

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board

Meeting Minutes

Date: 14 November 2016

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Broadland District Council, Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Norwich, NR7 0DU

Board Members:

Broadland District Council:

Cllr Ian Moncur, Cllr Andrew Proctor, Cllr Shaun Vincent

Norwich City Council:

Cllr Bert Bremner, Cllr Mike Stonard, Cllr Alan Waters

South Norfolk Council:

Cllr Colin Foulger, Cllr John Fuller, Cllr Lee Hornby

Norfolk County Council:

Cllr Tim East, Cllr Martin Wilby

Broads Authority

Cllr Paul Rice

Officers in attendance: Amy Broadhead, Mike Burrell, Phil Courtier, Richard Doleman, Angela Freeman, Tim Horspole, Andrea Long, Dave Moorcroft, Phil Morris, Graham Nelson, Adam Nichols.

1. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman advised the meeting that through his consultancy Abzag, he was promoting, on behalf of the landowner, a site for residential development in Colney through the Greater Norwich Local Plan. When this site was under consideration he would declare a disclosable pecuniary interest and shall vacate the chair and leave the room.

In the interests of transparency, he also brought to the Board's attention, that his father, Malcolm Vincent, through his company Vincent Howes, was promoting, on behalf of the landowners, a site for residential development in Costessey/Bawburgh through the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

In this case under the provisions of the Code of Conduct, there was no interest to declare which would prevent him from participating in the debate and chairing the meeting.

He added that he would be declaring the same interests when chairing Broadland's Place Shaping Panel and when as a Member of Broadland District Council's Cabinet and Council GNLP matters were considered.

Cllr John Fuller declared a non-pecuniary interest as a director of a company with an interest in a site at Seething.

Cllr Bert Bremner and Cllr Mike Stonard declared non-pecuniary interests as directors of Norwich Regeneration Limited.

2. **Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Sir Peter Dixon.

3. **Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2016 were agreed as an accurate record.

Minute no: 3 - Greater Norwich Development Partnership Terms of Reference

It was suggested that the public should be allowed to speak at GNDP meetings, if it was proportionate and did not stifle debate.

The Chairman noted that Board meetings were for the delivery of growth, not for hearing public comment at this stage. He noted that members of the public would have ample opportunity to comment during the consultation stages of the Local Plan drafting process and have speaking rights at individual Council meetings when the Plan was considered.

It was **AGREED** that a brief note on this matter would be brought to the next meeting.

4. **Greater Norwich Local Plan – Progress Report**

The Planning Policy Manager presented a progress report on the preparation of favoured options and reasonable alternatives for the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP).

The report also covered the draft objectives for the GNLP; development sites submitted for potential inclusion; an assessment approach for potential strategic scale development and the development of a Settlement Hierarchy.

Stakeholder Workshops, which had been held in September and the direction of travel for the topic-based area-wide GNLP policies, were also considered in the report.

The report requested Members views on the following:

- i. the proposed GNLP Objectives;
- ii. the sites submitted to date;
- iii. the approach to assessing strategic scales of development, to the sectors being assessed and the initial outputs of the assessment;
- iv. the issues raised in relation to the Settlement Hierarchy paper
- v. the GNLP Issues Paper in the light of the outputs of the Stakeholder Forums; and
- vi. the direction of travel for the area-wide policies.

Minor revisions to the GNLP Terms of Reference were also sought.

A Correction and Supplementary Note was circulated, which suggested potential criteria for an assessment of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) which would be considered in a specific report to the Board in January 2017.

It was suggested that there had been little direct debate concerning the NPA, although there were arguments for more dispersal of growth and for continuing to concentrate the majority of growth around Norwich.

The next key step of the Local Plan process will be a public consultation on the Favoured Option and Reasonable Alternatives and progress on preparation of that consultation report will be collated for a report to the Board in March 2017.

Members made the following suggestions and comments on the proposed Local Plan:

Context

- The context of the Plan required expanding to include strategic infrastructure developments (e.g. the completion of the western link of the NDR).
- The Plan should focus on delivery and be more interventionist.
- Infrastructure should not be limited to strategic projects, but a whole range of projects.
- The context should be expanded to cover large and small infrastructure.

Objectives

- The objectives should be condensed to no more than six brief statements that supported the overarching aims of the GNDP.

- A strapline or mission statement for the Local Plan should be drafted to inform the re-drafted objectives.

Call for Sites

- The Plan should not be constrained to those sites that had been submitted, but should be proactive and identify sites that fulfilled the objectives in the Plan.
- The Plan had too great a focus on housing; employment sites should also be identified.
- The completion of the Norwich Western Link should be considered in Growth Options, which should be ambitious in identifying opportunities for development up to 2036.
- Policy commitments for large projects should not be constrained by timeframes, longer term visions could also be acceptable.
- More work was required on Appendix 4, as it did not reflect the effects that the NDR would have on those settlements in its vicinity.

The Board was advised that the Norwich Western Link was beyond the remit of the Local Plan to deliver, as it would be the responsibility of Norfolk County Council Highways. However progress on the development of the scheme could be reflected in the Local Plan.

It was noted that it was likely that the Norwich Western Link would be made a priority of the County Council shortly.

Settlement Hierarchy

- An assessment of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) should be conducted before the Settlement Hierarchy was looked at in depth, as it would help inform development outside the NPA, especially when taking into consideration the effects of the NDR.
- The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should be used for identifying development need outside of the NPA.
- There was clear evidence that the Joint Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy remained appropriate and the NPA should be sustained.
- An expansion of the NPA should be debated in order to gain a balanced view with the right information to make an informed decision.
- The criteria for the NPA report should also include travelling to work.
- Expanding the NPA would ease pressure on the five year land supply requirement within it.

A Member drew the Board's attention to the wording in the Joint Core Strategy which stated that; 'The NPA is a longstanding local planning area used to ensure that growth needs arising from the Norwich urban area are addressed as close to it as possible.' He submitted that this was a key proposition to assess the NPA by.

It was confirmed that officers would take the points raised into account for the further development of the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

The Board confirmed that area-wide policies would be considered once the objectives of the Plan were clarified.

The Terms of Reference of the Board were noted.

5. **Any Other Business**

The date of the next meeting in January was to be confirmed.