

Place Shaping Panel

Agenda

Members of the Place Shaping Panel

Mr I N Moncur
(Chairman)

Mr G Everett
Mr R R Foulger
Miss S Lawn
Mrs J Leggett
Mr G K Nurden
Mr F O'Neill
Mr S Riley
Mr D B Willmott

Date

Tuesday 4 Dec 2018

Time

6.00 pm

Place

Council Chamber
Thorpe Lodge
1 Yarmouth Road
Thorpe St Andrew
Norwich

Contact

James Overy tel (01603) 430540

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

E-mail: james.overy@broadland.gov.uk



@BDCDemServices

If any Member wishes to clarify details relating to any matter on the agenda they are requested to contact the relevant Head of Service.

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

Under the above Regulations, any person may take photographs, film and audio-record the proceedings and report on all public meetings. If you do not wish to be filmed / recorded, please notify an officer prior to the start of the meeting. The Council has a protocol, a copy of which will be displayed outside of each meeting room and is available on request.

**The Chairman will ask if anyone wishes to
film / record this meeting**

A G E N D A

Page No

- | | | |
|----------|--|----------------|
| 1 | To receive declarations of interest under Procedural Rule no 8 | |
| 2 | Apologies for absence | |
| 3 | <u>Minutes of meeting held on 9 October 2018</u> | 3 – 8 |
| 4 | Matters arising therefrom (if any) | |
| 5 | <u>Draft Response to the National Parks Review Call for Evidence Consultation</u> | 10 – 19 |

P C Kirby
Chief Executive

Minutes of a meeting of the **Place Shaping Panel** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Tuesday 9 October 2018** at **6.00 pm** when there were present:

Mr I N Moncur – Chairman

Mr G Everett
Mr R R Foulger

Mrs J Leggett
Mr G K Nurden

Mr S Riley

Also in attendance were the Interim Head of Housing and Environmental Services, Spatial Planning Manager, Senior Community Planning Officer, Housing Enabler and Committee Officer (JO).

28 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 May 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

29 WEST BROADLAND GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT PLAN

The report requested that the Panel note and endorse a Green Infrastructure Project Plan for the western area of Broadland District, to complement a similar Plan that had been produced for the east of the district in 2015.

The Project Plan identified opportunities to enhance and develop woodlands, footpaths, informal open spaces and other green infrastructure in the west of the district, for the benefit of residents and wildlife.

The Plan had been drafted in preparation for when suitable financial resources became available through either planning permission contributions or the Community Infrastructure Levy; possibly in conjunction with other external funding sources.

The aim of the Plan was to help mitigate the environmental impact of future growth, allow residents to access recreational opportunities closer to home and to have a strong, positive effect on the health and wellbeing of the local population.

The Plan was focused on the following ten projects:

- Thorpe Marriott Greenway
- Drayton to Horsford Greenway
- Hellesdon to Drayton Greenway

- South Drayton Greenway
- Felthorpe Common / Drayton Drewray – Site Enhancements
- Horsford Heath / Horsford Woods – Site Enhancements
- East Horsford – Connectivity & Circular Walk
- Hevingham Park – Site Enhancements
- Great Wood, Haveringland – Site Enhancements
- Marriott's Way Circular Walks

In response to a query, it was confirmed that the Thorpe Marriott Greenway should be one of the first projects delivered, as the tree belt was owned by Broadland and there was no requirement to seek permission from landowners for the project. A planning application for the Thorpe Marriott Greenway was to be considered by the Planning Committee on 24 October 2018. Drayton Parish Council had supported the application, but Taverham Parish Council had expressed concerns about possible anti-social behaviour. It was confirmed that the area had been inspected and mitigation measures, such as defensive planting, could be put in place to prevent neighbouring residents from being disturbed. Specific police patrols in the area were suggested by the Panel, to prevent anti-social behaviour.

It was emphasised that the Green Infrastructure projects in both the east and west were a list of credible potential projects, which required the release of funding through development. They were not to be confused with allocated recreational spaces provided as part of a planning application.

AGREED

to note and endorse the West Broadland Green Infrastructure Project Plan.

30 RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE HOUSING GREEN PAPER – A NEW DEAL FOR SOCIAL HOUSING

The report presented a Government Green Paper 'A new deal for social housing', which proposed fundamental reforms to ensure social housing provided a safe, well managed environment following the Grenfell Tower tragedy.

A consultation on the Green Paper was being held and it was proposed that the Council respond, based on its experience as a predominantly non-stock holding authority.

The Green Paper was divided into the following five parts:

- Ensuring homes are safe and decent
- Effective resolution of complaints
- Empowering residents and strengthening the Regulator
- Tackling stigma and celebrating thriving communities
- Expanding supply and supporting home ownership

Broadland District Council currently owned two properties, which were used as Temporary Accommodation. All the social housing within Broadland was managed by Housing Associations such as Clarion, Orbit, Victory Housing Trust, Cotman, Saffron Housing Trust and Flagship.

A response to the Green Paper consultation was being compiled by Broadland officers in discussion with housing association staff. Input from officers at South Norfolk had also been requested, although no joint response would be made, as greater weight would be given to the number of responses received.

The final draft response to the Green Paper would be discussed with the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Wellbeing prior to submission.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Wellbeing advised the meeting that the Council had a very good record of delivering affordable housing; which had reached a 15 year high in 2015, with 257 properties completed. This figure had reduced since then, due to a lack of exceptions sites, but still remained high.

In answer to a query, the Panel was advised that there were no concerns that safety standards in social housing were less robust than in private rented accommodation.

A Member expressed concern about the loss of social housing stock and a lack of housing generally which meant that 40 percent of those in full time employment could not afford to buy a property. He suggested that local authorities should be doing more to generate housing stock to meet this need.

It was confirmed that the Council sought to achieve 33 percent affordable housing on large developments. However, developers might seek to reduce this number through viability assessments. The percentage of affordable housing sought in the Greater Norwich Local Plan, was still to be confirmed.

AGREED

to note the report and approve the method of submission to the consultation.

31 THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK AND THE GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN

The report set out key changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and how they would be integrated into the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

The main changes to the NPPF placed an emphasis on strategic planning (including joint working across boundaries), housing delivery, infrastructure enhancement and strong environmental protection. It was considered that the revisions would have a positive impact on the Greater Norwich Local Plan, due to an increase in the flexibility of policies.

The key themes changed within the NPPF that were relevant to the GNLP were:

- Design quality and effective use of land
- Environmental protection
- Diversification and mix of sites to improve delivery
- Developer contributions

These changes would require plan-making to take account of design standards, bio-diversity, sustainable access to sites, co-location of housing and employment areas and a greater diversity of homes for different markets. A review of the Community Infrastructure Levy would also be undertaken, when Government guidance was available.

Other changes included strengthening the Duty to Cooperate over cross boundaries into a Statement of Common Ground in order to meet stronger, more consistent expectations. Plans would also be subject to rolling five year reviews, which would mean that work on them would be ongoing.

A new Government methodology for assessing housing need, based on projections was awaited. This was a complex process, but early indications suggested that it would lead to fewer new dwellings being required in Broadland than under the previous methodology.

A Housing Delivery Test (HDT) had also been introduced to calculate net additional dwellings against the number of homes required.

Local authorities that did not meet HDT requirements would be required to produce an Action Plan that explained the under-delivery and the ways that delivery rates could be increased. Broadland's housing delivery could be measured over the whole of Greater Norwich rather than by district.

The Spatial Planning Manager confirmed that the NPPF had implications for Local Plans, but less so for Neighbourhood Plans. However, since Neighbourhood Plans had to conform to the strategic policies of Local Plans, it would be wise for Neighbourhood Plans to take account of any changes.

In respect of density, it was confirmed that there was a push in urban areas to make greater use of the space available. This increasingly meant that houses were being built with more storeys.

Members were advised that although local plans would seek to set out a strategy for community healthcare facilities, the recruitment of healthcare professionals, especially GPs, could not be addressed by the planning system.

Frustration was expressed by Members regarding delays in the commencement of construction following the granting of planning permission. However, it was acknowledged that there was a set timeframe for starting building that could not be accelerated.

AGREED

to note the key changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and the potential implications for the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

32 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

to exclude the Press and public from the meeting for the remaining business because otherwise, information which was exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 would be disclosed to them.

33 PROPOSAL FOR A JOINT STRATEGIC HOUSING STATEMENT FOR BROADLAND AND SOUTH NORFOLK

Following the decision by Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council to introduce a shared services arrangement, with one shared officer team led by a joint Managing Director, it was decided that a Joint Strategic

Housing Statement would be produced, which would complement each councils' existing Housing Strategies.

The housing markets of the two local authorities were similar and Broadland and South Norfolk Councils were both committed to active involvement in the housing market. Both authorities were also committed to substantial growth through the Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy and the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan.

Both councils had also transferred their housing stock to a housing association, so there were no 'council houses' in either administrative area. Consequently, both relied on close partnership working with housing associations to deliver new affordable homes and to make the best use of existing stock.

The Joint Strategic Housing Statement would seek to:

- establish a common approach to tenures and qualification for affordable home ownership;
- introduce 'essential worker' housing;
- establish the mutual qualification for available social housing for rent across both Districts; and
- take a joint approach to meeting need for supported housing.

It was anticipated that the Joint Strategic Housing Statement could be proposed for formal adoption by April 2019.

AGREED

to note the briefing paper.

The meeting closed at 7.40pm

PLACE SHAPING PANEL

4 December 2018

Final Papers

Item	Details	Page No
5	<u>Draft Response to the National Parks Review Call for Evidence Consultation</u>	10 – 19

DEMOCRATIC SERVICES

Broadland District Council
Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Norwich, NR7 0DU
Tel: 01603 430428
Email: cst@broadland.gov.uk

DRAFT RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL PARKS REVIEW CALL FOR EVIDENCE CONSULTATION

Portfolio Holder: Planning

Wards Affected: All within, or partly within the Broads Area

1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 Comments on the National Parks Review call for evidence consultation have been drafted. The Panel's views are sought on these.

2 KEY DECISION

- 2.1 This is not a key decision and has not been published in the Forward Plan.

3 INTRODUCTION

- 3.1 The Government has asked for an independent review of England's National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs). A review team, led by Julian Glover and a panel with a range of experiences and interests, has been set up and is currently holding a 'call for evidence' consultation (see Appendix 2). This consultation largely focuses on matters that are directly applicable to the national park authorities (including the Broads Authority). However, there are a couple of issues, relating to possible changes to boundaries and governance arrangements, that are felt to warrant a specific response by the Councils; in particular, it is understood that the Broads Authority will be submitting comments seeking an extension of their boundary to include the full extent of the parishes that the Broads Area are within. A draft response is appended to this report. This has been produced for consideration by both Broadland and South Norfolk Councils.
- 3.2 For Broadland, the comments would be submitted, under delegated procedures, by the Head of Planning in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder. The Panel's views on the comments are requested. The views of South Norfolk Council would also be taken into consideration in forming the final comments.

4 PROPOSED ACTION

- 4.1 It is proposed that the draft comments, with any appropriate amendments, are submitted to the National Parks Review Team as this Council's views on the 'call for evidence' consultation.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None arising directly from this report.

6 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None arising directly from this report. The current consultation is only a 'call for evidence' and further procedures would be necessary if the Government was minded to make any changes to National Parks.

7 RECOMMENDATION

7.1 The Panel is **RECOMMENDED** to endorse the response and suggest amendments to the proposed comments if appropriate.

Phil Courtier
Head of Planning

Background papers

None.

For further information on this report call John Walchester on (01603) 430622 or email john.walchester@broadland.gov.uk.

Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council Draft Response to the National Park Review - The Future of England's National Parks, Call for Evidence Consultation Dec 2018.

Relating to specific questions:

Q19. Designation of boundaries (and potential extension of boundaries of Broads Area).

The Broads Area, under the auspices of the Broads Authority, has equivalent status to a National Park. It is closely focused on river and wetland habitats, including internationally important wetland. As a result of its close focus, it largely excludes settlements and built-up areas even though it does extend into the centre of the regional city of Norwich. The districts of Broadland and South Norfolk lie at its core, with Broadland being between the northern “arms” of the Broads Area provided by the rivers Bure and Yare / Wensum, and South Norfolk within the corresponding southern “arms” of the rivers Yare / Wensum and Waveney.

As such, a large part of the outer edge of both districts comes within the Broads Area, and the Broads provides a valuable recreational resource for residents to visit. This value is also more widely recognised, nationally and internationally, with the name Norfolk and Suffolk Broads being synonymous with wildlife and water-based recreation.

This importance must continue to be recognised and expanded upon, for example in relation to the increasing importance of wildlife and habitats and its co-existence with recreation and enjoyment of the countryside. However, it is also important that any changes do not dilute the primary reasons for the creation of The Broads; that is, the protection and enjoyment of the specific areas that comprise the unique character area that is The Broads, and maintaining the navigation of the waterways. There has been a longstanding positive relationship with the Broads Authority. The Authority is represented on the member and officer groups overseeing the strategic planning of Broadland, South Norfolk and Norwich (the Greater Norwich Development Partnership), and the significance of the Broads is reflected in current and emerging planning documents and consequently the decisions that are made in accordance with those policies.

In terms of its boundaries, the current boundaries are appropriately defined to include those areas that accord with the identifiable character of The Broads, and also relevant to the purposes of the Broads Authority. The possibility of extending its boundaries would not be appropriate; this would merely include areas that actually had no close relationship to the defining characteristics of the Broads Area. Consequently, such extensions would simply incorporate areas of a general character, and so dilute and devalue its importance, with no benefit to helping meet the purpose of its designation.

A corresponding factor is that extending the boundaries, for example to include the whole of adjoining parishes, would place inappropriate and unnecessary restrictions on those areas. The settlements and other populated areas in the adjoining parishes do not relate well to the Broads area, rather their relationships are with the settlements, transport and service networks located away from the Broads. It would be illogical, and detrimental to the planning and infrastructure and service delivery for these settlements, for them to be included within a redefined Broads Area. The district councils would object and strongly resist any proposals to extend the boundaries in this way.

Since its inception, as well as through membership of the Broads Authority, all the relevant district councils, plus the County Councils, have worked closely with the Broads Authority and ensured that planning and other cross-boundary matters are discussed and dealt with.

A particular example is the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework which includes the Broads Authority and all the other planning authorities in Norfolk. A similar arrangement exists in Suffolk. This helps to enable effective planning across the area in accordance with the Government's "duty to co-operate" requirement for planning authorities. Such working relationships should continue to be built-upon rather than undertaking significant changes.

Q15. Governance

As discussed in the response to Q2, the relevant district councils have long worked with the Broads Authority and have good working relationships. These relationships should be built upon rather than making significant changes to the governance structure as it relates to the local authorities.

Landscapes review team panel

Landscapes review: call for evidence

October 2018

Contents

Overview 1

Introduction 1

 Confidentiality and data protection information 2

Before anything else 2

Part 1 - Opening thoughts..... 3

Part 2 - Views 3

Part 3 - Current ways of working..... 3

Part 4 - Closing thoughts 4

How to respond..... 4

Overview

The government has asked for an independent review of England's National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs). You can find more about the work of the [review](#) and our [Terms of Reference](#). Already the review team, led by Julian Glover and a panel with a range of experiences and interests, has carried out visits and meetings in many parts of England.

We will do more in the months ahead - but we want everyone to have a chance to contribute, whether you live in a National Park or AONB, run a business in them, enjoy visiting, care about landscapes and biodiversity, or represent an organisation with views that might shape and improve our findings. The questions are a guide: please do not feel you must answer them all – or have to write at great length. We have not set a word length on answers, as we know some people and organisations will want to reply in detail on specific points. However, we ask that where possible you keep each individual answer to no more than 500 words. It is not necessary to reply to every question so please ignore those which you do not think relevant to you. You may find it easier to write your answers elsewhere before pasting them into the text boxes which follow.

Introduction

1. Are you replying as a member of the public or on behalf of an organisation?

- Member of public
- Organisation

2. If you are replying as a member of public

a) What is your name?

b) What is your email address? If you enter your email address then you will automatically receive an acknowledgement email when you submit your response. We may also use this to contact you further.

c) Please tick all that apply

- I live in a National Park or AONB
- I work in a National Park or AONB
- I visit a National Park or AONB

3. If you are replying on behalf of an organisation or organisations

a) Which organisation(s)?

b) What is your name and position?

c) What is your email address? If you enter your email address then you will automatically receive an acknowledgement email when you submit your response. We may also use this to contact you further.

4. We would like to be able to use extracts from submissions in our final report. If you would not like them, potentially, to be made public, please tell us here. (Required)

- Yes, I'm content for you to use extracts of my response in the final report
- No, you may not use extracts from my response in the final report

5. We have obligations under freedom of information laws and there is more information below. For the purposes of these laws, would you like your response to be confidential? (Required)

- Yes
- No
- If you have answered yes, please give your reason

Confidentiality and data protection information

Information in responses to this call for evidence may be subject to release to the public or other parties in accordance with the access to information law (these are primarily the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIRs), the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and the Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA)).

Defra / The Review may publish the content of your response to this call for evidence to make it available to the public without your personal name and private contact details (e.g. name, email address, etc).

If you say 'Yes' you want your response kept confidential, please clearly state what information you would like to be kept confidential and why. This is to help us balance these obligations for disclosure against any obligation of confidentiality. If we receive a request for the information that you have provided in your response to this consultation, we will take full account of your reasons for requesting confidentiality of your response, but we cannot guarantee that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances.

If you click on 'No' in response to the question asking if you would like anything in your response to be kept confidential, we will be able to release the content of your response to the public, but we won't make your personal name and private contact details publicly available.

Before anything else

6. We would love to know what makes National Parks and AONBs special to you

We invite you to submit a recent picture which sums up what is special to you about our designated landscapes. It could be a place, a person, on a farm or of plants and wildlife. If you submit a photo, you must own its copyright and it may be used in the final report or online. Please tell us if that is OK.

- Yes, you can use my photo online or in the report

- No, you may not publish my photo

Part 1 - Opening thoughts

We would like any opening thoughts on the role played by National Parks and AONBs - you may want to make a more detailed suggestion further on.

7. What do you think works overall about the present system of National Parks and AONBs in England? Add any points that apply specifically to only National Parks or AONBs.

8. What do you think does not work overall about the system and might be changed? Add any points that apply specifically to National Parks or AONBs.

Part 2 - Views

We'd like to hear views on particular issues.

9. What views do you have about the role National Parks and AONBs play in nature conservation and biodiversity?

a) Could they do more to enhance our wildlife and support the recovery of our natural habitats?

10. What views do you have about the role National Parks and AONBs play in shaping landscape and beauty, or protecting cultural heritage?

11. What views do you have about the role National Parks and AONBs play in working with farmers and land managers and how might this change as the current system of farm payments is reformed?

12. What views do you have about the role National Parks and AONBs play in supporting and managing access and recreation?

13. What views do you have about the way National Park and AONB authorities affect people who live and work in their areas?

a) Are they properly supporting them and what could be done differently?

14. What views do you have on the role National Park and AONB authorities play on housing and transport in their areas?

Part 3 - Current ways of working

We'd like to ask some specific questions about the way National Parks and AONBs work at the moment.

15. What views do you have on the way they are governed individually at the moment? Is it effective or does it need to change, if so, how?
16. What views do you have on whether they work collectively at the moment, for instance to share goals, encourage interest and involvement by the public and other organisations?
17. What views do you have on their efforts to involve people from all parts of society, to encourage volunteering and improve health and well-being?
18. What views do you have on the way they are funded and how this might change?
19. What views do you have on the process of designation - which means the way boundaries are defined and changed?
20. What views do you have on whether areas should be given new designations? For instance, the creation of new National Parks or AONBs, or new types of designations for marine areas, urban landscapes or those near built-up areas
21. Are there lessons that might be learnt from the way designated landscapes work in other parts of the United Kingdom, or abroad?

Part 4 - Closing thoughts

22. Do you think the terms currently used are the right ones? Would you suggest an alternative title for AONBs, for instance and if so what?
23. The review has been asked to consider how designated landscapes work with other designations such as National Trails, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and Special Protected Areas (SPAs). Do you have any thoughts on how these relationships work and whether they could be improved?
24. Do you have any other points you would like to make that are not covered above?

How to respond

Responses to this call for evidence must be submitted online via Citizen Space by 18 December 2018 at:

<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/land-use/landscapes-review-call-for-evidence/>

If you are unable to submit online, please contact us at landscapes.review@defra.gsi.gov.uk or 0208 895 5371 and we will work with you to find a different way of responding.



© Crown copyright 2018

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence v.3. To view this licence visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/ or email PSI@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/publications

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

landscapes.review@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Or please call 0207 895 5371