

Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board Meeting Minutes

Date: 20 November 2017

Time: 1.00 pm

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

Board Members:

Broadland District Council:

Cllr Andrew Proctor, Cllr Shaun Vincent (Chairman)

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, Cllr Tim East, Cllr Judy Oliver

Broads Authority

Paul Rice

Officers in attendance: Amy Broadhead, Mike Burrell, Phil Courtier, Richard Doleman, Angela Freeman, Ellen Goodwin, Tim Horspole, Dave Moorcroft, Phil Morris, Graham Nelson, Adam Nichols and Marie-Pierre Tighe.

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 Ian Moncur, Cllr Martin Wilby and Sir Peter Dixon.

3. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The following questions were submitted to the Board:

Cllr Lesley Grahame

'The draft consultation offers only one transport policy option: 'Broadly continue the current approach to encourage public transport improvements, [and] walking and cycling improvements'. However, in the section on strategic transport issues, all the specific schemes mentioned were road building or road improvement projects. If policy was to favour public transport, walking and cycling, why was there no mention of existing public transport projects - for example the proposed rail station at Broadland Business Park or the Bus Rapid Transit corridors - or any number of possible strategic cycle links, while no fewer than six specific road schemes were listed?'

Officer response:

There were two questions in the consultation seeking views on the approach to transport issues.

The first, question 36, covered strategic transport connections that shaped the growth of the area, recognising the work of other bodies in promoting improvements. One of the suggested consultation drafting amendments to be considered at this Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board meeting recognises that the work on promoting rail enhancements needed to be referenced.

The second question, question 37, was seeking opinions on the local approach to promoting sustainable transport to support the growth that would be promoted in the GNLP. The GNLP is not the transport plan for the area, but would need to reflect the close inter relationship of development and transport.

Local measures to promote sustainable transport in the area in and around Norwich would be considered through the review of the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy. Norfolk's adopted 3rd Transport Plan provided the strategy and policy framework for the remainder of the area up to 2026.

Cllr Denise Carlo

The draft Regulation 18 consultation document is deeply disappointing and it does not address the challenges of the 21st century which include climate change.

The sections on climate change and transport were particularly weak and the contribution of transport to greenhouse gas emissions continues to be ignored. In its ninth annual assessment (June 2017), the Committee on Climate Change reported that emissions from transport and building stock were rising and effective new strategies and policies were urgently needed to ensure emissions continue to fall in line with the commitments agreed by Parliament.

Would the GNGB agree to re-draft the Plan and put climate change at the heart of achieving sustainable development to include a transport strategy based on achieving a major modal shift to sustainable transport modes, traffic reduction and no further new strategic road infrastructure?

Officer response:

This was not the draft Local Plan, but was a consultation on issues and options for the Plan. The consultation had questions on specific issues referred to in the question to seek views on how they should be tackled in the Plan.

Question 36 covered strategic transport issues, question 37 sustainable transport and question 52 the Plan's approach to climate change. The consultation allowed for the points raised in the question to be made. It was not considered necessary to re-draft the consultation document.

Cllr Simeon Jackson

The settlement hierarchy is a mechanism designed to promote development in places where it is most appropriate and sustainable, with good access to services. Paragraphs 4.152-4.158 state that the GNLP is considering combining the three village and rural categories in the settlement hierarchy to form 'village clusters', meaning that development is likely to be allocated even in villages with no services, and no non-car access to services. However, no evidence is provided for why this might be desirable, and the consultation document fails to address the impact that choosing such an option could have on the delivery of other GNLP objectives.

Please could the GNLP explain what evidence it had used to arrive at this option (as opposed to any number of other possible changes to the hierarchy), and how it is compatible with option TRA1 and paragraph 6.42, which state that policy must meet the objective to reduce reliance on the private car?

Officer response:

This was a consultation which asked questions about the possibility of using village clusters as an approach to the lower tiers of the settlement hierarchy. The consultation asked for evidence and views as to whether this could be a suitable approach.

Parish Cllr Andrew Cawdron

The Spatial Portrait of Greater Norwich (paragraph 2.21) on air quality says 'achievements in air quality are being achieved by road infrastructure changes'. Where is the evidence base or measurement locations and records to validate this statement? Norwich does not even record particulate levels.

Officer response:

To provide a little bit of extra context, paragraph 2.21 of the Growth Options consultation document referred to the Air Quality Management Plan for the City Centre and referred to other initiatives in addition to road infrastructure changes. It also stated that air quality was an important issue with more work to be done.

The Norwich City 2016 Air Quality Annual Status Report (ASR) is the most recent available evidence on air quality in the City Centre. The ASR stated on pages 3 and 4 that 'A good example of improvement in air quality resulting from the traffic changes in the city is the work done to implement new road layout and junction arrangements in the Chapelfield area of Norwich.... Triplicate diffusion tube monitoring was carried out for a full year prior to the scheme commencing, and had continued since. As a result of the changes, the annual mean NO₂ concentration had reduced from 60.9µg/m³ in 2013 to 43µg/m³ in 2015.'

Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 of the ASR set out the particulate monitoring that was carried out.

The 2017 Air Quality Annual Status Report was in production. Earlier ASRs were available on the Norwich City Council website and the 2017 report would be available in the near future.

**Jenn Parkhouse
Wensum Valley Alliance**

With regard to paragraph 6.169
: 'Landscape protection policies generally work well' - relatively few applications because of high chance of refusal', would you please provide evidence to support this claim, e.g. number of claims, areas concerned and benefiting from which type of protection, number refused, etc.

Officer response:

Paragraphs 6.165 to 6.168 of the Growth Options document set out the landscape protection areas and policy tools used to protect them. The key areas were:

- gaps between certain settlements such as between Wymondham/Hethersett and Hethersett/Cringleford;
- a corridor either side of the A47 around the south of Norwich;
- a corridor either side of the NDR in the Growth Triangle in Broadland;
- rural river valleys and urban valley fringe landscape areas including significant parts of the Yare and Wensum Valleys.

While some limited erosion to protected landscapes had taken place, the great majority of the protected areas remain undeveloped.

There were two potential means of assessing success – applications not made and applications refused. Unfortunately it was not possible to quantify the number of development proposals and planning applications that had not been submitted as a result of the designations.

In relation to planning applications in the Strategic Gaps, three applications were refused in South Norfolk in 2015/16, although two of these were subsequently approved on appeal, totalling about 10 hectares. No planning applications were received for land in the A47 Protection Zone in 2015/16.

Many of the designations had been in place for a significant period of time and the areas that they had sought to protect remain substantially undeveloped. Consequently, it was reasonable to conclude that this strong policy approach had been effective.

4. GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION GROWTH OPTIONS

The Greater Norwich Planning Policy Team Manager gave a presentation on the main consultation on the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP).

The GNLP was a joint Local Plan, which was comprised of the Strategy and Sites, but excluded the Development Management policies for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk up to 2036.

The GNLP was being produced at this time as part of a five year review cycle, which was good practice and to ensure a 15 year supply of housing land.

The GNLP would play a key role in driving forward the economy by ensuring that homes, jobs and infrastructure was provided; whilst also safeguarding the environment.

The Consultation was scheduled to be held from 8 January 2018 to 15 March 2018.

It was emphasised that the consultation posed questions; not answers, and would be open to both technical respondents and the general public.

There would be clear signposting for the consultation; with a series of roadshows and events to encourage a wide variety of respondents, who could comment in whatever level of detail they wished. Respondents would also be able to make their comments online.

It was likely that the key issues would be: delivery, housing numbers, growth options (distribution), infrastructure, green belt, new settlement, settlement hierarchy, sites, topic policies e.g. design, affordable housing and environmental protection.

The evidence base for the Plan would be made up of a wide variety of studies including: viability, flood risk, economy/retail/town centres and a Sustainability Appraisal.

The next stages would involve an analysis of consultation responses, which would then inform the evidence base for the publication of the Regulation 19 Plan in summer 2019, with final adoption by end 2020.

Members were advised that following consideration by the respective panels of each local authority seven amendments to the GNLP Regulation 18 Growth Options document had been proposed (attached at Appendix 1 to these Minutes).

There was also a proposal to reduce the affordable housing percentage requirement on sites, due to a higher delivery of affordable housing in the period up to March 2017 (attached at Appendix 2 to these Minutes).

RESOLVED

to agree the proposed amendments to the Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation 18 Growth Options document.

Cllr Tim East advised the meeting that he had concerns regarding the provision of healthcare especially in large settlements and would wish to see this issue dealt with more robustly in the document. He also would like to see the protection of the Wensum and Yare River Valleys extended to their tributaries as well. He also requested that a clearer differentiation be made between social housing and housing for people with disabilities, as 28 percent of residents in Greater Norwich were disabled.

In response, it was confirmed that Health Impact Assessments were a requirement of large scale housing proposal in the current policy and question 63 in the Growth Options document asked if this requirement should be included in the GNLP. Work had also been undertaken with healthcare

providers on a Norfolk Health protocol, so they would be aware of the impact of growth across Greater Norwich.

Members were advised that work on the Norfolk Health Protocol had been concluded in September 2017 and would be considered again by the Norfolk Member Duty to Co-operate Forum in January 2018. Health England have been invited to attend the meeting.

In respect of the tributaries of river valleys and disabled dwellings; it was suggested that these issues could be raised through the consultation.

In response to a query regarding the Site Proposals document, it was confirmed that this was an extract of sites that had been assessed for possible inclusion in the GNLP. The full document would eventually list all of these sites, with maps and a written summary of each village. Any further sites would come through the consultation process.

Cllr Alan Waters raised four issues about the overall scale of growth, distribution options and recognition of the role of Norwich, lack of detail proposed about delivery and time it has taken to produce the GNLP and implications of detailed member involvement and these were in a note he had prepared. At the meeting the Norwich City Head of Planning handed copies of the note to members of the public. Immediately after the meeting Cllr Waters submitted the detailed note on these issues which is appended to these Minutes.

In response to the issue of the housing allocations number being calculated by including a ten percent delivery buffer, Cllr John Fuller noted that this figure would be supplemented by windfall developments. It was also noted that the housing numbers had been amended following proposed changes in Government policy.

Cllr Andrew Proctor noted that all the Strategic Growth Options were worth due consideration.

RECOMMENDED TO THE CONSTITUENT AUTHORITIES:

The Board recommends that the constituent authorities:

- approve the “Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation 18 Growth Options” document for public consultation;
 - delegate authority to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Directors in consultation with the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Chair to:
 1. Make any minor corrections and presentational changes to the Growth Options paper; and
 2. Sign off the Site Proposals and Interim Sustainability Appraisal documents for public consultation.
-

The meeting closed at 13.54 pm.

