



Nottingham City Council Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport

Date: Friday, 11 December 2020

Time: 10.30 am

Place: Remotely via Zoom – <https://www.youtube.com/user/NottCityCouncil>

Councillors are requested to attend the above meeting to transact the following business

Director for Legal and Governance

Governance Officer: Mark Leavesley

Direct Dial: 0115 876 4302

- 1 Apologies for absence**
- 2 Declarations of interests**
- 3 Minutes** 3 - 6
Last meeting held on 11 September 2020 (for confirmation)
- 4 Midlands Engine Rail: Strategy update**
Presentation by Richard Mann, Midlands Connect
- 5 East Midlands Development Corporation**
Ken Harrison, Nottinghamshire County Council, to report
- 6 Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board update** 7 - 26
Report of Joint Officer Steering Group
- 7 Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan and Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan update** 27 - 28
Report of Joint Officer Steering Group
- 8 Transport update** 29 - 32
Report of Joint Officer Steering Group
- 9 Work programme** 33 - 36
For noting / discussion
- 10 Date of next meeting**
To note that the next meeting will be held at 10.30am on Friday 05 March 2021, either at Loxley House or remotely via Zoom (dependent on the pandemic situation at the time)

If you need any advice on declaring an interest in any item on the agenda, please contact the Governance Officer shown above, if possible before the day of the meeting

Citizens are advised that this meeting may be recorded by members of the public. Any recording or reporting on this meeting should take place in accordance with the Council's policy on recording and reporting on public meetings, which is available at www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk. Individuals intending to record the meeting are asked to notify the Governance Officer shown above in advance.

Nottingham City Council

Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport

Minutes of the meeting held remotely and livestreamed on YouTube on 11 September 2020 from 10.35 am - 11.43 am

Membership

Present

Councillor Gordon Wheeler (Vice Chair)
Councillor Michael Edwards
Councillor Eric Kerry
Councillor Sally Longford
Councillor Phil Rostance
Councillor Adele Williams

Absent

Councillor Jim Creamer
Councillor Linda Woodings

Colleagues, partners and others in attendance:

Nottingham City Council

James Ashton - Transport Strategy Manager
Peter McAnespie - Partnerships and Local Plans Manager
Phil Wye - Governance Officer

Nottinghamshire County Council

Sally Gill - Group Manager, Planning
Kevin Sharman - Place Department

1 Appointment of Chair

Resolved to appoint Councillor Linda Woodings as Chair of the Committee for the 2020/21 municipal year.

2 Appointment of Vice-Chair

Resolved to appoint Councillor Gordon Wheeler as Vice-Chair of the Committee for the 2020/21 municipal year.

In Councillor Wooding's absence, Councillor Wheeler chaired the meeting.

3 Apologies for absence

Councillor Linda Woodings - leave

4 Declarations of interests

None.

5 Minutes

Subject to amendments to the wording of minutes 5 and 6, the Committee confirmed the minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2020 as a correct record.

6 Transport update

James Ashton, Transport Strategy Manager, Nottingham City Council, presented the report providing an update on the transport related issues across the greater Nottingham conurbation, highlighting the following:

- (a) in February this year the City Council began to trial a new system for collecting data related to the operation of the transport network. The data from the trial has been used to understand the impact of the Covid 19 crisis on transport in Nottingham. General traffic levels (cars and motorcycles) are now at around 80-85% of normal levels, but passenger numbers remain low at around a third of normal levels on buses and the tram is operating with around 23-25% of normal passenger numbers. Cycling levels have increased, particularly at weekends where numbers were up to 200% higher than normal;
- (b) the City Council received £570,000 and the County Council received £263,250 through tranche one of the Emergency Active Travel Fund to spend on schemes to improve routes for cyclists and pedestrians;
- (c) initial conversations are taking place between officers at the City and County Councils regarding the potential to submit a bid to Midland Connect to enable the preparation of a scheme around the A6002 / A610 junction close to Junction 26 of the M1. Details of the scheme are yet to be finalised however the scheme would be aimed at reducing congestion both through the junction and also on the approach arms to the junction;
- (d) all NCT buses have now been retrofitted to meet the highest emissions standards. Trent Barton and CT4N are also retrofitting their buses but this has been delayed by the Covid-19 pandemic and will be complete by January 2021.

Committee members commented on the lack of information on rail services in the report. Rail colleagues have been invited to the next meeting.

They also commented on the inconvenience of the ongoing closure of Clifton Bridge and suggested lobbying local MPs to raise this.

Resolved to note the contents of the report.

7 Planning for the Future white paper

Peter McAnespie, Partnerships and Local Plans Manager, presented the report and gave a presentation on the White Paper, which contains far-reaching proposed changes to the planning system, which will impact on the work of this Committee. Consultation runs for 12 weeks and closes on 31st October. Peter highlighted the following:

- (a) the government considers the current planning system to be outdated, slow and bureaucratic and proposes changes to plan making, decision making and developer contributions;
- (b) the Local Plan will be simplified and will focus on identifying 'growth areas', 'renewal areas' and 'protected areas'. They will be subject to a simplified 'sustainable development test' replacing the existing 'tests of soundness';
- (c) the five year housing supply requirement may be scrapped, but enough land should still be planned for and the presumption in favour of sustainable development will be maintained;
- (d) Sustainability Appraisals are to be replaced with a simplified process for assessing the environmental impact of plans;
- (e) a new developer contributions system is to be introduced with a nationally set, flat-rate charge based on the final value of the development;
- (f) community consultation at the planning application stage is to be streamlined with more emphasis on engagement at the plan-making stage. Determination of planning applications is to be faster and more certain with firm deadlines and penalties for councils that fail to determine applications within the statutory time limit.

Resolved to

- (1) consider the content of the White Paper in so far as it relates to the work of the Committee;**
- (2) note the intention of both councils to respond to the consultations, and for a joint response to be prepared and submitted by the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board.**

8 Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board

Peter McAnespie, Partnerships and Local Plans Manager, presented the minutes of the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board to the Committee. Two presentations were given, one on the Toton Supplementary Planning Document and one on a Growth Options Study for Greater Nottingham.

Resolved to note the contents of the minutes and presentations.

9 Nottinghamshire Minerals and Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plans

Sally Gill, Group Manager Planning, Nottinghamshire County Council, presented the report, informing the Committee of progress with preparation of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan and the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan, highlighting the following:

- (a) the Draft Minerals Local Plan was submitted for examination in February 2020. Planned hearing sessions in April were postponed due to the Covid-19 Outbreak, and have now been confirmed for the week of Monday 26th October. Local community representatives who have made comments on the plan, including on proposed sites, have been invited to the sessions;
- (b) consultation on the Waste Local Plan was extended due to the Covid-19 Outbreak, and around 270 representations were received. Nine sites were put forward for potential waste development facilities and these will now be considered.

Resolved to note the contents of the report.

10 Work Programme

Resolved to

- (1) note the Joint Committee's work programme and give consideration to any future items;**
- (2) identify any work areas where partnership working between the two authorities would be mutually beneficial.**

11 Date of future meetings

Resolved to meet at 10.30am on the following Fridays (either at Loxley House or via Zoom video conferencing, dependent upon the pandemic situation at the time):

**11 December 2020
05 March 2021**

Meeting:	Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport
Date:	11 December 2020
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 projects funded through the partnership. This report updates the Joint Committee on the work of JPAB, and other strategic planning matters within the remit of the Committee.

2 Background

2.1 The last meeting of JPAB was held on 22 September 2020. The latest available minutes are from the meeting held on 30 June 2020, and these are appended to this report (appendix 1).

2.2 A summary of the main issues discussed at the 22 September meeting is provided below, updated as necessary.

2.3 The JPAB received a report on the Government's Planning for the Future White Paper, and its proposals for amending the standard methodology used in determining housing need for Council areas. JPAB resolved to delegate the preparation of a joint response to the strategic planning elements of the White Paper to the officer Executive Steering Group. The response was duly submitted and is appended to this report (appendix 2). It was noted that the proposed changes to the standard methodology would result in a higher housing need figure for Greater Nottingham as a whole, but with significant variations for individual local authorities. Each council has responded separately to this consultation.

2.4 JPAB also considered a report on progress with Strategic Plan preparation in Greater Nottingham.

2.5 Consultation on the growth Options document closed on 14 September, and around 4000 individual comments have been received. A new project plan and timetable is in preparation, to reflect delays caused by Coronavirus. This will be reported to JPAB in due course.

2.6 It was noted that Erewash BC's consultation on a separate "Options for Growth" document covering their Borough only had also concluded, and the Ashfield DC have commissioned evidence supporting work, and are in the process of reviewing the implications of the current government consultations, in particular the implication of the proposed changes to the standard methodology.

2.7 Update reports were also presented, on the Waste and Minerals Local Plans, on Homes England Capacity Funding Projects Monitoring.

2.8 The meeting agenda papers are available to view at <http://www.gnplan.org.uk/about-gnpp/joint-planning-advisory-board-meetings/>.

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 JPAB Papers, 22 September 2020

Contact Officer

Matt Gregory
Head of Planning Strategy and Building Control
Nottingham City Council
matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk
0115 876 3981

Appendix 1

ITEM 3	MINUTES OF THE GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD (JPAB) MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 30 JUNE 2020 VIA MS TEAMS
---------------	---

Ashfield: Councillor M Relf
Broxtowe: Councillor D Watts
City: Councillor S Longford; Councillor L Woodings
Derbyshire County: Councillor T King
Erewash: Councillor M Powell
Gedling: Councillor J Hollingsworth
Nottinghamshire County: Councillor T Harper (Chair); Councillor G Wheeler

Officers in Attendance

Ashfield: Christine Sarris
Broxtowe: Ruth Hyde; Steffan Saunders; Mark Thompson
Derbyshire County: Steve Buffery
Erewash: Steve Birkinshaw; Oliver Dove
Gedling: Alison Gibson
Growth Point: Matthew Gregory; Peter McAnespie
Nottingham City: Paul Seddon
Nottinghamshire County: Sally Gill; Ken Harrison
Rushcliffe: David Mitchell

AECOM: David Carlisle; Ben Castell

Apologies

Broxtowe: Councillor J McGrath
Rushcliffe: Councillor R Upton

1. **Introductions and Apologies**

Councillor T Harper (Chair) welcomed Members and Officers attending the closed meeting which needed to be virtual to meet Covid-19 regulations. Apologies were noted.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

- 3.1 Cllr Powell commented that the minutes circulated with the agenda papers were not the latest version which referred to his item under AOB. OD clarified that the amended minutes also confirmed that Steve Birkinshaw had attended the meeting held on 17 December 2019. **ACTION: PJW to circulate amended minutes.**

4. **Presentations**

- 4.1 (a) Toton draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Ken Harrison)

KH gave a presentation showing slides of the areas around Chetwynd Barracks and the HS2 Strategy. The railway station at Toton will include an innovative campus providing 4,500 homes across both sites with a mixed use approach. Further engagement on the Masterplan proposals are due to take place in the Autumn.

Toton Hub is equally distanced to both Nottingham and Derby centres, adjacent to Toton and Chetwynd Barracks and the A52 to the north. Its location is accessible to Ratcliffe on Soar and to the East Midlands Airport area. The Masterplan will ensure that infrastructure is delivered including new schools or school expansions. It will also improve connections with existing communities including Long Eaton. The Toton Delivery Board's aims are for jobs and opportunities in the development and to connect surrounding towns and communities. Access and movement of traffic would strategically improve the site with the terminus of the Park & Ride and NET extension.

The SPD recommends an enhanced network of blue and green environmental assets. It focuses on infrastructure, opportunities, and the localtion's unique strengths.

The SPD process allows for consultation and public engagement which will be led by BBC with the Toton Delivery Board. There will be a meeting in September to consider and finalise the document. PS pointed out that the public consultation will be complimentary with the Local Plan. **ACTION: PJW to circulate presentation slides.**

SS emphasised the huge collaboration through the Local Plan process involving infrastructure, transport, economic development, jobs and healthy living remit with the Toton Neighbourhood Forum. It is ambitious for the local area with an impressive growth agenda shaping growth in the community and getting the best out of it. Key principles can be established including good connectivity, green Infrastructure connections and links to nearby and further afield. It is a key gateway site to Long Eaton to the south west and Stapleford to the north.

PS gave Nottingham City's perspective and reinforced SS's need for connectivity plans. We need to ensure that connectivity is planned and is also delivered. The innovative campus must deliver employment as well as housing, and a mechanism is required to prevent displacement from existing centres with new job opportunities across the greater Nottingham.

KH referred to discussions at Toton Delivery Board about the sites connectivity. It will ensure that the station has both east and west street grid connection with Long Eaton having access by multiple modes for north and south links to Stapleford and Sandiacre. The short term phasing of connectivity involves a link road from Bardills Island.

LW referred to one particular slide which showed a large area of yellow on the pie charts which illustrated houses being built around the station with connection crucial to the success of the site. She raised her concern that the balance was overly residential, and there are opportunities for more high quality employment development in this highly accessible location.

KH explained that ARUP had incorporated an integrated approach and had advised in their framework for 4,500 homes across both sites and 6,500 employment opportunities.

MP wanted to ensure that all the initiatives being developed by different teams are all linked and delivering the same message.

KH confirmed that senior officers work jointly to ensure co-ordination.

DW would be attending the Toton Masterplan Working Group on Thursday 2 July and asked if the slides could be made available.

4.2 (b) Growth Options Study (David Carlisle and Ben Castell from AECOM)

DC and BC gave a presentation to review and assess the growth potential of Greater Nottingham in a variety of locations or new standalone sites. Their methodology was to look at opportunities and constraints. Utilising relevant expertise and a sift mapping exercise, they looked at potential areas, visited sites, and assessed their suitability for new strategic development.

Each site was assessed on a sustainable basis with due regard to planning constraints and constraints for habitat, flood zones, agricultural

land, heritage and the natural environment. Potential options to access existing transport hubs (eg HS2 line and East Midlands Hub), and access to highway/rail network together with the level of service were analysed.

The consultants have previously worked with the partner councils to prepare the 2010 'Tribal' studies. They have remodelled existing larger settlements to account for recent growth, improved access to public transport and services, town centres and school capacity.

Typologies were divided into three categories of small, medium and large sites.

Results summary showed the number of hectares assessed as potentially suitable for each authority for the next plan period.

Broxtowe	1,160
Erewash	1,200
Gedling	980
Rushcliffe	3,830

They considered the future connectivity and public transport network over the next 20-40 years for instance potential NET extensions and aspirations for bus and light rapid transport systems which might benefit and improve development links between Nottingham and Derby.

MR queried why Ashfield and Hucknall were not included, as it is part of the Greater Nottingham Growth area.

MG explained that the brief was set by Local Authorities – ADC was excluded due to it progressing its own Local Plan. CS also mentioned that the plans were misleading as Hucknall was shown to be part of GBC. She agreed with Cllr Relf that Duty to Co-operate requires clarity and that GBC and ADC should work together on their growth locations.

MP referred to the Executive Summary and his concerns that EBC had selected sites for public consultation which could provide enough housing to be built to meet requirements and queried why a site would be chosen on the Green Belt.

DC explained that Hopwell Hall (G9) was shown as potentially suitable for growth, but that not all sites will be developed. The main drivers were what would be the most suitable development patterns and growth, and that would be a decision for individual Councils.

DM recognised there was a need to have housing sites south of the river but there is currently enough housing capacity upto 2036 and demand for the next 15-20 years already being met.

DW raised concerns regarding site B8.

DC accepted that Trowell was constrained by ridge lines and development needed to be more focused west of the main built up area.

SS emphasised that before making a decision on any site sustainability appraisal and other assessments will be required.

ACTION: PJW to circulate copy of presentation.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to RECEIVE presentations on:

(a) Toton SPD	Ken Harrison
(b) Greater Nottingham Growth Options Study	AECOM

5. Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update (Matt Gregory)

MG's presentation was based on Nottingham City/Broxtowe/Gedling/Rushcliffe areas, but not Erewash as they were currently undergoing their Options for Growth Consultation. This had however been stalled during the lockdown. Their consultation period has therefore been extended to 20 July 2020.

ADC has commissioned an evidence base to support their Local Plan and are progressing through lockdown.

The Growth Options consultation seeks views from a wide range of stakeholders (developers and Statutory Bodies) and the general public with a number of questions to prompt comment. This document will be made available from 6 July on the partnership's website.

The document includes key objectives such as tackling climate change, education, economic development, new jobs and enough homes of the right type including affordable and adaptable homes of our future population make up. Following the pandemic there needs to be emphasis on creating vibrant and viable city and town centres to help restore growth, a natural environment and a biodiversity of new development construction and healthy communities.

It was recognised that government's standard methodology for new housing need is a starting point to consider whether we needed a higher or lower figure. The scale of growth expected by the standard methodology is 51,000 new homes by 2038. SHLAAs indicate that this total could be met, but sites might not be the right sites for our strategy and it is only a starting point.

Options include promoting urban intensification around the main built up areas, a more dispersed option on key settlements within districts or new settlements. There is a need to strengthen the network of town and district

centres who have faced economic challenges accelerated by Covid. The retail centres need to change accordingly but remain vibrant and include development of exemplary design where people want to live and work and enjoy their lives which has not previously been met.

Options could also promote growth which best matches blue and green infrastructure, and transport led options to promote more public transport against the private car and improve transport networks.

An overlay of green and blue infrastructure on the Growth Options map would identify gaps and how best to enhance networks. It must reflect existing commitments such as HS2.

The Green Belt is an important planning tool which can be a sensitive issue. We need to aspire economic growth for instance around Toton, to implement economic development alongside new homes and to support the LEP Strategy.

The assessment of Gypsies and Travellers and travelling show people accommodation needs has been delayed due to.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:

- (c) NOTE the consultation on the Growth Options planned to commence on 6 July 2020; and**
- (d) NOTE the situation with the Erewash Growth Options Consultation.**

6. Waste and Minerals Local Plans Update (Sally Gill/Steve Buffery)

- 6.1 SG explained that due to Covid-19 the Examination in Public into the Minerals Draft Local Plan has had to be postponed from April 2020 and a new date is awaited from the Inspectorate.
- 6.2 The consultation period for the Issues and Options document for the Joint Waste Plan with Nottingham City was extended to May 2020. Officers are currently assessing the responses.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to NOTE the progress with the Nottinghamshire/Nottingham and Derbyshire Waste and Minerals Local Plans.

7. Homes England Capacity Funding projects monitoring (Peter McAnespie)

- 7.1 PMcA reported project progress for Quarter 4 of Year 3 of the Capacity Funding. He referred to the Stanton site, work on which had stalled, but noted it was intended to be reported to Erewash Borough Council's Executive on 7 July, outlining how the funding could identify the infrastructure required to support that site.

- 7.2 PMcA will report timescales for projects at the next meeting.
- 7.3 RBC had approval to extend the post of Strategic Development Officer for up to nine months at a cost of £45,000.

Joint Planning Advisory Board resolved to:

- (a) **NOTE this report; and**
(b) **NOTE the decision of Executive Steering Group to repurpose £45,201.73 of grant funding for Rushcliffe.**

8. **Joint Planning Advisory Board Budget 2020/21**
(Matt Gregory)

- 8.1 MG referred to the figures in Table 1 of the report which set out the position at last financial year. Table 2 illustrated the budget for the current year incorporating the carried forward figures from the previous year and partner contributions. Table 2 shows how we would envisage those resources to be committed and expended. JPAB could allocate the surplus of £25,000 to planning jobs on next year's budget. MG also mentioned other funding was available for BBC, GBC, NCC and RBC from the Brownfield Register pilot scheme.
- 8.2 ESG had agreed partner contributions over the next three years totalling £70,800. Invoices will be issued to each authority imminently.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to

- (a) **NOTE the budget position at the close of 2019/20; and**
(b) **APPROVE the budget for 2020/21; and**
(c) **NOTE the partner contributions to the work of JPAB during 2020/21.**

9. **Any other business**

DM asked KH to amend the Development Corporation Draft Planning Statement of Intent in order to clarify the role in respect of strategic planning. MG agreed to propose revised wording with KH.

10. **Future Meetings 2020**

MG announced the next two JPAB meetings below but wanted the dates to be kept under review, to allow consideration of consultation processes for EBC and the other Councils Growth Options, with the aim of ensuring that plan making processes are aligned and complementary.

Cllr Relf wished to continue with virtual meetings to conform with our green aspirations.

DATE	TIME	VENUE
Tuesday 22 September	2.00 pm	MS Teams meeting (to be agreed)
Tuesday 15 December	2.00 pm	Council Chamber, Ground Floor, Council Offices, Beeston (to be agreed)

MEETING CLOSED AT 3.45 PM

Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership



Planning for the Future White Paper response on behalf of the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board

- 1 The Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board (JPAB) oversees the preparation of strategic plans in Greater Nottingham. Its membership is made up of the relevant Portfolio Holding Councillors of Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Erewash Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council, Gedling Borough Council, Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council.
- 2 At the meeting of 22 September 2020, JPAB resolved to submit a joint response to the White Paper on matters of relating to strategic planning. The response is attached below.



PLANNING WHITE PAPER – JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD RESPONSE

A NEW APPROACH TO PLAN-MAKING

Pillar One – Planning for development

Over-arching comments: –

The White Paper includes only limited detail on the operation of the proposed new planning system, which makes making comments more difficult.

UK economy is extremely fragile, and seeking to recover from the pandemic, major planning changes could potentially threaten recovery, for instance by deterring investment whilst investors await a more settled planning position.

There are no proposals in the White paper as to how the proposed system will assist in the “levelling up” of the nation, as Government housing targets in the context of no national or regional plan will deliver continue current trends in growth. This is a significant omission.

The approach appears to be geared towards major (housing) developments, such as urban extensions and new settlements, but how the fine grained complex character and history of a built up urban area is taken into account less certain. Equally the emphasis on housing delivery is at the expense of the roles of strategic and neighbourhood planning, or how radical reductions in carbon dioxide emissions are to be secured through the planning system.

Proposal 1: The role of land use plans should be simplified. We propose that Local Plans should identify three types of land – Growth areas suitable for substantial development, Renewal areas suitable for development, and areas that are Protected.

Defining just 3 areas with a blanket approach within each area could be a very blunt tool. It is potentially unsophisticated and lacking the fine grain required to address development in complex urban areas. The proposal of using sub areas (allocations?) might address this, but again more detail would be helpful.

It does seem better suited to managing change for major developments, such as new settlements, urban extensions, or large areas of targeted regeneration.

Examples of zoning systems from elsewhere (eg New York) do not support the stated aim of simpler and shorter Local Plans.

Proposal 2: Development management policies established at national scale and an altered role for Local Plans.

In principle this could help to simplify local plans. The NPPF already does this to some extent, but could go further. However, there is a risk that it could remove key areas of

local influence from democratic process, and not all areas are the same and are not experiencing the same issues.

Where national policies give a clear steer to developers, and provides a level playing field nationally, eg for carbon neutrality and other key elements of sustainable development, it could be beneficial.

Proposal 3: Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, replacing the existing tests of soundness. The Duty to Cooperate would be abolished. Public engagement is proposed to be largely through plan making, with permission being established through the plan in many instances.

Simplifying the tests of soundness could help to speed up Local Plan examinations.

Sustainability Appraisals have become an industry in their own right, and simplification would be welcome.

Whilst the W.P. advocates removing the Duty to Cooperate, it does not offer up any alternative approach to dealing with strategic planning matters. The Duty to Cooperate may not be ideal, but without an alternative to planning for strategic development across and between functional areas such as Housing Market Areas, the government will not meet its housebuilding aims. Too many LPAs are constrained, either through being urban and not having enough land to meet their own housing needs, or so environmentally constrained (Green Belt, AONBs etc) that they cannot meet their own needs. It is acknowledged that this recommendation could be tied in with the forthcoming Devolution White Paper.

However, the Duty has worked in the past in Greater Nottingham, and the proposals risk losing established mechanisms, without a replacement. Some of the benefits of joint working in Greater Nottingham include reduced and shared costs and a shared evidence base, together with the ability to present a more rational coherent set of policies to developers across an HMA (rather than every authority having their own unique approach). The Duty is useful not just from a housing numbers point of view but also from the point of view that infrastructure runs across administrative boundaries and co-operation is necessary to avoid the difficulty of conflicting objectives in planning for built development, and ensuring benefits are maximised for green and blue infrastructure to connect and flow across a wider area than just within administrative boundaries. Whilst it is recognised that these benefits could be achieved on a voluntary basis (ie without the Duty to Cooperate), experience from around the Country indicates that cooperation is facilitated by strong incentives.

If most public engagement with the planning system is through plan making, then this undermines democratic controls later in the process. It is well understood that people engage in the planning system when it directly effects them, ie at planning applications stage, and less so when proposals are notional, as in a local plan. Contrary to the aims of the White Paper, the proposals risk reducing the opportunity for consultation and public input into planning proposals.

Proposal 4: A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply being a

barrier to enough homes being built. The housing requirement would factor in land constraints and opportunities to more effectively use land, including through densification where appropriate, to ensure that the land is identified in the most appropriate areas and housing targets are met.

The planning system is often held to be responsible for the housing crisis, but around 90 per cent of planning applications are approved in England, and consent has been granted for up to one million homes that are yet to be built.

However, it is agreed that a methodology is required to determining housing need, but this needs managing across functional areas, ie Housing Market Areas. Any methodology should be sophisticated enough to take account of areas like Greater Nottingham, which made up of a number of authorities. The City is tightly bounded, so has little opportunity to extend the built up area, whilst surrounding boroughs are tightly constrained by Green Belt. Having a methodology linked to household projections does risk simply providing for more homes where they cannot be provided, so a regional or even national perspective is required.

A STREAMLINED DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCESS WITH AUTOMATIC PLANNING PERMISSION FOR SCHEMES IN LINE WITH PLANS

Proposal 5: Areas identified as Growth areas (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while automatic approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building.

This could be a very blunt a tool, as there will be sub divisions within growth areas suitable for different types of development, and unsuitable for others. Granting blanket outline consent therefore allows potentially unacceptable uses in inappropriate locations.

The use of sub areas (which would be very necessary for good planning and place making) whilst welcome, could result in a complex local plan, with policy approaches/design codes for each sub area, significantly acting against the Government's aim of simplifying and speeding up local plans.

Principle and detail cannot easily be separated in planning decisions. This is because the principle of the suitability of a site depends entirely on the detailed impacts the proposal may have. To understand whether, in principle, development should take place, one first has to understand this detail. The level of detail required to effectively grant outline planning permission across a growth area would be very significant, and the resource requirements could overwhelm many planning departments.

Proposal 6: Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology

The approach needs to reflect that some schemes do (rightly) take a long time to determine, and that this is in the public interest. The current 'minors' or 'majors' break down is too simplistic if firmer timetables are to be attached. Many extensions of time are requested by applicants rather than instigated by the LPA, and lack of flexibility in timescales will lead to perverse decisions, such as refusals where schemes could be

improved given sufficient time.

The possibility of refunding of the planning fee if the application is not determined within the timeframe, or for it to be deemed to have been granted, does not reflect the reality of development management, where applicants and the LPA work together to achieve successful outcomes, and negotiate for unacceptable schemes to be improved to make them acceptable. This inevitably extends the timescales involved, but greatly improves the outcomes. This approach characterises the planning system as negative, where in fact it is a positive agent in improving development proposals.

For appeals, only a tiny proportion of applications are determined in this way. Giving a rebate on fees for successful applicants misses the point that planning judgments can be finely balanced. It also provides a perverse incentive for an LPA to not refuse development that is unacceptable, due to the threat of loss of income needed to run the planning service, and equally, an incentive for more appeals, as applicants would have little to lose if they appeal, but could get their fee back (no financial penalty unless costs were awarded). The current system of allowing costs where behaviour by appellant or LPA is unreasonable works well, and takes account of the fact that legitimate planning judgments can result in different outcomes.

A NEW INTERACTIVE, WEB-BASED MAP STANDARD FOR PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Proposal 7: Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template.

More standardisation and access via technology would be welcomed, subject to appropriate resources being available.

A STREAMLINED, MORE ENGAGING PLAN-MAKING PROCESS

Proposal 8: Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable for key stages of the process, and we will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so.

Whilst it is true that some local plans take too long to prepare, the 30 month timescale of local plan preparation is arbitrary, as it cannot be based on any practical methodology of how long a new style local plan might take to prepare. It also takes no account of the resources available to LPAs, and especially the lack of design expertise to create multiple design codes covering a LPA area, needed to support the local plan. The Government's desire to get more public engagement in plan making is both time and resource hungry, and lengthens preparation timetables.

Having a single time frame for all areas is over simplistic, and does not recognise that some areas are more complex than others, eg urban areas with complex multiple issues vs largely rural areas with market towns and villages.

Proposal 9: Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital

tools

No comment - not a strategic matter.

Proposal 10: A stronger emphasis on build out through planning.

Splitting development sites is the only measure aimed at developers to speed delivery. Given inherent incentives in house builders operating models to drip deed houses to the market, tougher measures are required for this to be effective.

IN splitting sites, a legally binding mechanism would be required to force developers to work with other house builders to deliver different house types/tenures. Design codes alone will not be sufficient.

Design codes are resource heavy, and can also stifle innovation in design and place making.

Pillar Two – Planning for beautiful and sustainable places

Proposal 11: To make design expectations more visual and predictable, we will expect design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development.

Design Codes are useful planning tools, and their further use is welcomed. However, the resource implications need addressing. Many LPAs have very limited design expertise, and no specialist staff. There are simply not enough urban designers available to undertake this work. Poor quality Design Codes can result in bland and boring development, and stifle design innovation.

Proposal 12: To support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character, we will set up a body to support the delivery of provably locally-popular design codes, and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making.

These proposals are welcomed.

Proposal 13: To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England's strategic objectives can give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.

These proposals are welcomed.

Proposal 14: We intend to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences.

Again, the lack of design expertise in most LPAs will hamper this ambition. Good design is also in part a matter of judgment.

A beautiful design is only part of the planning consideration, and there may be other factors that require consideration through the decision making process. This proposal needs careful framing to ensure only appropriate development is fast tracked, and there are appropriate checks and balances to provide consideration of other planning matters.

Proposal 15: We intend to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits.

This would be welcome, planners and developers need clear and unambiguous government policies to allow for consistency in approach across the nation and to enable supply chain adaptation.

Proposal 16: We intend to design a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitats and species in England.

There is little detail of this proposal. If not properly framed, it could risk reducing environmental safeguards.

Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century

This is an important objective, but there is a risk that the proposals for three zone areas are not going to facilitate this aim, eg where growth could impact on historic assets or their settings, but is granted permission via the plan making process.

Proposal 18: To complement our planning reforms, we will facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.

The current level of ambition in this regard as expressed through the consultation on the Future Homes standard is not high enough, so further improvements to efficiency standards would be welcome, but they need to be universal and unambiguous to ensure developer buy-in.

Pillar Three – Planning for infrastructure and connected places

Proposal 19: The Community Infrastructure Levy should be reformed to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished.

If introduced, Infrastructure Levy rates should be set on the basis of local land values, to ensure that areas with low land values are not prejudiced, and that the Infrastructure Levy

does not unintentionally prevent development. This would risk low value areas not receiving sufficient funding through this route, and in this context, proposals to deliver affordable housing through the levy are unconvincing at present.

S106 has remained the right choice for many LPAs, as it is flexible, and can respond to very local land value issues. The Government should back up its claim that the new Infrastructure Levy would yield more than the existing process through detailed modelling, otherwise it is simply speculation.

Proposal 20: The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights.

This is strongly supported, Permitted Development has long been criticised as not contributing to required infrastructure. However, most easy conversions have already taken place, and so the impact may be limited.

Proposal 21: The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision

Areas with low land values and therefore low Infrastructure Levy rates may miss out on affordable housing provision, and so proposals to deliver greater levels of affordable housing through the levy are unconvincing at present.

Proposal 22: More freedom could be given to local authorities over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy

It is important to keep the link between development and where the Infrastructure Levy is spent, particularly in convincing local communities that development is acceptable. Once freedoms to break that link are made, it will be very difficult for cash-strapped local authorities to ignore the need to support service provision more generally.

Proposal 23: As we develop our final proposals for this new planning system, we will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms. In doing so, we propose this strategy will be developed including the following key elements:

- The cost of operating the new planning system should be principally funded by the beneficiaries of planning gain – landowners and developers
- Planning fees should continue to be set on a national basis and cover at least the full cost of processing the application type
- a small proportion of Infrastructure Levy of the income should be earmarked to local planning authorities to cover their overall planning costs

Skills and resourcing will be key to making any new planning system effective. Making development in the round pay for planning services is a good idea in principle, but those Councils with low land values will not receive much Infrastructure Levy funding. Therefore plan making costs should also be covered by planning application fees, as it is the policies they contain that planning applications are determined against.

Regulating pre application fees is unlikely to assist in LPAs covering their operating costs.

Proposal 24: We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions

This is supported, but there is a very large resourcing and skills gap nationally.

This page is intentionally left blank

Meeting:	JOINT COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
Date:	11 December 2020
From:	Joint Officer Steering Group

**NOTTINGHAMSHIRE MINERALS LOCAL PLAN and
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND NOTTINGHAM WASTE LOCAL PLAN**

1 SUMMARY

1.1 This report informs committee of progress with preparing:

- The Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan.
- The Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan;

2 BACKGROUND

Minerals

- 2.1 The County Council is preparing a revised Minerals Local Plan. It will cover the County area (policies for the City are included in its Land and Planning Policies document - Part 2 Local Plan).
- 2.2 Following completion of several stages of consultation, including an Issues and Options stage and consultation on a Draft Minerals Plan document, the County Council approved the Plan for formal publication at its meeting on 11 July 2019 and it was published for representations in September/October 2019.
- 2.3 The Plan was submitted for examination in February 2020 and hearing sessions were due to take place in late April 2020. These were postponed because of the COVID -19 outbreak but were held virtually by video between 26th and 29th October 2020. The County Council has prepared a schedule of proposed modifications to the Plan and these have been published for comments to be made between 27 November and 8 January 2020. Following this period and taking account of the modifications proposed and comments made upon them, the Inspector will complete and submit his Report to the Council on the Plan.

Waste

- 2.4 Following the County and City Councils decision to prepare a single Joint Waste Local Plan to replace the Waste Core Strategy, adopted by both Councils in December 2013, an initial consultation on the new Local Plan including a “Call for Sites” was launched on 28 February and concluded on 7 May 2020 (extended by a month in light of the COVID-19 outbreak)
- 2.5 The consultation exercise generated 270 representations on the “Issues and Options” document and nine potential waste management sites were put forward for consideration as part of the Call for Sites. Officers are assessing

the representations received and will feed the responses into the next stage of the Waste Local Plan.

- 2.6 It had been intended to brief the Members Working Group on the findings of the consultation exercise in Autumn this year, but this has been delayed due to the rescheduled Minerals Local Plan hearing sessions. A meeting of the Working Group will now be scheduled early next year. The next steps in the Waste Local Plan process will be the completion of a report of consultation, the updating of the Waste Needs Assessment and preparation of a Draft Plan for consultation.

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 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 Officers

Stephen Pointer,
Team Manager Planning Policy,
Nottinghamshire County Council
Tel 0115 993 9388 Email: stephen.pointer@nottscc.gov.uk

Matt Gregory, Head of Planning Strategy and Building Control
Development Department
Nottingham City Council
Tel: 0115 876 3974 Email: matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Meeting:	JOINT COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
Date:	11 December 2020
From:	Joint Officer Steering Group

Transport Update

1 SUMMARY

1.1 This report provides an update on the transport related issues across the Greater Nottingham conurbation. The report gives an update on the transport effects of the COVID – 19 crisis as well as information regarding the D2N2 Local Cycling and Walking Plan and recent funding awards.

2 BACKGROUND

Covid 19 Transport Update

In the August joint committee meeting it was reported that the city council had been monitoring the transport network to understand the effects of the restrictions on travel brought in to control the Covid 19 outbreak. This monitoring has continued over the autumn appendix 1 of this report contains a chart showing key events and how they have affected the transport network. Using the data collected during this period we can report the following:

- Over July, August and September traffic flows remained at around 85- 90% of their pre-Covid levels.
- Throughout this period Public Transport patronage grew slightly with Bus patronage peaking in mid to end of September at around 50% of pre-covid levels. This period also coincides with the return of School pupils and University students.
- Cycling remained above pre-covid levels throughout the summer and continues to peak at weekends.
- Restrictions started to be reintroduced at the end of September with pubs and restaurants closing at 10pm. Traffic flows started to fall at this point and have dipped to almost 50% of pre-covid level following the introduction of the recent lockdown in November.
- Tram and bus passenger numbers have also fallen to around 10% (tram) and 30% (bus) of normal levels
- East Midlands Rail are reporting passenger levels at between 15% and 20% of pre-covid levels.

D2N2 Local Cycling and Walking Plan

In 2017, as part of the Cycling & Walking Investment Strategy (CWIS), Central Government called on all highway authorities in England to produce an LCWIP as a pipeline of cycling and walking infrastructure improvements. This is part of its long-term approach to developing comprehensive local cycling and walking. The D2N2 transport authorities decided to make a joint bid, primarily because the main capital funding source for cycling and sustainable transport over several years had been from the LEP's Local Growth Fund and which still might be source of funding. The partners considered it as a continuation of other cooperative successful bids such as the Local Sustainable Transport Fund, Access Fund, Local Growth Fund and European Regional Development Fund. It was also felt it would help develop cross boundary routes. All four authorities are keen to enhance active travel, particularly in relation to tourism and the visitor economy.

The Plan is to be in three main parts:

- 1 - A network plan for cycling and walking identifying preferred routes;
- 2 - A prioritised program of infrastructure for future investment for a 10 to 15 year period – including a list of preliminary designed schemes, that whilst not “shovel ready” should have a robust cost estimate.
- 3 – An overarching report, which sets out the underlying analysis and provides a narrative, which supports the identified improvements. This should include how the LCWIP will be integrated into local policies and ensuring it supports the Strategic Economic Plan, with the investment in walking and cycling supporting jobs, growth, the visitor economy and housing. It should also promote cross boundary connectivity and improved air quality and health.

To reflect the diverse nature of the D2N2 area the partners decided to prioritise the cycling network and schemes based on three zones:

- i) Derby and Nottingham and urban connections
- ii) The Northern Urban Area (Chesterfield/Ashfield/Mansfield)
- iii) The remaining market towns and rural areas of the two counties

The initial draft D2N2 LCWIP was submitted to Department for Transport (DfT) by the end on November 2019 deadline. The DfT did not give any formal feedback, as our document was not complete. However, informally they told us that it was one of the better ones.

From December 2019 to July 2020 the partners and its nominated consultant undertook further work on the draft plan funded by Government and the partnership to improve the scoring system, produce an economic appraisal of the program and to improve the appearance of the document. Partners produced a short summary document for more general consumption and wider engagement. The key feature of the summary are the plans showing the top priority schemes for each of the three D2N2 zone. Each authority set out their top 5 priority schemes for the zones they have an interest in.

The economic appraisal gave a strong rate of return for the overall program - ‘high’ and ‘very high’ depending on inclusion of tourism benefits, with a maximum cost/benefit ratio of 8.

The draft final D2N2 LCWIP was submitted to DfT in August 2020 to support the Emergency Active Travel Fund tranche 2 bids by the four partners with a note that the document had still to be signed off politically.

The D2N2 LCWIP has been produced to be an evolving document. In the first instance, it will need to take on board input from LEP and relevant responses from stakeholder and the general after public consultation. (A report was taken to the LEP Place Board on the 9th December). The document will then be approved by each partners’ political bodies. It will be revised over time to reflect changing political, financial and social circumstances.

E-Scooter Launch

The City Council has launched a trial of an electric scooter hire scheme. More than 200 electric scooters will be available to hire in Nottingham as part of a 12-month trial which started at the end of October.

The City Council has partnered with Wind Mobility to provide the scheme. The scooters will be placed in on street location around the city and will be made available to rent on a short term “by the minute” basis via the use of a mobile phone App.

The aim of the scheme is to test the new form of transport to see how they will operate in practice and to see if the scooters could offer a practical new form of greener transport. As part of the Covid 19 response the Department for Transport (DfT) has made changes that allow the scooters to be used on public roads using the same road space as cyclists. These changes only apply to DfT approved areas. It will still be illegal to ride any other e-scooter on public roads.

A number of safeguards on the use of the scooter have also been put in place, including 'geo-fencing', which will restrict where e-scooters can be used, and will limit e-scooters to 4mph in pedestrianised areas in the city centre and Bulwell for the safety of riders and pedestrians. This technology also means the e-scooters won't operate outside Nottingham City Council boundaries and in other key locations, such as Old Market Square

Active Travel Fund

The Department for Transport recently announced allocations for Tranche 2 of the Active Travel Fund. Tranche 1 of the Emergency Active Travel Fund was initially announced in May 2020 and was intended to fund temporary schemes that enabled travelers to use active travel (cycling and walking) as an alternative to the car.

The City Council received £2.04m and the County Council have received £2.178m. These allocated funds are different to the amounts that were bid for originally. Therefore, a review of the Active Travel program will be required in both Authorities.

All schemes have been targeted in areas where we believe significant benefit can be derived in response to restart and recovery, as well as being deliverable within the timescales for ATF. We have also ensured that the schemes and measures put forward draw upon the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire elements of the D2N2 wide LCWIP, and complement the work we have begun to deliver through the Transforming Cities fund (TCF).

Clifton Bridge

Highways England contractors continue to work to repair Clifton Bridge. On Sunday the 8th November an additional lane was opened. The current arrangement is shown in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1; Current Clifton Bridge Traffic Layout

Highways England have also reported that they intend to open a further lane in the coming months, however as a result of further investigations to the bridge structure the scope of the work to the structure has now widened. This now means that the work is likely to continue on the bridge until Autumn 2021.

Access East Midlands Airport

The County Council is awaiting the outcome of the Rural Mobility Fund bid which is due to be assessed in December 2020 which includes Improved service provision to EMA/SEGRO site. The County also continues to engage with the City on Transforming Cities proposals for improved service provision as well as working with SEGRO on the implementation of their Public Transport Strategy.

3 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 It is recommended that the contents of this report be noted.

Contact Officers

Chris Carter, Development and Growth, Nottingham City Council

Tel: 0115 8763940

Email: chris.carter@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Kevin Sharman, Place Department, Nottinghamshire County Council

Tel: 0115 9772970

Email: kevin.sharman@nottscc.gov.uk

Meeting:	Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport
Date:	11 December 2020
From:	Joint Officer Steering Group

Joint Committee Work Programme

1 Summary

- 1.1 To consider the Committee's work programme from March to September 2021.

2 Background

- 2.1 The Joint Committee work programme will assist the management of the committee's agenda, the scheduling of the committee's business and forward planning. The work programme will be updated and reviewed at each pre-agenda meeting and committee meeting. Any member of the committee is able to suggest items for possible inclusion.
- 2.2 The work programme to September 2021 is attached for the consideration of the Committee.

3 Recommendation(s)

- 3.1 That the Joint Committee's work programme be noted and consideration be given to any future items.
- 3.2 That Joint Committee identify any work areas where partnership working between the two authorities would be mutually beneficial.

4 Background papers referred to in compiling this report

- 4.1 None.

Contact Officer

Matt Gregory, Head of Planning Strategy and Building Control, Nottingham City Council
Tel: 0115 876 3974 Email: matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Sally Gill, Group Manager Planning, Nottinghamshire County Council
Tel: 0115 99 32608 Email: sally.gill@nottscc.gov.uk

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
WORK PROGRAMME: MARCH TO SEPTEMBER 2021**

Report title	Brief summary of item	Decision or information?	Lead Officer	Author
05 March 2021				
Minerals Local Plan Update	To provide an update on progress with preparing the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan	Information	Stephen Pointer	Steven Osborne / James Ashton
Joint Waste Local Plan Update	To provide an update on progress with preparing the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Waste Local Plan	Information	Stephen Pointer / Matt Gregory	Stephen Pointer / Matt Gregory
Transport Update	To provide an update on key sustainable transport issues (including rail issues) for the Greater Nottingham area	Information	Chris Carter/Kevin Sharman	James Ashton / Kevin Sharman
Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board Update	To provide an update on the work of JPAB.	Information	Matt Gregory	Matt Gregory
June 2021				
Minerals Local Plan Update	To provide an update on progress with preparing the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan	Information	Stephen Pointer	Steven Osborne / James Ashton
Joint Waste Local Plan Update	To provide an update on progress with preparing the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Waste Local Plan	Information	Stephen Pointer / Matt Gregory	Stephen Pointer / Matt Gregory
Transport Update	To provide an update on key sustainable transport issues (including rail issues) for the Greater Nottingham area	Information	Chris Carter/Kevin Sharman	James Ashton / Kevin Sharman
Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board Update	To provide an update on the work of JPAB.	Information	Matt Gregory	Matt Gregory

September 2021				
Minerals Local Plan Update	To provide an update on progress with preparing the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan	Information	Stephen Pointer	Steven Osborne / James Ashton
Joint Waste Local Plan Update	To provide an update on progress with preparing the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Waste Local Plan	Information	Stephen Pointer / Matt Gregory	Stephen Pointer / Matt Gregory
Transport Update	To provide an update on key sustainable transport issues (including rail issues) for the Greater Nottingham area	Information	Chris Carter/Kevin Sharman	James Ashton / Kevin Sharman
Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board Update	To provide an update on the work of JPAB.	Information	Matt Gregory	Matt Gregory

This page is intentionally left blank