



## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PANEL

9.30am to 11.50am

25 July 2012

Present: Councillors Bremner (chair), Carlo (vice chair), Brimblecombe (substitute for Councillor Grahame), Grenville, Kendrick (substitute for Councillor Brociek-Coulton), Lubbock, Sands (M) and Stammers

Apologies: Councillors Brociek-Coulton and Grahame

### 1. MINUTES

**RESOLVED** to agree the minutes of the meetings held on 20 and 27 June 2012.

### 2. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) FOR NORWICH – SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTATION AND INFORMATION TO THE EXAMINER

The chair introduced the report and explained that this report was on the draft charging schedule and not about the collection and use of CIL.

The city growth and development manager presented the covering report and referred to the report to council (25 July 2012). The panel was advised that copies of the schedule, summarising the 35 responses to the consultation and the officers' response, were available in the members' group rooms. The Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) board had considered the report last week and supported the recommendations. Members were advised that there had been representations from three national supermarket chains in relation to the differential charging for retail stores suggesting that this should be the same regardless of scale. However officers were convinced that the evidence that this should be greater for large stores was robust and were not proposing to amend this. Members were advised that the same issue had been considered in Poole in Dorset and the CIL charge for retail had been dropped at the public examination stage. Members were also advised of the reasons for the lower rate of CIL for flats was because of the high costs of construction and that viability would be threatened. The one change proposed in response to the consultation was to reduce the threshold to which this rate applied from six storeys to five, following some further advice from NPS. Legal advice on the position of CIL in relation to the current position of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) had been obtained which confirmed that the CIL submission could

proceed as proposed. To assist the examiner a further evidence paper had been produced which demonstrates that the rates of CIL proposed were not dependent on the adoption of the remitted parts of the JCS and showed that there was an infrastructure funding gap irrespective of the growth locations. CIL could be adopted by the council at the end of 2012.

During discussion the city growth and development manager answered members' questions. She explained that each district council would charge and collect CIL for use on infrastructure within its own area or it could decide to contribute to larger infrastructure in a neighbouring district council area. The management and spend of CIL was subject to a further decision by the council. The government had not issued the amended CIL regulations which would set out how funds for parish councils or local communities would be allocated. .. A member pointed out that this council would need to consider developing a mechanism for community involvement such as parish councils or forums to manage CIL. Members were also advised that developers would need to pay the CIL charge at the beginning of a development, regardless of whether the costs of development rise during the construction process, and that for larger developments it was proposed that the charge could be made in staged payments allowing up to 2 years to pay depending on the level of CIL due. This put authorities in a stronger position than previously with S106 payments. There were strong sanctions for non payment of CIL charges which included imprisonment.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the recommendations to cabinet that it:

(1) notes the following material:

- (a) the report 'Statement of Representations Received Following Publication of the Draft Charging Schedules for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (Appendix 1 of the GNDP Board report);
- (b) the Statement of Modifications for the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule for Norwich City Council (Appendix 2 of the GNDP Board report);
- (c) the evidence paper Infrastructure requirement in advance of an adopted Core Strategy in the Broadland Part of the Norwich Policy Area (Appendix 3 of the GNDP Board report);
- (d) the supplementary evidence on the Build Costs of Flats in Norwich City (Appendix 4 of the GNDP Board report);
- (e) the Community Infrastructure Levy Draft Charging Schedule for Norwich (Appendix 6 of the GNDP Board report);
- (f) the copies of all representations made in accordance with Regulation 17 (available at the meeting and in Members' Rooms and on the GNDP website [www.gndp.org.uk/our-work/cil](http://www.gndp.org.uk/our-work/cil));
- (g) the Statement of Compliance (Appendix 8 of the GNDP Board report);

(2) recommends to council that it:

- (a) agrees a minor change to the CIL charging schedule for Norwich so that the £100 per sq m rate of CIL applies to flats of 5 storeys and above and publish the evidence supporting this change;
- (b) publishes the Statements of Modifications and evidence in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and submit these (and necessary submission documents as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the GNDP Board report) for examination by an independent examiner;
- (c) continues to work together towards the indicative timetable set out in paragraphs 7-9 of this report (Paragraph 4.6 of the GNDP Board report);
- (d) agrees that any minor changes to any of the documents to ensure consistency and clarity be delegated to the deputy chief executive (operations) following discussion with the relevant portfolio holder.

### **3. JOINT CORE STRATEGY FOR BROADLAND, NORWICH AND SOUTH NORFOLK – OUTCOME OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND NEXT STEPS**

The head of planning services presented the report and explained the outcome of the legal challenge to the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and referred members to paragraph 5 and 6 of the court order. Members were advised that the sustainability appraisal was not yet complete and would be updated in the light of the discussions on the reasonable alternatives at each of the partner authorities. Plans were displayed showing the location of three reasonable alternatives assessed through sustainability appraisal. There will be a need to incorporate the census figures when fully available into the evidence base.

Discussion ensued on each of the reasonable alternatives as set out in the report. The head of planning services explained that one of the disadvantages of alternative 3 was that it did not create sufficient critical mass to provide the necessary infrastructure for growth. Whilst alternative 1 was being proposed as being more attractive to the market and in a stronger position to deliver affordable housing, alternative 2 would not have to address the issues of the crossing the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) and or take up greater land take up. Members were advised that alternative 2 would focus on North Walsham Road and Salhouse Road and would be further away from the Broads. It would be dense development constrained by the NDR. Alternative 1 would open up the area to Rackheath and was the recommended option.

During discussion a member said that he had attended a meeting at Sprowston Town Council offices and there were people in Sprowston and Old Catton who supported alternative 1 because it would retain the environmental features of the area which would be lost in dense development under alternative 2. Members noted that there would be no denying that the character of Rackheath would be changed. Sustainable transport links by public transport and cycling would be developed.

Councillor Carlo said that the Green Group would not be supporting the recommendations. Alternatives 1 and 2 would lead to encroachment of the suburbs and the Green Group questioned the view that the overall housing figures were not a matter

for consideration as a result of the court order and she referred to initial findings of the 2011 census. She suggested another alternative to be worked up which comprised the delivery of 5,000 houses in the Sprowston area and deferring the delivery of 4,000 homes until after 2026, the end of the planning policy period. She said that it was unlikely that the strategy would deliver all the projected housing between now and 2026.

The head of planning services said that the trajectory for the delivery of housing growth went beyond 2026 and that to change the delivery of planned homes to unplanned provision would not comply with the court order. The JCS provided for growth of 37,000 homes in the GNDP area and to amend this would require a complete review of the process. The consultation on the sustainability appraisal and the modification of the plan allowed further comments to be made.

Councillor Lubbock said that she supported the JCS and was in favour of alternatives 1 and 2.

**RESOLVED** with 4 members voting in favour (Councillors Bremner, Kendrick, Grenville and Sands (M)), 3 members voting against (Councillors Carlo, Brimblecombe and Stammers) and 1 member abstaining (Councillor Lubbock) to cabinet that it endorses the following recommendations to council:

- (1) having considered the screening of reasonable alternatives set out in section four of the draft SA (available at [www.gndp.org.uk](http://www.gndp.org.uk) from 19 July, in Members' Rooms and summarised in 4.6 to 4.8 of Annex A) and the supporting evidence base (see paragraph 17 of this report), it is recommended that **reasonable alternative one** (the remitted text) is chosen as the most appropriate option.
- (2) agree that reasonable alternative one meets the tests of soundness set out in paragraph 1.5 of annex A, that the SA is finalised in due course and **reasonable alternative one** is taken forward for pre-submission consultation.
- (3) approve the publication of the remitted parts of the Joint Core Strategy (attached as Appendix 3 to Annex A) for pre-submission consultation supported by the evidence base listed in paragraph 17 of this report.
- (4) agree delegated authority for the deputy chief executive (operations) in consultation with the portfolio holder for environment and development to agree, in partnership with GNDP partners, to make further minor changes to the JCS and supporting documentation prior to publication to reflect emerging evidence and any necessary corrections.

#### 4. PLANNING POLICY UPDATE

The planning team leader (projects) and the planning team leader (policy) presented the report and together with the head of planning services answered members' questions.

During discussion on Broadland District Council's alternative sites consultation, the panel considered the proposal to allocate land at Pinebanks for housing. The alternative sites in this document have been proposed by developers and currently

have no status. Members recommended that the council should object to the loss of Pinebanks for recreation and leisure use. The head of planning services explained that although there were some parallels with the Lakenham Sports Ground site, the compulsory purchase of part of that site meant that it was no longer viable for use as a sports ground. Sport England was expected to comment on the Broadland District alternative sites consultation.

During discussion on the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on the reuse of existing buildings members considered the draft response proposed by the officers on behalf of the council and agreed that the proposals to introduce prior approval would increase bureaucracy and necessitate a review of delegations to officers because it would not always be possible to meet the deadlines of the committee cycle. Members were also advised that the proposal to make it easier for small hotels to convert to dwelling houses should not be a problem but the government had not specified a threshold and the conversion of large hotels to residential use should be controlled.

**RESOLVED** to endorse the officers' comments in response to the:

- (1) Broadland District Council consultation on alternative sites;
- (2) DCLG "New opportunities for sustainable development and growth through the reuse of existing buildings" consultation.

## **5. ENHANCED SUPPORT FOR RECYCLING SERVICES**

The environment service development manager presented the report and explained that the city council would submit a joint bid for funding to promote food waste recycling in partnership with Broadland District Council, South Norfolk Council and the county council. If the bid was successful the government would provide funding for three years and expect that the councils would provide funding for a further two years. The city council could fund the further two years from its waste recycling budget.

Discussion ensued in which the panel considered the success of the "door knocking" scheme considered at its last meeting. Some concern was expressed about encouraging the use of the compostable bags because it was not sustainable. Residents could wrap items in newspaper or wash out the bin after use. The participation rate in food waste recycling was 28% in some areas and there was evidence to suggest that if liners were provided free of charge this could rise to 70%. A member asked whether other barriers to participation in food waste recycling had been taken into consideration. The environment service development manager said that the responses received during the "door knocking" programme suggested that there were other reasons for people not using the food waste bins but there was strong evidence that provision of liners encouraged greater participation in food waste recycling.

Councillor Lubbock suggested that the council appointed a member of the council to act a recycling champion to encourage the correct use of recycling bins.

**RESOLVED** to recommend to cabinet that it approves a bid in the region of £475.5k to the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Weekly Support Scheme, in order to expand the food waste collection service and continue the current programme of doorstep recycling support into financial years 2013-14 and 2014-15.

CHAIR