

Minutes of a meeting of the **Place Shaping Panel** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Thursday 3 May 2018** at **6.00 pm** when there were present:

Mr S A Vincent – Chairman

Mr R R Foulger

Mrs J Leggett

Mr I N Moncur

Mr S Riley

Mrs Bannock, Mr Grady, Mr Knowles and Mr Leggett also attended the meeting for its duration.

Also in attendance were the Spatial Planning Manager and Committee Officer (JO).

24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

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 (GNLP).

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 as a Member of Cabinet and Council, GNLP matters were considered.

25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr Everett, Mrs Hemsall and Mr O'Neill.

26 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

27 **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATIONS ON DRAFT REVISED NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON 'SUPPORTING HOUSING DELIVERY THROUGH DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS'**

The report set out proposed responses to the Government's consultations on a draft revised National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF) and the statement on Supporting Housing Delivery through Developer Contributions.

Both consultation responses had been produced under the Greater Norwich Development Partnership with additional input from South Norfolk and Broadland Officers. Members were advised that the responses from the other Greater Norwich planning authorities might differ.

The NPPF was being revised as the current Framework had been affected by a number of Ministerial Statements and legal decisions since it was published in March 2012. The new draft NPPF had substantial changes to the layout of the document, which made it easier to read, but it did not have significant changes to the content. It did, however, incorporate policy proposals previously consulted on in the 2017 Housing White Paper and Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultations.

Key elements of the Framework were:

- Strategic and local plans should be reviewed at least every five years and to ensure they were 'an appropriate strategy' not 'the most appropriate strategy' (this would make local plans more robust if challenged);
- Twenty percent of allocated sites should be a half hectare or less;
- No affordable housing on sites with fewer than ten units;
- Ten percent of affordable home ownership properties would be required on major sites.

Members were informed that the five-year land supply requirement remained, but that a greater emphasis was now being placed on delivery. This would be measured by a Housing Delivery Test, which would be calculated on an annual basis for each planning authority and published by the Secretary of State. If the test indicated that delivery had fallen below 95 percent of the housing need in the District over the previous three years an Action Plan would be required to assess the causes and identify actions to increase delivery in future years. If housing delivery were less than 75 percent of the identified need there would be a presumption in favour of any development in a sustainable area. A Member noted that this could allow developers to delay

construction in some areas, so that they could take advantage of opportunities to secure planning permission elsewhere.

The draft NPPF would also require Statements of Common Ground to be produced, which confirmed that effective joint working on cross boundary matters was being addressed, as required under the Duty to Cooperate.

The Panel was advised that the draft NPPF was unlikely to have any further significant changes made to it before it came into force during the summer.

The second consultation was on the Government Statement on Supporting Housing Delivery through Developer Contributions, which aimed to make the system of developer contributions more transparent and accountable by reducing complexity and increasing certainty. This was intended to support swifter development and increase market responsiveness to changes in land values.

The Statement proposed a simplified Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) production process, as well as the scrapping of S106 pooling restrictions in CIL areas. Changes were also proposed for CIL charging schedules, which would allow local authorities to take account of the existing use and increased value land following the granting planning permission.

The Panel was informed that some amendments had been made to both consultation responses, since the Agenda had been published; with both consultation responses now included the following comment for clarification:

Broadland District Council is a member of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, which also includes South Norfolk Council, Norwich City Council, Norfolk County Council and the Broads Authority, and the responses make reference to this Partnership. This is not a composite response on behalf of the Partnership and individual members may submit separate and alternative responses from their perspective, in particular the County Council response will reflect its wider strategic role.

The NPPF consultation also included the following response to question 35, which referred to habitats and biodiversity:

Also, to be correct, in paragraph 172 reference should be made in criteria (a) and (b) to geodiversity as well as biodiversity.

The consultation response to Supporting Housing Delivery through Developer Contributions now included the following additional comment in respect of Question 24, which referred to improving transparency and increasing accountability:

The Council very much welcomes the increased flexibility that removing the restrictions in regulation 123 would give to CIL authorities seeking to meet the infrastructure needs of their area. Such needs can change rapidly and can be best successfully addressed by using finance from a number of different sources. We are aware that this proposal has given rise to some concerns from industry and infrastructure providers but would suggest that arrangements that exist in organisations such as Greater Norwich Growth Board, where CIL revenues are pooled and used to fund a shared infrastructure need across a wide area which are agreed not only by the local three District/City Councils but also the County Council and the Local Enterprise Partnership. We consider that these procedures should be sufficient to address the concerns raised so would request that even if the Government does not press ahead with the proposal to remove the restrictions in regulation 123 it does find a way to give the proposed flexibility to authorities such as those within the GNGB who are working co-operatively across boundaries and different tiers of government to prioritise infrastructure spending in order to maximise delivery.

NB: Norfolk County Council (a member of the GNPD Partnership) have submitted an alternative response on this question reflecting their role as a key infrastructure provider.

The Panel noted and commended the responses the consultations

The meeting closed at 6.47 pm.