



Sustainable Development Panel

16:00 to 17:00

14 November 2023

Present: Councillors Hampton (chair), Giles (vice chair), Carrington, Champion, Driver, Hoechner Lubbock and Oliver

Apologies: Councillor Osborn

1. Declarations of Interest

None.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2023.

3. 2021/22 Annual Monitoring Report

The Planning Policy Team Leader presented the report and apologised that in the absence of the report author, she would take back any questions that required further information. The full Greater Norwich Development Partnership Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) 2021/22 had been published temporarily on the council's website but would be available on the Greater Norwich Growth Board's website. The report provided the information to monitor the effectiveness of the Greater Norwich Joint Core Strategy for the period 2021 to 2022. As in the previous period (2020/2021) the AMR report had been published later than usual due to the delay caused by the pandemic and the Greater Norwich Development Team's resources being diverted to focus on the public examination of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP), due to be adopted in March 2024.

During discussion members of the Planning Policy Team Leader advised members that the AMR covers only the period 2021 to 2022. She also undertook to provide further information to questions outside the meeting. (These responses are appended to the minutes of this meeting at Appendix A.)

In reply to a member's question, regarding Table 3.31 Number of listed buildings lost/demolished, the Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the data would not

reflect the more recent loss of listed or locally listed buildings lost to fire or demolished outside this period¹.

A member asked how the monitoring of the reduction in carbon emissions was included in the process, mapped against targets. She considered that the current monitoring was inadequate. The Planning Policy Team Leader said that it was acknowledged that the monitoring data would change when the new GNLP was adopted. This could not be finalised until the completion of the plan as monitoring referred to each policy. She would take this back as an action.

A member referred to Table 3.30 Percentage of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and asked why the data was missing for the period 2018 to 2020. The Planning Policy Team Leader said that this data was measured by the Environment Agency, and it could be that the data was not available for the period. A member suggested that some of this could be due to the constraints of lockdowns due to Covid during this period.

A member pointed out that the action against the climate change score card showed that progress in achieving the aims of the policies had performed well. She considered there needed to be further information to break down the data by land use, local government area and financial/economical areas. In reply, the Planning Policy Team Leader said that there would be a new set of data connected to the objectives of the policies. Some data relied on third parties and moving forward new sources of publicly available data would be used to monitor the effectiveness of the policies by the GDLP team.

A member referred to Table 3.23 Objective 5: to allow people to develop to their full potential by providing educational facilities to meet the needs of existing and future populations and said that there needed to be a new indicator that picks up the young people who were not in education, training, or apprenticeships. The Planning Policy Team Leader said that this was useful feedback.

The panel discussed the five-year land supply. The Planning Policy Team Leader said that she was not aware that there was an exemption to demonstrate a five-year land supply because of Nutrient Neutrality. It was expected that at the time of adoption of the GNLP, it would be possible to demonstrate the five-year land supply. It was important for local planning authorities to be able to defend against proposals for development of less sustainable sites.²

Discussion ensued in which a member asked at what date did Nutrient Neutrality cease to be an issue for Broadland District Council, South Norfolk Council and the

¹ The report author subsequently confirmed that the number of listed buildings lost/demolished during the zero.

² The report author subsequently provided the following response – For the purposes of decision making, the Greater Norwich authorities have not sought to demonstrate a five-year land supply since March 2022 due to the constraints introduced by the requirement for development to demonstrate nutrient neutrality. As part of the preparation of the Greater Norwich Local Plan, a housing trajectory has been produced. This takes a cautious approach to housing delivery, taking account of nutrient neutrality. Taking account of progress being made in respect of both private and council nutrient mitigation schemes, the Greater Norwich authorities consider there is sufficient clear evidence to demonstrate a five-year land supply at the point the GNLP is adopted.

city council and commented that the mitigation that was being put in place appeared to be piecemeal. The Planning Policy Team Leader said that there was discussion on individual sites at the public examination. The joint venture, the Norfolk Environmental Credits, and the city council's own nutrient mitigation scheme to retrofit council housing stock, allowed some planning consents to be granted. A member expressed concern that mitigation was costly and that the local councils did not have the money to compulsory land to provide it.

A member said that she considered that the measurement of only two particulates for air quality monitoring was inadequate. She considered that this should include all the particulates recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO) to lower the threshold of air pollution for human life.

Discussion ensued on the AMR data and that its principal function was to monitor the efficacy of the policies in the local plan and as evidence to support initiatives. An example of this was the introduction by the council for an Article 4 Direction in response to loss of office floor space following the relaxation of permitted development rights.

Members noted that the Greater Norwich Growth Board would consider the AMR at its next meeting and the full report would be available on its website.

In reply to a question from a member, the Planning Policy Team Leader said that the award of credits in relation to Nutrient Neutrality fell outside the period 2021 to 2022 covered by this AMR. There would be a report to cabinet to determine whether the council joins the joint venture in due course. Three planning applications for developments, which includes Anglia Square, have been granted conditional to the council's credit mitigation scheme.³

The Planning Policy Team Leader said that she was not aware of the progress on the DM26 Progress on the implementation of the UEA Masterplan.⁴

RESOLVED to:

- (1) note the contents of the 2021/22 GNDP Annual Monitoring Report;
- (2) note that the panel considers that monitoring data going forward should include:
 - (a) more robust carbon emissions data;
 - (b) a breakdown of the climate change score card by land use, local government area, and financial/economic area;
 - (c) a new indicator to ensure that people in education/training or apprenticeships.

³ Three planning permissions have been issued at Anglia Square, Argyle Street and Ber Street with the intention of using credits under the city council's mitigation scheme.

⁴ There is no more up to date information in relation to the UEA Master Plan available. The council continues to meet with the Higher Education Institutions in Norwich to understand their growth plans as part of our engagement around Purpose Built Student Accommodation, and any updates will be reported as part of the next Annual Monitoring Report.

- (d) ensure that the monitoring of Air Quality particulates is in accordance with the WHO recommendations;
- (3) ask the Planning Policy Team Leader to provide further information to members' questions (responses were subsequently provided by the report author and have been included in these minutes as footnotes.)

CHAIR