

**Decision Maker:**        **Development Control Committee**

**Date:**                    **28<sup>th</sup> June 2012**

**Decision Type:**        Non-Urgent                    Non-Executive                    Non-Key

**Title:**                    **REVIEW OF GREEN BELT, METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND AND URBAN OPEN SPACE BOUNDARIES**

**Contact Officer:**        Doug Ogilvie, Planner (Planning Strategy and Projects Team)  
Tel: 020 8313 4454 E-mail: Doug.ogilvie@bromley.gov.uk

**Chief Officer:**         Bob McQuillan

**Ward:**                    All

---

**1. Reason for report**

- 1.1 The Local Development Plan Advisory Panel (LDPAP) agreed in May that work undertaken in preparation of the Core Strategy will be incorporated into a Bromley Local Plan to comply with the Government's Planning Reforms. A review of the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Urban Open Space boundaries was prepared for the Local Development Framework Advisory Panel (LDFAP) in May, to suggest amendments to these boundaries for inclusion in the Local Plan. This report sets out these suggested changes and asks Development Control Committee to agree their incorporation in the Local Plan Options and Preferred Strategy Consultation document. The Executive will be asked to agree this document for consultation in the early autumn.

---

**2. RECOMMENDATION(S)**

- 2.1 Members agree that the suggested amendments to the Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land and Urban Open Space boundaries set out in this report be endorsed and included in the forthcoming Local Plan consultation document.

### Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: New Policy:
  2. BBB Priority: Children and Young People Excellent Council Quality Environment Safer Bromley:
- 

### Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Not Applicable:
  2. Ongoing costs: Not Applicable:
  3. Budget head/performance centre: Planning and Renewal budget
  4. Total current budget for this head: £2.0m
  5. Source of funding: Existing revenue account 2012/13
- 

### Staff

1. Number of staff (current and additional): 74 ftes
  2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours:
- 

### Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Statutory Requirement
  2. Call-in: Not Applicable:
- 

### Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): Borough-wide
- 

### Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? Views are being invited.
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: These will be reported orally to the Committee.

### **3. COMMENTARY**

#### **3.1 Introduction and context**

3.1.1 When the report on responses to the Core Strategy Issues Document were reported to the Development Control Committee on 17 November last year it was recommended that a review of the Green Belt boundary be undertaken, specific attention being paid to the sites arising during this consultation, together with those proffered during the emergence of the UDP in 2001. In addition members also resolved to include the boundaries of both Metropolitan Open Land and Urban Open Sites in this review.

3.1.2 Since this Development Control Committee met the Government has published its National Planning Policy Framework, which replaces virtually all the previous guidance on open space. However as far as the Green Belt is concerned, the guidance on the definition of boundaries and the purpose of including land in it has changed little.

#### **3.2 The review and its findings.**

3.2.1 In the case of the all three designations the following were types of site considered:

- Sites which were the subject of representations during the last UDP Review but where no changes resulted
- Sites which have been proffered since then
- Sites which were the subject of representations on the Core Strategy Issues Document consultation
- Sites which have been developed as the result of appeal decisions, or re-configuration of developments following the adoption of the UDP
- Sites (mainly urban Open Space) which on further consideration warrant designation because of their importance to the local community

3.2.2 In the case of Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land (which the London Plan equates to Green Belt) the following criteria were applied:

- Land is not included which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open;
- The boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period; and
- The boundaries are defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.
- Any changes would be make other sites more vulnerable – i.e. there would be a risk of further encroachment

3.2.3 In the case of Urban Open Space:

- All open space of public value, which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation, both passive and active or are of importance to the local community in terms of the visual amenity they provide.

3.2.4 When this report is referred to the Executive to approve for consultation, it will include officer comments on the early representations received suggesting changes to designations, but which have not been proposed in this review.

#### **3.3 Summary of the changes suggested.**

3.3.1 Maps and schedules of suggested changes attached as Appendix 1 (Green Belt) and Appendix 2 (Metropolitan Open Land & Urban Open Space). In each case there is a summary detailing the types of change, deletion or new designation and the corresponding total areas.

#### 4. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 These changes to the boundaries options will be incorporated into the Local Plan consultation. Once Local Plan is adopted planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan (which includes the Local Plan).

<b>Non-Applicable Sections:</b>	Financial Implications Legal Implications Personnel implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	DCC 17/11/2011