you would have thought they would have made the effort.

So the licence application has gone through what has happened though, and this is the good news, is that Merton Council have set up a Safety Advisory Group and enforcement officers

from Sutton Council have asked to be part of that group, they have already had conversations with enforcement officers in Merton who share our concerns so we expect to have input into how the concert is going to be organised and hopefully will make sure that it doesn't have such a negative impact as happened last summer.

Supplementary question asked by Councillor Jed Dwight

Thank you for that Councillor Dombey. My issue really, obviously, was raised by residents as a real issue after it happened last summer. Councillor Nandha quite rightly brought it here to the Council, raised it with you, and I was just hoping - actually that it's great that you raised it with the leader of Merton Council, that's good - but I think also it would have been great if officers had put something in writing or something to try and get that moving along, because the first I knew about it was literally seeing a tweet to say that it had been given the licence by Merton Council and it will be going ahead again this summer.

It just doesn't give us any opportunity now really in real terms to try and support our residents and it's an issue for your residents just as much as it was an issue for mine. So I thank you for what you said - you know we do need to work together on it but I think officers really need to be involved and not just in this specific case but other cases in future with neighbouring Councils, I've known that Neighbouring Councils generally work quite well together on big events like this - which is going to be at Morden Park - and I just think we need to work more closely together, together with officers in future.

Reply by Councillor Ruth Dombey

And I agree we need to work together. As I said before Sutton Council officers are in contact with Merton and they've asked to be part of the Safely Advisory Group.

One of the things I'm really surprised, because I asked how many complaints were made by Merton residents, and discovered that all complaints were made to the organisers of the event rather than the Council which I think is very bad practice.

Sutton Council received 4 complaints but you and I know that actually it was far more serious than that and extended quite a wide distance. So it would be helpful if you would let residents know that if there are issues around noise they can report it online or via the Council out of hours telephone number. But the aim is to ensure that the concert isn't noisy - as bad as last year - so Sutton Council officers will be part of the Safely Advisory Group and our hope is their views will be listened to and as a result it won't have the negative impact that happened last summer.

The following questions were not reached at the meeting and written responses were provided.

7. Question asked by Councillor Neil Garratt to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

APPENDIX B

The Government has released additional funds for pothole repairs and road resurfacing this winter, of which Sutton Council received almost half a million pounds. Without this extra money, how much would Sutton Council otherwise have spent on pothole and road resurfacing for this year, and what improvements should we expect this will make to Sutton's roads?

Response

The Council received £474,000 additional funding and the table below contains the list of carriageways that will be resurfaced in March 2019 using the majority of this additional DfT money (£391,000). The remaining £83,000 will be used to bolster reactive road maintenance (£50,000) and repairs to a highway structure (£33,000). The carriageway works allow us to bring forward 2.3km of resurfacing into 2018/19 that was otherwise planned for next year.

Sections of Milton Avenue
Middleton Road (from 273/275 to Shaftesbury Road)
Wandle Road (Elmwood Close to Birchwood Avenue)
Birchwood Avenue
Langley Avenue
Collingwood Road (Crown Road to Bushey Road)
Staplehurst Road (Harbury Road to Radcliffe Gardens)
York Road (under bridge)
Stanley Park Road (Anglesey Court Road to Anglesey Gardens)
Culvers Avenue - Millside to Reynolds Close

The capital funding for carriageway resurfacing for 2018/19, excluding additional funding, is £718,000 and the budget for reactive carriageway repairs is £548,000 (again excluding the additional funding), although it should be noted that this includes road markings, street nameplates, surface dressing, etc, as well as pothole repairs.

8. Question asked by Councillor James McDermott - Hill to Councillor Steve Penneck, Lead Member for Libraries, Arts, Heritage & Culture

In June 2015 the Worcester Park Library Garden was created and subsequently let to the Friends of Worcester Park Library, despite there being no overall support expressed within the group for this to take place.

Does the Council regret this happening given that the garden has slipped into a serious state of disrepair?

Response

I thank Cllr McDermott-Hill for raising this issue.

No, I don't regret this community initiative, which came directly from the Friends of the Library, with the support of Waitrose. I hope it will continue to have support from the ward councillors.

I visited the garden recently and, far from being in a serious state of disrepair, I was pleasantly surprised by what the Friends have achieved, with the support of various grants. The garden seemed to me to be in good order, although in need of some weeding and garden maintenance.

Let me emphasise that from the start this project was a Friends initiative, in partnership with Waitrose. The Friends were supported by all parties at the Local Committee and at the Planning Committee.

The Library service ensured at the outset that the Friends fully understood that there was no council budget to maintain the garden and that responsibility for this would remain solely with the Friends.

I know that since the garden was completed, the Chair of the Friends Group has changed, as has much of the membership, and the manager of the Waitrose store has also moved on. I understand that the current Friends group members are aware of their responsibility for looking after the garden but are concerned about their ability to continue to do so.

There is always a risk when community groups take on projects, as membership of those groups is fluid. In supporting those projects, Local Committees have to take risks and have to be prepared to continue that support when there are problems.

It would be a great pity if this lovely garden were to be lost or allowed to become overgrown. Can I suggest that the councillor discusses with his colleague Cllr Drummond how the Local Committee might mobilise local volunteers? He might also want to look at other sources of help such as the recent government initiative to support communities in setting up and maintaining pocket parks – Pocket Parks Plus.

9. Question asked by Councillor Catherine Gray to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Could you please tell me how many shop units are currently vacant in the London Borough of Sutton?

Response

Based on business rates data as at 15 February 2019, there are 102 vacant retail properties in the London Borough of Sutton out of 1,831 units. This represents a vacancy rate of 5.5%.

10. Question asked by Councillor Peter Geiringer to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

APPENDIX B

Over the past 12 months, how much has it cost this Borough to remove fly tipping and in the same period, how many fines for this were issued and for how much revenue----with how many people taken to court and successfully prosecuted ?

Response

Veolia does not have a dedicated resource solely for fly tipping collections, so it is not possible to extract a specific cost for collection. Costs are contained within the total SLWP contract fee paid to Veolia Environmental Services.

Small amounts of fly tipped waste that can be linked back to a resident are treated as littering and incur fixed penalty notices of £80 (reduced to £50 for early payment) for these offences. In 2018, 25 notices were issued by the Environmental Enforcement Team.

Offenders who are identified as being responsible for larger or commercial waste fly tipping are issued with £400 fixed penalty notices (no discount for early payment). In 2018, seven such notices were issued by the Environmental Enforcement Team.

The total income arising from fixed penalty notices for fly tipping in 2018 was approximately £2,900.

The issue of a fixed penalty notice, when paid, provides immunity from prosecution for that offence. The Council has the option of prosecuting those who fail to pay the fixed penalty notice, however, each case is looked at on its own merits and for the majority of unpaid fixed penalties, it is usually not in the public interest to pursue. This decision is influenced by factors such as the vulnerability or mental health needs of alleged offenders, inability to trace those who notices were issued to and have subsequently moved, and also the cost of prosecution versus the severity of the offence. In extreme cases prosecution would be the preferred option rather than issuing a fixed penalty. While the published fine level from a successful prosecution is up to £50,000, the reality is the courts impose much lower fines. No prosecutions for fly tipping or non-payment of fees were commenced in 2018.

More could be done by the Government to revise the sentencing guidelines for fly tipping and also provide local government with additional resources to tackle the issue locally.

11. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Sutton Council gave permission for an additional 80 flats to be built on the former Felnex site. Residents in this particular development will have exclusive rights to a gym and a bistro. When the council gave planning permission were any undertakings given by the developers that these apartments would be affordable and if not why not?

Response

The planning permission did not approve an additional 80 residential (Class C3) dwellings. The previous approvals (refs C2009/62175/OUT & C2014/68760/OUT) for the development included a Class C2 use, in the form of a residential care home. This element was removed from the most recent proposal and replaced with 80 self-contained assisted living units and these remain within Class C2 classification.

As these units do not fall within class C3 for residential dwellings, they are not subject to any affordable housing provision under national planning policy.

The remainder of the development provided 20% affordable housing across the 725 (C3 use class) dwellings that were approved.

12. Question asked by Councillor Lily Bande to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

Could you please provide us with the frequency on updates to elected members, parents' forum, and other stakeholders on the progress of Written Statement of Action; in regards to improving the quality of Education Health and Care (EHC) Plan and your review to the process?

Response

The implementation of the Local Area SEND Written Statement of Action (WSOA) is governed by the Children and Families Act (CFA) Executive Board, co-chaired by the Strategic Director of People Services and the Managing Director of Sutton's Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The CFA Executive Board takes place once a month and has representation from across the partnership and Sutton Parents' Forum (SPF). The progress of the WSOA is also presented every quarter at the People Committee to members and the general public. There is also a standing item on the progress of the WSOA at every Sutton Disability and Transition Partnership Board (SDTPB). Moreover, information on progress has been presented at school head forums, governor forums, SPF termly coffee mornings and surgeries with parents. I receive regular briefings, as do members of the opposition. I also receive feedback from parent carers and recently met with representatives from the Parent Carer Forum. I have met with primary school heads and am planning to meet secondary school heads. In addition, the monthly education bulletin provides updates and is circulated to a wide group of partners. The last edition contained an invitation from Councillor Batt and me for us to visit schools and we would envisage that these visits will be an opportunity for teachers to feed back their views on the progress of Written Statement of Action.

Improving the quality of EHC Plans is one of the main areas of focus of the WSOA. As presented in previous reports to the People Committee, the process and templates for the EHC Needs Assessments have been reviewed, with the statutory timescales for completing the needs assessment improving from 42% to 62%. The plans are currently being monitored for quality and an action plan is being developed on required improvement.

13. Question asked by Councillor Tony Shields to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

'I understand that a response to the "cease and desist" letter has been sent to many hundreds of residents twice. Why?'

Response

The Council has checked with the support teams involved and it appears that, unfortunately, some names were entered on to the spreadsheet twice, due to an administrative error. With such a large volume of responses, the letters were printed and put into envelopes for posting without the duplication being spotted.

14. Question asked by Councillor Peter Geiringer to Councillor Sunita Gordon, Lead Member for Resources

One of the Lib Dem Council bright ideas was to purchase the Maplins business premises in Sutton High Street, though it was a well known fact that high streets (especially Sutton) were in decline.

Shortly after the purchase of the Maplins store the company went out of business. How long has the site been empty and how much vital revenue has been lost forever?

Response

The Council bought the retail development at 71/81 High Street in Summer 2017 before some of the more significant national business failures in the retail sector. The property consists of five retail units of which the one formerly occupied by Maplins is the only one vacant. The others have been occupied continuously since that time and a new tenant has now been identified for the vacant unit, subject to contract and planning consent.

In cash terms, the loss of rent since Maplins closed in June 2018 has been £67,500 based on their lease which had been due to come to an end in January 2022. The Council takes a prudent approach to its commercial property portfolio and our viability appraisal for the purchase of this property assumed void periods between lettings.

15. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Residents in the New Mill Quarter will be obliged to buy their heat from SDEN. Given that the heat will be coming partly from gas boilers on the site can the council say what percentage of the heat will come from hot water from the incinerator and what percentage will come from the gas boilers?

Response

Gas boilers are being used as a temporary heating solution until the SDEN pipework is fully installed. They will then be used as a back-up for when the ERF is offline and to top up supplies when there are peaks in demand. This provides better reliability compared to conventional heat suppliers. SDEN is therefore unable to state definitively the percentage of heat that will come from the Energy Recovery Facility or the gas boilers.

16. Question asked by Councillor Lily Bande to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

How does the council monitor commissioning arrangements for the provision of housing; to ensure that residents with priority need status for accommodation, such as: care leavers, victims of domestic abuse, pregnant women, families with children, the elderly, people with mental health and physical disabilities, are not homeless or threatened with homelessness?

Response

Preventing homelessness is one of the statutory housing responsibilities delegated to Encompass, the Council's local authority trading company (LATC). Under the contractual arrangement with Encompass, the LATC is overseen by a board of directors, the make-up of which includes senior council staff.

The performance of Encompass is routinely monitored by council client officers scrutinising the organisation's performance using a suite of indicators. The indicators includes a number of performance indicators focusing on homelessness and homelessness prevention, linked to the new statutory duties under the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017.

In addition to Encompass' activity, the Council also commissions housing support providers to play a key role in preventing homelessness. Last year the Council consolidated the commissioning of housing support for adults under a single contract, which was recently awarded to St Mungos, a charitable organisation with extensive experience and expertise in helping the most vulnerable members of society. Sutton Housing Partnership, as the Council's housing management provider, also provides support to vulnerable tenants to help them maintain their tenancy and avoid becoming homeless, for example through rent arrears.

If prevention activities are unsuccessful then certain vulnerable groups are deemed to be in "priority need" and are prioritised in their access to social housing via the housing register. In regard to victims of domestic abuse specifically, the legislation around local authority housing responsibilities has recently been strengthened and this has resulted in a revised housing allocations policy, which will be taken to the Housing, Economy and Business Committee in March, for discussion and approval.

17. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Given that the price of gas is around 4 pence per kWh and in most new developments a dwelling comes with a gas boiler with warranty. Why is that SDEN customers will be paying a £28 pounds a month standing charge and in excess of 5.3 pence per kWh to have their homes heated by a mixture of gas and incinerator hot water?

Response

As you have been informed before numerous times, it is incorrect to compare prices from properties with individual gas boilers to SDEN as they do not take into account the whole life cycle cost.

SDEN's pricing policy can be found [here](#), it clearly states that:

“SDEN will operate a fair pricing policy where customers’ heat charges are set to offer price parity and where possible a cost saving against the alternative whole life cycle cost of heat that each customer would otherwise pay.”

18. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

If New Mill Quarter residents feel that they are being overcharged by SDEN what steps can they take to cancel the contract and find an energy supplier that offers better value.?

Response

SDEN has a pricing policy where customers’ heat charges are set to offer price parity and where possible a cost saving against the alternative whole life cycle costs of heat that they would otherwise pay.

When purchasing/moving into a property, customers are required to sign a Residential Supply Agreement (RSA). The customer’s rights to terminate this agreement are clearly set out in the RSA.

19. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

The council has spent £30 million buying land which it hopes one day will be used as the site of the building that will lead the fight against cancer. Now that Cancer Research UK has said that that PM10 and PM 2.5 particulates are carcinogenic. What steps are the council taking to monitor particulate levels in Hackbridge Wallington North and Beddington during times children are at school or going to or coming from school?

Response

Monitoring of PM₁₀ is carried out at four automatic monitoring stations around the borough. There are two monitoring stations located in Beddington, as well as ones in Wallington and Worcester Park. The monitoring data shows that there is compliance with the Air Quality Objectives for PM₁₀ for at least six years. The objectives are based on World Health Organisation recommendations and relate to hourly and annual exposure.

The Council also monitors PM_{2.5} alongside one of its PM₁₀ monitors in Beddington Lane.

As a PM₁₀ monitor will capture all particles with a diameter of 10 microns or less, it will be capturing PM_{2.5}. The finer particles make up part of the value that is given for PM₁₀ (i.e. they are a subset of the total that is recorded). We know therefore that the concentrations of finer particles (PM_{2.5}) will always be equal to or lower than the values for PM₁₀.

The monitors are operating all day every day and the monitoring data is publicly available on the LondonAir website. The data can be interrogated to identify levels at specific dates and times.

20. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

Will funds made available in section 106 money that came from Viridor's Incinerator planning permission to allow residents concerned about air pollution to install air quality monitors?

Response

The wording of the section 106 agreement refers to sums of money "to be used by the Council towards the installation of an air quality monitoring station in the vicinity of the site"; "to be used by the Council as a contribution towards the running of the Beddington air quality monitoring station" and "to be used by the Council to carry out NO₂ monitoring sampling via 3 different diffusion tubes". The money is to be used for the purposes set out in the agreement only.

21. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Marian James, Chair of the People Committee

New builders are taking over at the New Hackbridge School, has the council any idea when the school is likely to be finished and have the builders been asked to put in air filtration equipment due to the school being only 850 metres from the incinerator?

Response

In order to measure the impacts from the school development against specific benchmarks, an Air Quality Neutral Assessment was carried out during the development control process which identified that mitigation measures to reduce the impacts from transport associated with the school could have a beneficial effect. Conditions were therefore recommended for

APPENDIX B

inclusion on any planning consent to ensure that these mitigation measures are implemented, including School Travel Plans and Electric Vehicle Charging points.

The assessment did not, however, identify that any impact requiring the use of filtration equipment was required for this development and, as such, this is not being provided at the school.

We are not yet in a position to confirm the completion date for the project. We have signed a letter of intent with Wilmott Dixon but we are not yet in contract. We are working with the contractor to agree the outstanding works including their value and should be in a better position to understand the likely programme in the coming weeks.

22. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

Currently large amounts of municipal solid waste are being dumped in the Viridor Landfill causing an awful stench and attracting ever increasing amounts of seagulls. It is suggested that this extended use was granted so that Viridor can ensure the maximum amount of rotting organic material is present. It is methane gas from its decomposition that powers the landfill engines that not only going to supply heat to SDEN but also generate lucrative subsidised electricity. Why has the council allowed this to happen and can the council not see that this is a blatant conflict of interest and a disregard of its obligations to support residents rather than its business partner in SDEN Viridor?

Response

The ERF is currently still in the commissioning phase while testing continues and there have been instances where both lines of the ERF have not been working. In line with the planning permission therefore, the landfill site has been used. An extension to the end-date for landfill operations has been granted to allow for the delay in making the ERF lines operational, whilst they are still in the commissioning phase. This deed of variation to the legal agreement ensures that landfill will cease at the end of December 2019.

23. Question asked by Councillor Nick Matthey to Councillor Manuel Abellan, Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhoods Committee

Residents in Beddington have claimed that since the traffic lights at the pedestrian crossing have been removed crossing the road has become more hazardous and that vehicle speeds have increased. What evidence can the council supply that this is not the case?

Response

The installation of new crossings is only one element of a number of improvements being introduced along Hilliers Lane and Beddington Lane through the village area. All the improvements have been designed to complement each other and create an area of highway that is appropriate for this predominantly residential environment. The road layout

through the village is in the process of being enhanced, with road narrowings to encourage vehicles to drive at a more appropriate speed along Hilliers Lane and Beddington Lane. In combination with these speed reduction measures, a lorry ban is proposed between Hilliers Lane (at its junction with Croydon Road) and Beddington Lane (at its junction with Derry Road). This will mean no vehicles of 7.5 tonnes or above, unless servicing the village, will be allowed to enter this area 24 hours a day/seven days a week, and this will be enforced by new CCTV camera technology.

Although we have no evidence of vehicle/pedestrian incidents, once these improvements are in place, Hilliers Lane and Beddington Lane are expected to see an improvement in terms of lower vehicle speeds and a substantially lower number of heavy goods vehicles using this section of road, giving the village a much-improved feel and appearance. I would like to reassure you that once these improvements have been installed, full post-construction monitoring will take place in terms of speed and volume of vehicles to measure the effectiveness of the initiatives.

**Appendix C
Council Questions (8.13)****LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
QUESTIONS: STANDING ORDER 8.13****1. Question asked by Councillor Tom Drummond to Councillor Manuel Abellan,
Chair of the Environment & Neighbourhood Committee**

At 11:55pm on 4th March 2019, the Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations Consultation was officially closed.

In our neighboring borough, the Epsom and Ewell Council closely analysed the consultation documents. Council leaders, including the Chair of Epsom's Environment Committee were deeply concerned and submitted a robust, deeply critical response. This response can be read on-line and provides complete transparency as to their view point. I noted from their response a number of interesting points :

- The increase in air traffic volumes combined with a lowering in height from around 7,000 feet to just 3,000 or even 2,000 feet from the ground.
- A four or five-fold increase in sound intensity from overflying aircraft.
- The resulting increase in air pollution, and adverse effect on air quality, identifying harmful pollutants within in aviation fuel.

It is clear to me reading this response, Epsom and Ewell's residents have been well represented, just as they should be.

I can not find an equivalent submission on the Sutton council website. My search of 'Heathrow' results in only historic documents being found. There seems to be nothing relating to the consultation.

Since the window for submissions has closed, can you advise what if any response has been submitted by the London Borough of Sutton?

If a response has been submitted, please forward it and advise where it is on-line for the residents to read?

Response from Councillor Manuel Abellan

The Council submitted a response to the Heathrow consultation on Monday 4 March and published the response on its website on Wednesday 6 March. An abridged and full copy of the Council's response is available at:

https://www.sutton.gov.uk/news/article/361/heathrow_airport_proposed_expansion
https://www.sutton.gov.uk/news/article/363/london_borough_of_sutton

**LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
QUESTIONS: STANDING ORDER 8.13****2. Question asked by Kerrie Peek to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee**

With H+M finally opening and another coffee shop opening soon do you have any other plans to fill the empty units on the high street and what are your plans to keep people shopping on Sutton High Street when Croydon Westfield opens.

Response from Councillor McCoy

I would refer you initially to my response to your question about bringing shoppers back to Sutton High Street put to the January council meeting as it references the work being done to ensure empty properties are put to good use:

I am really pleased that you have asked this question. There is a lot of understandable concern about the future of high streets across the UK, and here in Sutton there has been a huge amount of work going on for some time. However this work doesn't always get talked about as it is often 'behind the scenes' and ongoing.

There are three key strands of work covering the short term, the medium term and the longer term.

***For the longer term** we have a Town Centre Masterplan. This looks at major redevelopment and the infrastructure of the town centre and what is required to meet the needs of the high street of the future. We know that online retail has completely changed the way people shop, and what they want from their high street. The demand now is for more leisure activities, experiences and events. Our Masterplan is timely as we are able to plan ahead for that change. Increasing housing in the town centre will also bring more consumers to our high street, and if we can get the Tram here it will help even more.*

This longer term focus has already led to the change in ownership of the St Nicholas Centre; the redevelopment of Times Square and its purchase by Sports Direct; the redevelopment of the Empire Cinema; H&M taking over the BHS site and developer interest in many of the key sites in the town centre.

***In the medium term** the council has used its Investment Portfolio to attract and retain businesses that will ensure a vibrant high street. The council already owns a number of properties in the high street so it can help ensure we retain good quality businesses. It can also invest in new properties to prevent them being left empty or under occupied as it has done with the BHS and RBS buildings. There are also exciting plans afoot to revitalise existing spaces.*

Appendix C
Council Questions (8.13)

LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
QUESTIONS: STANDING ORDER 8.13

In the short term we encouraged the set up of the Town Centre Business Improvement District called Successful Sutton. It is known that places with BIDs tend to have more resilient and vibrant town centres. The BID supports local businesses and retailers, ensures the area is attractive for shoppers and has been responsible for all the major events such as the Christmas light switch on, seasonal markets and the fantastic Big Bang event. These events are key attractors for shoppers and are supported by the local shops and businesses. The BID also helps to market Sutton as a place for business and investment and have been great partners for the council in recent years

In addition, I can advise that the Council works with landlords of vacant shops to encourage 'meanwhile' and long-term use and speaks directly with retailers to encourage them to locate in the High Street. To support the continuing vibrancy of the High Street, the Council seeks to maintain full occupancy in the properties it owns and it also acquires property when it can make an impact and it is prudent to do so.

In respect of the Westfield development, if and when it does take place, we do not see this as having a significant impact on Sutton town centre. Our neighbouring boroughs of Croydon and Kingston have always had a major town centre retail offer but Sutton has been able to hold its own against this competition. Studies have shown that Sutton town centre has a loyal customer base who only venture to other more substantive shopping centres on occasion. Sutton's offer is that it is safe, of 'human scale' and parking is easy and cheap.

3. Question asked by Charlie Mansell to Councillor Jayne McCoy, Chair of the Housing, Economy & Business Committee

What land in the borough has been de-designated as Metropolitan Open Land and Green Belt through development of Local Plan Policy over the last 5 years and in listing this can it be set out what the land's current designation now is in planning terms?

Response from Councillor McCoy

The following land has been de-designated from the Green Belt in the past five years:

Land De-designated	Reason for De-designation	New Use
Residential properties on Roman Way, Lawson Way, Kenny Drive and Burns Close (-9.3ha)	Council considered that the current use did not represent Green Belt.	The area had been in residential use for approximately 15 years. Previously it was developed land in the Green Belt, being the nurses' home for Queen Mary Hospital.

LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
QUESTIONS: STANDING ORDER 8.13

Land to the South of the Gypsy and Traveller site (-0.4ha)	Inspector's Change. The Council's preferred option was to have the Green Belt designation wash over the site so that it could revert to Green Belt if not required for a Gypsy and Traveller site in the future.	Gypsy and Traveller site extension
--	---	------------------------------------

The following land has been de-designated from Metropolitan Open Land in the past five years:

Land De-designated	Reason for De-designation	New Use
Land West of Beddington Lane (-4.4ha)	Inspector's Change. The council argued vehemently against its de-designation at the Local Plan Examination-in-Public.	Industrial Land
Former All-Weather Pitch and Part of the Tennis Centre (-2.6ha)	Inspector's Change. The council's preferred option was to have the MOL designation wash over the site so it could revert to MOL if a school was not required in the very long-term.	Currently built development in MOL. New use: Secondary School

The following land has been designated MOL in the past five years:

Land Designated	Reason for Designation	New Use
Land at Mayflower Park (+1.4ha)	The Hamptons development provided more open space than originally anticipated.	Public Open Space
Land at Grove Park (+0.7ha)	A playing field previously used by a school has been incorporated into the park.	Public Open Space

The following land has been designated as either Public Open Space or Urban Green Space (green space which is not freely accessible to the public):

Appendix C
Council Questions (8.13)

LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
QUESTIONS: STANDING ORDER 8.13

Land Designated	Reason for Designation	New Use
Mayflower Park (all of the park, +12.4ha)	Park creation following The Hamptons development.	Public Open Space (already most of it was MOL)
Land at Grove Park (+0.7ha)	A playing field previously used by a school has been incorporated into the park.	Public Open Space
Queen Mary's Park (+8.5ha)	Park creation following nearby residential development.	Public Open Space (already Green Belt)
Beddington Farmlands - Wandle Valley Regional Park (+44ha)	Park creation following the cessation of landfill operations.	Public Open Space (already MOL)
Beddington Farmlands - Wandle Valley Regional Park (+68ha)	Habitat creation following the cessation of landfill operations.	Urban Green Space (already MOL)

Note: The Hackbridge Primary School on Land North of BedZED, Hackbridge has the MOL designation washing over it as the Inspector forgot to order it be taken off.

4. Question asked by Charlie Mansell to Councillor Ruth Dombey, Leader of the Council

In view of the comment at paragraph 1.13.19 on page 35 of the Epsom and St Helier Trust Report: *Two Year operating Plan 2017/18 and 2018/19 - Refresh 2018-19* which says "*St Helier site - when the renal facility has been re-provided we would like to demolish these buildings. This will enable us to sell surplus land for high density housing. This land sale could be scheduled for 2019/20.*", will she indicate what discussions the Council has had with the Trust or its agents in terms of land ownership and planning status of the site or, if not, whether any are planned; and in doing so will she set out clearly to the public what is the Council policy towards a potential sale of any land there of which Sutton Council is the long-term freehold owner setting out whether the Council opposes such a sale of land and also of any change to the land's current planning status?

Link to the Epsom and St Helier Trust report is here and a copy is also attached
<https://www.epsom-sthelier.nhs.uk/download.cfm?doc=docm93jjm4n9057.pdf&ver=22233>

Response from Councillor Dombey

**LONDON BOROUGH OF SUTTON
QUESTIONS: STANDING ORDER 8.13**

The [Sutton Local Plan](#) (adopted in 2018) identified St.Helier Hospital as Site Allocation S55 and allocated it for “Health.” As the allocation shows, the Council expects development to take the form of:

- improving healthcare available to residents
- improving access to and from Wrythe Lane
- utilising car parking facilities more efficiently
- incorporating Tramlink/Sutton Link into the design and layout of the site

The Epsom and St Helier Trust objected to the allocation in the Draft Local Plan ([Representations](#), see page 84). However, the Council and the Inspector at the Local Plan Examination-in-Public dismissed the objection. As a result, I can confirm that the land, under the current Local Plan, cannot be developed for housing.