



SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PANEL

9.30am to 12.10pm

29 June 2011

Present: Councillors Bremner (chair, following election), Carlo (vice chair, following election), Grenville, Little, Stammers and Sands (M)

Apologies: Councillors Brociek-Coulton and Lubbock

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR

RESOLVED to appoint Councillor Bremner as chair for the ensuing civic year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

RESOLVED to appoint Councillor Carlo as vice chair for the ensuing civic year.

3. MEMBERSHIP

It was noted that Councillor Stammers would be replacing Councillor Offord as a member of this panel.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bremner declared a personal interest in item 8, preparation of masterplan for Earlham Hall because a close family member is employed at the University of East Anglia.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2011.

6. SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (DPD) – ADDITIONAL CONSULTATION FOR MAJOR AMENDMENTS/NEW SITES

The planning team leader (regeneration) presented the report and the supplementary report, circulated at the meeting, which provided further assessment on the sites included in the Regulation 25 consultation, and, together with the senior planner (policy), answered members' questions.

The panel then considered each of the sites proposed for inclusion in the additional consultation as set out in appendix 1.

In relation to site reference E015(M), Kerrison Road/Hardy Road, Gothic Works, members expressed concern about the cumulative effect of loss of employment land in the area; contamination on the land and the affect that housing might have on the road infrastructure. Officers advised that the issue of loss of employment land and possible contamination had been identified in the constraints. Heavy industrial traffic to the site was incompatible with the narrow residential roads and housing was considered a more suitable use.

Councillor Carlo asked that the site at reference H006, King Street Stores and Sports Hall be removed from the consultation to allow for users of the sports hall facility to produce a business plan to retain the facility. During discussion the head of planning services advised that the proposal was included in the consultation as it would be an opportunity to test the soundness of the need for sports and leisure elements in the proposed mixed use for this site and should provide evidence to support this. Members commented that sites allocated on adjacent sites had not been developed but noted that the site allocation plan was for a long term plan and would be effective once adopted until 2026.

Members commented that they expected that site reference H029b, Gas holder at Gas Hill, would be contaminated.

Councillor Bremner said that he would be meeting with Lakenham ward councillors on 7 July 2011 to discuss the proposed site allocation for site reference M007, part of former Lakenham Sports and Leisure Centre, Cricket Ground Road. The head of planning services explained the history of the site and that public consultation would be a useful way to bring this redundant site back into use. Councillor Little said that there needed to be some clarification of the streets that would be used to access the site in the consultation and that Smithfield Road was a busy road with a school. Members were advised that access was indicative at present but could be considered further. Access for instance could be limited to the allotments.

In response to a question relating to the protection of the Yare Valley corridor (site reference land west of Bluebell Road, Bartram Mowers Ltd), the head of planning services said that the site allocation was already delineated by some development, in the form of buildings, sheds and hard standing areas, alternating with green grassed areas. Members confirmed that this site could be included in the consultation.

With reference to site reference MO49, Mile Cross Depot, Councillor Carlo suggested that there was potential for employment from recycled materials given the proximity to the tip. It was noted that this would be a suitable use for small business units.

Members considered the retention of the façade of Van Dal shoe factory (site reference NOR0093(H), Van Dal Shoes, Dibden Road) and were advised that it could be demolished and was not of sufficient architectural merit or condition to justify its conservation. The head of planning services said that the site had previously been withdrawn pending the outcome of a planning application for a

hostel to the rear of the site. This had been granted and the hostel was now under construction.

RESOLVED to recommend to cabinet recommend that cabinet authorises further public consultation on the additional and amended sites as set out in appendix 1 subject to:

- (1) in relation to site reference H006 – King Street store and sports hall, to request that the proposed allocation is amended to encourage sports development to be requires as part of the redevelopment of this site;
- (2) noting the comments recorded above.

7. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES (DPD) – FEEDBACK FROM REGULATION 25 CONSULTATION AND NEXT STAGES

(Councillor Grenville left the meeting during this item.)

The head of planning services presented the report and together with the planner (policy) answered members' questions. (A supplementary report was circulated at the meeting which replaced paragraph 8 of the report.) Members were advised that all comments received had been recorded on the database and that some of the issues arising from the comments were already being addressed in early versions of redrafted policies.

Discussion ensued on the recommendations to redraft policy DM4 (energy efficiency and renewable energy). Councillor Stammers commented that the standards for renewable energy in the adopted joint core strategy (JCS) were minimum standards (10%) and this could lead to the acceptance of lower standards rather than seeking to achieve better ones. The head of planning services explained that the JCS set the minimum standard as part of the application process and there was scope to exceed that provision where it was viable and practicable.

Councillor Carlo referred to policy DM3 (design) and said that design could be used to alleviate the effect of climate change. Urban areas had more hard surfaces (concrete, brick and tarmac) and were therefore warmer than rural areas. Features such as living roofs and walls, window boxes, nest boxes and planting to encourage biodiversity and improve drainage should be part of building design. Copenhagen was such an example of a green city. Other members supported this suggestion both for the long term importance for future generations but also to encourage tourism in the city. In response the head of planning suggested that further evidence should be obtained to see how far it was legitimate to move this policy forward and what measures to could be used to maximise greening of development in the city. It was suggested that there should be further debate on this issue at the next meeting. The head of planning referred to the green infrastructure corridors in the city, which link up to encourage the movement of wildlife, and said that there had not been sufficient evidence to support the formal identification of these corridors in the DM policies plan.

Discussion then ensued on policy DM27 (Norwich Airport) and whether it should be modified to reflect emerging changes in the direction of government policy on the sustainable development of regional airports. Councillor Carlo referred to the recent

DfT scoping paper on developing a sustainable aviation framework for the UK, suggesting that policy DM27 be modified to reflect the likely changes in national policy on airport expansion arising from that document and also to address the social and environmental impacts of aviation on the local community and on global warming. Members also discussed the need for retaining policy DM27 in the plan at all, given that government policies and the Joint Core Strategy already supported the managed expansion of the airport. Members felt that the policy should be retained since it would promote debate on the need for Norwich airport to produce its master plan. The lack of public transport links to the airport was noted. Members were advised that the airport was broadening its business base. Councillors Bremner and Grenville both considered that it would be unrealistic to limit the use of the airport and that it was part of the city's economic success. Councillor Carlo suggested the use of fuel efficient aircraft, with quieter engines, to mitigate the environmental and social impacts. Councillor Little, referred to paragraph 92 of the report relating to JCS policy 6, and suggested that it would be more correct to replace "supporting" with "managing", and inserting "safe environment limits" so that the statement read as follows: "managing within safe environmental limits, the growth and regional significance of Norwich International Airport for both leisure and business travel to destinations across the UK and beyond". The head of planning services said that there could be supporting text in the DM policies plan to reflect this.

Councillor Little referred to policy DM9 in relation to Mousehold Heath and said that he was concerned that the pavilion could not be locally listed since it was not in a conservation area. The head of planning said that there had been some progress on the issue of local listing which he would email to members of the panel in due course.

RESOLVED having considered the response to the consultation draft of the Development Management Policies Plan, to:

- (1) endorse these changes as a basis for taking forward work to produce the Regulation 27 draft version of the document;
- (2) in relation to policy DM3 (design), request that the head of planning services provides further information on green infrastructure achieved through design to be reported to the next meeting.

8. PREPARATION OF MASTERPLAN FOR EARLHAM HALL

(Councillor Bremner had declared a personal interest in this item.)

The head of planning services presented the report and said that copies of the vision and design document (VADD) could be available to panel members on request.

Discussion ensued in which members discussed public concern to previous proposals for the development of the site and that the state of the greenhouses were now derelict and in poor state of repair. Members were advised that there had been relatively responses to the consultation on the University of East Anglia's masterplan.

RESOLVED to note the progress towards the preparation of the masterplan for Earlham Hall and endorse the consultation arrangements as proposed in the report.

9. CORPORATE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

The environment strategy manager presented the report and answered questions. There would be a briefing session for members of the council on the proposals to install photo voltaic (PV) panels on the roof of City Hall.

RESOLVED to:-

- (1) receive the environmental statement 2010-11;
- (2) thank the environment strategy manager for his contribution.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED to:

- (1) agree a schedule of meetings for 2011-12 at the next meeting;
- (2) hold the next meeting on Wednesday 27 July 2011 at 9.30am.

CHAIR