

Meeting:	<b>JOINT COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT</b>
Date:	08 September 2017
From:	Joint Officer Steering Group

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

### **1 SUMMARY**

1.1 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.

### **2 BACKGROUND**

2.1 There have been no meetings of JPAB since the last meeting of Joint Committee, the last JPAB meeting took place on 15 June 2017.

2.2 At the time of writing the minutes of this meeting had not been agreed by the Board, and will be reported to the next Joint Committee. The minutes of the previous meeting which took place on 2 March are appended to this report (Appendix 1), and a summary of issues discussed at the 15 June meeting is provided below.

#### **JPAB meeting held 15 June 2017**

2.3 Due to there being a number of new Members of JPAB at the June meeting, the Board noted its Terms of Reference and received a presentation on the previous work of the Board and on its immediate future priorities, which include implementing the core Strategies through the preparation of Part 2 Local Plans and the development of strategic sites. Future work of the JPAB also includes managing the Housing and Communities Agency's Capacity Fund as a result of a successful JPAB bid for funding, and beginning early work on the review of the Core Strategies.

2.4 The position on Local Plan preparation and the development of strategic sites throughout Greater Nottingham was noted, with Councilors being particularly interested in progress with the Gedling Examination, as Gedling is the first Council to reach this stage.

2.5 JPAB had previously delegated making a response to the Housing White Paper "Fixing our Broken Housing Market" (Feb 2017) to officers, and a report outlining the submitted response was received.

2.6 JPAB also received reports setting out its core revenue budget for 2017/18, the remaining capital budget, and noted the success of the joint bid for HCA Capacity Funding, JPAB being awarded £885,000 of new revenue funding to unlock barriers to development on key sites.

2.7 The next meeting of JPAB will be on 14 September 2017.

### **3 RECOMMENDATION(S)**

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

## **4 BACKGROUND PAPERS REFERRED TO IN COMPILING THIS REPORT**

4.1 None.

### **Contact Officer**

Matt Gregory  
Planning Policy and Research Manager  
Nottingham City Council  
Tel: 0115 876 3981  
E-mail: [matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk](mailto:matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk)

## APPENDIX 1

### MINUTES OF THE GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD (JPAB) HELD ON THURSDAY 2 MARCH 2017 AT BROXTOWE BOROUGH COUNCIL

#### PRESENT

**Broxtowe:** Councillor T Harper (Chair)  
**Erewash:** Councillor M Powell  
**Gedling:** Councillor J Hollingsworth  
**Nottinghamshire County Council:** Councillor J Creamer  
**Rushcliffe:** Councillor R Butler

#### Officers in Attendance

**Ashfield:** Neil Oxby  
**Broxtowe:** Mrs Ruth Hyde; David Lawson  
**Derbyshire County Council:** Steve Buffery  
**Erewash:** Steve Birkinshaw  
**Gedling:** Dawn Alvey  
**Greater Nottingham PP:** Matthew Gregory  
**Nottinghamshire County:** Stephen Pointer  
**Rushcliffe:** David Mitchell

#### Observers

**General Public:** John Hancock  
**HCA:** Mark Banister  
**Peveril Homes:** Paul Stone

#### Apologies

**Ashfield:** Councillor D Davis; Mrs Christine Sarris  
**Broxtowe:** Steffan Saunders  
**Derbyshire County Council:** Councillor P Dunn; Christine Massey  
**Nottingham City:** Councillor N McDonald; Councillor J Urquhart; Paul Seddon  
**Nottinghamshire County Council:** Councillor S Calvert; Mrs Sally Gill; Councillor K Greaves

## 1. **Welcome and Apologies**

- 1.1 Councillor T Harper, Chair, welcomed those attending and apologies noted.
- 1.2 An apology was received from Christine Massey, Derbyshire County Council, who announced that she was leaving DCC on 13 March. She wanted to pass on her best wishes to Members of the Board and said that it had been a great pleasure to have worked with all of you.
- 1.3 The Chair also announced that Mark Banister would be leaving HCA and wished him all the best for the future. MB reported that another delegate would be appointed to the group. He said HCA was currently going through a restructure and as yet it had to be decided how they will manage the area.
- 1.4 The Chair welcomed back Dawn Alvey representing Gedling Borough Council.

## 2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

## 3. **Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising**

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2016 were approved following amendment to page 2 Item 4.2 referring to the fact that it was the low embankment option which had no technical details, not the viaduct option.

RH had sent a letter to HS2 complaining about the lack of relevant details but to date has not received a response.

## 4. **Local Plans Update** (Matt Gregory)

- 4.1 ADC submitted their Local Plan on 24 February. Hearing sessions will be arranged in the near future with an update at the next meeting.  
BBC now has approval for their residential allocations to be published subject to additional work in relation to an additional site at Brinsley.  
EBC had their Stanton SPD adopted on 19 January as part of the development framework.  
GBC currently at examination stage.  
Nottingham City had a review of the deliverability of a number of sites with a new timetable which is likely to involve a further round of consultation prior to submission.  
RBC is working on further options for housing delivery.
- 4.2 The Minerals Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State 15 December 2016 with the hearing session to take place in June 2017.
- 4.3 JH gave an update from GBC's Examination by the Inspector which commenced on 6 February. The areas covered were the housing allocations and the site selection process. Following the first week the Inspector was aware of concerns with Duty to Co-operate which had consequential impacts on site issues. The approach to calculating housing supply and 5 year land supply was supported, but the Inspector required more detailed information on future delivery dates/rates for some sites. The Inspector was concerned that no provision for gypsy and travellers had been included as part of a

policy to address their needs, despite the fact that all the gypsies and travellers recorded in GBC live in bricks and mortar.

The Inspector asked for views on what bearing the Housing White Paper should have on the Plan, considering that it is a consultation document and the regulatory framework does not yet form part of the Government policy.

By 23 March all GBC proposed changes will be put forward to the examination. GBC will need to revisit housing allocations policy for distribution of homes, and revise the 5 year land supply calculation based on the most up to date information.

**Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to NOTE the progress with the Local Plans covering Greater Nottingham and the progress on the implementation of strategic sites included in the Local Plans covering Greater Nottingham.**

## 5. Housing White Paper (Matt Gregory)

### 5.1 Fixing our Broken Housing Market (presentation)

MG presented his summary of the Government's Housing White Paper (HWP), which was published last month, and how it would reflect on the work of this group.

The HWP refers to the under supply of new housing. The main three themes identified were:

1. New planning policy landscape
2. Better use of land
3. Improving housing delivery

Planning Policy: The HWP highlights that too few councils have a Local Plan and proposes that everywhere should have an up-to-date Local Plan with a 5 year review.

Duty to Co-operate is not working as well in other parts of the country as it does in Greater Nottingham, and the HWP proposes introducing a Statement of Common Ground for Councils to set out how they are meeting the Duty to Cooperate, and in particular how they intend to address objectively assessed development needs.

NPPF currently contains a presumption for a single Local Plan for each LPA. The HWP will allow for a more flexible approach, along the lines of the Aligned Core Strategies, and this is welcomed as it can be tailored to local circumstances.

Small/medium house builders will be encouraged to develop smaller sites through a variety of mechanisms. Neighbourhood Plans should be able to request a housing figure to provide in their Neighbourhood Plans. All local plans should set out design expectations.

Improving Delivery: The HWP acknowledges that there are delays in sites getting planning approval. Councils will have the option of having their five year land supply fixed for one year, but in doing so would require a 10% buffer.

Where there is a large scale public investment (eg HS2) this could help to unlock the housing supply, and Local Plans should show how housing uplift will be achieved.

Planning fees are to be subject to a 20% increase, with a further 20% increase available for LPAs delivering against their Local Plans. The uplift will be ring fenced to speed up the planning process.

LPAs will be penalised where housing provision falls behind housing targets in their Local Plans. This appears to replicate in large part the approach to 5 year land calculations, and will result in LPAs being penalised for events outside their control, such as a market downturn.

There will be a major announcement in the Autumn Budget 2017 relating to CIL/S106 agreements.

The HWP relaxes provisions for starter homes, which are now included as part of the affordable homes package, although LPAs will be expected to deliver 10% affordable homes to buy on sites over 10 dwellings.

TH – To have an extra 20% charge is welcome, and most LPAs would agree to go for it. This could help pay towards subs to JPAB.

RH – The rules are clear that we cannot substitute the fees. We should be able to demonstrate additionality if there is some opportunity of money to support the work of this Group as this would help us in our plan making, delivery and processes.

TH – Not necessarily for this year but for future years.

DM – thanked MG for the White Paper update. JPAB suggested ESG prepare a response. Where Councils are working together to deliver housing, there should be a mechanism to share that five year housing supply across the area. He reported that RBC had to provide double the number of homes that BBC and GBC are for their large strategic sites which were some way off achieving delivery of housing. He asked for support for this approach.

RH – would need some kind of flexibility on delivery rates and it is not right to treat an area in isolation. Think how to revise our plan and look at issue and see how housing need will be distributed across our area in the future will be challenging. Given the absence of a Regional Spatial Strategy next time, agreeing a distribution of housing across the JPAB area will not be so straight forward, but will be very contentious and challenging. The HWP does not seem to help much in this regard.

SBk (EBC) – next round of plan making particularly challenging if individual LA's only aim is to protect their own interests. However If a shared approach is taken, there would be more responsibility as a partnership to be more positive and more helpful as a group to respond to the challenge.

JC – raised concern with high density properties which brings its own problems with anti-social behaviour, car parking etc. The government's approach to viability is punishing district councils.

JH – on the home ownership point it is becoming more difficult to own your own home with the average house price being £215k. Landlords are running longer tenancies and not accepting housing benefit claimants.

TH – Quality of design is an issue, for instance at Field Farm. Inspector was in favour of the builder but in doing so, losing the quality of the development.

RB – does high density mean the return of tower blocks?

RH – Only government can resolve why the housing market is broken as builders are complaining that lack of funds and resources to provide schools etc which leads to a lack of money for infrastructure.

SP – radical changes are likely to be made to CIL and S106, including the relaxation of pooling rules. Our response needs to make the case for a more transparent and workable scheme.

NO – ADC is pooling contributions for new schools but limited by S106 rules.

TH – a case in BBC where a school needed rebuilding, adjoining land was sold and used for housing. This gets the housing numbers up on a brownfield site and the school is rebuilt.

MB – try to implement growth where there's potential housing growth to go with HS2 Growth Strategy and make it work across boundaries.

RH – is there any appetite for officers within this Group to invest a small portion of their 20% fee increase into resources to help this Group accelerate its housing delivery. Need a decision made by 13/3/17 as do not want to miss this opportunity.

TH – will do anything to speed up housing supply then would be good use of funds.

RB (RBC) – would invest

MP (EBC) – would invest.

RH - (£80k) invest in our own planning department to resource this group.

DM – with the large sites capacity fund need to work out how the pool will work out and what goes into the shared management.

RH – These initiatives rising from the HWP will need to be considered, discussed and reported back at the next meeting.

RB – There are very few brownfield sites within RBC. The public wish to protect the Green Belt, interested to see how the government see this working out.

MP – What Green Belt offers to a city or a town can be different in different locations, with some areas being more valuable, but how do you measure its importance? It should be the less important land that is released for development.

SB (DCC) – people are often confused between Green Belt, greenfield and green open spaces.

**Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:**

- (a) CONSIDER the implications of the strategic planning proposals put forward in the White Paper.**
- (b) DELEGATE Executive Steering Group to prepare a response to the White Paper consultation on strategic planning matters.**

**6. Programme of Development (Matt Gregory)**

**6.1 Capital Programme Update:**

6.1.1 Ilkeston Station is now paid up and due to open on 2 April 2017.

6.1.2 Knights Close is well underway and the final claim is anticipated by the end of this financial year.

6.1.3 A claim is still awaited for Wetland Landscapes which will run into the next financial year.

**6.2 Revenue Update:**

6.2.1 The balance of approx. £120k will be rolled forward to JPAB's evidence base studies.

6.2.2 Commissioned work to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment should be available shortly.

**6.3 HCA Capacity Fund**

MB revealed that the joint bid had gone through the HCA process for DCLG's decision. The JPAB bid had received a positive response from HCA but the money will need to be

released by the end of this financial year. He advised that JPAB needed to clarify the Accountable Body and suggested Nottingham City. Confirmation from Nottingham City's S151 Officer would be required to receive the £850k.

MB confirmed that there would be if no conditions attached to it. He will inform the group of his successor. If the bid is approved in its entirety then the group should ensure resources would be allocated to areas over the next three to four years.

RH agreed that ESG needed to redevelop their thinking and proposals to respond to those points.

MB proposed that if JPAB was successful HCA could be invited to the ESG.

<b>Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to NOTE the update on the capital and revenue programmes.</b>
---

7. HS2 Route Refinement Consultation 2016/17 (Steve Birkinshaw)

7.1 SBk explained that the HS2 route was a conurbation issue. The preferred line would pass through Long Eaton and therefore two options were considered to identify their potential consequences. His presentation made comparisons between the two options which focused on the impact during construction; flood risk issues; noise emissions and visual impact.

7.2 Option 1: the line would run along a viaduct through Long Eaton and continue to the hub station at Toton; and

Option 2: the line would run along a raised embankment and continue to the hub station at Toton.

- Both options had some visual impact but Option 2 was found to be more visually oppressive to residents.
- More demolition work and disruption to the town would be required to create a road subway beneath the embankment.
- The road subway would be below surface level and therefore at possible flood risk.

Both options would need viaducts continuing onto the hub station at Toton with a 10m height clearance.

7.3 MP emphasised the importance of having a modern design. If JPAB presses for a viaduct, the bridge could become an iconic structure. Derbyshire's evidence preferred the viaduct option valuing its benefits and opportunities. The HS2 Delivery Board will next meet on 6 March.

7.4 JC drew attention to the huge wall for the embankment option which could lead to graffiti and would also close off the town. He would support the viaduct option for its future benefits with less maintenance being required compared to the street level option.

7.5 MB reported that HS2 Ltd would have costed both options but would not necessarily choose the cheaper option.



**Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:**

- (a) RECOMMEND to the Secretary of State the viaduct option through Long Eaton as the option that will cause the least harm to the local community.**
- (b) REQUEST that the Secretary of State has due regard to the desirability of enabling classic compatible trains, new classic through rail services, new classic shuttle train services, an extension of the NET Tram, mass-transit connections to Derby and East Midlands Airport, local through bus service operation, taxi, cycling and pedestrian access from both sides of the station, and the strategic development potential of adjacent land in the design of the East Midlands Hub Station.**

**8. AOB**

- 8.1 DM advised that RBC held a Planning Peer Review on 15-17 February. They had “critical friends” including representation from the LGA to look at their planning services. Their next meeting would look at internal development control committees, and externally the development growth agenda to meet the five year land supply. The report will be taken to Cabinet in April/May.

Feedback was to focus and make the most of valuable planning resources. It was recommended that JPAB be reinvigorated, it had recognition for the development of the Core Strategy, but now needed a mechanism to deliver. DM stated that RBC had the two largest sites in the HMA and seeks views on how JPAB can work together to focus more on delivery.

- 8.2 TH pointed out that JPAB is about delivering houses and sharing best practices.
- 8.3 MB suggested the group identify housing sites collectively where there is demand, if keen to align, to help boost economic growth in the area. LEP’s growth fund allocation budget would be available 2020/21.
- 8.4 RH explained that LEP had not been able to give the group its support for housing and wondered how LEP funding could support housing growth. It was suggested to invite David Ralph to explain what LEP’s strategy is and how it could put money into this area to deliver the Core Strategies.
- 8.5 TH asked MG to include Peer Review on the next agenda.

9. **Future Meetings 2017**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>TIME</b>	<b>VENUE</b>
Thursday 15 June	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston
Thursday 14 September	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston
Thursday 14 December	2.00 pm	Old Council Chamber, Town Hall, Beeston

MEETING CLOSED AT 4.00 PM