

Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership



AGENDA

GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD Tuesday, 22 September 2020 2:00pm: via Microsoft Teams

1. Introductions and Apologies
2. Declaration of Interests
3. Approval of minutes of last meeting and matters arising
4. Government Consultations – (1) Planning for the Future White Paper and (2) Changes to the current planning system **MG**
5. Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update **MG**
6. Waste and Minerals Local Plans Update **SG/SB**
7. Homes England Capacity Funding projects monitoring **PM**
8. Any other business **ALL**
9. Future Meetings



ITEM 3	MINUTES OF THE GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD (JPAB) MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 30 JUNE 2020 VIA MS TEAMS
---------------	---

Ashfield: Councillor M Relf
Broxtowe: Councillor D Watts
City: Councillor S Longford; Councillor L Woodings
Derbyshire County: Councillor T King
Erewash: Councillor M Powell
Gedling: Councillor J Hollingsworth
Nottinghamshire County: Councillor T Harper (Chair); Councillor G Wheeler

Officers in Attendance

Ashfield: Christine Sarris
Broxtowe: Ruth Hyde; Steffan Saunders; Mark Thompson
Derbyshire County: Steve Buffery
Erewash: Steve Birkinshaw; Oliver Dove
Gedling: Alison Gibson
Growth Point: Matthew Gregory; Peter McAnespie
Nottingham City: Paul Seddon
Nottinghamshire County: Sally Gill; Ken Harrison
Rushcliffe: David Mitchell

AECOM: David Carlisle; Ben Castell

Apologies

Broxtowe: Councillor J McGrath
Rushcliffe: Councillor R Upton

1. Introductions and Apologies

Councillor T Harper (Chair) welcomed Members and Officers attending the closed meeting which needed to be virtual to meet Covid-19 regulations. Apologies were noted.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Approval of Minutes of the Last Meeting and Matters Arising

- 3.1 Cllr Powell commented that the minutes circulated with the agenda papers were not the latest version which referred to his item under AOB. OD clarified that the amended minutes also confirmed that Steve Birkinshaw had attended the meeting held on 17 December 2019. **ACTION: PJW to circulate amended minutes.**

4. Presentations

- 4.1 (a) Toton draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Ken Harrison)

KH gave a presentation showing slides of the areas around Chetwynd Barracks and the HS2 Strategy. The railway station at Toton will include an innovative campus providing 4,500 homes across both sites with a mixed use approach. Further engagement on the Masterplan proposals are due to take place in the Autumn.

Toton Hub is equally distanced to both Nottingham and Derby centres, adjacent to Toton and Chetwynd Barracks and the A52 to the north. Its location is accessible to Ratcliffe on Soar and to the East Midlands Airport area. The Masterplan will ensure that infrastructure is delivered including new schools or school expansions. It will also improve connections with existing communities including Long Eaton. The Toton Delivery Board's aims are for jobs and opportunities in the development and to connect surrounding towns and communities. Access and movement of traffic would strategically improve the site with the terminus of the Park & Ride and NET extension.

The SPD recommends an enhanced network of blue and green environmental assets. It focuses on infrastructure, opportunities, and the location's unique strengths.

The SPD process allows for consultation and public engagement which will be led by BBC with the Toton Delivery Board. There will be a meeting in September to consider and finalise the document. PS pointed out that the public consultation will be complimentary with the Local Plan. **ACTION: PJW to circulate presentation slides.**

SS emphasised the huge collaboration through the Local Plan process involving infrastructure, transport, economic development, jobs and healthy living remit with the Toton Neighbourhood Forum. It is ambitious for the local area with an impressive growth agenda shaping growth in the community and getting the best out of it. Key principles can be established including good connectivity, green

Infrastructure connections and links to nearby and further afield. It is a key gateway site to Long Eaton to the south west and Stapleford to the north.

PS gave Nottingham City's perspective and reinforced SS's need for connectivity plans. We need to ensure that connectivity is planned and is also delivered. The innovative campus must deliver employment as well as housing, and a mechanism is required to prevent displacement from existing centres with new job opportunities across the greater Nottingham.

KH referred to discussions at Toton Delivery Board about the sites connectivity. It will ensure that the station has both east and west street grid connection with Long Eaton having access by multiple modes for north and south links to Stapleford and Sandiacre. The short term phasing of connectivity involves a link road from Bardills Island.

LW referred to one particular slide which showed a large area of yellow on the pie charts which illustrated houses being built around the station with connection crucial to the success of the site. She raised her concern that the balance was overly residential, and there are opportunities for more high quality employment development in this highly accessible location.

KH explained that ARUP had incorporated an integrated approach and had advised in their framework for 4,500 homes across both sites and 6,500 employment opportunities.

MP wanted to ensure that all the initiatives being developed by different teams are all linked and delivering the same message.

KH confirmed that senior officers work jointly to ensure co-ordination.

DW would be attending the Toton Masterplan Working Group on Thursday 2 July and asked if the slides could be made available.

4.2 (b) Growth Options Study (David Carlisle and Ben Castell from AECOM)

DC and BC gave a presentation to review and assess the growth potential of Greater Nottingham in a variety of locations or new standalone sites. Their methodology was to look at opportunities and constraints. Utilising relevant expertise and a sift mapping exercise, they looked at potential areas, visited sites, and assessed their suitability for new strategic development.

Each site was assessed on a sustainable basis with due regard to planning constraints and constraints for habitat, flood zones, agricultural land, heritage and the natural environment. Potential options to access existing transport hubs (eg HS2 line and East Midlands Hub), and access to highway/rail network together with the level of service were analysed.

The consultants have previously worked with the partner councils to prepare the 2010 'Tribal' studies. They have remodelled existing larger settlements to account for recent growth, improved access to public transport and services, town centres and school capacity.

Typologies were divided into three categories of small, medium and large sites.

Results summary showed the number of hectares assessed as potentially suitable for each authority for the next plan period.

Broxtowe	1,160
Erewash	1,200
Gedling	980
Rushcliffe	3,830

They considered the future connectivity and public transport network over the next 20-40 years for instance potential NET extensions and aspirations for bus and light rapid transport systems which might benefit and improve development links between Nottingham and Derby.

MR queried why Ashfield and Hucknall were not included, as it is part of the Greater Nottingham Growth area.

MG explained that the brief was set by Local Authorities – ADC was excluded due to it progressing its own Local Plan. CS also mentioned that the plans were misleading as Hucknall was shown to be part of GBC. She agreed with Cllr Relf that Duty to Co-operate requires clarity and that GBC and ADC should work together on their growth locations.

MP referred to the Executive Summary and his concerns that EBC had selected sites for public consultation which could provide enough housing to be built to meet requirements and queried why a site would be chosen on the Green Belt.

DC explained that Hopwell Hall (G9) was shown as potentially suitable for growth, but that not all sites will be developed. The main drivers were what would be the most suitable development patterns and growth, and that would be a decision for individual Councils.

DM recognised there was a need to have housing sites south of the river but there is currently enough housing capacity upto 2036 and demand for the next 15-20 years already being met.

DW raised concerns regarding site B8.

DC accepted that Trowell was constrained by ridge lines and development needed to be more focused west of the main built up area.

SS emphasised that before making a decision on any site sustainability appraisal and other assessments will be required.

ACTION: PJW to circulate copy of presentation.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to RECEIVE presentations on:

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| (a) Toton SPD | Ken Harrison |
| (b) Greater Nottingham Growth Options Study | AECOM |

5. Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update (Matt Gregory)

MG's presentation was based on Nottingham City/Broxtowe/ Gedling/Rushcliffe areas, but not Erewash as they were currently undergoing their Options for Growth Consultation. This had however been stalled during the lockdown. Their consultation period has therefore been extended to 20 July 2020.

ADC has commissioned an evidence base to support their Local Plan and are progressing through lockdown.

The Growth Options consultation seeks views from a wide range of stakeholders (developers and Statutory Bodies) and the general public with a number of questions to prompt comment. This document will be made available from 6 July on the partnership's website.

The document includes key objectives such as tackling climate change, education, economic development, new jobs and enough homes of the right type including affordable and adaptable homes of our future population make up. Following the pandemic there needs to be emphasis on creating vibrant and viable city and town centres to help restore growth, a natural environment and a biodiversity of new development construction and healthy communities.

It was recognised that government's standard methodology for new housing need is a starting point to consider whether we needed a higher or lower figure. The scale of growth expected by the standard methodology is 51,000 new homes by 2038. SHLAAs indicate that this total could be met, but sites might not be the right sites for our strategy and it is only a starting point.

Options include promoting urban intensification around the main built up areas, a more dispersed option on key settlements within districts or new settlements. There is a need to strengthen the network of town and district centres who have faced economic challenges accelerated by Covid. The retail centres need to change accordingly but remain vibrant and include development of exemplary design where people want to live and work and enjoy their lives which has not previously been met.

Options could also promote growth which best matches blue and green infrastructure, and transport led options to promote more public transport against the private car and improve transport networks.

An overlay of green and blue infrastructure on the Growth Options map would identify gaps and how best to enhance networks. It must reflect existing commitments such as HS2.

The Green Belt is an important planning tool which can be a sensitive issue. We need to aspire economic growth for instance around Toton, to implement economic development alongside new homes and to support the LEP Strategy.

The assessment of Gypsies and Travellers and travelling show people accommodation needs has been delayed due to.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:

- (c) NOTE the consultation on the Growth Options planned to commence on 6 July 2020; and**
- (d) NOTE the situation with the Erewash Growth Options Consultation.**

6. **Waste and Minerals Local Plans Update** (Sally Gill/Steve Buffery)

- 6.1 SG explained that due to Covid-19 the Examination in Public into the Minerals Draft Local Plan has had to be postponed from April 2020 and a new date is awaited from the Inspectorate.
- 6.2 The consultation period for the Issues and Options document for the Joint Waste Plan with Nottingham City was extended to May 2020. Officers are currently assessing the responses.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to NOTE the progress with the Nottinghamshire/Nottingham and Derbyshire Waste and Minerals Local Plans.

7. **Homes England Capacity Funding projects monitoring**
(Peter McAnespie)

- 7.1 PMcA reported project progress for Quarter 4 of Year 3 of the Capacity Funding. He referred to the Stanton site, work on which had stalled, but noted it was intended to be reported to Erewash Borough Council's Executive on 7 July, outlining how the funding could identify the infrastructure required to support that site.
- 7.2 PMcA will report timescales for projects at the next meeting.
- 7.3 RBC had approval to extend the post of Strategic Development Officer for up to nine months at a cost of £45,000.

Joint Planning Advisory Board resolved to:

- (a) NOTE this report; and**
- (b) NOTE the decision of Executive Steering Group to repurpose £45,201.73 of grant funding for Rushcliffe.**

8. **Joint Planning Advisory Board Budget 2020/21**
(Matt Gregory)

- 8.1 MG referred to the figures in Table 1 of the report which set out the position at last financial year. Table 2 illustrated the budget for the current year incorporating the carried forward figures from the previous year and partner contributions. Table 2 shows how we would envisage those resources to be committed and expended. JPAB could allocate the surplus of £25,000 to planning jobs on next year's budget. MG also mentioned other funding was available for BBC, GBC, NCC and RBC from the Brownfield Register pilot scheme.

8.2 ESG had agreed partner contributions over the next three years totalling £70,800. Invoices will be issued to each authority imminently.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to

- (a) NOTE the budget position at the close of 2019/20; and**
- (b) APPROVE the budget for 2020/21; and**
- (c) NOTE the partner contributions to the work of JPAB during 2020/21.**

9. **Any other business**

DM asked KH to amend the Development Corporation Draft Planning Statement of Intent in order to clarify the role in respect of strategic planning. MG agreed to propose revised wording with KH.

10. **Future Meetings 2020**

MG announced the next two JPAB meetings below but wanted the dates to be kept under review, to allow consideration of consultation processes for EBC and the other Councils Growth Options, with the aim of ensuring that plan making processes are aligned and complementary.

Cllr Relf wished to continue with virtual meetings to conform with our green aspirations.

DATE	TIME	VENUE
Tuesday 22 September	2.00 pm	MS Teams meeting (to be agreed)
Tuesday 15 December	2.00 pm	Council Chamber, Ground Floor, Council Offices, Beeston (to be agreed)

MEETING CLOSED AT 3.45 PM

ITEM 4 Government Consultations – (1) Planning for the Future White Paper and (2) Changes to the current planning system

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published its much-anticipated Planning for the Future white paper on 6th August 2020. The white paper contains far-reaching proposed changes to the planning system, which will impact on the work of this Committee. The consultation on the white paper closes on 31st October 2020. A parallel consultation, proposing changes to the ‘standard methodology’ for calculating housing need has also been published, with an earlier consultation deadline of 1st October 2020

Recommendations

It is recommended that Joint Planning Advisory Board:

- (a) **CONSIDER** the implications of the Government Consultations on the current planning system and on the Planning for the Future White Paper; and
- (b) **DELEGATE** the preparation of a joint response on matters of strategic interest where there is a consensus of view to the Executive Steering Group.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Government has long been of the view that the planning system is too complex for its users to navigate, adding costs and delay to both plan making and to decision taking. In particular it is considered to be a break on development and growth. A series of incremental changes have been introduced in the past decade or so with the aim of speeding up the process, but the Government has decided that a root and branch review of the whole planning system is required to address its perceived failings.
- 2.2 Section 3 below gives an overview of the white paper proposals, whilst appendix 1 lists the consultation questions which are of a strategic nature and of most relevance to Joint Planning Advisory Board (JPAB). An initial reaction to the question is also included to prompt debate, but these are ‘work in progress’ and are not meant to represent the views of the JPAB.

3.0 Planning for the Future White Paper

- 3.1 The Government has long held the view that the planning system is outdated, slow and bureaucratic. The publication of the Planning for the Future white paper proposes a wholesale review of both plan making, decision taking and developer contributions. The white paper can be viewed at

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>. Its main proposals are summarised below.

- 3.2 Local plans would be simplified and focus on identifying three categories of land – "growth areas" that are "suitable for substantial development"; "renewal areas" that are "suitable for development"; and "protected areas". In "growth areas", outline approval would be automatically granted for forms and types of development specified in the plan. Development in renewal areas would "cover existing built areas where smaller scale development is appropriate" and could include the "gentle densification" of residential areas, development in town centres, and small sites in and around villages. There would be a "statutory presumption in favour of development" specified in the plan. Protected areas, including green belt, conservation areas and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), would still be subject to "more stringent" development controls and full planning applications would be required for new schemes.
- 3.3 Local plans should be subject to a single and "simplified" statutory "sustainable development" test, replacing the existing "tests of soundness". This new test "would consider whether the plan contributes to achieving sustainable development in accordance with policy issued by the secretary of state", the consultation states. The test could also "become less prescriptive about the need to demonstrate deliverability".
- 3.4 Instead of general policies for development, local plans would be required to set out site- and area-specific requirements for development, alongside locally-produced design codes. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) "would become the primary source of policies for development management".
- 3.5 The legal duty to cooperate, which requires local planning authorities to continuously and effectively engage with neighbours on strategic issues such as housing need, "would be removed". However, it adds that "further consideration will be given to the way in which strategic cross-boundary issues, such as major infrastructure or strategic sites, can be adequately planned for, including the scale at which plans are best prepared in areas with significant strategic challenges".
- 3.6 The government is considering scrapping the five-year housing land supply requirement. The document says its "proposed approach should ensure that enough land is planned for, and with sufficient certainty about its availability for development, to avoid a continuing requirement to be able to demonstrate a five-year supply of land". However, it proposes to "maintain the housing delivery test and the presumption in favour of sustainable development as part of the new system".
- 3.7 Councils and the Planning Inspectorate would be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable of no more than 30 months for plan preparation with "sanctions for those who fail to do so". The average time taken from plan publication to adoption rose from an average of 450 days in 2009 to 815 days in 2019, the paper states, while there is "currently no statutory requirement around timescales for key stages of the plan-making process".

- 3.8 The need for sustainability appraisals alongside plans would be abolished and instead a "simplified process for assessing the environmental impact of plans, which would continue to satisfy the requirements of UK and international law and treaties".
- 3.9 Local plans would need to be "visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology and supported by a new standard template", the document says.
- 3.10 The planning process would be increasingly digitised, moving from "a process based on documents to a process driven by data". Local authorities would be helped to use digital tools to support "a new civic engagement process for local plans and decision-making".
- 3.11 Under a proposed new "fast-track for beauty", proposals for high-quality developments that reflect local character and preferences would benefit from "automatic permission". New development would be expected to create a "net gain" to areas' appearance.
- 3.12 Design codes, which would be expected to be prepared locally, would be made "more binding" on planning decisions. A new body would be established to support the delivery of design codes across the country.
- 3.13 The standard housing need method would be changed so that the requirement would be "binding" on local planning authorities who would "have to deliver [it] through their local plans". The new method "would be a means of distributing the national housebuilding target of 300,000 new homes annually". It says the requirement would be focused on areas where affordability pressure is highest and on brownfield land. It would also have regard to the "size of existing urban settlements" in an area, and the "extent of land constraints".
- 3.14 A new 'single infrastructure levy' will replace the existing developer contributions system of section 106 agreements and the community infrastructure levy. The government says the new levy will be a nationally-set, flat rate charge and would be based on the final value (or likely sales value) of a development. It says it intends the new levy to raise more revenue than under the current system of developer contributions, and deliver "at least as much" affordable housing, and on-site affordable housing, as at present
- 3.15 The new levy could be used to "capture a greater proportion of the land value uplift that occurs through the grant of planning permission, and use this to enhance infrastructure delivery. But such a move "would need to be balanced against risks to development viability".
- 3.16 The scope of the levy "could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights". Such a move "would allow these developments to better contribute to infrastructure delivery and making development acceptable to the community.
- 3.17 Big development sites would be split between developers to accelerate delivery. The government proposes to revise the NPPF to make it clear that masterplans and design codes for sites prepared for substantial development should seek to include a

variety of development types from different builders, which would allow more phases to come forward together.

- 3.18 Community consultation at the planning application stage is to be “streamlined”. Instead, there would be “a new emphasis on engagement at the plan-making stage”, the document says.
- 3.19 The determination of planning applications "should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines". The "well-established time limits of eight or 13 weeks for determining an application from validation to decision should be a firm deadline – not an aspiration which can be got around through extensions of time as routinely happens now".
- 3.20 Applications should be "shorter and more standardised". There should be just "one key standardised planning statement of no more than 50 pages to justify the development proposals", the paper proposes.
- 3.21 Penalties for councils that fail to determine an application within the statutory time limits could involve "the automatic refund of the planning fee for the application". Ministers also "want to explore whether some types of applications should be deemed to have been granted planning permission if there has not been a timely determination". Where applications are refused and the decision is overturned at appeal, the paper proposes that "applicants will be entitled to an automatic rebate of their planning application fee".
- 3.22 Each local planning authority would be required to have a chief officer for design and place-making.
- 3.23 Fees should continue to be set nationally but "cover at least the full cost" of processing applications, "based on clear national benchmarking". It added that this "should involve the greater regulation of discretionary pre-application charging to ensure it is fair and proportionate". The costs of operating the planning system should be "principally funded" by developer contributions "rather than the national or local taxpayer". Currently, the document says, "the cost of development management activities by local planning authorities is to a large extent covered by planning fees". However, the "cost of preparing local plans and enforcement activities is now largely funded from the local planning authority's own resources". In future plan making functions could be funded from the Infrastructure Levy.
- 3.24 The government has promised to "develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms". Proposals for "improving the resourcing of planning departments" will be published "later this year", it adds.
- 3.25 Councils "should be subject to a new performance framework which ensures continuous improvement across all planning functions from local plans to decision-making and enforcement – and enables early intervention if problems emerge with individual authorities".
- 3.26 Consultation on the white paper proposals run for 12 weeks until October 29. The suggested changes to local plans, developer contributions and development

management will require primary legislation followed by secondary legislation. The white paper expects new local plans to be in place by the end of the Parliament.

- 3.27 Clearly, these are very significant changes to the planning system, which will require a considered response. All Councils will be responding in their own right, but it is also recommended that a joint response be prepared on behalf of the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board, on matters of strategic interest where there is a consensus of view.
- 3.28 Appendix 1 to this report starts to consider the implications of the white paper, and is for discussion. (Note this is work in progress).

4.0 Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations

- 4.1 A separate consultation document has also been published, of most relevance to JPAB is the proposed revised standard methodology for calculating housing need, but it also includes changes to affordable housing policy and to Permission in Principle. The consultation document is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system>.
- 4.2 If the new proposals for the standard methodology are unchanged by the consultation, they result in the following outcomes to the housing need of the councils making up Greater Nottingham:

Local Planning Authority	Current standard method	Proposed standard method
Ashfield DC	481	813
Broxtowe BC	368	490
Erewash BC	392	344
Gedling BC	458	534
Nottingham City	1,149	897
Rushcliffe BC	604	1,054

- 4.3 The standard methodology will be replaced in due course by the binding figures proposed by the white paper (paragraph 3.13 above).

Contact officer:-

Matt Gregory
Greater Nottingham Planning Manager
0115 876 3981
matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

APPENDIX 1

PLANNING WHITE PAPER

A NEW APPROACH TO PLAN-MAKING

Pillar One – Planning for development

Initial comment:

Over-arching thoughts: –

Is now the right time to introduce significant changes to the planning system? The UK economy is extremely fragile, and seeking to recover from the pandemic, major planning changes could potentially threaten recovery, for instance by deterring investment until the planning system has settled.

How will this system assist in the “levelling up” the UK, as Government housing targets in the context of no national or regional plan will deliver continue current trends in growth.

The approach appears to be geared towards major developments, such as urban extensions and new settlements, but how the fine grained complex character and history of a built up urban area is taken into account less certain.

Given the front loading of planning into plan making, and the emphasis on design codes for all areas, there is a danger that the approach will not simplify or speed up planning – development and design are subjective. There is a risk that design becomes more bureaucratic and less creative.

Proposal 1: The role of land use plans should be simplified. We propose that Local Plans should identify three types of land – Growth areas suitable for substantial development, Renewal areas suitable for development, and areas that are Protected.

Initial comment:

Defining just 3 areas with a blanket approach within each area could be a very blunt tool. It is potentially unsophisticated and not fine grained enough to address development in complex urban areas.

It does seem better suited to managing change for major developments, such as new settlements, urban extensions, or large areas of targeted regeneration.

Examples of zoning systems from elsewhere (eg New York) do not bear out the claim that zoning systems are simpler and shorter.

Proposal 2: Development management policies established at national scale and an altered role for Local Plans.

Initial comment:

In principle this could help to simplify local plans. The NPPF already does this to some extent, but could go further. However, there is a risk that it could remove key areas of local influence from democratic process, and not all areas are the same and are not experiencing the same issues.

Where it gave a clear steer to developers, and provides a level playing field nationally, eg for carbon neutrality and other key elements of sustainable development, it could be beneficial.

Proposal 3: Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, replacing the existing tests of soundness. The Duty to Cooperate would be abolished. Public engagement is proposed to be largely through plan making, with permission being established through the plan in many instances.

Initial comment:

Sustainability Appraisals have become an industry in their own right, and simplification would be welcome.

Whilst the W.P. advocates removing the Duty to Cooperate, it does not offer up any alternative approach to dealing with strategic planning matters. The Duty to Cooperate may not be ideal, but without an alternative to planning for strategic development across and between functional areas such as Housing Market Areas, the government will not meet its housebuilding aims. Too many LPAs are constrained, either through being urban and not having enough land to meet their own housing needs, or so environmentally constrained (Green Belt, AONBs etc) that they cannot meet their own needs. It is acknowledged that this recommendation could be tied in with the forthcoming Devolution White Paper.

However, the Duty has worked in the past in Greater Nottingham, and proposals risk breaking what is already established, without a replacement.

If most public engagement with the planning system is through plan making, then this significantly undermines democratic controls later in the process. It is well understood that people engage in the planning system when it directly affects them, ie at planning applications stage, and less so when proposals are notional, as in a local plan. The proposals risk reducing the opportunity for consultation and public input into planning proposals.

Proposal 4: A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. The housing requirement would factor in land constraints and opportunities to more effectively use land, including through densification where appropriate, to ensure that the land is identified in the most appropriate areas and housing targets are met.

Initial comment:

The planning system is often held to be responsible for the housing crisis, but around 90 per cent of planning applications are approved in England, and consent has been granted for up to one million homes that are yet to be built.

However, it is agreed that a methodology is required to determining housing need, but this needs managing across functional areas, ie Housing Market Areas. Any methodology should be sophisticated enough to take account of areas like Greater Nottingham, which made up of a number of authorities, the City is tightly bounded, so has little opportunity to extend the built up area, whilst surrounding boroughs are tightly constrained by Green Belt. Having a methodology linked to household projections does risk simply providing for more homes where they cannot be provided, so a regional or even national perspective is required.

A STREAMLINED DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCESS WITH AUTOMATIC PLANNING PERMISSION FOR SCHEMES IN LINE WITH PLANS

Proposal 5: Areas identified as Growth areas (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while automatic approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building.

Initial comment:

This could be a very blunt a tool, as there will be sub divisions within growth areas suitable for different types of development, and unsuitable for others. Granting blanket outline consent therefore allows potentially unacceptable uses in inappropriate locations.

The use of sub areas (which would be very necessary for good planning and place making) whilst welcome, could result in a complex local plan, with policy approaches/design codes for each sub area, significantly acting against the Government's aim of simplifying and speeding up local plans. The level of detail required to effectively grant outline planning permission would be very significant, and the resource requirements could overwhelm many planning departments.

Proposal 6: Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology

Initial comment:

The approach needs to reflect that some schemes do (rightly) take a long time to determine, and that this is in the public interest. The current 'minors' or 'majors' break down is too simplistic if firmer timetables are to be attached.

The possibility of refunding of the planning fee if the application is not determined within the timeframe, or for it to be deemed to have been granted, does not reflect the reality of development management, where applicants and the LPA work together to achieve successful outcomes, and negotiate for unacceptable schemes to be improved to make

them acceptable. This inevitably extends the timescales involved, but greatly improves the outcomes. This approach characterises the planning system as negative, where in fact it is a positive agent in improving development proposals.

For appeals, only a tiny proportion of applications are determined in this way. Giving a rebate on fees for successful applicants misses the point that planning judgments can be finely balanced. It also provides a perverse incentive for an LPA to not refuse development that is unacceptable, due to the threat of loss of income needed to run the planning service, and equally, an incentive for more appeals, as applicants would have little to lose if they appeal, but could get their fee back (no financial penalty unless costs were awarded). The current system of allowing costs where behaviour by appellant or LPA is unreasonable works well, and takes account of the fact that legitimate planning judgments can result in different outcomes.

A NEW INTERACTIVE, WEB-BASED MAP STANDARD FOR PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Proposal 7: Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template.

Initial comment:

More standardisation and access via technology would be welcomed.

A STREAMLINED, MORE ENGAGING PLAN-MAKING PROCESS

Proposal 8: Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable for key stages of the process, and we will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so.

Initial comment:

The 30 month timescale of local plans is arbitrary, as it cannot be based on any practical methodology of how long a new style local plan might take to prepare. It also takes no account of the resources available to LPAs, and especially the lack of design expertise to create multiple design codes covering a LPA area, needed to support the local plan. Neither does it reflect the Government's desire to get more public engagement in plan making, which is both time and resource hungry.

Having a single time frame for all areas is over simplistic, and does not recognise that some areas are more complex than others, eg urban areas with complex multiple issues vs largely rural areas with market towns and villages.

Proposal 9: Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools

Initial comment:

Not a strategic matter.

Proposal 10: A stronger emphasis on build out through planning.

Initial comment:

A mechanism would be required to force developers to work with other house builders to deliver different house types/tenures. Design codes alone will not be sufficient.

Design codes are resource heavy, and can also stifle innovation in design and place making.

Pillar Two – Planning for beautiful and sustainable places

Proposal 11: To make design expectations more visual and predictable, we will expect design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development.

Initial comment:

Design Codes are useful planning tools, and their further use is welcomed. However, the resource implications need addressing. Many LPAs have very limited design expertise, and no specialist staff. There are simply not enough urban designers available to undertake this work. Poor quality Design Codes can result in bland and boring development, and stifle design innovation.

Proposal 12: To support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character, we will set up a body to support the delivery of provably locally-popular design codes, and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making.

Initial comment:

These proposals are welcomed.

Proposal 13: To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England's strategic objectives can give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.

Initial comment:

These proposals are welcomed.

Proposal 14: We intend to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences.

Initial comment:

Again, the lack of design expertise in most LPAs will hamper this ambition. Good design is also in part a matter of judgment.

A beautiful design is only part of the planning consideration, and there may be other factors that require consideration through the decision making process. This proposal needs careful framing to ensure only appropriate development is fast tracked, and there are appropriate check and balances to provide consideration of other planning matters.

Proposal 15: We intend to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits.

Initial comment:

This would be welcome, planners and developers need clear and unambiguous government policies to allow for consistency in approach and supply chain adaptation.

Proposal 16: We intend to design a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitats and species in England.

Initial comment:

There is little detail of this proposal. If not properly framed, it could risk reducing environmental safeguards.

Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century

Initial comment:

This is an important objective, but there is a risk that the three zone areas are not going to facilitate this aim, eg where growth could impact on historic assets or their settings, but is granted permission via the plan making process.

Proposal 18: To complement our planning reforms, we will facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.

Initial comment:

The current level of ambition in this regard is not high enough, so further improvements to efficiency standards would be welcome, but they need to be universal and unambiguous to ensure developer buy-in.

Pillar Three – Planning for infrastructure and connected places

Proposal 19: The Community Infrastructure Levy should be reformed to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished.

Initial comment:

S106 has remained the right choice for many LPAs, as it is flexible, and can respond to very local land value issues. If introduced, Infrastructure Levy rates should be set on the basis of local land values, to ensure that areas with low land values are not prejudiced, and that the Infrastructure Levy does not unintentionally prevent development. This would risk low value areas not receiving sufficient funding through this route, and in this context, proposals to deliver affordable housing through the levy are unconvincing at present.

Proposal 20: The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights.

Initial comment:

This is strongly supported, Permitted Development has long been criticised as not contributing to required infrastructure. However, most easy conversions have already taken place, and so the impact may be limited.

Proposal 21: The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision

Initial comment:

Areas with low land values and therefore low Infrastructure Levy rates may miss out on affordable housing provision, and so proposals to deliver affordable housing through the levy are unconvincing at present.

Proposal 22: More freedom could be given to local authorities over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy

Initial comment:

It is important to keep the link between development and where the Infrastructure Levy is spent, particularly in convincing local communities that development is acceptable. Once freedoms to break that link are made, it will be very difficult for cash strapped local authorities to ignore the need to support service provision more generally.

Proposal 23: As we develop our final proposals for this new planning system, we will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms. In doing so, we propose this strategy will be developed including the following key elements:

- The cost of operating the new planning system should be principally funded by the beneficiaries of planning gain – landowners and developers
- Planning fees should continue to be set on a national basis and cover at least the full cost of processing the application type
- a small proportion of Infrastructure Levy of the income should be earmarked to local planning authorities to cover their overall planning costs

Initial comment:

Skills and resourcing will be key to making any planning system effective. Making development in the round pay for planning services is a good idea in principle, but those Councils with low land values will not receive much Infrastructure Levy funding. Therefore plan making costs should also be covered by planning application fees, as it is the policies they contain that planning applications are determined against.

Regulating pre application fees is unlikely to assist in LPAs covering their operating costs.

Proposal 24: We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions

Initial comment:

This is supported, but there is a very large resourcing and skills gap nationally.

ITEM 5 Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update

2.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 JPAB agreed to the principle of preparing a new Strategic Plan covering Greater Nottingham at its December 2017 meeting. This report updates on progress with the review, and in particular addresses an open letter to the Leaders and Chief Executives of Rushcliffe Borough Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Erewash Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council and Nottingham City Council.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Joint Planning Advisory Board:

- a) **NOTE** the delay to progress with Strategic Plan preparation in Greater Nottingham and the situation with the Erewash Growth Options Consultation; and
- b) **AGREE** that a joint response be prepared to the open letter appended to this report, explaining that the partner Councils consider it is important to continue the strategic plan making process for the reasons set out in section 4 of this report.

2.0 **Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan (Broxtowe, Gedling, Nottingham City, Rushcliffe)**

- 2.1 The Project Plan as set out in the papers which were circulated in lieu of the last JPAB meeting has been significantly impacted by Coronavirus, officers having to work from home, and a delay in receiving the Growth Options Study. As a consequence, it was necessary to delay the planned publication of the Growth Options consultation, which has however recently concluded. To allow for the disruption caused by the Coronavirus, and the fact that the consultation is taking place over the summer holiday period, the consultation period was extended from six weeks to ten weeks, ending 14th September 2020.
- 2.2 Consultation has been almost entirely electronic, in line with the Government's advice on temporarily amending Statements of Community Involvement. However, a small number of libraries have been furnished with hard copies where this has been considered appropriate.
- 2.3 A significant number of responses have already been made, both via email, and through the council's joint consultation portal, Inovem.
- 2.4 The Project Plan setting out steps for the remainder of the plan preparation process is being revisited in the light of the delay caused by Coronavirus, and in addition some study commissions required to support the draft Plan have been postponed, and will need to be reprogrammed into the timetable. (See section 4 below)

3.0 Erewash Growth Options Consultation

- 3.1 Erewash BC's consultation on a separate "Options for Growth" document closed on Monday 20th July, and the responses are currently being processed. Erewash may be in a position to give an update on scale and nature of the responses, and proposed next steps, at the meeting.

4.0 Ashfield Local Plan

- 4.1 Ashfield has commissioned relevant evidence base work to support the production of their local plan and officers have been progressing the plan with members through the lockdown. Officers are currently awaiting the outcome of a number of evidence base reports and are in the process of reviewing the implications of the current government consultations with members, in particular the implication of the proposed changes to the standard methodology.

5.0 Open letter to the Leaders and Chief Executives formally request the suspension of the Strategic Plan 'Growth Options Consultation July 2020'

- 5.1 A letter has been sent from the Chairs, Gotham Parish Council, Barton in Fabis Parish Council, Thrumpton Parish Meeting, Kingston on Soar Parish Council and a Rushcliffe Borough Councillor, requesting that the preparation of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan be suspended. A copy of the letter is appended to this report.

- 5.2 The reasons for the requested suspension can be summarised as:

- (1) the current Covid 19 pandemic prevents Councils from providing Covid secure spaces in which to hold public meetings to inform communities and allow the normal communication and proper debate required to collect and gauge the views of our residents.
- (2) Covid 19 pandemic is already having fundamental short and long term impacts on society including housing needs, travel patterns, employment and growth with major implications for the Strategic Plan. The consultation should be suspended until these changes have been properly assessed and incorporated.
- (3) Thirdly, the Government has recently published for consultation its 'Planning for the Future' White Paper. This could mean replacing the existing tests of soundness, updating requirements for assessments (including on the environment and viability) and abolishing the Duty to Cooperate. These changes will have significant implications for the content of Strategic Plans and again the process should be suspended until the implications are clear.
- (4) there has been no opportunity for local communities to challenge the terms of reference or 'key study principles' of the Growth Options Study produced by AECOM, in particular factual inaccuracies, the 'key study principles' and resulting conclusions as to which sites are suitable for development are fundamentally flawed. These principles arbitrarily state that "the study is 'policy

off' with regards to Green Belt designation", contrary to the importance of Green Belt as set out in the NPPF.

- 5.3 Having considered the points raised above, the reasons set out below explain why it is important to continue the strategic plan making process in Greater Nottingham.

Impact of Covid 19

- 5.4 The Government has made it clear that it wants to see Local Plans progressing through the system as a vital means for supporting economic recovery (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/coronavirus-covid-19-planning-update#local-plans>). In recognition of the difficulties in holding traditional consultation events and meetings, it has also issued additional planning guidance on reviewing and updating Statements of Community Involvement, which all the Councils have followed. The current consultation has been extended from 6 weeks to 10 weeks to assist interested parties in making a response.
- 5.5 In addition, local plans should be reviewed every 5 years, and there is a risk of government intervention if progress is not made. Notwithstanding the more recently adopted part 2 local plans, the Core Strategies were all adopted in 2014, and are now more than 5 years beyond their adoption dates. An up to date strategic planning framework across the area is vital to ensure local planning authorities can continue to plan positively for their areas with minimal risk of their policies being deemed out of date, and decisions being made on that basis.
- 5.6 Whilst it is recognised that there may be long term impacts of the Covid pandemic that are not fully understood, the strategic plan is at an early stage of preparation. Future versions of the Plan can respond to unexpected impacts, and policies can be framed to be flexible enough to respond to changes in circumstance.

'Planning for the Future' White Paper

- 5.7 The white paper is a consultation document, and the final outcome may be different from the current consultation proposals. The implementation of any new planning system requires significant primary and secondary legislation. Based on previous amendments to planning legislation these proposals could take a number of years. It will be important to have an up to date strategic planning framework in place to ensure proper planning in the interim, and an orderly transition to any new planning system. In the meantime, the Duty to Cooperate remains an essential part of plan making.

Ability to challenge the Growth Options Study

- 5.8 The consultation on the Strategic Plan Growth Options provides the opportunity to challenge the assumptions and findings of the Growth Options study. No decisions have yet been made on the scale and location of new development, and the consultation responses will inform any decisions which will feed into the next version of the plan.

5.9 It is therefore recommended that a joint response be prepared, on behalf of the JPAB explaining that the partner Councils consider it is important to continue the strategic plan making process for the reasons set out above.

6.0 Duty to Cooperate

6.1 The open letter makes reference to the white paper proposal to abolish the Duty to Cooperate. JPAB oversees strategic plan making, and effectively discharges the Duty to Cooperate in Greater Nottingham. In the context of the current geography of local government in Greater Nottingham, there are a number of reasons why it is considered necessary to continue this approach, which include:

- (a) The Duty remains in place until it is revoked or replaced by primary legislation, and it is a key test of soundness for local plans undergoing examination;
- (b) A mechanism is required to plan effectively for cross boundary infrastructure, and to fully recognise the impacts of strategic development across the area.
- (c) Under our current arrangements, local sovereignty over planning decisions is retained.
- (d) The arrangements represent good value for money for constituent councils, and preparing plans on a stand-alone basis would incur significant additional expense, for instance through examinations and evidence base costs which are currently shared.
- (e) JPAB meetings are held quarterly, and do not represent an undue burden on councillor/officer time. The small secretariat service funded by partner contributions adds value to the plan making process; and the resource would have to be replicated in individual areas if it did not exist, which would inevitably cost more.
- (f) The sharing of experiences and learning from other authorities has proved to be of great value, for instance the approach of the Inspector into the Gedling local plan examination enabled other authorities to be prepared for similar issues at their own examinations.
- (g) Working collectively has attracted significant additional resource (for example capacity funding) which has helped to speed up development of sites and remove blockages to development.

7.0 Strategic Plan Review Progress

7.1 A summary of progress is as follows:-

Background work

7.2 The Housing Market Area Boundary Study is complete and has been reported to JPAB.

7.3 The review of the Councils' Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs) in so far as they relate to the Main Built Up Area has completed and reported to JPAB. Decisions on its recommendations are being implemented where appropriate in order to align our respective SHLAAs as far as practicable, and a record created of whether recommendations are accepted or not, so that an audit trail is available to inform examinations and appeals.

Growth Options commission

- 7.4 AECOM completed this work and the final document has been received. It is available on the GNPP website as part of the Growth Options consultation.

Housing Need Assessment

- 7.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local authorities to support their Local Plans with an assessment of the need of different types of housing for different parts of the Community, such as those requiring affordable housing, or the elderly (often referred to as Strategic Housing Market Area Assessments – SHMAAs). Icenic consultants were appointed to undertake this work. A student technical paper has been drafted for Broxtowe Borough Council and the other elements of the study have been completed. Draft versions of the report have been circulated for officer comment and Gedling housing colleagues have raised a number of concerns which are currently being dealt with. Although the final report was delayed due to sickness, it has now been submitted and is being given a final check before being published on the partnership website.

Gypsy and Traveller Housing Need Assessment

- 7.6 A Gypsy and Traveller Housing Needs Assessment has been procured from specialist consultants separately from the rest of the Housing Needs Assessment. RRR consultants have been appointed to undertake the work and an inception meeting was held on 12th February. Four chapters of this study have been drafted outlining the current situation in respect of Traveller and Travelling Showpeople in Greater Nottingham, the results of initial stakeholder consultation and the methodology moving forward. The Coronavirus restrictions meant that interviews with the travelling community could not be undertaken. The consultants have confirmed that a final report will be available in November 2020. Rushcliffe Borough Council are leading on this commission.

Green and Blue Infrastructure Study

- 7.7 A scoping paper for a Green and Blue Infrastructure Study has been prepared. Officer meetings have been held by the Councils with a view to preparing a single mapping resource of GBI across the area, which will be supported with a detailed background paper. Phase 1 of this work has been largely completed, and Phase 2 is likely to require the commissioning of specialist consultants. It will be used to overlay with potential growth options identified by the Growth Options study, and with the results of Growth Options consultation will help inform a preferred growth option.

Other work

- 7.8 The brief for an Economic Land Requirements Study is currently out for tender. A brief for a Town Centres study has been prepared, although the commissioning of this has been postponed due to the impact of Coronavirus restrictions and the uncertainty of town centre prospects in the short term.

- 7.9 The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which will support the plan review has been scoped out, and contacts established with main infrastructure providers. This will provide the basis for a draft IDP for the Preferred Option/Consultation Draft.
- 7.10 A Sustainability Scoping (SA) report has been prepared, submitted to the statutory bodies for consultation, and updated accordingly. The next stage of the SA will accompany the draft Strategic Plan, following consultation on the Growth Options. A working group has been established to progress this.
- 7.11 The Growth Options is currently out for consultation using the Inovem consultation portal, hosted on the web, with a closing date of 14th September. Due to the impact of Coronavirus restrictions on how each authority consults, interim Statements of Community Involvement have been prepared.
- 7.12 Following on from a commission to investigate how our Strategic Housing Land Availability work could be better aligned, an agreed methodology has been prepared which responds to the recommendations set out in the consultant's report. This will inform this year's SHLAA work, and will be published in due course. A consistent approach will provide robust evidence to support housing targets to be set out in the Strategic Plan.
- 7.13 The partnership's 2017 Planning Delivery Fund (PDF) award includes funding provision for a 12 month temporary planner/project manager post to assist with the review. It was agreed that underspend from other PDF projects and reallocation of some Homes England (HE) funding allowed this to be extended to 24 months. Interviews for the post as a secondment opportunity have been undertaken and it is hoped to appoint the successful candidate by October.

8.0 Next Steps

- 8.1 The next steps on the review of strategic policies are envisaged to be:
- Completing supporting studies (Economic Land Requirements Study, Gypsy and Travellers needs study etc).
 - Develop the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy, including procurement of later stages if required.
 - Consider responses to the Growth Options consultation.
 - Scope out policies for the draft Local Plan.
 - Continue SA process for the draft Local Plan.

Lead Officer:

Matt Gregory, Greater Nottingham Planning Manager
matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk, 0115 876 3981

APPENDIX 1

Open letter to the Leaders and Chief Executives of:

Rushcliffe Borough Council

Broxtowe Borough Council

Erewash Borough Council

Gedling Borough Council

Nottingham City Council

Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan

The undersigned Parish Councils / Parish Meetings formally request the **suspension** of the Strategic Plan 'Growth Options Consultation July 2020' (GOC) for the following reasons:

Firstly, the current Covid 19 pandemic prevents Councils from providing Covid secure spaces in which to hold public meetings to inform communities and allow the normal communication and proper debate required to collect and gauge the views of our residents.

Secondly, the Covid 19 pandemic is already having fundamental short and long term impacts on society including housing needs, travel patterns, employment and growth with major implications for the Strategic Plan. The consultation should be suspended until these changes have been properly assessed and incorporated.

Thirdly, the Government has recently published for consultation its 'Planning for the Future' White Paper. This could mean replacing the existing tests of soundness, updating requirements for assessments (including on the environment and viability) and abolishing the Duty to Cooperate. These changes will have significant implications for the content of Strategic Plans and again the process should be suspended until the implications are clear.

Fourthly, with regard to the Growth Options Study produced by AECOM which is identified as a "main component of the evidence base" (1.16 Figure 1.3 of the GOC), there has been no opportunity for local communities to challenge the terms of reference or 'key study principles' of this document.

In addition to many factual inaccuracies, the 'key study principles' and resulting conclusions as to which sites are suitable for development are fundamentally flawed. These principles arbitrarily state that "the study is 'policy off' with regards to Green Belt designation" in direct contravention of the Government's statement of the importance to be given to the Green Belt in planning considerations (NPPF para 133). The Strategic Plan should be suspended until a revised 'Growth Options Study' has been properly developed.

We therefore formally request that the Strategic Plan 'Growth Options Consultation' process is suspended until these issues have been addressed.

Proceeding with the consultation in its current form despite the issues we have raised, would risk any resulting Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan being found 'unsound' and subject to potential judicial review.

Yours sincerely,

██████████ - Chair, Gotham Parish Council (██████████)

██████████ – Chair, Barton in Fabis Parish Council (██████████)

██████████ - Chair, Thrumpton Parish Meeting (██████████)

██████████ - Chair, Kingston on Soar Parish Council (██████████)

Councillor ██████████ Rushcliffe Borough Council (██████████)

ITEM 6 Waste and Minerals Local Plans Update

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report updates JPAB on progress with the Nottinghamshire/Nottingham and Derbyshire Waste and Minerals Local Plans.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Joint Planning Advisory Board **NOTE** the progress with the Nottinghamshire/Nottingham and Derbyshire Waste and Minerals Local Plans.

2.0 Plans Update

Nottinghamshire/Nottingham

- 2.1 Nottinghamshire County Council is preparing a new Minerals Local Plan for the period to 2036. Consultation on Issues and Options was undertaken between 20 November 2017 and 14 January 2018 and a Draft Local Plan was published for consultation between 27 July and 28 September 2018. The Plan was published for representations between 30 August and 11 October 2019, and was submitted to the Secretary of State in February 2020. Public hearing sessions, as part of the Independent Examination, were scheduled to take place in late April but have been postponed due to the Covid 19 situation. It is likely they may take place virtually by means of video conferencing in the Autumn but specific dates have yet to be announced.
- 2.2 Nottinghamshire County and Nottingham City Councils are preparing a single Joint Waste Plan in 2019 to replace the 2013 Waste Core Strategy. A monitoring report and waste needs assessment have been prepared and consultation on the SA Scoping and Issues and Options document was completed in May 2020. Feedback from this consultation is now being analysed and this, together with a revised Waste Needs Assessment, will inform the next stage in preparing the Joint Waste Plan which is consultation on a Draft Plan.

Derbyshire/Derby

- 2.3 Consultation on a range of minerals topic papers entitled 'Towards a Minerals Local Plan' – Proposed Approach was carried out in Spring 2018. Following publication of the NPPF in 2019 which now stipulates that local plans should cover a 15 year period from adoption of the plan the Councils are extending the Plan period to 2036. This means that the Councils have had to re-examine the situation regarding the supply of sand and gravel from the Plan area to determine the scale of additional provision that the Plan must make and the amount that will be required from new sites. As part of this re-examination, the Councils have asked sand and gravel operators within the county if they wished to promote additional sites for working during the Plan period to 2036. This has resulted in three further sites being put forward. These sites have now

being assessed alongside other sites that were previously considered and five preferred sites have been identified.. The Councils will be consulting on the potential sand and gravel sites in late summer (subject to Covid 19 considerations). A consultation on the full proposed draft Plan is anticipated in late Autumn/Winter 2020 with the publication plan and submission anticipated in 2021.

- 2.4 A series of background and evidence papers on local and strategic waste matters have been prepared. This includes an updated forecasting approach on waste capacity need across the plan period. It also provides a summary of the quantities of waste generated which now encompasses the period from 2006-2018. The papers include a series of questions or gaps in knowledge/evidence which will be used as the basis for the consultation roll out. The consultation will be a hybrid between issues and preferred approach
- 2.5 Consultation on the papers will take place in late summer 2020 and also include running some drop in events around the County to give residents the opportunity to view and comment. This will then be used to draw up the draft plan for consultation in Autumn / Winter 2020. Anticipated completion and adoption of the new plan is in 2021.

Lead Officer:

Matt Gregory, Greater Nottingham Planning Manager
matt.gregory@nottinghamcity.gov.uk, 0115 876 3981

ITEM 7 HE Capacity Funding – Quarter 1 (Year 4) April – June 2020

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 To report to JPAB the progress made on Homes England (HE) Capacity Funding projects.

2.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that Joint Planning Advisory Board **NOTE** this report and the details set out in Appendix 1.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 The Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board successfully bid for £855,000 of HE grant funding in Spring 2017. Under the conditions of the grant award, the Partners are required to provide monitoring information to HE on a quarterly basis and identify key risks, issues and mitigation measures.

4.0 Progress/updates – Quarter 1 (Year 4) – April – June 2020

- 4.1 Progress/updates for this quarter is set out in Appendix 1.
- 4.3 Of note is the fact that Gedling projects are intending to make significant progress in the near future on their remaining projects, and there is a small amount of grant remaining for the Nottingham City Council's Island, River Leen and Padstow sites project which NCC will seek to repurpose in line with grant conditions.

4.0 Risks and Issues

- 4.1 Stanton Regeneration Site project remains amber as Erewash colleagues have yet to provide details as to how this site will be progressed. In addition, JPAB agreed to work up some reserve projects for both any underspend of the HCA funding and also to have projects 'oven ready' should further opportunities for grant funding come forward. These will continue to be progressed.

5.0 Next Steps

- 5.1 Authorities will continue to populate the monitoring spreadsheet and work up reserve projects. Progress on quarter 2 will be reported to the next JPAB meeting.

Contact Officer:

Peter McAnespie
Partnerships and Local Plans Manager
Nottingham City Council

Tel: 0115 876 4068

E-Mail: peter.mcanespie@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Appendix 1: Homes England Funding Monitoring Report

Project Name	Homes England Capacity Funding	Report Date:	27 th August 220		
Project Manager	Peter McAnespie	Reporting Period:	Quarter 1 (Year 4) April – June 2020		
Client Lead	Matt Gregory	Overall Status (RAG)	Amber	Budget (RAG)	Amber
Brief description of Project					
<p>The Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board (GNJPAB) successfully bid for £855,000 of HCA grant funding in Spring 2017. The grant will support the delivery of 9,096 new dwellings by funding a range of technical surveys and specialist consultancy advice. The GNJPAB Partners comprise Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Erewash Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council and Nottingham City Council. The Partners will now submit funding requests/supporting information to Nottingham City Council as accountable body to access grant.</p> <p>The project is to administer the distribution of the funding and report on its use by the Partners to the GNJPAB Executive Steering Group.</p>					
Approval (last governance route)		Homes & Community Association award letter 7 March 2017 DDM 27/04/2017			
Business benefits expected					
<p>Maximise efficiencies and outputs through joint commissioning, sharing of specialist staff and expertise and a single point of contact via Nottingham City Council as Accountable Body.</p> <p>The Capacity fund provides an opportunity for Local Authorities to work with landowners and developers to fully investigate and understand the barriers to site delivery, undertake appropriate feasibility work, site investigation, optioneering and drawing on specialist skills to broker meaningful and realistic development programmes and infrastructure phasing.</p>					
Progress April to June 2020					
<p>Erewash:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stanton Regeneration site: A report will be taken to Council Executive on 7th July to authorise the receipt and expenditure of this grant on its original purpose. • Grant total: £100,000. Remaining: £98,684.06 <p>Gedling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A60 corridor transport assessment: The deadline for expressions of interest in the transport modelling work is 28th August 2020 and it is intended that consultants will be appointed and work commence next month. The timescale for the completion of work is dependent on the conclusions of the modelling of the initial scenario, as it may be that a further scenario (subject to further cost) needs to be tested. The outcome of the modelling work will help to inform the next stage of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan which will consider the allocation of strategic sites for development. • Grant total: £90,000. Remaining: £88,815.36 					

- **Station Road and Burton Road:** GBC have re-purposed the remaining £45,457 of funding allocated to Top Wighay Farm and Rolleston Drive to support developments at Station Road and Burton Road. It is intended that any further underspends be used to progress a further site at Killisick with an overall capacity of around 140 homes.
- Grant total: £45,457.70. Remaining: £42,967.70

NCC:

- **Waterside:** Full commitment of Homes England funding anticipated. Remainder to be utilised to progress relocation of business strategy to release land for housing, or for feasibility work on a building for relocating existing occupiers.
- Grant total: £70,000. Remaining: £14,857.66

Rushcliffe sites:

- The Strategic Sites Delivery Officer post has been extended until 31 March 2021 in order to enable continued support to be provided in the run up to the submission of the first planning application for the east Gamston strategic site and then during the application's determination. An application was due to be submitted in June but due to the pandemic, this has now been put back until November.
- East of Gamston: Meetings recently been held with Taylor Wimpey and Barwood (represented by Savills) to discuss submission of first planning application on land under their control, masterplanning for the whole site and preparation of a SPD to provide a framework for the whole site's delivery. All main parties are to be invited to participate in the preparation of the SPD. Taylor Wimpey and Barwood have received from the Borough Council written pre-application advice and a Scoping Request has also been processed providing to the applicants help to shape the EIA required as part of any outline application.
- South of Clifton Strategic Allocation: The Borough Council anticipate the submission of further reserved matters applications, including phase 1 housing and additional infrastructure applications. The Borough Council has agreed revisions to the layout sought by the developer.
- North of Bingham: Continued build out phase 1 of the site is expected. Full planning permission for the residential element is now approved so bar any revisions/variations no further residential planning applications are anticipated. Application to revise the house types across one of the later phases of development, circa 300 units has been approved.
- Former RAF Newton: Both the S73 application and the Reserved Matters Application for all 528 dwellings have now been approved.
- Grant total: £240,000. Actual and committed spend to date totals £224,798.27. Remaining: £15,201.73

Closed Projects: Homes England funded element of work now complete:

- Ashfield: Harrier Park/Rolls Royce. Broomhill Farm - funding repurposed to procure Conurbation Planning Policy Manager post.
- Broxtowe: Walker Street

- NCC: Island, River Leen and Padstow sites. There is £5,647 remaining of the grant total of £50,000 for the Island site

Risks / Issues / Escalations / Change requests			Red: Requires escalation Amber: Can be treated, transferred within delegated authority Green : Progressing as planned	
	Severity	Action	Owner	Live/Closed
1. Erewash: Lack of progress on Stanton Regeneration site	Amber	Update requested from Erewash	SB/AR	Live

Funding Allocation: £855,000					RAG Status		AMBER
Forecast spend Yr4/Qtr 1	£855,000	Actual & Committed Expenditure	£579,241*	MP Fee	£9,585	Remaining	£266,173
Actual & Committed Spend (inc MP Fee)	Year 1	£9,585 (Quarter 1)	£61,543 (Quarter 2)	£98,303 (Quarter 3)	£294,086 (Quarter 4)		
	Year 2	£352,769 (Quarter 1)	£367,078 (Quarter 2)	£487,078 (Quarter 3)	£502,078 (Quarter 4)		
	Year 3	£502,078 (Quarter 1)	£532,078 (Quarter 2)	£533,738 (Quarter 3)	£613,684 (Quarter 4)		

Notes on reasons for budget variances:

* No change in actual spend for Year 4 Qtr 1 however, reduction in commitment from the previous quarter.

Budget RAG Status: Require further detail from Boroughs as to proposed spend to confirm progressing as planned

ITEM 9 Any other business

ITEM 10 Future Meetings

Tuesday 15 December at 2.00 pm

Council Chamber, Council Offices, Beeston