

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board Meeting Minutes

Date: 23 June 2017

Time: 9.00 am

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

Board Members in attendance:

Broadland District Council:

Cllr Ian Moncur, Cllr Andrew Proctor, Cllr Shaun Vincent

Norwich City Council:

Cllr Paul Kendrick, Cllr Mike Stonard, Cllr Alan Waters

South Norfolk Council:

Cllr Charles Easton, Cllr John Fuller, Cllr Lee Hornby

Norfolk County Council:

Cllr Stuart Clancy

Officers in attendance:

Amy Broadhead	Greater Norwich Projects Team
Mike Burrell	Greater Norwich Local Plan Team
Phil Courtier	Broadland District Council
Richard Doleman	Norfolk County Council
Angela Freeman	Greater Norwich Projects Team
Ellen Goodwin	Greater Norwich Projects Team
Tim Horspole	South Norfolk Council
Tracy Jessop	Norfolk County Council
Dave Moorcroft	Norwich City Council
Phil Morris	Norfolk County Council
Graham Nelson	Norwich City Council
Adam Nicholls	South Norfolk Council

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 an employment site at Seething.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received on behalf of Cllr Tim East and Cllr Martin Wilby, Norfolk County Council, and Sir Peter Dixon, Broads Authority.

3. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

There were no questions from the public.

4. GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN: HOUSING NUMBERS

The report set out how the provisional figures for the number of homes to be allocated in the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) had been established, as well as identifying potential 'reasonable alternative' approaches for those housing numbers for use in consultation.

ORS consultancy had undertaken extensive research into housing need in Greater Norwich and had concluded that the overall housing provision required in the GNLP to 2036 was 48,478. The vast majority of these had already been allocated, which meant that the proposed new allocations will need to provide for 8,900 new homes.

A Member noted that although growth was increasing, due to changing demographics and the rate of household formation increasing, the number of new homes required was less than had been expected. He also noted that the 8,900 homes included a 23 percent buffer and this buffer could increase even more with windfall sites. He emphasised that this was giving large infrastructure providers good notice of the expected growth and that they should plan accordingly.

Another Member noted that the report demonstrated that careful and considered work had been done to provide evidence for uplift in the housing numbers in the GNLP, which was a good base for the future.

In response to a query, it was confirmed that the figures could be confidently expected to meet the housing targets in Norwich; however it was emphasised that the figures were provisional and would take account of the

representations that would be made to the GNLP Regulation 18 consultation. Members were also advised that the Government was committed to publishing a standard methodology for calculating housing need and this could have an impact on housing numbers in the GNLP.

RESOLVED

to endorse the approach proposed to establishing housing numbers and potential reasonable alternatives to them for use in the Regulation 18 consultation on the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

5. GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN: DEVELOPING GROWTH STRATEGY OPTIONS

The report set out emerging approaches for developing a range of reasonable growth options for the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

The options put forward would need to be justified on evidence and therefore seen as 'reasonable'. The options had been drafted taking into account the vision and objectives of the GNLP, with significant weight attached to economic drivers and new transport infrastructure.

The options would provide different potential distributions of growth, with varying degrees of concentration nearer Norwich, focus on transport corridors and dispersal around the area, including the potential for a new settlement. This would allow both strategy and sites to be consulted on at the same time.

Members were asked to note that the base position for new allocations set out in the paper provides for 4,900 of the 8,900 additional homes needed to 2036 in the Norwich urban area and in other towns and villages. Seven options for the strategic location for new allocations cover the remaining 5,000 homes needed.

A Member suggested that the narrative that would accompany the options in the consultation should be clear and not overly complicated. It should set out why the work was being done, how it would be achieved and have a good plan to deliver it. Overall, it should focus on the delivery of housing that already had permission, as well as setting out delivery for the future.

A Member questioned if seven options might be too many and lead to confusion, however other Members noted that past consultations had received substantial responses with an even greater number of options.

It was suggested that there might be less of a focus on Norwich in terms of jobs in the future, due to changes in technology that would allow businesses to locate in rural areas. However, it was also noted that technology firms in particular often clustered together in order to share knowledge and services and that Norwich remained the economic driver of Norfolk.

In terms of transport infrastructure; it was suggested that many of the assumptions being made might seem old fashioned within a few years, due to advances in technology, and that small developments would be easier to provide infrastructure for than larger developments; which could favour rural dispersal.

It was suggested that a flexible form of words be found to describe 'village', to avoid restricting them to civil boundaries or other forms of defined settlement, which could act as a constraint to development.

A Member also considered that establishing a new village with 1,000 houses to be delivered in the Plan period, as proposed in the report, was doubtful and that it was more likely to be two new villages with 500 houses each delivered in the Plan period.

In response, Members were advised that it was considered that new villages of 1,000 dwellings would be achievable by 2036 with sufficient commitment, but this would be clarified for the consultation and the text would be amended to reflect the points made by the Board.

It was noted that a rationale had been set out for each option and that they should all go forward for consultation. It was possible that this might result in a hybrid option, but it was important that the consultation be undertaken and all views considered and reasoned conclusions arrived at.

The meeting was informed that the relevant Panels at each constituent authority would receive briefings on the Growth Strategy Options and the proposals for public consultation would go to each Cabinet in October 2017.

RESOLVED

to

- (1) note the options presented and that they are initial work to be further refined; and
- (2) recommend to the constituent authorities that the report forms a reasonable basis for further investigation to be developed into a range of reasonable strategy options for the public consultation under Regulation 18 later this year.

The meeting closed at 9.42 am.