

# Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board

## Agenda

### **Members of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board**

#### **Representing Broadland District Council**

Cllr Stuart Clancy  
Cllr Andrew Proctor  
Cllr Shaun Vincent

#### **Representing Norwich City Council**

Cllr Brenda Arthur  
Cllr Bert Bremner  
Cllr Alan Waters

#### **Representing South Norfolk Council**

Cllr Derek Blake  
Cllr Colin Foulger  
Cllr John Fuller

#### **Representing Norfolk County Council**

Cllr Derrick Murphy  
Cllr Graham Plant  
Cllr Ann Steward

#### **Representing Broads Authority**

Cllr Murray Gray

#### **Representing Homes & Communities Agency**

Claire Hupton

#### **Representing New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership**

Andy Wood

#### **Officers**

Roger Burroughs	Broadland District Council
Phil Kirby	Broadland District Council
Andrea Long	Broads Authority
Sandra Eastaugh	GND Partnership Manager
Chris Starkie	New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership
Richard Doleman	Norfolk County Council
Mike Jackson	Norfolk County Council
Phil Morris	Norfolk County Council
Mike Burrell	Norwich City Council
Jerry Massey	Norwich City Council
Graham Nelson	Norwich City Council
Tim Horspole	South Norfolk Council
Andy Radford	South Norfolk Council

## **Date**

Thursday 20 September 2012

## **Time**

2pm

## **Place**

Council Chamber  
City Hall  
Norwich  
NR2 1NH

## **Contact**

Sara Utting tel (01603) 430428

Broadland District Council  
Thorpe Lodge  
1 Yarmouth Road  
Thorpe St Andrew  
Norwich NR7 0DU

Fax: (01603) 430411  
E-mail: [sara.utting@broadland.gov.uk](mailto:sara.utting@broadland.gov.uk)

- 1 **To receive declarations of interest under Procedural Rule no 8**
- 2 **Apologies for absence**
- 3 **Minutes of meeting held on 19 July 2012** **1 - 7**
- 4 **Matters arising therefrom (if any)**
- 5 **Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk**  
Proposed submission consultation verbal update and timetable
- 6 **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**  
Examination verbal update and timetable
- 7 **City Deals** **8 - 13**  
To receive a report recommending the preparation of a 'City Deals' bid and the preparation of a revised Greater Norwich Economic Strategy.

**Date of Next Meeting**

13 December 2012

# Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board

Minutes of a meeting of the **Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board** at the Sprowston Diamond Centre, School Lane, Sprowston on **Thursday 19 July 2012** at **2pm** when there were present:

Cllr Andrew Proctor – Chairman

Cllr Stuart Clancy  
Cllr Shaun Vincent  
Cllr Brenda Arthur  
Cllr Bert Bremner  
Cllr Alan Waters  
Cllr Derek Blake  
Cllr Colin Foulger  
Cllr John Fuller  
Cllr Ann Steward  
Cllr Murray Gray  
John O'Mahony  
Andy Wood

## Officers

Roger Burroughs - Officer  
Phil Kirby – Officer  
Sandra Eastaugh – Officer  
Richard Doleman

Phil Morris  
Mike Burrell  
Graham Nelson  
Tim Horspole  
Andy Radford  
Sara Utting (Clerk)

## Representing

Broadland District Council  
Broadland District Council  
Norwich City Council  
Norwich City Council  
Norwich City Council  
South Norfolk Council  
South Norfolk Council  
South Norfolk Council  
Norfolk County Council  
Broads Authority  
Homes & Communities Agency  
New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership

Broadland District Council  
Broadland District Council  
GND Partnership Manager  
Norfolk County Council

Norfolk County Council  
Norwich City Council  
Norwich City Council  
South Norfolk Council  
South Norfolk Council  
Broadland District Council

## 26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Mr Fuller	29 (JCS for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk)	Owned land in the Broadland area

## 27 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Andrea Long (Broads Authority); Cllr Derrick Murphy (Norfolk CC); Cllr Graham Plant (Norfolk CC); Mike Jackson (Norfolk CC); Claire Hupton (Homes & Communities Agency) and Chris Starkie (New Anglia LEP).

### 28 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2012 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 29 JOINT CORE STRATEGY (JCS) FOR BROADLAND, NORWICH AND SOUTH NORFOLK – PRE-SUBMISSION PUBLICATION FOLLOWING THE LEGAL CHALLENGE TO THE JCS

Sandra Eastaugh presented the report on the work undertaken by the partner authorities of the GNDP to comply with the Court Order to reconsider the remitted parts of the JCS, supplemented by a presentation by Graham Nelson. A copy of the Sustainability Appraisal had been emailed to Board members and in addition, a copy was tabled at the meeting and had been published on the GNDP website.

The report emphasised that it had not been a requirement to review the whole of the JCS; it was a reconsideration of only those parts of the JCS which were remitted by the Court Order and Schedule and the remainder of the JCS remained adopted. The Court Order and remitted text only related to the distribution of housing identified within the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) – a total of 9,000 homes – and associated employment. Housing distribution in South Norfolk and Norwich City remained the same, as did the housing distribution in the rural part of the Broadland area not in the NPA.

It was noted that the work to comply with the Court Order had been mainly undertaken by the GNDP team of officers, together with the Council's legal advisers, a "critical friend" from POS Enterprises and consultants from URS, the company commissioned to carry out the sustainability appraisal work. The work undertaken had been to generate and test reasonable alternatives, if any, to the remitted parts of the JCS. The guidance available advised that "reasonable" should be derived by assessing alternatives against the objectives of the strategy.

Graham Nelson explained the staged approach to the identification of reasonable alternatives, as follows:

#### Stage 1 – establishing strategic scope of reasonable alternatives

Consideration of dispersal versus concentration of housing growth – this concluded that the degree of concentration and dispersal set out was correct and there was no scope for further dispersal in either South Norfolk or Norwich City Councils' areas but there was scope for a small sites allowance in the Broadland area. The rest of stage 1 involved the identification of potential locations for strategic growth and potential scales of that growth.

Stage 2 – assessing the suitability of the sectors for different scales of growth

Eighteen sectors, including combinations of individual sectors, had been tested against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives of the Plan for strategic scale growth. Conclusion was for six individual locations and one combination to accommodate the strategic scale growth.

Stage 3 – identification of reasonable alternatives

The six individual locations and the one combined location were assessed leading to the three most reasonable alternatives which were subsequently tested against the sustainability objectives.

The three reasonable alternatives were:

**Alternative One** (remitted parts of the JCS)

7,000 in the combined north east (inside and outside the line of the NDR) sector (rising to 10,000 beyond the Plan period) including 25 hectares of employment land at Rackheath

**Alternative Two** (growth focused in the north east, inside the line of the NDR)

7,000 in north east (inside the NDR) sector (rising to 10,000 beyond the Plan period) including 25 hectares of employment land at Broadland Business Park or Norwich International Airport in addition to those in the adopted policies of the JCS.

**Alternative Three** (growth focused in south west with the balance in the Broadland part of the NPA)

4,600 in south west (making a total of 7,000 at this location in the Plan period (rising to 10,000 beyond) when combined with growth identified in the adopted JCS)

2,400 across the Broadland part of the NPA made up of two small scale locations of at least 1,000 each in north east sector (inside NDR) and north west sector

An additional 25 hectares of employment land in association with the large scale strategic housing development in the south west or at Norwich International Airport

The three reasonable alternatives had been tested against the Sustainability Appraisal framework to a comparable level covering social and environmental

and economic considerations and to a level where it was possible to determine their respective merits. The Board noted the number of differences in performance between the three reasonable alternatives, as detailed in the report. In summary, Alternative Three was considered to be the weakest of the three, due to uncertainty over if it could deliver the required growth within the Plan period and officers were recommending that it be rejected; Alternative Two had a number of merits but was less certain to deliver to the planned trajectory while Alternative One overcame some of the disadvantages of Option Two and would allow development to be better planned, not be subject to compromise by the availability of developable land. Therefore, Alternative One was recommended as the most appropriate option and should form the basis of the pre-submission consultation. Graham Nelson supplemented the reasons for the basis of the officer recommendation, as follows: Alternative One resulted in a reduced level of pressure on the environmental assets in the north east; was better in transport terms, eg the Bus Rapid Transit Corridors providing access to employment in the city centre; was the more deliverable option than Alternative Two as based on separate growth locations, therefore allowing for a higher rate of affordable housing due to increased viability issues; creation of a better quality environment for people to live in, eg green spaces etc with a high sense of design worth.

In conclusion, the Board noted the list of pre-submission documents as detailed in the report and that robust and proper consultation could now take place as, in the officers' opinion, the tests of soundness of the JCS could be satisfied.

The Chairman summarised that there were four key elements to consider:

- the terms of the Order had been complied with
- the robustness of the considerations of the alternatives
- recognition of the three reasonable alternatives which had come forward and
- the conclusion of the Sustainability Appraisal to date and the officer recommendation.

Reference was made to the most recent Census and whether its results would have any implications for the JCS. Graham Nelson responded that the overall levels of need were still robust and defensible and it was not planned to do any more updates before the consultation as there was nothing in the Census to cast doubt on the overall level. The JCS papers would be updated following the consultation and prior to submission. Cllr Fuller added that the plan for growth was 1% per annum for the next 20-30 years and in South Norfolk, growth had reached a level of 11.9% over the past 10 years and so he had every confidence in the numbers quoted. In addition, in a national

survey, South Norfolk was listed in the top ten for new business start-ups. He concluded that it was right to dismiss Alternative Three, as borne out by the evidence and it was wrong to contain all growth within the NDR as the densities would be too high etc, therefore Alternative One was the best option. The Chairman concurred with this view, along with the Councillors from the other authorities. In addition, Dr Gray drew attention to the potential adverse implications on the Broads Authority area of Alternative 1 but accepted the possible mitigation in the evidence papers.

The Chairman thanked the officers for all their hard work, which had been painstaking at times, and congratulated them for the professional manner in which the evidence had been gathered and put forward.

### **AGREED:**

- (1) that, having considered the screening of reasonable alternatives set out in section four of the draft Sustainability Appraisal and the supporting evidence base, to **RECOMMEND** to each partner Council
  - (a) that alternative 1 is chosen as the most appropriate option;
  - (b) alternative 1 be taken forward to pre-submission.
- (2) to approve the pre-submission documents and that each partner Council be **RECOMMENDED** to
  - (a) approve the pre-submission publication of the remitted parts of the JCS
  - (b) to delegate authority to the GNDP Directors and the GNDP Manager, in consultation with the respective portfolio holders, to make further minor changes prior to publication to reflect emerging evidence and any necessary corrections.

### **30 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) – SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION TO THE EXAMINER**

Roger Burroughs presented the report in response to the comments received on the Regulation 16 Publication of the Draft Charging Schedules for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. It was noted that draft Charging Schedules had been published during February to March 2012 and attracted a total of 35 responses. The key issues to emerge from the consultation were:

- the approach to residential charging zones
- the charging rates for residential development
- the charging rates for non-residential uses
- infrastructure provision

Following representations, a small number of modifications were being suggested to the draft Charging Schedules covering: the threshold for the application of CIL for flatted development; clarifying the Charging Zone maps in relation to identifying the Broads Authority area and minor wording changes.

Roger Burroughs advised that the Examination for Poole Borough Council had highlighted the differentiation between large and small retail premises. Officers had looked at the Core Strategies of other authorities which had been approved and some did include differentials for differing levels of retail. Information could be found within the FAQ on the Planning Advisory Service website.

It was noted that the most significant modification being proposed related to the rate for flatted development. Advice had been sought from Norfolk Property Services and their evidence showed that the higher rate should apply to developments of 5 storeys and above.

In response to the issue of the legal challenge to the JCS and its implications for the independent examination of the CIL, an evidence paper had been produced which demonstrated that the rates of CIL being proposed were not dependent on the precise distribution of housing development within the NPA. Accordingly, the Partnership was intending to submit CIL before formal adoption of the JCS and a timetable had been drawn up with the submission of CIL and pre-submission publication of the remitted parts of the JCS occurring simultaneously. Legal advice had been sought, together with advice from the Planning Inspectorate, on this issue.

Based on the indicative timetable, the Planning Inspectorate had advised that the examination of CIL could take place in September 2012, enabling adoption in early December 2012.

Board Members expressed their support for the proposals and

### **AGREED:**

that each partner Council be **RECOMMENDED** to

- (1) agree a minor change to the CIL charging schedule for Norwich so that

the £100 per sq m rate of CIL applied to flats of 5 storeys and above and publish the evidence supporting this change;

- (2) publish the Statements of Modifications and evidence in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and submit these (and necessary submission documents as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the covering report) for examination by an independent examiner;
- (3) continue to work together towards the indicative timetable set out in the timetable referred to above and
- (4) delegate authority to the Director representative on the GNDP Board, following discussion with the relevant portfolio holder, to agree any minor changes to any of the documents to ensure consistency and clarity.

### **31 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

#### **AGREED:**

to note the date of the next meeting as Thursday 20 September 2012 at 2pm.

*The meeting closed at 3pm*

## City Deals and the Greater Norwich Economic Strategy

### Summary

Eight city deals have been agreed between Government and the core cities outside London. Greater clarity over other financial factors (particularly the relocation of business rates) means there is now an opportunity for local government to develop similar local growth deals. A presentation on the potential content of a deal will be given at this meeting.

A locally developed and credible economic strategy will be central to any local deal. The current Greater Norwich Economic Strategy (GNES) needs to be refreshed.

### Recommendation

Members agree to the drafting of

- i. a revised Greater Norwich Economic Strategy
- ii. a City Deals bid

## 1. Introduction

1.1. Eight city deals have been agreed between Government and the core cities outside London. Greater clarity over other financial factors (particularly the relocation of business rates) means there is now an opportunity for local government to develop similar local growth deals. Members considered a report on City Deals at their Board meeting in March and agreed to pursue the potential for a local deal with Government.

1.2. A locally developed and credible economic strategy will be central to any local deal. The current Greater Norwich Economic Strategy (GNES) was finalised in 2009 and covers the period to 2014. The strategy is accompanied by “Our 10 Key Actions”, an eight page A5 précis and an action plan. The strategy and accompanying documents are now largely out of date and need to be revised.

## 2. Local growth deals

2.1. Tight public expenditure limits will constrain traditional Government funding streams. Tailored ‘City Deals’ have now been agreed between Government and the eight core cities outside of London. Each Deal is different; focusing on the powers, freedoms and incentives required by each locality to address barriers to growth. In return, Government requires “stronger and more accountable local leadership”.

2.2. Growth deals offer a way for localities to come forward with proposals to re-engineer public and private investment according to functional geographies. The flexibility, freedoms and investment provided by a City Deal type approach strengthens the relationship between local economic prosperity and the shape and level of public resources used to overcome the barriers to growth faced by

each local economy

- 2.3. The GNDP appears to be strongly placed among smaller cities in 2/3-tier areas to promote a local deal. The potential content of such a deal will be the subject of a presentation to your meeting.

### 3. The economic strategy

- 3.1. The Greater Norwich Economic Strategy is a key part of the overall approach to delivering sustainable development in the area. It provides the economic focus to delivering growth, sitting alongside the Joint Core Strategy, NATS, green infrastructure activity and the LIPP.

- 3.2. **South Norfolk Council adopted a supplementary Economic Strategy in November 2011.** Broadland council has adopted the GNES as its main strategic document for economic development and utilises a local set of economic success criteria to direct day to day economic development work. Norwich City Council is looking to supplement the GNES with additional economic strategy documents to meet local and member requirements in the near future. The County Council has adopted the strategy and more recently adopted a countywide strategy to add value to the area based approach.

### 4. The need to refresh the strategy

- 4.1. A GNDP-wide Economic Strategy is vital evidence needed to sit behind and inform the City Deals bid.

- 4.2. A revised GNES should not only describe the economic aspirations of the GNDP it should also reflect the current national economic conditions and the tight public sector operating climate. There is also a need to reflect the changed national and regional structures and context for example the GNES makes numerous references to EEDA and has no mention of the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP). A revised document could be substantially slimmed down to perhaps a dozen pages and focussed on the 10 Key Actions and delivery plan.

- 4.3. The 10 Key Actions are appended with a brief commentary. This identifies areas of success and areas where progress has been more disappointing. While all 10 actions remain valid the strategy to deliver them will need to be refocused. Members may wish to comment on priorities including any additional areas to consider.

- 4.4. **Working together makes best use of our combined resources. While it is expected that the review could be managed partly within existing resources, reduced capacity across the partners suggests that a small amount of additional investment may be required.** It is proposed that consultation with business and other agencies would be achieved through existing structures and networks with no additional costs.

### 5. Implications

- 5.1. **Finance:** City Deals has the potential to significantly increase investment in the partnership area.

- 5.2. **Staff:** **While work will be managed partly by existing resources, additional investment may be required.**

- 5.3. **Property:** Property assets could be included in a City Deal
- 5.4. **Section 40, Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006:** Green economy is a key part of the existing economic strategy and could form a focus any deal. A City Deal could enhance the ability to deliver green infrastructure
- 5.5. **Legal Implications:** No impacts at this stage
- 5.6. **Human Rights:** No impacts at this stage
- 5.7. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA):** Not required at this stage.
- 5.8. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act:** As a high level strategy the GNES has limited direct impact on crime and disorder. Increased opportunity for work can be expected to reduce some types of crime. A local deal could provide opportunities to deliver infrastructure and other initiatives to address crime and disorder issues.

### Recommendation

Members agree to the drafting of

- iii. a revised Greater Norwich Economic Strategy
- iv. a City Deals bid

### Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Sandra Eastaugh	01603 223264	sandra.eastaugh@norfolk.gov.uk

	<p>If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact and ask for xxxx or textphone xxxx and we will do our best to help.</p>
---	---

Review of GNDP's 10 key actions to support the Economic Strategy  
2009 – 2014

EXTANT ACTION	COMMENTS
1 Developing Norwich Research Park	Central to high value job creation, raising aspirations and raising Norwich's profile. The strategy needs to reflect the progress over the last three years and the development programme currently underway, highlighting the benefits and opportunities being realised from TGAC to Project 26 etc.
2 Supporting Enterprise Hubs	This is still an important action, with Hethel expanding to increase capacity, EPIC looking to continue to promote creative industry growth and smaller initiatives such as the provision of the Norwich Enterprise Centre building by City Council and the Eco & Business Centre in Rackheath already engaging with existing and nascent eco businesses to promote new technologies, services and environmentally friendly business.
3 Transport improvements	Significant progress has been made. Examples include investment on BRT routes, delivery of the St Augustine's gyratory, funding for the NDR/Postwick and the start of work on the A11 dualling. Continuing priorities include NATS/NDR, A47, key rural route improvements, rail and airport improvements (rolling stock/facilities and services), plus rural transport provision to improve access to employment and training opportunities.
4 Improving Broadband capacity	BT Openreach roll-out has commenced in some peripheral Greater Norwich areas and the NCC/BDUK £30m programme to "fill-in" rural gaps and some City "white spots" is out to tender. Similarly a variety of WiFi (microwave) broadcast solutions are, for example, offering 10Mb+ bespoke services in locations away from the City.
5 Tackling unemployment and raising skills	This action has become even more important over the past three years. NEET numbers in Greater Norwich remain undiminished and now the proportion of 20+ year olds without suitable qualifications, skills or experience of a real job is as large as it has ever been in the last 15 years.

	<p>A number of initiatives are underway including: the investment of £3m to support more Norfolk apprenticeships over the next two academic years with a large proportion of them expected in the GNDP, the apprenticeships in the construction sector resulting from the partnership between the City Council and the HCA, and the establishment of the new University Technical College.</p>
6 Building a low carbon economy	<p>This action not only retains its key status but its importance has continued to increase over the last three years and a re-emphasis is required. Low carbon and eco/environmental products and services continue to rise in public awareness and in importance commercially. New Anglia LEP is the national lead LEP on the low carbon economy through its Green Economy Pathfinder project</p>
7 Creating jobs and training in construction	<p>Not only retaining its key status but requiring a much greater emphasis to help deliver and spread the benefits of sustainable development. With the recession progress over the past three years has been limited. Additional practical initiatives need to be developed and promoted. Current examples include the City Council's Building Futures pilot project and Broadland's cleantech construction supply chain project running for builders, professionals and merchants.</p>
8 Boosting retail and tourism	<p>Retail, particularly in the City centre, remains a key driver of the Greater Norwich economy whilst tourism is important across the area as a whole. Retail and tourism support our market towns. Tourism is a LEP priority. Since 2009 there have been ongoing changes in tourism support including the demise of EET. There is a need to review and re-appraise practical methods for GNDP to boost these sectors. This could include promoting and supplementing initiatives such as the "ambassador" training through HEART and City College's Retail Academy.</p>
9 Creating premises for new and expanding businesses	<p>There remains a need to ensure both that existing vacant city centre floor-space is fit-for-purpose and new business premises and land are brought forward. The GNDP could demonstrate practical support and develop</p>

	information sharing programmes for Agents, Promoters and Developers with regard to growth initiatives and actively seek incubator and grow-on premises development.
10 Raising Greater Norwich's profile	The ongoing commitment to partnership working and delivery has raised the Greater Norwich profile. However, this area of work could be revisited and re-invigorated to more actively promote of existing and proposed assets.