

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

Date **18th December 2009** agenda item number **4 (supplement)**

From **JOINT OFFICER STEERING GROUP**

Supplement to Report

STRATEGIC PLANNING UPDATE - SECTION 4 (4) Advice

- 1 In the report on item 4 it was reported that EMRA was awaiting Ministerial approval to not progress with the housing provision element of the Regional Plan and the situation would be reported verbally to Joint Committee. EMRA is still awaiting Ministerial approval but hopes to receive it by its Joint Board in January. If ministerial approval is forthcoming no Section 4(4) advice would be required on the housing provision, however it is necessary to establish a response in case Ministerial approval is not given.
- 2 Consequently, the paragraphs below indicate the advice to be submitted if nothing further is received from EMRA and housing provision remains in the RSS Partial Review. This reflects the comments made at consultation stage on the options then presented.
- 3 If housing provision remains an element of the Partial Review, EMRA may ask the Section 4(4) authorities for advice on a RSS Preferred Option indicating, for example the scale of development anticipated for the HMA for 2021-31. In that event the City and County Councils would ask for further time to consider the implications of that, which would need time and resources to understand and respond to in the light of the emerging Aligned Core Strategy evidence and policy.

Spatial Development Options response (pending further information)

- 4 The current HMA approach is of focusing development and regeneration in the Principal Urban Area of Nottingham and the Sub Regional Centres of Hucknall and Ilkeston. Given that 2021 is less than 10 years after the proposed adoption of the aligned Core Strategy, a radical change of strategy is not appropriate or justified. The Spatial Development Options put forward are not based on a scale of growth envisaged for the HMA or the capacity of the HMA. Indeed, it may be better to work out the preferred Spatial Development Option for the HMA and then base the scale of growth on what the HMA can best benefit from.
- 5 A growth level similar to the adopted EMRP may be able to be achieved through a hybrid option of options 1 with 3 i.e. mainly urban

concentration/regeneration, but also more closely reflecting the findings of the Sustainable Urban Extensions study, increasing the role of the 2 Sub-Regional Centres of Hucknall and Ilkeston and other important transport nodes. A level of growth which is too high could result in unwanted town cramming or in a too dispersed pattern of growth and the unwanted possibility of a large new settlement.

- 6 Regarding the scale of development proposed, while this is unknown at this stage (pre-agenda), the authorities have significant doubts about the need to provide at the high levels of the earlier issues stage, as expressed in their response to that stage. As far as housing growth in the City is concerned it is unlikely that the 20,000 dwellings required in the adopted EMRP (2006-26) will be achieved, so a figure of 17,000-20,000 for the period 2006-31 may be more realistic, given the current economic climate and the move away by developers from brownfield and City Centre residential development to greenfield Sustainable Urban Extensions

RECOMMENDATION

It is RECOMMENDED that members of the Committee note the contents of the report.

Contacts

Sally Gill

Communities – Nottinghamshire County Council

TEL 0115 9774537 sally.gill@nottscc.gov.uk

Paul Tansey,

Environment & Regeneration – Nottingham City Council

TEL 0115 9155491 paul.tansey@nottinghamcity.gov.uk