

Meeting **JOINT COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND
TRANSPORT**

Date **21st SEPTEMBER 2012**

agenda item number **7**

From **JOINT OFFICER STEERING GROUP**

GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD UPDATE

Summary

- 1 The Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board (JPAB) oversees the preparation of Aligned Core Strategies across Greater Nottingham, and the implementation of the New Growth Point infrastructure projects. This report updates the Joint Committee on the work of JPAB.

Background

- 2 Meetings of JPAB have been held on 21st June and 23rd August 2012. The minutes of the previous 19th April 2012 meeting and the 21st June 2012 meeting are attached to this report, as appendix 1 and 2. The minutes of the 23rd August meeting are yet to be considered by JPAB and are therefore not available for inclusion in this report.
- 3 Due to a relatively light agenda, the meeting held on 21st June 2012 was a 'virtual' meeting, with papers circulated and approved by e-mail.
- 4 The main items of business for the meeting of 23rd August 2012 were:-

Greater Nottingham Core Strategies

- 5 Noted the large number of representations made on the recently published Core Strategies for Broxtowe, Gelding and Nottingham City, and for Erewash. Highlighted the next stages in progress towards Examination, primarily consideration of the representations, summarising the main points raised, proposing any necessary changes (and consulting on these if necessary), and making practical arrangements for the examination itself.
- 6 Ashfield District Council are preparing a 10 year Local Plan covering the whole of their District, and are targeting a 'Preferred Option' consultation for September 2012. Rushcliffe Borough Council are currently considering an appropriate date to submit their Core Strategy.

Planning Inspectorate Meeting– Verbal Update

- 7 Reported back on the main areas of discussion at a meeting held on the morning of the 23rd August: the National Planning Policy Framework compatibility checklist, the Duty to Cooperate on housing matters, Model Policy embodying the national “Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development”, evidence required to demonstrate whether or not a local authority is ‘persistently’ demonstrating non delivery of housing in their area, and various procedural matters which need to be considered in the lead up to examination.
- 8 Items on the Programme of Development, the Community Infrastructure Levy (Presentation from Gedling Borough Council) and the Local Sustainable Transport Fund were also considered.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the contents of this report.

Background Papers referred to in compiling this report

Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board papers for 21st June and 23rd August 2012.

Contact Officer

Matt Gregory
Greater Nottingham Growth Point Planning Manager,
Development Department
Nottingham City Council
Tel: 0115 876 3981
E-mail: matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Appendix 1

ITEM 2	MINUTES OF THE GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD HELD ON 19th APRIL 2012 AT THE OLD COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, BEESTON
---------------	--

PRESENT

Broxtowe: Councillor Steve Barber (Chair);
Erewash: Councillor G Smith;
Gedling: Councillor R Allan;
Nottingham City: Councillor A Clark;
Nottinghamshire County: Councillor R Jackson;
Rushcliffe: Councillor D Bell

Officers in Attendance

Ashfield: Ms Christine Sarris;
Broxtowe: Mrs Ruth Hyde
Erewash: Mr Steve Birkinshaw;
Gedling: Mr Peter Baguley;
Growth Point: Ms Dawn Alvey, Mr Matt Gregory;
Nottingham City: Mrs Sue Flack;
Rushcliffe: Mr Richard Mapletoft

Observers

Growth Point: Mr Matthew Grant;
Barratt Homes Ltd: Mr Robert Galij;
Environment Agency: Mr Kasi Hussain;
Nottingham City: Councillor Ian Malcolm;
Mr John Hancock

Apologies:

Ashfield: Councillor Glenys Maxwell;
Broxtowe: Mr Steve Dance
Derbyshire: Mrs Christine Massey;
HCA: Mr Mark Banister;
Nottingham City: Mr Grant Butterworth, Councillor Jane Urquart;
Nottinghamshire County: Councillor Richard Butler, Mrs Sally Gill;
Rushcliffe: Mr Paul Randle

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

Councillor Steve Barber, Chair, welcomed those attending and introductions were made.

2. **Declarations of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

3. **Approval of Minutes of last meeting**

Minutes of the last meeting were approved and seconded. There were no matters arising.

4. **Aligned Core Strategies**

4.1 MG reiterated approval of the ACS should be before the summer holiday period. Erewash Borough Council will publish their own document on 21 June with Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City continuing with their timetable for 11 June. The timetable itemised at 2.7 of the ACS report will be in the hands of the Planning Inspectorate not the councils.

4.2 Ashfield District Council is intending to prepare a Local Plan which will cover a 10 year period.

4.3 Rushcliffe Borough Council has now published its Core Strategy for representations. Other partner councils will work with Rushcliffe for a conjoined Examination. RM (Rushcliffe) announced that this was likely to be in the Autumn. He confirmed that the closing date for representations is in fact 8 May and not 10 May as previously reported.

4.4 A series of documents are being prepared for the Inspector which will be published alongside the ACS.

It was resolved that JPAB NOTE the progress towards publication of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies, and the indicative timetable for Submission and Adoption.

5. **National Planning Policy Framework**

5.1 MG's presentation summarised the changes of the NPPF final publication from the draft version and offered an open discussion on the content at the end of the presentation. He said it would be some time before the implications of the NPPF were realised.

5.2 MG advised that Local Plans should be in line with NPPF and councils have been given a year to incorporate the changes to their plans. Inspectors will give greater weight to plans that have approved policies and consistency with the NPPF.

- 5.3 Cllr Barber (Chair) asked for likes and dislikes of the NPPF.
- 5.4 Cllr Clark (City) asked if the sequential test was now reinstated.
MG - sequential approach is now included and relates to retail, office and leisure uses.
- 5.5 Cllr Clark (City) concerned about cost of flood risk.
MG's interpretation of the changes meant that responsibility had been passed on to local authorities.
- 5.6 Cllr Clark (City) asked how the Core Strategies approach to the 'Presumption in Favour of Development' would be tested and expressed concerns about the resources of the Planning Inspectorate to deal with the number of emerging plans/appeals.
MG said that Inspectors at Examination would need to assess whether plans had been prepared with regard to evidence. If not then issues of 'soundness' would arise. Likely to be additional pressure on the Planning Inspectorate and need for additional Inspectors.
- 5.7 Cllr Bell (Rushcliffe) was aware that it would be a long time before technical documents would be available and therefore authorities would be subject to more appeals of validity.
MG - there is a joint view taken with RTPI that NPPF would lead to more planning appeals.
- 5.8 Cllr Barber (Broxtowe) - Localism element is welcomed but the focus on viability is likely to place more pressure on greenfield sites without solutions to bringing forward historic brownfield sites. The NPPF also places more costs on Local Authorities in terms of evidence, eg flood risk studies.
- 5.9 Cllr Clarke (City) NPPF encourages local involvement but there are real difficulties in engaging at a strategic level. Public interest tends to be generated on specific sites.
- 5.10 Cllr Allan (Gedling) had engaged with the public by issuing 52,000 copies to local residents but generally all responses to new homes being built in their area was "NIMBY".
- 5.11 Cllr Bell (Rushcliffe) welcomed more protection for the Green Belt but the NPPF is more onerous regarding viability and deliverability. Unless economic conditions improve housing numbers will not be delivered.
MG - depending on market conditions it is very challenging. Need to be aspirational but realistic. The environmental sector say the housing provision is too high whilst the development sector consider the numbers too low.
- 5.12 Cllr Allan (Gedling) important that we identify appropriate land supply for houses, delivery will be subject to market conditions.

- 5.13 Cllr Bell (Rushcliffe) Plans have to be deliverable.
- 5.14 MG - and aspirational.
- 5.15 Cllr Barber (Broxtowe) - it has ambiguity therefore open to more challenges so need to set aside more money for legal challenges.
- 5.16 RH (Broxtowe) – likely to be many challenges – will need to learn from experience of other councils too.
- 5.17 MG - noticed more challenges appearing on Local Plans for sustainable development. Informal discussions with Planning Inspectors have indicated, through their experience, that previously developers would not undermine their whole plan. Developers seeking to undermine the whole plan in favour of sustainable development is an increasing possibility.
- 5.18 Cllr Allan (Gedling) - plan for growth. Was the old system that bad? Is this change really needed?
- 5.19 MG - inappropriate to answer.
- 5.20 CS (Ashfield) - appreciated shorter document, we should welcome growth which is well designed.
- 5.21 Cllr Clarke (City) – NPPF infers that it is progrowth but is a regulatory framework rather than the means to promote growth.
- 5.22 Cllr Barber (Broxtowe) - working on a joint Plan, is it a move forward or backwards?
- 5.23 Cllr Bell (Rushcliffe) - it's a move forward.
- 5.24 Cllr Allan (Gedling) – joint working sensible and alternatives not favoured.

<p>It was resolved that JPAB NOTE the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework, and commented on aspects considered to be of particular interest.</p>

6. **Growth Point Revenue Budget**

- 6.1 DA gave an update on the Revenue budget with a full outturn to be reported at the next meeting.
- 6.2 The draft revenue budget was shown at Table 1 of the report which is subject to an audit on 9/10 May.

- 6.3 Approval was sought to extend Growth Point contracts for the three posts to the end of April 2013 to see through the ACS up to and after Examination stage. The additional cost would be met from savings in staff salaries from the previous year and from the Masterplan budget.
- 6.4 Examination costs were summarised at Table 2 of the report excluding legal costs. With joint working there would be savings for a single Examination process which would be shared with each authority for appointment/ secondment of a Programme Officer, fees and activities.

JPAB resolved to

APPROVE unanimously the draft revenue budget.

APPROVE unanimously the staffing arrangements as set out in the report subject to formal agreement with Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council.

NOTE the costs associated with Examination of the Core Strategies and potential cost savings.

7. Any other Business

DA had received notification from Derbyshire County Council that their Infrastructure Delivery Plan had been prepared and would be reported to Cabinet for approval on 24 April 2012.

8. Date of Next Meeting

Future meeting dates were announced as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Venue</u>
Thursday 21 June 2012	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston
Thursday 23 August 2012	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston
Thursday 18 October 2012	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston
Thursday 20 December 2012	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston

Appendix 2

ITEM 3

MINUTES OF THE VIRTUAL GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD HELD ON 21ST JUNE 2012

1. Papers for the June meeting were circulated to JPAB members by email. With the following recommendations:

Agenda Item	Recommendation
1. Declaration of Interests	
2. Approval of minutes of last meeting and matters arising	Approve
3. Aligned Core Strategies	Note
4. Programme of Development	Note

2. The following responses were received:

Local Authority	JPAB Member	Agenda Item			
		Declarations of Interest	Minutes	Aligned Core Strategies	Programme of Development
Ashfield District Council	No response				
Broxtowe Borough Council	Cllr Barber	None	Approved	Noted	Noted
Derbyshire County Council	No Response				
Erewash Borough Council	Cllr Smith	None	Approved	Noted	Noted
Gedling Borough Council	Cllr Allan	None	Approved	Noted	Noted
Nottingham City Council	Cllr Clark	None	Approved	Noted	Noted
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cllr Butler	None	Noted (not at previous meeting)	Noted	Noted
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Cllr Bell	None	Approved	Noted	Noted

3. Regarding Item 3 2.2 Councillor Barber noted that that Erewash had approved their Core Strategy at Council and that this brings four councils close to convergence with only 3 weeks separating the consultations. The process seems to be on track but with challenges remaining in achieving a wider understanding of the need to balance housing shortages and pressures on the green belt.
4. Cllr Barber welcomed the news the majority of schemes are complete (Item 4 5.1) and requested a report on at the next meeting on Gedling Colliery and Ilkeston Station. Regarding Ilkeston Station, Cllr Barber commented on the advantages of a PTE in the delivery such schemes.

It would be advantageous to secure the remaining funding prior to new franchise arrangements being established and raised the possibility of lobbying for the scheme at parliamentary level.

5. Cllr Butler commented on the update on Ilkeston Station and encouraging progress.

Date of Next Meeting

6. Future meeting dates are as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Venue</u>
Thursday 18 October 2012	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston
Thursday 20 December 2012	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston