

**Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport**

**Date:** Friday, 21 September 2012  
**Time:** 10:00  
**Venue:** County Hall  
**Address:** County Hall, West Bridgford, Nottingham NG2 7QP

**AGENDA**

- |          |  |                |
|----------|--|----------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b><u>Minutes of the last meeting held on 22 June 2012</u></b><br>Details  | <b>3 - 6</b>   |
| <b>2</b> | <b><u>Apologies for Absence</u></b><br>Details   | <b>1-2</b>     |
| <b>3</b> | <b><u>Declarations of Interests by Members and Officers:- (see note below)</u></b><br>(a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests<br>(b) Private Interests (pecuniary and non-pecuniary) | <b>1-2</b>     |
| <b>4</b> | <b><u>Joint Waste Development Plan - Preparation for Submission of the Core Strategy</u></b><br>Details  | <b>7 - 10</b>  |
| <b>5</b> | <b><u>Transport issues - update</u></b><br>Details   | <b>11 - 16</b> |
| <b>6</b> | <b><u>Rail issues - Update</u></b><br>Details  | <b>17 - 20</b> |
| <b>7</b> | <b><u>Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board Update</u></b><br>Details   | <b>21 - 30</b> |



**JOINT COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT**

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 22 JUNE 2012 AT COUNTY  
HALL, WEST BRIDGFORD, NOTTINGHAM FROM 10.00 AM TO 11.15 AM**

**NOTTINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**

- ✓ Councillor Butler
- ✓ Councillor Greaves
- ✓ Councillor Heptinstall
- ✓ Councillor Jackson

**NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL**

- ✓ Councillor Clark
- ✓ Councillor Malcolm
- A Councillor Neal
- ✓ Councillor Urquhart

- ✓ Indicates present at meeting

**ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

**RESOLVED 2012/001**

That the appointment by the County Council of Councillor Richard Butler as Chairman be noted.

**ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR**

**RESOLVED 2012/002**

That the appointment by the County Council of Nottingham City Councillor Jane Urquhart as Vice-Chair be noted.

**MEMBERSHIP**

**RESOLVED 2012/003**

That the membership of the Joint Committee on Strategic Planning & Transport as set out on the agenda be noted.

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **RESOLVED 2012/004**

That the terms of reference of the Joint Committee be noted.

## **MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED 2012/005**

That the minutes of the last meeting on 23 March 2012 were agreed as a true and correct record and signed by the Chair, after it was noted that Councillor Heptinstall's apologies were not recorded for that meeting.

## **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None.

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

None

## **NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

Paul Tansey, Development Department, Nottingham City Council gave a summary of the new National Planning policy Framework and the implications of the new Framework for the Councils. He informed the Committee that there were three fundamental objectives which were to give power to communities to shape the places they live in; to support growth; and protect the environment. He explained that the Framework makes it more difficult to refuse in terms of transport with car parking thresholds being removed. Mr Tansey reported that the policy in the Framework document had not changed significantly and was not as radical as originally thought. It was felt that the Framework policies would be more relevant for the County.

Councillor Butler stated that if an application for large housing developments were granted then the Local Plan should include employment in the area which would reduce the need to commute.

Councillor Malcolm felt that people were more likely to use buses if they did not have to change but that it was more difficult to get employment in the outlying areas and people were more likely to travel into the city centres.

It was agreed that there was a need for co-operation on plan making with shared evidence bases. It was noted that officers across Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire County and Derbyshire have meetings regularly to review plan making.

## **RESOLVED 2012/006**

That the report be noted.

### **JOINT WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN – PROGRESS ON THE CORE STRATEGY**

Suzanne Moody, Principal Planning Officer, Policy, Planning & Corporate Services, Nottinghamshire County Council introduced the report. She reported that a draft of the development plan had been submitted in March/April this year which had received a low numbers of responses. After possible changes the Core Strategy will then be presented to the Secretary of State in September. Further meetings with the Planning Directorate will take place with recycling targets to be put in the Core Strategy. She stated that there would be an Officer/Member Working Group meeting in July where recommendations from both Councils which could then be submitted to the Inspectorate.

## **RESOLVED 2012/007**

That the report be noted.

### **LOCAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FUND – UPDATE**

Kevin Sharman, Team Manager, Transport Plans and Programmes, Environment & Resources Department, Nottinghamshire County Council updated the Committee on the work of the Joint Planning Advisory Board. He stated that £5m had been secured enabling Smart cards and Travel Hubs to be introduced. He reported that there had been a bid for £11m and a separate bid for 4 urban towns but both bids had been unsuccessful. It was agreed that the Committee would continue to lobby and campaign for extra funding for the city and county.

## **RESOLVED 2012/008**

That the report be noted.

### **RAIL ISSUES – UPDATE**

Jim Bamford, Rail Officer for the authorities, gave an update on rail issues including informing members that the first phase of linespeed works have commenced for the Midland Mainline, and will be completed by 2014. He reported that a formal announcement by the Government was awaited for specific schemes to receive funding for the period 2014 - 2019. It was agreed that Councillors Jackson and Urquhart would write a final letter to the Minister pressing the funding the outstanding MML enhancements.

Mr Bamford updated the Committee on Nottingham Rail Station by stating that the car park had now been completed and an overbridge was being constructed for completion in 2014 for the NET Phase 2 project. He stated

that £85,000 had been received to improve cycle parking and cycle hire at the Nottinghamshire rail stations. He reported that the Nottingham Railway Station would be closed next summer for building work. The Committee asked Jim to report back to the next meeting with more details.

It was noted that there was a proposal to build a railway station at Ilkeston which would involve the station being in Derbyshire with the car park in Nottinghamshire. Members expressed support regarding the building of Ilkeston Railway Station, and a willingness to support Derbyshire if requested.

#### **RESOLVED 2012/009**

- (1) That in their responses on rail franchise devolution both Councils should require that 'inter-Regional services' must continue to be specified at a national level, and require an opportunity to participate in the stakeholder groups for any devolved franchises.
- (2) That the report be noted.

#### **GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD – UPDATE**

Sue Flack, Director of Planning and Transport at Nottingham City Council updated the Joint Committee on the work of the Joint Planning Advisory Board.

Following their approvals, Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City Councils had published their Aligned Core Strategies for a statutory period ending on 23rd July 2012. Erewash Borough Council would be seeking formal approval on 21st June. Due to the later publication date, Erewash will be publishing a separate document. The report also set out a proposed timetable to Examination and Adoption in Autumn 2013.

#### **RESOLVED 2012/010**

That the report be noted.

#### **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Joint Committee will be held on Friday 21<sup>st</sup> September commencing at 10.00 am at County Hall.

The meeting closed at 11.15 am.

#### **CHAIRMAN**

**JOINT WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN –  
PREPARATION FOR SUBMISSION OF THE CORE STRATEGY**

**Purpose of the Report**

1. To report on progress with the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy where the process is moving towards Full Council approval from both Authorities in December for the submission of the Draft Waste Core Strategy for independent examination.

**Information and Advice**

2. The preparation of the Waste Core Strategy has gone through a number of key stages to gather and present evidence and put forward the issues and establish the options that been considered as part of developing the final Plan. This has included several stages of informal consultation and a recent publication stage to allow for formal representations from the public and other stakeholders.
3. As reported to the last Joint Committee the Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document was published for a formal period of public representations between 5 March and 30 April 2012. 220 representations from a 34 different organisations and individuals have now been considered. A schedule of representations received and the councils' responses has been produced and published as a background paper to the relevant committee/executive board reports.
4. As reported to the previous Committee there are changes necessary to the Plan arising from the representations. Other changes to policies are necessary as a result of discussions with nearby waste planning authorities under the Councils' Duty to Co-operate', which is a requirement of the Localism Act. Finally, changes are also needed as a result of the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012.
5. These changes fall into two categories,
  - Main changes; this is the term given to major changes, which will be considered by the Inspector at the forthcoming Examination of the Plan as an integral part of the Submission Draft Plan.
  - Minor changes; these are minor, technical and typographic changes that do not affect the substance of the Plan. These are also published, but will not be considered at the Examination.
6. A schedule of all the Proposed Changes, main and minor has been presented as an appendix to the relevant committee/executive board reports.

## Summary of Key Responses to Representations and Main Changes

7. There were challenges to waste data used as evidence in the Plan. Whilst this could be a significant matter, the challenge is not accepted on the grounds that the Plan uses the most up to date figures/estimates and no additional, more reliable or accurate information has been presented by the objectors. As the objectors are seeking a reduction to waste arisings without any substantive evidence to support it, no changes are proposed to the Plan.
8. There have also been objections from Natural England and the Environment Agency on points of detail. These are more appropriate for the Development Management policies, which will be in a later Development Plan Document (DPD).
9. In line with the NPPF, and in accordance with guidance from the Government's Planning Advisory Service (PAS), the Councils need to amend the Plan to include a policy that reflects the overarching principle of sustainable development. Advice received indicates that inclusion of this policy is the most straightforward way of demonstrating compliance to an Inspector. The addition of this policy is one of the main changes set out in the schedule.
10. A nearby waste authority has objected to the lack of a specific policy on hazardous and low level radioactive waste. Officers from the Authorities have met regarding this matter and changes are proposed to Policy WCS4 (now *Disposal sites for hazardous, non-hazardous and inert waste*) to reflect this.
11. Changes are proposed to Policy WCS5 (*Power station ash*) to recognise the potential for, but limitations of, stockpiling pulverised fuel ash (PFA) for future recycling or re-use.
12. Amendments are proposed to Policy WCS6 (*General Site Criteria*) to clarify that this applies to facilities for all types of waste, including hazardous, unless specified otherwise in the text. Additional text also confirms that Green Belt policies will also apply where relevant.
13. A proposed amendment to Policy WCS9 on safeguarding expands this policy to cover the need to safeguard land for the possible future expansion of facilities.
14. Changes are also proposed to Policy WCS11 to reflect that Planning Policy Statement 10 (PPS10) does not allow for an assessment of need where facilities are in line with an up to date development plan. The policy has therefore been amended to ensure that proposals likely to bring in waste from outside Nottinghamshire must demonstrate wider sustainability benefits in terms of either the site location or the waste hierarchy. It is now titled *Managing non-local waste*.
15. Concerns were raised over an inadequate level of environmental protection in policy WCS12 with wording being overly positive towards waste facilities. Officers held subsequent discussion with objectors, development management teams and took into account the new guidance in the NPPF. Policy WCS12 has been re-drafted to be more specific on the circumstances in which development would not be allowed; this should provide a more robust basis against which to determine future planning applications and



if necessary defend against appeals. It is also now titled *Protecting and enhancing our environment*).

16. Further Sustainability Appraisal work has been undertaken in order to assess the potential impacts on social, economic and environmental factors brought about by the Proposed Changes to the Plan. An Equalities Impact Assessment has also been done, as required.

### **Next steps**

17. The two Authorities will now approve the Schedule of Changes through Full Council meetings scheduled for September. The changes to the Core Strategy will then undergo a six week period for representations ending in November. Once this process has been completed, the Authorities' Full Councils will be asked to give approval for the Plan to be submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination. The Examination of the Plan by an independent inspector is anticipated to take place in the New Year.

### **Other Options Considered**

18. Not applicable as preparation of the Waste Core Strategy and other development plan documents is a statutory function of both authorities.

### **Reason/s for Recommendation/s**

19. To ensure that members are aware of the progress of the Waste Development Framework.

### **Statutory and Policy Implications**

20. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, equal opportunities, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1) It is recommended that Members of the Committee discuss and note the above report

### **Contact officers:**

Suzanne Moody, Policy Planning & Corporate Services, Nottinghamshire County Council

Tel: 0115 977 72108

Email: [suzanne.moody@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:suzanne.moody@nottscc.gov.uk)

Sarah Watson

Development Department – Nottingham City Council

Tel: 0115 876 3974

Email: [sarah.watson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:sarah.watson@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)



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

Date: **SEPTEMBER 2012** Agenda item number: **5**

From: **JOINT OFFICERS STEERING GROUP**

## **TRANSPORT ISSUES UPDATE**

### **Purpose of report**

1. To update the Committee on key transport issues for the Greater Nottingham area.

### **Devolution of Local Major Transport Schemes Funding**

2. On 31<sup>st</sup> January the Department for Transport (DfT) published a consultation document on proposals for a new model for local major transport scheme prioritisation and investment for the next Spending Review period (2015 to 2019). The Department for Transport has now published responses to the consultation and written to local authorities stating the intention to confirm the detailed proposals after the summer Parliamentary recess including detailed guidance on establishing Local Transport Bodies.
3. In the mean time the Department is inviting local partners to confirm Local Transport Body boundaries and membership. In formulating these it is suggested boundaries should be coterminous with existing local authority and Local Enterprise Partnership boundaries. The deadline for confirming Local Transport Body arrangements is 28 September.
4. Future funding allocations will be determined through formulae largely based on population data from the 2011 census. Indicative funding allocations will be published once Local Transport Body arrangements have been confirmed.
5. Decisions on prioritising investment will then be devolved to the Local Transport Bodies but the responsibility for delivery will remain with the promoting local authority.
6. The Government intends the new system to ensure the best outcomes for economic development whilst meeting carbon reduction objectives, and

transfer power to local communities enabling more responsive decision-making based on local economic conditions.

### **Nottingham City Deal**

7. On the 5 July Greg Clark MP, Minister of State for Decentralisation and Cities released a written statement summarising the deals that have been concluded for the first wave of city deals focused on the eight largest English cities outside London including Nottingham.
8. The stated purpose of the deals is to give cities greater powers to drive local economic growth, to facilitate specific projects that will boost local economies and strengthen local governance arrangements.
9. Each of the deals are specific to each city with both cities and Government offering and requiring things in return. Nottingham's City Deal is focussed on a package of business development activities concentrated on a particular area of the city, its Creative Quarter within the city centre. Initiatives cover fostering enterprise, supporting a high quality workforce and developing 21<sup>st</sup> century infrastructure.
10. Transport measures being supported through the deal are:
  - Up to £8 million for public realm and transport infrastructure in the Creative Quarter.
  - Up to £1 million for transport behaviour change test bed to support people into employment.
  - Department for Transport to facilitate discussion between Nottingham and Traffic Commissioners to support the enforcement of the Statutory Bus Quality Partnership standards in the City to ensure the smooth operation of local public transport.
  - Explore devolving powers to the local authority to better manage traffic and tackle congestion through extended control over illegal traffic manoeuvres (eg ignoring banned turns/yellow boxes to improve traffic flow and public transport reliability).
11. Detailed action plans are being prepared setting out how each of the deal elements including timescales for implementation.

### **Local Sustainable Transport Fund update**

12. At the previous meeting, Joint Committee was informed of progress on first and second phases of Local Sustainable Transport Fund initiatives. Since this time the Government has announced large scale bid allocations. This resulted in the Nottingham Urban Area being allocated £10.320 million in addition to £4.925 million previously allocated for the period up to March

2015. Including local contributions from matched Local Transport Plan capital programme and partner contributions the total package is valued at £35 million.

13. The City Council led the preparation of the Nottingham Urban Area bid partnership comprising Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership, Sustrans, NHS Nottingham City, Nottinghamshire County Council and Derbyshire County Council.
14. Programme allocations and revised governance arrangements were approved at the City Council's Executive Board on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2012. The LSTF package consists of five main workstrands described below.
15. **A: Smartcard development and integrated ticketing (£3.915m revenue and £0.985k capital)** to support access to employment and training by improving integration and unlocking sustainable travel opportunities. The existing Citycard is being developed to offer an integrated smartcard available for use on bus, tram, and local train services for all operators, with the best fare guaranteed for passengers; pilot a travel support package for eligible college students; and support improved multi-modal integration at public transport interchanges through secure cycle parking facilities.
16. Additional funding will be directed towards expanding the range of public transport products available on the Citycard such as cycle hire and on-street and off-street parking payment options, providing further travel support solutions to low income groups and job seekers, offering personalised journey planning for key target groups and extension of the travel training programme of support for people with learning difficulties and other disabilities.
17. **B: Establish a network of Community Smarter Travel Hubs (£2.165m revenue and £1.790 capital)** designed to promote behaviour change and provide travel services tailored to the needs of local communities to address travel barriers to accessing jobs and services. Following a tendering exercise The Ridewise third sector organisation have been awarded a three-year grant to deliver a "Travel Right" programme of activities to support citizens in north Nottingham. A Neighbourhood Travel Right Coordinator will work with the community to commission locally focused sustainable travel services such as local events and activities to promote the use of public transport, walking and cycling, bespoke services such as personalised journey planning for job seekers, cycle training and taster sessions, route planning, bike recycling/reconditioning, a coordinated programme of locally prioritised small-scale access and interchange improvements and development of social marketing approaches to help raise awareness of travel options.

18. The Main Bid funding includes allocations to expand the Community Smarter Travel Hub model to also serve the central and south areas of Nottingham and further hubs in the wider urban area. The workstrand includes funding for a programme of 20mph limits to be implemented across the City to improve safety and to create a more attractive walking and cycling environment.
19. **C: WorkSmart (£1.477m revenue and £2.200m capital)** is delivering a coordinated programme to support the needs of the business community with smarter travel services and developing the low carbon transport network. Funding is supporting Big Wheel Business Club activities which are being expanded to deliver an increased range of practical support services and grants tailored to the different needs of larger and smaller employers to support local economic development.
20. Further funding will be directed towards delivering a low carbon public transport network through the introduction of 19 hybrid electric vehicles and infrastructure provided for the Linkbus fleet (matched with funding recently secured through the Green Bus Fund), development of a network of on-road strategic cycle corridors, improved walking and cycling links to public transport, other smarter choices measures and development of a city car club.
21. **D: Active travel partnerships (£2.218m revenue and £0.240m capital)** for delivering a programme to encourage walking and cycling for local journeys. Funding is being used to develop a refreshed programme of events and community cycling activities, continue the UCycle Nottingham programme expanded to include further education colleges to provide personalised travel planning advice together with small-scale transport infrastructure improvements within and to college sites.
22. **E: Programme management (£0.255m revenue)** to coordinate programme delivery, the commissioning and procurement of key services and monitoring activities to meet DfT evaluation requirements.
23. There is widespread support within the business and the local community for the bid proposals and the community delivery model as demonstrated by the consultation exercise undertaken as part of the bid preparation.
24. Project initiation and procurement approaches are currently being investigated to commission key transport services.
25. A formal progress report setting out what was achieved during the 2011/12 financial year including two case studies on the Citycard integrated ticketing scheme and the Big Wheel Business Club were submitted to the Department for Transport in July 2012. A partnership newsletter is now

being published on a quarterly basis to keep project partners informed on a regular basis.

### **Nottingham Express Transit Phase Two**

26. Construction works on NET Phase Two are now well underway, with over 1,000 plots of land possessed in order to build the scheme. Demolition of the properties on Chilwell Road has been completed, and the multi-storey car park in Beeston has also been demolished. Utility diversions are taking place in various locations along both routes.
27. Excavation of the former railway embankment is due to commence in the near future. Foundation construction for the bridge over Nottingham Station has commenced, with construction works on other structures to begin over the next two to three months, which will include deck strengthening to Clayton Canal Bridge and strengthening works to the arches at Wilford Toll Bridge.
28. Local Liaison Groups have been established for the six main areas that the tram extensions will serve, and construction information continuing to be distributed to those living and working near the tram works. A new construction focused website has also been created which allows people to find out construction information for their local areas, as well as the entire routes.
29. Static information displays have now been provided at major destinations along the two extensions, and all 50 schools which are near to the two new tram lines were visited prior to the school's summer holiday, so that children received construction site safety briefings.

### **Recommendation**

30. It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this report.

#### Contact officers

Chris Carter, Development, Nottingham City Council  
Tel: 0115 8763940  
Email: [chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

Kevin Sharman, Environment and Resources, Nottinghamshire County Council  
Tel: 0115 9772970  
Email: [kevin.sharman@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:kevin.sharman@nottscc.gov.uk)





## **RAIL ISSUES UPDATE**

### **Purpose of the report**

1. To update the Committee on key rail issues in and into the Greater Nottingham Local Transport Plan (LTP) area and rail services across local authority boundaries. The work of the two Councils, although separate, is complementary, and of mutual benefit.

### **Midland Main Line (MML)**

2. On 16th July the Government announced that for the period 2014 - 2019 it was making over £9 billion available for enhancements to the railway network. It also published its formal 'High level Output Statement' (HLOS) as required under the Railways Act 2005 which sets out the enhancements that the Government requires to be delivered 2014 - 2019.
3. As reported to previous meetings of this committee, the 2 Councils had been campaigning for the last 4 years to secure enhancements of the track that would allow reduction of the Nottingham – London journey time to 90 minutes from its current 104 minutes. This would require:-
  - the first £69million phase of MML LSI (Line Speed Increase) works, to raise the speed limits at a series of locations along the MML, which works Network Rail has in hand, scheduled for completion in 2014;
  - the second phase of the MML LSI works, notably raising the speed at a few more locations, most significantly at Market Harborough/Great Bowden;
  - the £11.6million upgrade of the track layout around Nottingham station, which will increase capacity and raise speeds, for which the County Council secured funding in October 2008, and which works will be undertaken in summer 2013; and
  - an enhanced layout at Leicester, similar to the works at Nottingham, but with a flyover to reduce congestion and delays caused to MML trains by freight trains.
4. Paragraphs 34 & 35 of the HLOS specify electrification of what is being called 'the electric spine' route from the south coast to Sheffield. This covers 7 lines from Southampton northwards, including 'Bedford - Nottingham and Derby, and Derby - Sheffield (Midland Main Line).

5. Crucially for our aspirations, paragraph 36 states "**opportunities should be pursued to speed journeys through efficient enhancements** in conjunction with the (electrification) improvements, **notably between Bedford and Corby and at Derby**. The Secretary of State wishes to see **sufficient capacity to provide for forecast freight flows through the electric spine at Leicester**. The industry is to undertake further development work to confirm the full scope and requirements for the delivery of this scheme, which the Secretary of State believes is deliverable within the Statement of Funds Available." (emphasis added).
6. Publication of the HLOS was followed that afternoon by a verbal statement given to the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for Transport, Justine Greening, with subsequent questions from MPs. At our behest, Paul Blomfield MP asked Paul Blomfield (Sheffield Central): "I welcome the Secretary of State's statement, but may I ask her for further clarification of her earlier answers about track improvements? **In particular, will the programme include track improvements at all three bottlenecks on the midland main line—Derby, Leicester and Market Harborough —without which we will not get the targeted improvements in journey times?**"  
Justine Greening: "I will need to confirm that specific point, but **I am certainly aware that track improvements will happen at Leicester. I believe that they will also happen at Derby, but I will need to find out about Market Harborough** and write to the hon. Gentleman." (emphasis added).
7. It is these the track upgrades at these 3 locations that would allow (and are necessary for) Nottingham - London journey times to be reduced to 90 minutes from 104 minutes at present, which will become 99 minutes in 2014 on completion of the initial phase of the linespeed works which is already funded. In fact we wouldn't want electrification to be done until the track upgrade has been done and the speed limits raised and capacity increased at Market Harborough, and Leicester and Derby - if the present track layout at any of those places was electrified now then we would be stuck for ever with the low speed/slow journeys and congestion.
8. As is clear from Justine Greening's answer the Government now requires the track upgrades at both Leicester and at Derby, which is really excellent news. This means that they will both definitely happen - the rail industry has to do what the Government requires. The enhancement at Market Harborough is not yet secure, and I am continuing to work to that end.
9. The HLOS was a story of national consequence. It says a lot for the effectiveness of the lobbying that the Midland Main Line was one of the most prominent schemes in the HLOS statement itself, in the parliamentary debate, and in the media coverage - indeed, the Midland Main Line was the main lead story on both national TV and radio news for most of Saturday 14<sup>th</sup> July, and featured very prominently on Monday 16<sup>th</sup>.
10. Generally the press coverage was well informed. But it is worth setting out one aspect that sometimes gets muddled in the media: -

- **The cost of the track upgrades is £220million** (Market Harborough £30m, Leicester £120m, and Derby £70m). That is on top of the £69million currently being invested in the first phase of linespeed works, making a total of £290m. That investment produces a double benefit - faster journeys, and increased capacity (especially for more freight trains to get lorries off the roads);
- **electrification will cost a further £550million**, which is worth it primarily because it will reduce the operating costs of the MML by around £50million per annum. It will also produce environmental benefits - a reduction in Co2 emitted and other pollutants, and electric trains are quieter. But the electrification is not what produces the journey time reduction.

### Nottingham - Birmingham

11. The upgrade at Derby was part of the MML lobbying package to benefit MML passengers on trains via Derby, although Nottingham's MML trains do not go that way. However, the works at Derby will enormously benefit Nottingham – Birmingham trains.
12. At present, Nottingham – Birmingham trains take 77 minutes for 56¾ miles = 44mph. Average speeds between England's other 'Core City' conurbations are usually around 60mph. The reason that the Nottingham – Birmingham service is far slower than standard is because Nottingham – Birmingham trains have to negotiate 4 congested 'pinch-points' at Birmingham, Derby, Trent junction and Nottingham, each of which seriously constrains the times at which Nottingham – Birmingham trains can pass through.
13. As a result of our lobbying over the recent years, these pinch-points are being progressively eased:-
  - the forthcoming (2013) track upgrade around Nottingham station (see para 3 above),
  - the installation of extra track and higher speeds at Trent, reported to joint committee in 2009 and 2010, and
  - the upgrade at Derby that will result from the July 16th HLOS announcement.
14. Unfortunately, it is not possible to realise the journey time benefit of the enhancements at Nottingham or Trent until the Derby works are done. That is because even if trains can get to Derby earlier they just have to sit in the platform at Derby for longer until their onward path to Birmingham is available. However, with Nottingham and Trent 'freed-up' in 2013, then once the Derby enhancement works have been completed, which should be in 2017, Nottingham – Birmingham trains will be able to get an optimum quick path with no need to wait at all 3 locations, and it should be possible to reduce Nottingham – Birmingham journey times by at least ten minutes or more, bringing the Nottingham – Birmingham average speed much closer to the norm. Thus the HLOS commitment to the works at Derby will be hugely beneficial for the Nottingham – Birmingham service.

### East Coast Main Line

15. The HLOS also included £240m for further enhancements to the East Coast Main Line. This continues the well-established East Coast Main Line programme, for which investment of £509million is currently underway. Although none of this investment is in Nottinghamshire it will reduce delays, improve journey times and increase capacity for all East Coast Main Line services including those to/from Newark and Retford.

### Nottingham Station Hub scheme

16. City Council to supply update in September

### Other Schemes

17. Work continues on the many other schemes, including
- A second train per hour Nottingham – Newark;
  - Nottingham – Newark linespeed increase/journey time reduction, and increased service at intermediate stations;
  - Nottingham – Leeds linespeed increase/journey time reduction;
  - Radford junction linespeed increase/journey time reduction;
  - Nottingham – Skegness linespeed increase/journey time reduction, and increased service at intermediate stations;
- Further details will be reported to future joint committee meetings.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **Contact Officers**

Jim Bamford, Communities Department, Nottinghamshire County Council

Tel: 0115 9773172

E-mail: [jim.bamford@nottscc.gov.uk](mailto:jim.bamford@nottscc.gov.uk)

Chris Carter, Development Department, Nottingham City Council

Tel: 0115 8763963

E-mail: [chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

---

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

Date **21<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> June and 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2012. The minutes of the previous 19<sup>th</sup> April 2012 meeting and the 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012 meeting are attached to this report, as appendix 1 and 2. The minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012 was a 'virtual' meeting, with papers circulated and approved by e-mail.
- 4 The main items of business for the meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 23<sup>rd</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> June and 23<sup>rd</sup> 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](mailto:matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

## **Appendix 1**

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

### **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.

<b>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.</b>
---

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.

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

## 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 21<sup>ST</sup> 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

