Minutes of a meeting of the **Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board** at the Sprowston Diamond Centre, School Lane, Sprowston on **Thursday 19 July 2012** at **2pm** when there were present:

Cllr Andrew Proctor – Chairman

	Representing
Cllr Stuart Clancy	Broadland District Council
Cllr Shaun Vincent	Broadland District Council
Cllr Brenda Arthur	Norwich City Council
Cllr Bert Bremner	Norwich City Council
Cllr Alan Waters	Norwich City Council
Cllr Derek Blake	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Colin Foulger	South Norfolk Council
Cllr John Fuller	South Norfolk Council
Cllr Ann Steward	Norfolk County Council
Cllr Murray Gray	Broads Authority
John O'Mahony	Homes & Communities Agency
Andy Wood	New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership
Officers	
Roger Burroughs - Officer	Broadland District Council
Phil Kirby – Officer	Broadland District Council
Sandra Eastaugh – Officer	GND Partnership Manager
Richard Doleman	Norfolk County Council
Phil Morris	Norfolk County Council
Mike Burrell	Norwich City Council
Graham Nelson	Norwich City Council
Tim Horspole	South Norfolk Council
Andy Radford	South Norfolk Council
Sara Utting (Clerk)	Broadland District Council

26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Mr Fuller	29 (JCS for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk)	Owned land in the Broadland area

27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Andrea Long (Broads Authority); Cllr Derrick Murphy (Norfolk CC); Cllr Graham Plant (Norfolk CC); Mike Jackson (Norfolk CC); Claire Hupton (Homes & Communities Agency) and Chris Starkie (New Anglia LEP).

DRAFT

28 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

29 JOINT CORE STRATEGY (JCS) FOR BROADLAND, NORWICH AND SOUTH NORFOLK – PRE-SUBMISSION PUBLICATION FOLLOWING THE LEGAL CHALLEGE TO THE JCS

Sandra Eastaugh presented the report on the work undertaken by the partner authorities of the GNDP to comply with the Court Order to reconsider the remitted parts of the JCS, supplemented by a presentation by Graham Nelson. A copy of the Sustainability Appraisal had been emailed to Board members and in addition, a copy was tabled at the meeting and had been published on the GNDP website.

The report emphasised that it had not been a requirement to review the whole of the JCS; it was a reconsideration of only those parts of the JCS which were remitted by the Court Order and Schedule and the remainder of the JCS remained adopted. The Court Order and remitted text only related to the distribution of housing identified within the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) – a total of 9,000 homes – and associated employment. Housing distribution in South Norfolk and Norwich City remained the same, as did the housing distribution in the rural part of the Broadland area not in the NPA.

It was noted that the work to comply with the Court Order had been mainly undertaken by the GNDP team of officers, together with the Council's legal advisers, a "critical friend" from POS Enterprises and consultants from URS, the company commissioned to carry out the sustainability appraisal work. The work undertaken had been to generate and test reasonable alternatives, if any, to the remitted parts of the JCS. The guidance available advised that "reasonable" should be derived by assessing alternatives against the objectives of the strategy.

Graham Nelson explained the staged approach to the identification of reasonable alternatives, as follows:

Stage 1 – establishing strategic scope of reasonable alternatives

Consideration of dispersal versus concentration of housing growth – this concluded that the degree of concentration and dispersal set out was correct and there was no scope for further dispersal in either South Norfolk or Norwich City Councils' areas but there was scope for a small sites allowance in the Broadland area. The rest of stage 1 involved the identification of potential locations for strategic growth and potential scales of that growth.

DRAFT

Stage 2 – assessing the suitability of the sectors for different scales of growth

Eighteen sectors, including combinations of individual sectors, had been tested against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives of the Plan for strategic scale growth. Conclusion was for six individual locations and one combination to accommodate the strategic scale growth.

Stage 3 – identification of reasonable alternatives

The six individual locations and the one combined location were assessed leading to the three most reasonable alternatives which were subsequently tested against the sustainability objectives.

The three reasonable alternatives were:

Alternative One (remitted parts of the JCS)

7,000 in the combined north east (inside and outside the line of the NDR) sector (rising to 10,000 beyond the Plan period) including 25 hectares of employment land at Rackheath

Alternative Two (growth focused in the north east, inside the line of the NDR)

7,000 in north east (inside the NDR) sector (rising to 10,000 beyond the Plan period) including 25 hectares of employment land at Broadland Business Park or Norwich International Airport in addition to those in the adopted policies of the JCS.

Alternative Three (growth focused in south west with the balance in the Broadland part of the NPA)

4,600 in south west (making a total of 7,000 at this location in the Plan period (rising to 10,000 beyond) when combined with growth identified in the adopted JCS)

2,400 across the Broadland part of the NPA made up of two small scale locations of at least 1,000 each in north east sector (inside NDR) and north west sector

An additional 25 hectares of employment land in association with the large scale strategic housing development in the south west or at Norwich International Airport

The three reasonable alternatives had been tested against the Sustainability Appraisal framework to a comparable level covering social and environmental

DRAFT

and economic considerations and to a level where it was possible to determine their respective merits. The Board noted the number of differences in performance between the three reasonable alternatives, as detailed in the report. In summary, Alternative Three was considered to be the weakest of the three, due to uncertainty over if it could deliver the required growth within the Plan period and officers were recommending that it be rejected; Alternative Two had a number of merits but was less certain to deliver to the planned trajectory while Alternative One overcame some of the disadvantages of Option Two and would allow development to be better planned, not be subject to compromise by the availability of developable land. Therefore, Alternative One was recommended as the most appropriate option and should form the basis of the pre-submission consultation. Graham Nelson supplemented the reasons for the basis of the officer recommendation, as follows: Alternative One resulted in a reduced level of pressure on the environmental assets in the north east; was better in transport terms, eg the Bus Rapid Transit Corridors providing access to employment in the city centre; was the more deliverable option than Alternative Two as based on separate growth locations, therefore allowing for a higher rate of affordable housing due to increased viability issues; creation of a better quality environment for people to live in, eg green spaces etc with a high sense of design worth.

In conclusion, the Board noted the list of pre-submission documents as detailed in the report and that robust and proper consultation could now take place as, in the officers' opinion, the tests of soundness of the JCS could be satisfied.

The Chairman summarised that there were four key elements to consider:

- the terms of the Order had been complied with
- the robustness of the considerations of the alternatives
- recognition of the three reasonable alternatives which had come forward and
- the conclusion of the Sustainability Appraisal to date and the officer recommendation.

Reference was made to the most recent Census and whether its results would have any implications for the JCS. Graham Nelson responded that the overall levels of need were still robust and defensible and it was not planned to do any more updates before the consultation as there was nothing in the Census to cast doubt on the overall level. The JCS papers would be updated following the consultation and prior to submission. Cllr Fuller added that the plan for growth was 1% per annum for the next 20-30 years and in South Norfolk, growth had reached a level of 11.9% over the past 10 years and so he had every confidence in the numbers quoted. In addition, in a national

DRAFT

survey, South Norfolk was listed in the top ten for new business start-ups. He concluded that it was right to dismiss Alternative Three, as borne out by the evidence and it was wrong to contain all growth within the NDR as the densities would be too high etc, therefore Alternative One was the best option. The Chairman concurred with this view, along with the Councillors from the other authorities. In addition, Dr Gray drew attention to the potential adverse implications on the Broads Authority area of Alternative 1 but accepted the possible mitigation in the evidence papers.

The Chairman thanked the officers for all their hard work, which had been painstaking at times, and congratulated them for the professional manner in which the evidence had been gathered and put forward.

AGREED:

(1) that, having considered the screening of reasonable alternatives set out in section four of the draft Sustainability Appraisal and the supporting evidence base, to **RECOMMEND** to each partner Council

(a) that alternative 1 is chosen as the most appropriate option;

(b) alternative 1 be taken forward to pre-submission.

(2) to approve the pre-submission documents and that each partner Council be **RECOMMENDED** to

(a) approve the pre-submission publication of the remitted parts of the JCS

(b) to delegate authority to the GNDP Directors and the GNDP Manager, in consultation with the respective portfolio holders, to make further minor changes prior to publication to reflect emerging evidence and any necessary corrections.

30 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) – SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION TO THE EXAMINER

Roger Burroughs presented the report in response to the comments received on the Regulation 16 Publication of the Draft Charging Schedules for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. It was noted that draft Charging Schedules had been published during February to March 2012 and attracted a total of 35 responses. The key issues to emerge from the consultation were:

- the approach to residential charging zones
- the charging rates for residential development
- the charging rates for non-residential uses
- infrastructure provision

Following representations, a small number of modifications were being suggested to the draft Charging Schedules covering: the threshold for the application of CIL for flatted development; clarifying the Charging Zone maps in relation to identifying the Broads Authority area and minor wording changes.

Roger Burroughs advised that the Examination for Poole Borough Council had highlighted the differentiation between large and small retail premises. Officers had looked at the Core Strategies of other authorities which had been approved and some did include differentials for differing levels of retail. Information could be found within the FAQ on the Planning Advisory Service website.

It was noted that the most significant modification being proposed related to the rate for flatted development. Advice had been sought from Norfolk Property Services and their evidence showed that the higher rate should apply to developments of 5 storeys and above.

In response to the issue of the legal challenge to the JCS and its implications for the independent examination of the CIL, an evidence paper had been produced which demonstrated that the rates of CIL being proposed were not dependent on the precise distribution of housing development within the NPA. Accordingly, the Partnership was intending to submit CIL before formal adoption of the JCS and a timetable had been drawn up with the submission of CIL and pre-submission publication of the remitted parts of the JCS occurring simultaneously. Legal advice had been sought, together with advice from the Planning Inspectorate, on this issue.

Based on the indicative timetable, the Planning Inspectorate had advised that the examination of CIL could take place in September 2012, enabling adoption in early December 2012.

Board Members expressed their support for the proposals and

AGREED:

that each partner Council be **RECOMMENDED** to

(1) agree a minor change to the CIL charging schedule for Norwich so that

DRAFT

the £100 per sq m rate of CIL applied to flats of 5 storeys and above and publish the evidence supporting this change;

(2) publish the Statements of Modifications and evidence in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and submit these (and necessary submission documents as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the covering report) for examination by an independent examiner;

(3) continue to work together towards the indicative timetable set out in the timetable referred to above and

(4) delegate authority to the Director representative on the GNDP Board, following discussion with the relevant portfolio holder, to agree any minor changes to any of the documents to ensure consistency and clarity.

31 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

AGREED:

to note the date of the next meeting as Thursday 20 September 2012 at 2pm.

The meeting closed at 3pm

DRAFT