

Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership

AGENDA

GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD Tuesday, 15 December 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. Presentation: Green & Blue Infrastructure Study (Phase 1) **JK**
5. Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update **MG**
6. Government Consultations: Planning for the Future White Paper and Changes to the current planning system: Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations **MG**
7. Waste and Minerals Local Plans Update **SG/SB**
8. Homes England Capacity Funding projects monitoring **PM**
9. Any other business **ALL**
10. Future Meetings



**ITEM 3 MINUTES OF THE GREATER NOTTINGHAM JOINT PLANNING
ADVISORY BOARD (JPAB) MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 22
SEPTEMBER 2020 VIA MS TEAMS**

PRESENT

Ashfield: Councillor M Relf

Erewash: Councillor M Powell

Gedling: Councillor J Hollingsworth

Nottingham City: Councillor L Woodings, Councillor M Edwards

Nottinghamshire County: Councillor T Harper (Chair)

Rushcliffe: Councillor R Upton

Officers in Attendance

Broxtowe: Ruth Hyde; Mark Thompson

Derbyshire County: Steve Buffery

Erewash: Steve Birkinshaw

Gedling: Alison Gibson

Growth Point: Matthew Gregory; Peter McAnespie

Nottingham City: Paul Seddon

Nottinghamshire County: Sally Gill

Rushcliffe: David Mitchell

Observers

David Bainbridge

Robert Galij

Andrew Bamber

Dave Lawson

Kelvin Humphreys

N. Corbishley

Paul Stone

Tom Genway

Caolan Gaffney

Angela Smedley

Steve Freek

Apologies

Derbyshire County: Councillor T King

1. **Introductions and Apologies**

Councillor T Harper (Chair) welcomed everyone to the meeting, which was virtual (and recorded) due to Covid-19 restrictions and apologies were noted.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

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

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 30 June 2020 were approved as recorded.

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

4.1 MG reported that the MHCLG published its much anticipated White Paper on 6 August to introduce changes to the planning system. Consultation on the White Paper would close on 31 October. There is also a separate consultation for a revised standard methodology for housing need. The recommendation for JPAB is to consider the Planning for the Future White Paper, with the preparation of a joint response delegated to the ESG for matters of strategic interest, where there is a consensus view.

4.2 MG proceeded with a short slide presentation outlining the main proposals. Section 4 of the report which covered consultation on the proposed standard methodology and its implications for individual councils.

4.3 The key points to note were:

- Government's intention to speed up the planning process.
- Identify land in the Local Plan for the following three development categories:
 - Growth
 - Renewal
 - Protected
- Local Plans would have a simplified examination procedure. Local development management policies to be replaced by nationally set policies. Duty to Co-operate to be removed.
- The Local Plan is currently produced every five years but a new 30 month deadline is proposed to ensure that there is enough land for housing, subject to new statutory requirements. Sustainability Appraisal to be replaced with a simpler and more transparent process to meet the requirements of law.
- S106 to be replaced with a new levy capturing land value uplift which will also apply to developments built under permitted development rights.
- A revised and mandatory standard methodology to ensure that there will be sufficient housing in areas with affordability issues.

- Large sites to be split between several developers offering different housing products. Planning application phases, housing delivery and sales would be faster. Planning applications where required will be streamlined through a greater focus at the plan making stage. There will be penalties imposed where councils fail to determine within guidelines.
- Each Council to appoint a Chief Officer for design and place-making.

4.4 MG asked Members to consider the draft comments at Appendix 1 to respond to the Government's White Paper.

4.5 TH thought the comments were of good quality.

4.6 MP was mindful that there may only a response from JPAB and not from individual councils. He thanked MG for the presentation and asked who might be responding on behalf of JPAB.

4.7 LW noted that the current process is lengthy, but there is less funding being provided by government. The White Paper did not appear to offer a simpler or faster system. She continued to point out that the lack of housing delivery could not be laid at the door of the planning system, as developers have received planning permission but these were not being built out. Within the City Centre further support is required for brownfield sites due to fragile viability, and in certain cases sites have a higher flood risk.

4.8 MG advised that Nottingham City would be providing a separate response in addition to the joint response. Other councils would also respond in their own right. These were confirmed as follows:

NCC will be responding

RBC will be responding to both consultations

GBC will be submitting two separate responses

ADC will respond to both consultations

BBC will provide a separate response to both consultations

MG also noted to agree a joint response.

4.9 MR (ADC) reinforced Cllr Woodings comment about financial pressures. He advised that ADC had amongst the lowest affordability for housing in the UK despite them requiring an increase of 69% in houses they needed to provide in the area. They already have low house prices, and developers will not build even if it is in the Local Plan, they tend to cherry pick sites. There are some good ideas in the White Paper but there was also a lot wrong with it.

4.10 SBk (EBC) supported the changes for Sustainability Appraisals and to move away from the old system. He was positive about the new strategic CIL. He continued to say that the Local Plan was harder to adopt than giving planning permission as it takes five years to adopt a plan but local authorities are expected to grant planning permission within 13 weeks. He considered this change would help to restore a plan-led system. Government reform of the planning system should support regeneration.

4.11 RU (RBC) RBC accepts the need for more housing, and has led the way with its current local plan. We need to enable young people renting who cannot buy

affordable housing to get on the housing ladder. With his previous knowledge and experience of the planning system as a Chartered Surveyor he has seen the planning system become more bureaucratic and slow. It takes 5-7 years for a Local Plan to be approved therefore it needs radical reform. Suggest a joint response and own responses as well.

- 4.12 ME (N.City) found the proposals intriguing in terms of environmental challenges as the City faces a number of consequences of climate change, including flooding and urban over-heating. However, high quality, sustainable and carbon neutral developments are what is needed. The ability to convert premises to flats make no reference to the value of the offices, and do not contribute to affordable housing or local open space. If it is less profitable then developers will just sit on the land. The area needs housing solutions which are fit for the 21st Century.
- 4.13 MG will sum up the wide range of views to agree a joint response and respond to government, including any alternative suggestions that might be preferable.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:

- (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.

5. **Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update** (Matt Gregory)

- 5.1 MG gave an update on the plan making process which has been delayed due to Covid-19. The Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan consultation has now been completed and responses are currently being assessed. EBC have also completed their consultation and are assessing all representations received. With regards to ADC's Local Plan they are currently assessing their evidence base and the implications of the government's proposed Standard Methodology for their area.
- 5.2 An open letter was sent by a number of parish councils requesting suspension of the Growth Options consultation for the following reasons:
- (i) Covid-19 impact on consultation process
 - (ii) Longer term impact of plans
 - (iii) Is the Government's White Paper appropriate for the future?
 - (iv) Local communities have not had chance to challenge the evidence base of Local Plans

It was suggested that the Board responds as follows:

- (i) Government expects councils to continue with Local Plan preparation and has issued guidance how to undertake community involvement with current consultations being extended to allow more time to respond.
- (ii) Councils have less control over planning decisions where their Local Plans become out of date.
- (iii) Preparing flexible policies to respond to the issues and challenges arising from Covid 19.
- (iv) The White Paper proposals for changing the planning system are unlikely to be introduced quickly therefore for the interim there is a need to continue with Duty to Co-operate as this is still a legal requirement.

- (v) The ability to challenge key elements of the Growth Options Study was available during the public consultation.

MG asked for views on whether to continue with the plan making process for the Greater Nottingham.

RU (RBC) gave their support to keep the plan moving along.

MP (EBC) expressed his concern that we were running out of time and agreed with RBC. There has been adequate time given for community involvement and EBC completed face to face meetings prior to the Covid restrictions. Developers will force the process so we should not delay.

LW (Nottingham City) agreed that it would be wrong to delay the process. Consultation time periods had been extended and for a vast majority consultation was available online, and people who did not have access to the internet at home were able to have access when some of the libraries reopened. This virus situation could last for another 18+ months. We need to be more imaginative how we consult and suggested using methods such as MS Teams.

MG confirmed the consensus to provide a joint response for the reasons set out in the report for the Chair, Cllr Tony Harper, to send the letter on behalf of JPAB.

- 5.3 MG referred to the reasons why Duty to Co-operate was still the best option for plan making in Greater Nottingham. It remains law until it is replaced and until then it is important to continue. Working in partnership has attracted additional resources such as HE Funding and has saved individual councils significant money.
- 5.4 ME (Nottingham City) referred to para 7.6 regarding Gypsies and Travellers and how to address new ways to consult with their community. MG advised that results would be available in November as consultations were now able to take place. The results of the study will inform the Strategic Plan Review.

Joint Planning Advisory Board was resolved to:

- (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.**

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

- 6.1 SG reported that the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State earlier this year and had hoped for Examination at the end of April. However due to lockdown restrictions the date has had to be postponed until 26 October and will now be a virtual Examination although conducted in the same way as any other Local Plan Examination by the Planning Inspector.
- 6.2 The Waste Local Plan will be a joint plan with Nottinghamshire County and Nottingham City Councils. All comments are currently being looked at following the Issues and Options consultation and these will inform the first draft of the Waste Local Plan.

- 6.3 SBuffery from Derbyshire County Council reported that their Minerals Local Plan was jointly being prepared with Derby City Council. They have also experienced Covid-19 implications on progressing the Plan which has impacted on timescales. The key change is to incorporate a sand and gravel document into the Plan upto 2036. Due to a shortfall in sand and gravel sites being promoted there was a consultation to identify any additional sites suitable for allocation. There are now an additional three sites making a total of eight sites overall which will now be consulted on. There will be an eight weeks consultation from October with a Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan anticipated early next year. The Issues and Options consultation will be published towards the end of the year or early next year.
- 6.4 ME asked if DCC had any information regarding a proposal for another incinerator in Derby, and if lessons could be learned from Nottinghamshire to ensure a more green approach to waste management. SBuffery was unable to comment as the proposal falls within the Derby City Council area.

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 highlighted two references to note from the report. GBC will need to address how they intend to progress with their remaining funding and EBC will need to provide information on how they intend to progress with the Stanton Regeneration site.
- 7.2 Appendix 1 illustrated how the money has been spent for the period. All other projects (except those mentioned above) are heading towards completion.
- 7.3 MP explained that he was unable to provide an update on the Stanton site due to its current sensitive state with developers and landowners.

Joint Planning Advisory Board resolved to NOTE this report and the details set out in Appendix 1.

8. **Any other business**

Nil

9. **Future Meetings 2020**

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

MEETING CLOSED AT 3.15 PM

ITEM 4 Presentation: Green & Blue Infrastructure Study (Phase 1)

To present work undertaken by the Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership on the Green & Blue Infrastructure Study (Phase 1)
(John King, Rushcliffe Borough Council)

Contact officer:-

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

ITEM 5 Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan Update

1.0 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.

Recommendations

It is recommended that Joint Planning Advisory Board:

- (a) **NOTE** the progress with Strategic Plan preparation in Greater Nottingham; and
- (b) **AGREE** the proposal to develop a preferred growth option through Councillor workshops.

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

- 2.1 The consultation on the Strategic Plan Growth Options closed on 14th September 2020. There was an excellent response, with around 3,500 individual comments being made from citizens, businesses, developers and public bodies which have so far been entered into the consultation portal, with a few outstanding.
- 2.2 Consultation was undertaken almost entirely electronically, in line with the Government's advice on temporarily amending Statements of Community Involvement. Although some responses were entered directly into the consultation portal, the majority were made by email (and some by post) which considerably lengthens the time taken to process the responses.
- 2.3 The main consideration in preparing for the next version of the draft Strategic Plan is setting the quantum and distribution of housing across the area. This is made more difficult due to the lack of certainty around the outcome of a revised standard methodology. Once the quantum and distribution of housing is set, this will need to be reflected in an updated Statement of Common Ground.
- 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. 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). The process and timing of setting the quantum and

distribution of development is also a key factor in arriving at an agreed preferred growth option as a basis for the next version of the strategic plan.

- 2.5 Clearly, arriving at an agreed preferred growth option is going to require appropriate political input. This is discussed further at 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.
- 3.2 The process of agreeing a preferred growth option set out in paragraph 2.5 is equally relevant to progressing both strategic plans.

4.0 Agreeing a Preferred Growth Option

- 4.1 Critically, it will be necessary to agree a preferred growth option, including setting the quantum and distribution of development across the plan area. However, there are a number of uncertainties that need to be factored in, not least the fact that the Government has yet to settle on a final standard methodology for determining housing need.
- 4.2 It is proposed that agreeing a preferred option is best progressed by way of Councillor workshops early in the new year. A first workshop will consider the responses to Growth Options consultations, and how a range of potential growth outcomes could be accommodated. This will allow consideration of different approaches to growth.
- 4.3 A second workshop, ideally held after the publication of the revised standard methodology, will refine the range of options taking into account factors such as site assessments, site sustainability and deliverability, impacts/benefits on green and blue infrastructure etc.
- 4.4 Holding the workshops early in the new year will allow for consideration of the outcome by JPAB at its March meeting.

5.0 Ashfield Local Plan

- 5.1 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.

6.0 Strategic Plan Review Progress

6.1 A summary of progress is as follows:-

6.2 Completed work:

- Housing Market Area Boundary Study
- Review of the Councils' Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs)
- Greater Nottingham Growth Options Study
- Housing Need Assessment

6.3 Ongoing work:

Gypsy and Traveller Housing Need Assessment

6.4 A Gypsy and Traveller Housing Needs Assessment has been procured from specialist consultants (RRR) separately from the rest of the Housing Needs Assessment. RRR have confirmed that a final report will be available in December 2020. Rushcliffe Borough Council are leading on this commission.

Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) Study

6.5 Phase 1 of this work, the collection of baseline data has been largely completed, with the identification and mapping of strategic GBI assets and corridors due to finish shortly. Phase 2 is likely to require the commissioning of specialist consultants and will overlay GBI and potential growth options, to ensure that protecting, enhancing and providing new GBI is a central element in informing a preferred growth option.

Economic Land Requirements Study

6.6 The Economic Land Requirements Study has been commissioned from Lichfield consultants, who are in the process of collating all necessary data. A draft report is anticipated for January, with the final report in early February.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

6.7 The Sustainability Scoping report has been updated in response to consultation. The next stage of the SA will accompany the draft Strategic Plan. A working group has been established to progress this, and a workshop with interested parties is being organised to assess the reasonable alternative growth options, to inform and support the preferred option.

6.8 Other work:

- 6.9 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.
- 6.10 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. The next stage will be to hold interviews/meetings with infrastructure providers to establish initial requirements, expectations, and possible funding opportunities.
- 6.11 Following on from the commission to investigate how Strategic Housing Land Availability work could be better aligned across Greater Nottingham, 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.
- 6.12 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 be used to extend this to 24 months. Mark Thompson from Broxtowe Borough was the successful applicant, and began in post on 9th November.

7.0 Next Steps

- 7.1 The next steps on the review of strategic policies are envisaged to be:
- Consider responses to the Growth Options consultation.
 - Agreeing a preferred growth option, including setting the quantum and distribution of development.
 - Scoping out transport assessment/modelling.
 - Completing supporting studies (Housing Need, Gypsy and Travellers needs study).
 - Develop the GI Strategy, including procurement of stage 2.
 - Scope out policies for the draft Local Plan.
 - Continue the SA process for the draft Local Plan.
- 7.2 If the process of setting a preferred option set out in section 4 is agreed, the aim would be to publish a draft plan following the County Council elections which take place in May. This would allow for publication of a Pre Submission Version (Regulation 19) of the plan in winter 2021/22.

8 Open Letter

- 8.1 At its September meeting, JPAB considered a letter from RBC Parish Councils. A joint response was agreed and sent. Subsequently a follow up letter was

received, which has also been replied to. The full trail of correspondence is attached below at Appendix 1.

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,

Gillian May - Chair, Gotham Parish Council (gothamgillianm@outlook.com)

Allan Kerr – Chair, Barton in Fabis Parish Council (allan.kerr@btinternet.com)

Ben Wilson - Chair, Thrumpton Parish Meeting (motionhq@gmail.com)

Mark Johnson - Chair, Kingston on Soar Parish Council (paulamarked2@aol.com)

Councillor Rex Walker Rushcliffe Borough Council (cllr.rwalker@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

My Ref: TH/MJG/JPAB

Your Ref: -

Contact: Cllr Tony Harper

Date: 30 September 2020

Email: Cllr.Tony.Harper@nottsc.gov.uk

Broxtowe Borough Council

Town Hall
Foser Avenue
Beeston
Nottingham
Nottinghamshire
NG9 1AB

Tel: 0115 917 7777
www.gngrowthpoint.com

SENT VIA EMAIL TO:

Gillian May - Chair, Gotham Parish Council
Allan Kerr – Chair, Barton in Fabis Parish Council
Ben Wilson - Chair, Thrumpton Parish Meeting
Mark Johnson - Chair, Kingston on Soar Parish Council
Councillor Rex Walker Rushcliffe Borough Council

Dear Councillor

Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan

I write in response to your letter received 27 August 2020, requesting that the preparation of the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan be suspended. The Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board considered your letter at its meeting on 22 September. The Board resolved to prepare a joint response to your letter, setting out the reasons why it is considered important to continue the strategic plan making process. These reasons are:

1 Impact of Covid 19

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.

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

2
30 September 2020

minimal risk of their policies being deemed out of date, and decisions being made on that basis.

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.

2 'Planning for the Future' White Paper

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.

3 Ability to challenge the Growth Options Study

The consultation on the Strategic Plan Growth Options provided 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.

The next stage of strategic plan making will be a full draft of the plan, which will be subject to further wide consultation, and the Board looks forward to your engagement with the process going forward.

Yours sincerely



Cllr Tony Harper
Chair of Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board

Copies to: Leaders and Chief Executives of:
Broxtowe Borough Council
Erewash Borough Council
Gedling Borough Council
Nottingham City Council
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Executive Steering Group members

Cllr Tony Harper
Chair of Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board
c/o Broxtowe Borough Council
Town Hall
Foster Avenue
Beeston
Nottingham
NG9 1AB

<via email>

Dear Councillor,

Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan

Thank you for your letter of 30th September in response to our open letter of 27th August.

It would appear that both you and the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board has been misinformed as to the nature of our original request. We did not, as you state, request “that the preparation of the GNSP be suspended”. **We requested that “*the Strategic Plan ‘Growth Options Consultation’ process is suspended until these issues [which we set out in the letter] 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.*”**

We clearly asked for work to continue to take account of the issues we identified, but that the consultation be suspended until that time.

We understand the importance of the timescales involved and the need for Councils to plan with “minimal risk of their policies being deemed out of date”. However, meeting those timescales is far more likely to be achieved through a Plan which is ‘right first time’ and takes account of issues such as Covid now without the requirement as you propose for multiple “future versions” of the Plan.

We specifically do not feel that our concerns regarding the adequacy of the AECOM Growth Options Study have been addressed by your response and feel that pressing on with consultation on the Plan, underpinned by this document, risks causing the future delay and challenge that you understandably wish to avoid.

Given that our request was to suspend the consultation on the plan, rather than the plan itself, we note that a response was not considered by the Board until 22 September 2020, over a week after the consultation period ended on 14 September 2020. Our letter was sent on 27 August 2020, thus giving sufficient time for it to be considered before the consultation period ended. We therefore conclude that not only has our request been misrepresented/misunderstood but also has been effectively ignored by not being considered before the end of the consultation period.

If you intend to follow the route of producing “future versions” of the Plan, can you confirm that we will be consulted and have the opportunity to comment on the assumptions behind these ahead of the production of the full draft plan. At the full draft plan stage the consultation is normally limited to the soundness and process of preparation of the plan, rather than its underlying assumptions and evidence base.

During any future consultation, we also ask that you take account of the Covid restrictions prevailing at that time and in particular, extend the period of time for responses taking account of the difficulties in properly consulting our communities.

Yours sincerely,

Gillian May - Chair, Gotham Parish Council (gothamgillianm@outlook.com)

Allan Kerr – Chair, Barton in Fabis Parish Council (allan.kerr@btinternet.com)

Ben Wilson - Chair, Thrumpton Parish Meeting (motionhq@gmail.com)

Mark Johnson - Chair, Kingston on Soar Parish Council (paulamarked2@aol.com)

Councillor Rex Walker Rushcliffe Borough Council (cldr.walker@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

My Ref: TH/MJG/JPAB

Your Ref: -

Contact: Cllr Tony Harper

Date: 2 November 2020

Email: Cllr.Tony.Harper@nottsc.gov.uk

Broxtowe Borough Council

Town Hall
Foser Avenue
Beeston
Nottingham
Nottinghamshire
NG9 1AB

Tel: 0115 917 7777
www.gngrowthpoint.com

SENT VIA EMAIL TO:

Gillian May - Chair, Gotham Parish Council
Allan Kerr – Chair, Barton in Fabis Parish Council
Ben Wilson - Chair, Thrumpton Parish Meeting
Mark Johnson - Chair, Kingston on Soar Parish Council
Councillor Rex Walker Rushcliffe Borough Council

Dear Councillor

Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan

Thank you for your letter of 20 October 2020, replying to my response dated 30 September to your initial open letter.

Your letter was given full consideration by the Joint Planning Advisory Board on 27 September, and whilst it is acknowledged that the meeting fell after the close of the consultation period, acknowledgments of your letter were sent, stating our proposed approach. Your request to suspend the consultation process would have the same impact on the preparation timetable of the Plan as suspending the plan making process, and the reasons agreed by the Joint Board as set out in my letter of 27 September apply equally.

With regard to the AECOM report, this is only one part of the evidence base. Before any site is included in the Strategic Plan it will be fully assessed against all reasonable alternative sites by the Councils for suitability and deliverability, including undergoing Sustainability Appraisal and consideration of required infrastructure through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Transport modelling will also be undertaken to ensure impacts on the transport network can be accommodated or mitigated against.

I note that you have responded to the recent consultation, and can confirm that your comments will be given full consideration as we prepare the next version of the Strategic Plan. Furthermore, it is the Councils' intention to prepare an informal draft Strategic Plan

2

2 November 2020

for further consultation in 2021, prior to the formal 'Regulation 19' pre-submission version of the Plan. I can therefore also confirm that you will be consulted at this time and have the opportunity to comment on the assumptions behind any sites that may be included in the Plan.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A Harper', written in a cursive style.

Cllr Tony Harper

Chair of Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board

Copies to: Leaders and Chief Executives of:
Broxtowe Borough Council
Erewash Borough Council
Gedling Borough Council
Nottingham City Council
Rushcliffe Borough Council
Executive Steering Group members

Item 5	Government Consultations: Planning for the Future White Paper and Changes to the current planning system: Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations
---------------	---

1.0 **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published the 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 closed on 31st October 2020. A parallel consultation, proposing changes to the 'standard methodology' for calculating housing need closed on 1st October 2020

Recommendations

It is recommended that Joint Planning Advisory Board NOTE the joint response to the Planning for the Future White paper.

2.0 **Background**

Planning for the Future White Paper

- 2.1 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. At its September meeting, JPAB resolved to delegate the preparation of a joint response on matters of strategic interest where there is a consensus of view to the Executive Steering Group.
- 2.2 The white paper can be viewed at <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future>. The joint response submitted on behalf of JPAB is at Appendix 1 to this report.
- 2.3 The government are currently considering consultation responses, and have indicated that the response to consultation is likely in the new year.

Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations

- 2.4 A separate consultation document was also published, which proposed a revised standard methodology for calculating housing need (it also included changes to affordable housing policy and to Permission in Principle).

- 2.5 If the new proposals for the standard methodology were to remain unchanged by the consultation, they would 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

- 2.6 The Government has stated that it is alive to the issues raised by many Councils as part of the consultation, and a revised approach to housing need is anticipated in the new year.

Contact officer:-

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

Greater Nottingham Planning Partnership

Planning for the Future White Paper response on behalf of the Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board

- 1 The Greater Nottingham Joint Planning Advisory Board (JPAB) oversees the preparation of strategic plans in Greater Nottingham. Its membership is made up of the relevant Portfolio Holding Councillors of Ashfield District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Erewash Borough Council, Derbyshire County Council, Gedling Borough Council, Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council.
- 2 At the meeting of 22 September 2020, JPAB resolved to submit a joint response to the White Paper on matters of relating to strategic planning. The response is attached below.



PLANNING WHITE PAPER – JOINT PLANNING ADVISORY BOARD RESPONSE

A NEW APPROACH TO PLAN-MAKING

Pillar One – Planning for development

Over-arching comments: –

The White Paper includes only limited detail on the operation of the proposed new planning system, which makes making comments more difficult.

UK economy is extremely fragile, and seeking to recover from the pandemic, major planning changes could potentially threaten recovery, for instance by deterring investment whilst investors await a more settled planning position.

There are no proposals in the White paper as to how the proposed system will assist in the “levelling up” of the nation, as Government housing targets in the context of no national or regional plan will deliver continue current trends in growth. This is a significant omission.

The approach appears to be geared towards major (housing) 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. Equally the emphasis on housing delivery is at the expense of the roles of strategic and neighbourhood planning, or how radical reductions in carbon dioxide emissions are to be secured through the planning system.

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.

Defining just 3 areas with a blanket approach within each area could be a very blunt tool. It is potentially unsophisticated and lacking the fine grain required to address development in complex urban areas. The proposal of using sub areas (allocations?) might address this, but again more detail would be helpful.

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 support the stated aim of simpler and shorter Local Plans.

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

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 national policies give 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.

Simplifying the tests of soundness could help to speed up Local Plan examinations.

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 the proposals risk losing established mechanisms, without a replacement. Some of the benefits of joint working in Greater Nottingham include reduced and shared costs and a shared evidence base, together with the ability to present a more rational coherent set of policies to developers across an HMA (rather than every authority having their own unique approach). The Duty is useful not just from a housing numbers point of view but also from the point of view that infrastructure runs across administrative boundaries and co-operation is necessary to avoid the difficulty of conflicting objectives in planning for built development, and ensuring benefits are maximised for green and blue infrastructure to connect and flow across a wider area than just within administrative boundaries. Whilst it is recognised that these benefits could be achieved on a voluntary basis (ie without the Duty to Cooperate), experience from around the Country indicates that cooperation is facilitated by strong incentives.

If most public engagement with the planning system is through plan making, then this undermines democratic controls later in the process. It is well understood that people engage in the planning system when it directly effects them, ie at planning applications stage, and less so when proposals are notional, as in a local plan. Contrary to the aims of the White Paper, 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.

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.

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.

Principle and detail cannot easily be separated in planning decisions. This is because the principle of the suitability of a site depends entirely on the detailed impacts the proposal may have. To understand whether, in principle, development should take place, one first has to understand this detail. The level of detail required to effectively grant outline planning permission across a growth area 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

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. Many extensions of time are requested by applicants rather than instigated by the LPA, and lack of flexibility in timescales will lead to perverse decisions, such as refusals where schemes could be improved given sufficient time.

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.

More standardisation and access via technology would be welcomed, subject to appropriate resources being available.

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.

Whilst it is true that some local plans take too long to prepare, the 30 month timescale of local plan preparation 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. The Government's desire to get more public engagement in plan making is both time and resource hungry, and lengthens preparation timetables.

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

No comment - not a strategic matter.

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

Splitting development sites is the only measure aimed at developers to speed delivery. Given inherent incentives in house builders operating models to drip deed houses to the market, tougher measures are required for this to be effective.

IN splitting sites, a legally binding 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 checks 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.

This would be welcome, planners and developers need clear and unambiguous government policies to allow for consistency in approach across the nation and to enable 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.

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

This is an important objective, but there is a risk that the proposals for 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.

The current level of ambition in this regard as expressed through the consultation on the Future Homes standard 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.

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.

S106 has remained the right choice for many LPAs, as it is flexible, and can respond to very local land value issues. The Government should back up its claim that the new Infrastructure Levy would yield more than the existing process through detailed modelling, otherwise it is simply speculation.

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

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

Areas with low land values and therefore low Infrastructure Levy rates may miss out on affordable housing provision, and so proposals to deliver greater levels of 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

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

Skills and resourcing will be key to making any new 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

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

ITEM 7 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 then 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, took place virtually by video between 26th and 29th October 2020. The County Council is now in the process of preparing a schedule of post-hearing modifications for public consultation. This is anticipated to take place in late November/December.
- 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 been assessed alongside other sites that were previously considered and five preferred sites have been identified. The Councils commenced a consultation on a Sand and Gravel Site Allocations Document on 20th October which runs until 13th December 2020. A consultation on the full proposed draft Plan is anticipated in the Spring of 2021 and submission anticipated in late Summer 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 the Spring of 2021 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 late Summer 2021. Anticipated completion and adoption of the new plan is in 2022.

Lead Officers:

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

Stephen Pointer, Team Manager Planning Policy,
Nottinghamshire County Council
stephen.pointer@nottscc.gov.uk, 0115 993 9388

Steve Buffery, Team Leader Policy and Monitoring
Derbyshire County Council
Steven.Buffery@derbyshire.gov.uk 01629 539808

ITEM 8 HE Capacity Funding – Quarter 2 (Year 4) July to September 2020

1.0 Summary

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

2.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that JPAB **NOTE** this report and the details set out in Appendix 1 and **NOTE** the re-purposing of Nottingham City Council's Island project underspend as set out in Appendix 2.

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 2 (Year 4) – July to September 2020

- 4.1 Progress/updates for this quarter is set out in Appendix 1.
- 4.3 There is a small amount of grant remaining for the Nottingham City Council's Island project which NCC intend to repurpose in line with grant conditions. This 're-purposing' of £5,647.00 was agreed at the last ESG. (Project details are provided at appendix 2)

4.0 Risks and Issues

- 4.1 Stanton Regeneration Site project has been highlighted as Amber until further details as to how this site will be progressed have been established. 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 3 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:	12 th November 220		
Project Manager	Peter McAnespie	Reporting Period:	Quarter 2 (Year 4) July - September 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: The north half of the former Stanton Ironworks site has now been sold by St Gobain to a development company. Active discussions are being held between the Planning Authority and that development company, and between that development company and Homes England, with a view to using the accelerated housing fund monies to fund a study to firmly establish ground conditions with the view to supporting a planning application. • Grant total: £100,000. Remaining: £98,684.06 <p>Gedling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A60 corridor transport assessment: Systra has now been appointed to undertake transport modelling work. Work commenced in September 2020 and is due to be completed by January 2021. However, 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:** Following a refresh of progress on delivering the Waterside Supplementary Planning Document NCC are now preparing an Action Plan for the Poulton Drive area. They have re-engaged with key stakeholders and are undertaking a review of title/leaseholder interests prior to feasibility work.
- Grant total: £70,000. Remaining: £14,857.66

Rushcliffe sites:

- The Strategic Sites Delivery Officer post will be extended until 30 June 2021 in order to enable continued support to be provided for the projects.
- Further discussions are taking place with the landowners/land promoters to discuss the adoption of an SPD framework the site together as piecemeal submissions are now looking like the only prospect of this site delivering some six years after adoption.
- East of Gamston: To date two productive meetings have been held with the landowners/promoters and a third is scheduled prior to the end of the year (2020) to discuss content, timescale and workloads. All landowners have been advised that it is highly unlikely that the Borough Council would determine any planning applications for the site until an SPD has been formally entered into by all parties and adopted by the Borough Council. Submission of the outline application is anticipated in late December 2020.
- South of Clifton Strategic Allocation: Three separate Reserved Matters (all for infrastructure provision; roads, drainage and earthworks) have now been determined, numerous discharge of conditions applications are currently pending determination and a forth for an electricity primary substation is due for determination shortly. The first reserved matters application for residential development is anticipated to be submitted for consideration by the end of the year (2020).
- North of Bingham: The Borough Council understands that a submission to vary the house types (circa. 100 dwellings) for part of the site surrounding the primary school may be submitted for consideration shortly.
- Former RAF Newton: Applications to discharge conditions have been submitted and are currently pending determination. Similarly an application to vary one individual house has also been submitted for consideration.
- Grant total: £240,000. All grant committed.

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 which is proposed to be repurposed as detailed in Appendix 2 of this report.

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	Further details on the timetable to progress this site to be provided when known	SB/AR	Live

Funding Allocation: £855,000					RAG Status		AMBER
Forecast spend Yr4/Qtr 2 (July – Sept 2020)	£855,000	Actual Expenditure	£529,352	Committed Expenditure	£60,500	Remaining	£265,147
Actual Expenditure	Year 1	£0.00 (April – June 2017)	£9,585 (July – Sept 2017)	£9,585 (Oct – Dec 2017)	£113,303 (Jan – March 2018)		
	Year 2	£113,303 (April – June 2018)	£168,872 (July – Sept 2018)	£311,130 (Oct – Dec 2018)	£331,293 (Jan – March 2019)		
	Year 3	£331,293 (April – June 2019)	£376,296 (July – Sept 2019)	£391,296 (Oct – Dec 2019)	£489,352 (Jan – March 2020)		
	Year 4	£489,352 (April – June 2020)					

Notes on reasons for budget variances:

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

Appendix 2 - Homes England Capacity Funding – repurposing of grant monies. Nottingham City Council

Site

Waterside - Area bounded by Poulton Drive, Daleside Road, Lady Bay Bridge and River Trent

Current uses

Generally industrial, light industrial and sui generis (including waste recycling, garage, showrooms, storage, offices)

Local Plan

Entire site is allocated for development (primarily residential) in the Nottingham Local Plan and is anticipated to deliver between 350 and 420 dwellings in the longer term, however, between 100 and 200 dwellings are expected to be developed within the Plan period with a mid-point of 150, to take account of potential complex site assembly.

Description and Rationale for Funding

The sites fall within the Waterside Regeneration Area close to the final phase of Trent Basin redevelopment being progressed by Blueprint.

Nottingham City Council owns several assets in the area. In order to accelerate the pace of change in the Waterside, the Council wishes to work with neighbouring owners to create development parcels which are attractive and which deliver development which meets the aims of the Waterside Supplementary Planning Document.

Positive discussions regarding working collaboratively on site redevelopment have been held with two key stakeholders. However, ownership is complex in this area and due to historic uses viability is likely to be challenging.

Capacity funding is proposed to be used to undertake baseline work to refresh the title information for the area (approx. £500). This is anticipated to be complete with 2 months (completed by end of December 2020). The remaining funding may also be used to undertake feasibility and appraisal work to test indicative schemes to understand the costs and viability of development and subject to the outcome undertake acquisition and marketing of a strategic sites.

ITEM 9 Any other business

ITEM 10 Future Meetings

Dates to be confirmed

Council Chamber, Council Offices, Beeston