

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

Date **12 DECEMBER 2014** agenda item number **5**

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 Local Plans across Greater Nottingham, and the implementation of the Programme of Development infrastructure projects. This report updates the Joint Committee on the work of JPAB.

Background

- 2 The last meeting of JPAB took place on 13th November. The minutes of this meeting are not available, but a summary of the main items of business and any update since the meeting is provided below. The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 19th June are attached for information (appendix 1).

Meeting held on 13th November

- 3 The items included an update on HS2 and the Higgins Report, Local Plans across Greater Nottingham, an update on the Programme of Development, and an update on the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF).

HS2 – Board was updated on the announcement in the Higgins report (Published 27th October) that consideration was being given to a location to the east of the M1 for the East Midlands Hub station, as a possible alternative to Toton. Most Councils did not consider the case for changing the location had been made, but Rushcliffe Borough have an established view that the Hub station should be located at the Parkway Station on the Midland Main Line. It was agreed that further work on the planning and economic advantages of the Toton location would be a helpful input into the consideration being given by HS2 to the station locations, and Broxtowe Borough agreed to take a lead on drafting a proposal, for circulation to all JPAB members, following which Broxtowe Borough would request contributions from participating Councils. It was also agreed that a letter be drafted for the Chair's

signature, reminding Sir Higgins that connectivity to Mansfield/Ashfield area was an important consideration.

Local Plans update – a report was presented highlighting progress with Local Plans across Greater Nottingham. Significant changes since the last meeting were that the Rushcliffe Core Strategy Inspectors report was anticipated for Fact Checking by the Borough in early December, and that Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough and Nottingham City Councils had adopted their Aligned Core Strategies. It was reported that a legal challenge has been received by all three Councils, the Claimant being Calverton Parish Council. The challenge will be contested, and the three Councils have appointed Counsel to advise them.

Programme of Development – the position with the remaining Growth Point budgets was presented, and it was noted that the only outstanding capital project is Ilkeston Station, and that financial completion of Growth Point capital projects is anticipated this financial year. It was also reported that three joint studies were in the process of being commissioned, an Employment Land study covering the whole of Greater Nottingham, as well as Ashfield, Mansfield and Newark and Sherwood Districts, a Retail Study covering Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City and Rushcliffe Borough Council areas, and a Plan-wide Viability Study covering Broxtowe Borough, Nottingham City and Rushcliffe Borough Council areas.

LSTF – JPAB was updated on progress with the implementation of the LSTF, and it was noted that a partnership bid to DfT to continue the best performing elements of the LSTF programme in 2015/16 has been successful in securing a further for £1.18 million of revenue funding.

Recommendation

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

Background Papers referred to in compiling this report

- 5 None.

Contact Officer

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

APPENDIX 1

MINUTES OF THE GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD HELD ON THURSDAY 19 JUNE 2014 AT 2.00 PM IN THE OLD COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, BEESTON

PRESENT

Broxtowe: Councillor Steve Barber;
Erewash: Councillor Chris Corbett;
Nottingham City: Councillor Jane Urquhart;
Nottinghamshire County: Councillor Jim Creamer;
Rushcliffe: Councillor Richard Butler

Officers in Attendance

Ashfield: Ms Christine Sarris;
Broxtowe: Mr Steve Dance; Mrs Ruth Hyde;
Cabe: Ms Kathy MacEwen; Mr David Waterhouse;
Derbyshire County: Mrs Christine Massey;
Erewash: Mr Adam Reddish;
Gedling: Mrs Joanna Gray;
Growth Point: Ms Dawn Alvey, Mr Matt Gregory;
HCA: Mr Alan Bishop;
Nottingham City: Mrs Sue Flack; Ms Jennie Maybury;
Nottinghamshire County: Ms Lisa Bell;
Rushcliffe: Mr Andrew Pegram

Observers

Broxtowe: Mr Steffan Saunders;
General Public: Mr John Hancock;
Nottingham City: Councillor Ian Malcolm;

Apologies:

Ashfield: Councillor John Wilmot; D Mitchell;
Gedling: Councillor Darrell Pulk;
Nottingham City: Councillor Alan Clarke;
Nottinghamshire County: Councillor Steve Calvert;

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

Councillor Barber Chaired the meeting. He welcomed those attending and introductions were made.

2. **Declarations of Interests**

Councillor Urquhart declared that she was a member of the NET Board for the City Council.

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

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

4. **Presentation on Design Support for Large Scale Housing Schemes**

Dave Waterhouse and Kathy MacEwen gave a presentation for the service Cabe can provide to assist local authorities with their large scale housing developments. They can provide links to industry, government agencies, local authorities and developers to assist with the process of planning and design. They aim to use good urban design to create places for communities which are aesthetically pleasing, incorporating areas for physical activities whilst exploiting the natural landscape. They can offer workshops with Built Environment panellists to guide local authorities through the process of planning for large schemes and offer design solutions which have proved favourable in similar types of areas.

RB (RBC) does Cabe think the developer takes notice of discussions?

KM – most of the involvement is with major developers and architects – discussions are generally very constructive and serve to try and bring everyone together to look at the future and what they want to achieve whether it is in the private or public sector. Dialogue early in the design process is preferable stage.

JU (City) is the cost of good design understood by developers and can Cabe respond to different types of housing such as schemes geared for the elderly.

KM – Each challenge may be assisted with reference to solutions/approaches from other places. It's a question of how to balance those needs and explore the issue by seeing what is happening around the country. Good design does not have to cost more.

JC (NCC) Viability issues are usually raised by developers. Is there advice on how to include effective approaches to energy reduction and opportunities for large scale energy generation?

DW – Basic requirements are covered by the Building Regulations but councils may seek higher standards such as the Code of Sustainable Homes (CFSH). Energy provision benefits communities and householders.

AB (HCA) The HCA also promotes reviews with large scale housebuilders. There is some resistance for them to commit substantive changes to their schemes. Experience of the approach taken to good design and parking on RBC schemes will be replicated at

GBC. Govt is still aiming for building regulations to include requirements for new homes to be zero carbon by 2016.

CM (DCC) New standard is likely to be less onerous than CFSH.

AB (HCA) Building in energy efficiency is a matter for the local authority.

CS (ADC) queried Cabe relationship to OPUN.

KM – Cabe no longer has a formal affiliation. Our experience with developers is that they are reluctant for Cabe to get involved and believe the service is expensive although it is approximately £2.5k for a review. The key is striking a balance to avoid unsightly streetscenes by working with people, integrating everyone to set the future.

AP – generally developers are reluctant to this type of activity as it can be seen as delaying the process and adding cost.

DW – key is to suggest workshop at the earliest stage so that both developers and public stakeholders benefit and add value to the project.

SF (City) – the experience of Built Environment Experts assist where sites need expert construction. Tackling specific issues with reference to real examples is useful.

DW – authorities need to take a multi-disciplined approach.

SD (BBC) thinking about the cost and procurement for design advice at the Housing Market Area level, there may be advantages/discounts for joint advice via this Board and consistent messages to developers.

KM – the cost is met by the developer, some are funded by the local authority where there is a local authority interest. Most are secured by Planning Performance Agreements.

DW – through the PPA mechanism, support and training will be provided. Copies of a document titled: "Greater Nottingham Design support for large scale housing" by Cabe at the Design Council, May 2014 was left for circulation.

5. **Core Strategy Update** - MG

MG gave an update for each authority's Core Strategies.

5.1 **Ashfield**

ADC has still yet to make a formal decision to withdraw their Local Plan.

5.2 **Erewash**

EBC has adopted its Local Plan and is progressing Supplementary Planning Documents.

5.3 **Rushcliffe**

RBC has Examination hearing sessions commencing on 1 July.

5.4 Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City

Waiting for Inspectors fact check report - anticipated in July prior to formal issue for publication.

Several Examinations have been criticised for reliance on out of date evidence and been delayed or found unsound. It is therefore important to ensure the partnership's evidence base is up-to-date including employment studies, retail studies and viability assessments.

AP (RBC) if all goes well RBC would like to work on Stage 2 in partnership with other councils.

MG – RBC already regarded as aligned and further partnership working welcomed.

SB (Chair) was pleased with commitment to partnership working.

It was resolved that Joint Planning Advisory Board NOTE the progress of the Greater Nottingham Core Strategies.

6. Programme of Development - DA

Expenditure

Nottingham City Council's internal audit team have reviewed Growth Point's 2013/14 expenditure and issued a report confirming "High Assurance". A formal update has been provided to Leicester City Council.

Capital

Good progress continues on the capital programme which is due to be completed by the end of this year.

Revenue

The revenue budget was agreed at the last meeting to take account of staff salaries over the next three years. In Table 2 a working revenue budget of approximately £100k remains which will be insufficient to cover joint commissions. Therefore councils will need to review their own budgets to support commissioning work. It was proposed that each council contributes equal shares towards these study costs unless all partners benefited from a study, in which case a contribution from the Growth Point programme would be made.

A programme of future studies and estimated costs over the next three years was provided. Joint studies were regarded as more robust providing common methodologies and consistency and cost savings.

SD (BBC) Notts CC is part of JPAB but they are not listed as a contributor.

AP (RBC) Queried if the study costs be split equally or be proportionate.

JU (City) simplest approach is to equally split cost, although there may be occasions where there is clearly more benefit to one partner and where it may be more relevant to look at cost apportionment.

CM (DCC) Are there possibilities to commission at D2N2 level to provide further savings such as householder projections?

SD (BBC) It would depend on the type of study and the relevance of a wider area.

DA – Geography of study is important as is the timing of studies and the various stages of plan preparation. Household projections may present a timing issue.

CS (ADC) We need to balance scope of studies and partners required timescales.

CC (EBC) Erewash in full support of joint HMA commission for the employment land study – delivers significant savings.

SD (BBC) - Invited vote on principles how much each contributes.

SB (Chair) Vote carried for equal shares.

It was resolved that Joint Planning Advisory Board:

- (a) NOTE the update on the 2013/14 audit and capital programme;**
- (b) APPROVE the draft revenue budget;**
- (c) APPROVE, in principle, the approach to sharing the costs of future commissions and priorities for the remaining revenue budget.**

7. HS2 - SF

SF (City) reported her recommendations for the HS2 Toton Hub Station governance arrangements.

Governance arrangements have now been agreed for the Programme Board through East Midlands Councils.

The eastern leg Birmingham to Crewe line is being pushed but may have to wait until after the General Election.

A decision is expected in mid-July for the LEP funding bid of £1m for supporting the development of HS2. If the bid is approved in principle then JPAB can apply for funding through LEP for development work.

In order to meet the timescale of the HS2 Agreement in the Autumn, it was suggested that a workshop be held in August for the Board to prepare a vision statement to inform the growth strategy idea for the area HS2 in the East Midlands.

JU (City) -Government has been engaging through the Core Cities network and important that we demonstrate support.

SF (City) – Alternative route may make connections to Derby more problematic. If we cannot agree amongst ourselves we may lose out to other areas, we need to work

harder and faster as other proposed stations are far ahead of us in developing their vision and requirements for connectivity. We need to send clear information to Government that we have one vision.

SB (Chair) There are also known issues for Stoke and Crewe.

RH – agreed that we need to work quickly to agree an overarching vision. Our good track record stands us in good stead. When Steve Hammond MP visited he understood we were not like Leeds/Birmingham/Manchester and that it is slightly more complicated for us to work together but we still need to send a clear message. There are a number of interconnecting layers. It is Important that we can develop these across the different counties of Derbyshire/Leicestershire/Nottinghamshire to maximise economic potential and growth strategy to a wider area. In Broxtowe wide engagement to shape the vision is welcomed. Need to focus on the big picture and work away into the detail.

SB (Chair) suggested involving members into a well facilitated workshop together with Derbyshire and Leicestershire, organisations with expertise such as Cabe and local stakeholders. A large venue will then need to be sourced.

RB (RBC) reiterated that Rushcliffe has resolved not to support Toton as the preferred station as they favour East Midlands Parkway but is a supporter of HS2.

SB (Chair) there will need to be a link to the airport with cycling provision (PEDALS).

The reopening Bennerley viaduct may provide opportunities for cycle route connections.

Joint Planning Advisory Board resolved to:

- (a) NOTE the governance arrangements outlined with the addition of Ashfield District Council to the Programme Board;**
- (b) SUPPORT the principle of developing a growth strategy for the HS2 East Midlands Hub area including a vision for the station and the economic benefits of HS2 to the conurbation and the wider area;**
- (c) AGREE in principle to submitting a bid requesting funds for items related to planning and development of the station and its surrounds should the relevant funding be received by the LEP;**
- (d) AGREE that a workshop for JPAB members is arranged in August to discuss these items and to influence the development of both the growth strategy and any funding bid.**

8. Local Sustainable Transport Funding - JM

Jennie Maybury (City) reported progress of the LSTF programme with a bid for continuation funding up to 2016 for specific elements submitted in March. Through the current programme:

Smartcard development and integrated ticketing improvement are on track making it easier for people to buy a range of ticket products.

There are now five Community Smarter Travel Hubs operational in the area.

The WorkSmart scheme continues to support local employers including launch of the City Car Club. The Medilink service between Park & Ride sites and Nottingham hospitals is now electric with electric charging points for buses, electric cars and electric bikes provided at the Queens Drive Eco Hub..

The range of active travel events are being held over the summer to involve people with different abilities in cycling including Cycle Live incorporating the Great Notts Bike Ride.. Locations for cycle parking and hire have been identified in Rushcliffe and Arnold but agreeing a viable location in Beeston is proving difficult during the tram works.

Through LEP funding it is possible to provide and complement sustainable travel options for commuter cycle corridors and networks.

SB (Chair) it was good to see that integrated ticketing was improving.

JU (City) local people are more active around Community Smarter Travel Hubs especially from a health perspective this has positive outcomes.

RB (RBC) recognised that Smarter Travel Hubs were not in RBC. If an area could be identified for a cycle hub in West Bridgford would it be considered.

JM (City) the suggestion would be raised and a decision made based around other activities and prioritising in the area.

Joint Planning Advisory Board resolved to NOTE the report which set out progress on the delivery of the current LSTF programme and proposals for continuation of LSTF activities in 2015/16.

9. Any other business

The Chair announced that it was Steve Dance's last JPAB meeting before retirement and thanked him for all his good work.

SD responded that he had worked in planning for 41 years but the last five years were the best he had ever seen with joint working and encouraged the Board to continue.

10. Proposed Dates for Future Meetings

Proposed dates tabled as below to commence at 2.00 pm.

Date	Venue
Thursday 4 September	Broxtowe Town Hall – Old Council Chamber
Thursday 13 November	Broxtowe Town Hall – Old Council Chamber