

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board Meeting Minutes

Date: Tuesday 19 June 2018

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Broadland District Council, Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Norwich, NR7 0DU

Board Members:

Broadland District Council:

Cllr Ian Moncur, Cllr Andrew Proctor, Cllr Shaun Vincent

Norwich City Council:

Cllr Paul Kendrick, Cllr Alan Waters

South Norfolk Council:

Cllr Charles Easton, Cllr Lisa Neal

Norfolk County Council:

Cllr Martin Wilby

Broads Authority

Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro

Officers in attendance: Mike Burrell, Phil Courtier, Richard Doleman, Debbie Lorimer, Graham Nelson, Judy Oliver, Marie-Pierre Tighe, Jean Brittain.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chairman advised the meeting that through his consultancy Abzag, he was promoting, on behalf of the landowner, a site for residential development in Colney through the Greater Norwich Local Plan. When this site was under consideration he would declare a disclosable pecuniary interest and shall vacate the chair and leave the room.

In the interests of transparency, he also brought to the Board's attention, that his father, Malcolm Vincent, through his company Vincent Howes, was promoting, on behalf of the landowners, a site for residential development in Costessey/Bawburgh through the Greater Norwich Local Plan. In this case under the provisions of the Code of Conduct, there was no interest to declare which would prevent him from participating in the debate and chairing the meeting.

He added that he would be declaring the same interests when chairing Broadland's Place Shaping Panel and when as a Member of Broadland District Council's Cabinet and Council GNLP matters were considered.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received on behalf of Cllr Stuart Clancy, Cllr Tim East and Cllr John Fuller.

3. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The following question was received from Dickleburgh Parish Council:

Concern has been expressed by Dickleburgh and Rushall residents that, if they give an opinion in favour or against a particular development site around the villages, their name and their opinion are visible to all online. Since residents very often know the landowners involved, the result has been - and will be - a chilling effect on comments. Is it a legal necessity for anyone who gives an opinion to be publicly named and are there any implications for data protection?

Response

Attributing comments on sites to individuals was the standard practice of the Greater Norwich authorities and was common practice in the production of local plans nationwide. This was made clear as part of the GNLP consultation. It is important that the Greater Norwich authorities could identify individuals who make comments. This helps to ensure the integrity of the consultation process as, for example, it prevents multiple responses being made by any individual.

To clarify this the Local Plan Team would seek legal advice on whether there was a requirement to publish the names of consultation respondents and any implications for data protection (to be attached at Appendix 1 to these Minutes when received).

4. HIGH LEVEL REPORT ON THE REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION ON THE GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN

The report provided initial feedback on the Regulation 18 consultation on the Greater Norwich Local Plan, which was undertaken over January to March 2018. A more in depth analysis of the consultation and further evidence would be contained in the draft Statement of Consultation, which would be published September/October 2018.

Due to changes in Government policy in relation to housing numbers and a difficulty in reaching a consensus, the consultation covered Issues and Options instead of the draft Plan, as originally intended.

The consultation had been very successful; with over 8,000 representations received, and 180 new sites submitted.

The Growth Options element of the consultation proposed, 43,000 homes and 7,200 additional homes to 2036. Feedback included comments on:

- Strategic Approach
- New Settlement
- Green Belt
- Housing Numbers
- Jobs Growth
- Settlement Hierarchy
- Affordable Housing

Members were advised that they would need to undertake a lot of collaborative work on a number of key issues for a draft Plan that complied with the National Planning Policy Framework to be completed. Evidence would continue to be gathered for the development of policies, as the Plan was drafted.

It was noted that the six proposed distribution options for growth were likely to be amalgamated into one strategy containing elements of more than one of the options. The majority of respondents had favoured options promoting concentration development over wider dispersal.

Mixed views were expressed through the consultation on the potential for a new settlement, although it was emphasised that adequate funding must be identified if this option was chosen. Four options for a new settlement had been put forward; one at Honingham Thorpe and three to the east and south of Wymondham. Providing the relevant infrastructure to deliver a new settlement during the lifetime of the GNLP would be a key consideration; although it was noted that Government initiatives, such as development partnerships, might help with this. There was also some support for a Green Belt, with a wedge based approach most favoured.

It was noted that housing numbers would need to be reviewed to take account of new household projections and these were likely to change over the lifetime of the Plan.

Other issues consulted upon included; jobs, with the majority supporting enhanced growth consistent with the City Deal. The urgent need for affordable housing was also raised by many through the consultation, with a focus on the need for smaller homes.

In addition to the 562 sites consulted on, a further 180 new sites had been submitted. New sites could continue to be submitted throughout the Regulation 18 process, although very late submissions would be determined by the Planning Inspector. The consultation document had not indicate any preferred sites at this stage.

The Board was informed that the next stage of the process would be a focused consultation on the newly submitted sites over October - December 2018. This would be followed with a draft (Regulation 18) Plan to be

consulted on in September-October 2019 with preferred policy options, growth strategy and site allocations. A number of briefing notes would be brought to the Board over the coming months for Members to determine how these elements of the draft Plan would be selected.

RESOLVED

to note the content of the report, which will contribute to the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan 'Statement of Consultation' and producing a draft Plan in due course.

5. REVISED TIMELINE FOR THE GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN

The report presented options for a revision of the timetable of the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

The reasons for a revision were the large number of new sites that had come forward, the forthcoming publication of a revised National Planning Policy Framework, as well as legal advice which had confirmed that to rely on a single Issues and Options consultation, rather than asking for comments on a draft Plan, could risk the Plan being found unsound, or subject to legal challenge.

The following two timetable Options were proposed for consideration:

Option 1 was the recommended Option and would allow a Regulation 18 draft Plan to be produced swiftly, utilising the Issues and Options feedback, which could then progress to a pre-submission Regulation 19 Plan for consultation with a final adoption of date of September 2021. It was emphasised that this option would need consensus to be reached quickly, to be achievable.

Option 2 would increase the time before the Regulation 19 document could be produced and extend the date of the adoption to March 2022.

Members considered Option One (below) to be the most preferable, as it would allow the Plan to be adopted faster and more efficiently.

Production milestones	
Focussed consultation on newly submitted sites	Oct. – Dec. 2018
Complete and publish draft (Regulation 18) plan for consultation: to include preferred policy options, growth strategy and site allocations	Sep. – Oct. 2019
Complete and publish pre-submission draft (Regulation 19) plan for consultation: to include agreed strategic policies, sites and site-specific proposals	Feb. - March 2020
Formal submission of GNLP to Secretary Of State (Regulation 22)	June 2020

Public Hearings	January 2021
Consultation on Proposed Main Modifications	March – April 2021
Publication of Inspector’s Report	July 2021
Adoption of the Greater Norwich Local Plan	September 2021

It was emphasised, however, that careful attention should be given to the consultation process, to ensure that as wide an audience as possible was given the opportunity to comment, and that all proper procedures were undertaken to ensure that the Plan would be sound and not subject to legal challenge.

RESOLVED

to approve Option 1 as the timetable for progressing the GNLP and to update the constituent authorities Local Development Schemes accordingly.

The meeting closed at 2.44 pm.