

Sustainable development panel

Date: Wednesday, 18 July 2018

Time: 09:30

Venue: Westwick room, City Hall, St Peters Street, Norwich, NR2 1NH

Committee members:*

Councillors:

Carlo
Hampton
Lubbock
Maguire
Stewart
Stonard
Thomas (Va)
Trevor

For further information please contact:

Committee officer: Jackie Rodger
t: (01603) 212033
e: jackierodger@norwich.gov.uk

Democratic services
City Hall
Norwich
NR2 1NH

www.norwich.gov.uk

Information for members of the public

Members of the public and the media have the right to attend meetings of full council, the cabinet and committees except where confidential information or exempt information is likely to be disclosed, and the meeting is therefore held in private.

For information about attending or speaking at meetings, please contact the committee officer above or refer to the council's website



If you would like this agenda in an alternative format, such as a larger or smaller font, audio or Braille, or in a different language, please contact the committee officer above.

Agenda

Page nos

1 **Appointment of chair**

To elect the chair for the ensuing civic year

2 **Appointment of vice chair**

To elect the vice chair for the ensuing civic year

3 **Apologies**

To receive apologies for absence

4 **Declarations of interest**

(Please note that it is the responsibility of individual members to declare an interest prior to the item if they arrive late for the meeting)

5 **Minutes**

5 - 8

To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2018

6 **Planning Policy Update and Work Programme**

9 - 38

Purpose - To update members on the current work programme of the planning policy team and to set out the key work items that are expected to be reported to the sustainable development panel in coming months.

7 **Greater Norwich Local Plan Update**

39 - 44

Purpose - To update members on the current work programme of the planning policy team and to set out the key work and to set out the key work items that are expected to be reported to the sustainable development panel in coming months.

Date of publication: **Tuesday, 10 July 2018**



Sustainable development panel

09:30 to 11:20

21 March 2018

Present: Councillors Stonard (chair), Thomas (Va) (vice chair), Davis, Carlo (substitute for Councillor Grahame), Jackson, Lubbock, Maguire and Malik

Apologies: Councillor Grahame

1. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest. However, it was noted that panel members had received emails about the River Wensum Strategy.

2. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2018.

3. River Wensum Strategy

The team leader regeneration presented the report. She referred to Appendix 1 which set out the proposed changes to the River Wensum Strategy, and explained that PC2 referred to a comment from the county council's environment, transport and development committee regarding the need to include a reference in the document to the proposed Western Link from the Northern Distributor Road to the A47. She also pointed out that under PC14, the document reference should be to map 5.

Discussion ensued in which the team leader regeneration answered members' questions. Members commented on the strategy which they considered to be positive. A member suggested that there was potential to link in with the Active Hours project in the city, particularly with residents in Mile Cross.

A member commented that she was unhappy with the wording in paragraphs 28 and 30 regarding income generation. It was not fair to say that the city council would generate an income. The pontoons would require maintenance. The chair said that the strategy was financially neutral but had potential to identify income generation schemes which would benefit the city as a whole. There was no specific budget for the strategy but it would act as the basis for funding bids. The Broads Authority would receive mooring fees for the use of pontoons. The team leader said that she understood the point being made that the text should reflect the potential to benefit the city in the wider sense.

Discussion ensued on the development of projects and consultation with residents and communities as funding came forward. A member said that he was pleased that the residents' concerns had been taken on board and the missing link of Riverside Walk, between Fye Bridge and Whitefriars, had been removed from the action plan. He said that he considered that whilst it was a long term ambition to link the Riverside Walk but it would require a lot of thought before implementation at this part of the river.

A member said that she was pleased that biodiversity had been included in the objectives. She referred to her question to council (23 January 2018) and pointed out that as the River Wensum provided the drinking water for the city, she was concerned that pesticides, particularly neonicotinoids, were entering the river system from run off from agricultural land up river and there should be a reference in the strategy. In response other members commented that the health of the river was already covered in the strategy and noting that the EU was considering a ban on the use of neonicotinoids. A member expressed concern that drilling down into too much detail meant that it would cease to be a strategy and it was pointless to include a specific reference to the use of a pesticide which the strategy could not address. The team leader regeneration said that the biodiversity enhancement plan would be developed in partnership with the University of East Anglia and Norfolk Wildlife Trust. The focus was on the health of the river and it might be possible to investigate the use of pesticides as part of this. The chair referred to paragraph 11(b) and suggested that the panel recommended additional wording to reflect the health of the river in its broader context. However, following some discussion members considered that "water quality" should be added to the objective relating to the enhancement of the natural environment and biodiversity.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) endorse the revised River Wensum Strategy and to recommend it to cabinet, subject to the inclusion of "water strategy" in the natural environment, with biodiversity, objective:
- (2) thank Judith Davison, team leader regeneration, for pulling together the River Wensum Strategy and co-ordinating the multi-agency approach.

4. Publication of Draft Revisions of the National Planning Policy Framework

The head of planning services introduced the report and questioned the level of consideration that would be given to responses on the draft framework. He cited the recent consultation on a methodology for assessing housing needs which around 75 per cent of respondents had not supported the methodology yet it was now proposed to be incorporated into the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The team leader regeneration presented the report and summarised the changes proposed to the NPPF. The focus of the changes was on housing delivery and included the delivery of affordable housing and based on recent government consultations. The key themes were:

- Plan making: a crucial area given that over half of local planning authorities (LPAs) in England did not have an up-to-date local plan in place. The

proposed measures included plans and policies that did not duplicate each other; change to test of soundness; and, strengthening joint working through statements of common ground.

- Housing needs and requirements: introducing new standardised methodology for assessing housing and housing products which include build to rent and affordable home ownership.
- Use of land: Measures include protection of green belt land and prioritisation of Brownfield over Greenfield sites; LPAs required to agree housing land supply on an annual basis fixed for one year;
- Housing delivery: Measures to encourage development to be brought forward include introduction of housing delivery test; the use of small sites (20 per cent of supply should be sites of less than half a hectare); and reduction of implementation time scales to two years.
- Developer contributions to support housing delivery: Measures proposed should reduce complexity and support swifter development (by improving viability assessment in plan making and transparent accountability).

The planning system was not the problem in terms of planning delivery. The focus on numbers and efficiency of sites could lose sight of factors that drive high quality housing in places which contribute to quality of life – key factors for local people. Councils need powers to intervene in situations where schemes should be brought forward but there did not appear to be much evidence of mechanisms for enforcement. LPAs need to establish housing need and neighbourhood plans would need to accommodate growth and not be a tool to resist it. The NPPF was not proactive in promoting a strong competitive economy or the development of strong communities which were more than just housing developments. The changes to affordable housing outlined at least a 10 per cent affordable home ownership as part of the overall affordable housing contribution for the site in major housing developments. The implications of this would need to be considered as it was not clear how this would be interpreted. There would be an exemption for sites that only provided Build to Rent homes and affordable private rent would qualify for affordable housing in build-to-rent schemes. The revised NPPF places more emphasis on viability assessment at local plan stage as opposed to the decision making stage. This was a simplistic view of how development economics work and that further assessment was needed as costs and values change over time.

Discussion ensued on viability assessments in which members commented on the 20 per cent profit margin for developers. Members noted that the intention was to deliver housing but this could weaken the local planning authority's position when negotiating affordable housing contributions with developers. A member said that he considered that the proposals transferred the profit risk to the LPA from the developer and there should be more powers to challenge viability assessments. The head of planning services said that a 20 per cent profit margin might deter developers from developing high risk sites. It was considered that there was a danger that the proposed changes may tend to reduce the number of affordable housing units delivered through the planning process. Members were advised that developers must pay the community infrastructure levy and currently this cannot be used to provide affordable housing.

The introduction of the standard methodology for the assessment of housing need was considered likely to promote more new housing in outlying areas rather than in

urban areas and, therefore, there was a strategic risk that of under-delivery of housing where it was needed. The local implications were that the Norwich Policy Area was unlikely to be used to assess housing land supply going forward.

Members were advised that right to buy (RTB) was not part of the revised NPPF but was subject to another review and could affect what the council did in building council houses for rent.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) note that the head of planning services will respond to the government consultations on its proposed changes to revise the NPPF and to reforming developer contributions;
- (2) ask the head of planning services to arrange a members' briefing on CIL and viability assessments.

5. Joint Core Strategy Annual Monitoring Report 2016-17

The head of planning services introduced the report and pointed out that the report touched on the five year land supply which, notwithstanding the proposed changes in the NPPF, was still holding up well.

The team leader regeneration presented the report.

During discussion the head of planning services and the team leader regeneration answered members' questions. The panel noted that 85 per cent of the population in the Greater Norwich Policy Area lived in the city. Developments on privately owned open space were not considered a loss to public open space. The development at Lakenham Sports and Cricket ground had increased public open space because it had provided new cycle or pedestrian routes through the site. An emerging policy was coming forward in the Greater Norwich Local Plan that sought to protect employment in the city centre and promote the use of sustainable modes of transport, such as public transport, walking and cycling. A member said that she was concerned about urban heat generation.

Discussion ensued in which members commented on the report. A member said that he was disappointed that Article 4 had not been implemented to restrict the growth of houses in multiple-occupation in the city. There was a lack of data about renewable energy. The Joint Core Strategy did not contain a policy on self and custom builds and that this should be considered in the development of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP). The report did not analyse the impact of county council cuts to rural bus subsidies and the impact that this had on access to market towns. He also suggested that with pressure on resources monitoring should be targeted to where it could make a difference.

RESOLVED to note the publication and content of the 2016-17 Joint Core Strategy Annual Monitoring report.

CHAIR

Report to Sustainable development panel
18 July 2018
Report of Director of regeneration and development
Subject Planning policy update and work programme

Item

6

Purpose

To update members on the current work programme of the Planning Policy team and to set out the key work items that are expected to be reported to Sustainable Development Panel in coming months.

Recommendation

To note the contents of this report.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority a prosperous and vibrant city, a safe, clean and low carbon city, and a healthy city with good services.

Financial implications

None

Ward/s: All Wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Stonard - Sustainable and inclusive growth

Contact officers

Graham Nelson, head of planning services 01603 212530

Judith Davison, planning policy team leader 01603 212529

Background documents

None

Report

Purpose

1. This report summarises key elements of the council's planning policy work programme, including strategic planning activity including the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (NSPF) and emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP), and local planning policy issues. It also includes responding to changes in national policy guidance.
2. It identifies reports which are expected to be discussed by Sustainable Development Panel in the current civic year 2018-19.

Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework

3. Following the endorsement of the first version of the NSPF in March 2018, work is now under way on updating the document in light of the anticipated content of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (which is due to be published by government on 26 July) and commitments made in the current NSPF. The NSPF work programme centres on the update of the NSPF and developing this into a Statement of Common Ground.
4. Key aspects of the NSPF work programme for 2018 include:
 - (a) Developing the NSPF into a Statement of Common ground covering the whole of Norfolk.
 - (b) Review of agreements in the NSPF to ensure they fit the government guidelines on the Statement of Common requirements.
 - (c) Review of the impacts of the new housing methodology on the housing section and the ability of each authority to meet its own housing needs. This will involve writing to each authority involved in the NSPF and all neighbouring authorities, on behalf of the Norfolk wide Member Forum, to formally confirm if they will need to seek assistance from their neighbours to meet their housing need.
 - (d) Review of the section on delivery issues and proposed actions to take forward jointly.
 - (e) Producing a GI Strategy for Norfolk and review of GI section within the NSPF; and
 - (f) Commissioning a study looking into housing with care and other specialist housing needs which will include a supported and agreed planning and housing need evidence base.
5. A report to Sustainable Development Panel is anticipated in September in relation to point (c) above, to provide Norwich City Council's response to the Norfolk wide Member Forum on the issue of housing need.
6. It is also anticipated that the draft revised NSPF (which will serve as a formal Statement of Common Ground as anticipated to be required by the NPPF) will be reported to the sustainable development panel in December, which will then be consulted upon in early 2019.

Greater Norwich Local Plan

7. Progress on the emerging GNLP is set out in a separate report to this Panel meeting: see this report which provides feedback from the Regulation 18 consultation and the revised plan production timetable. Despite the slippage to the timetable, significant progress has been made on the emerging plan which is now expected to be adopted by September 2021.
8. The next stages include:
 - (a) A report to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership in September providing detailed feedback on the Regulation 18 public consultation
 - (b) A verbal report to panel in September (prior to a report to GNGB later that month) on the content of the consultation on newly proposed and revised allocation sites due to commence in October.
 - (c) It is anticipated that there will be further reports in early 2019, feeding back from the consultation and on the development of strategy options.

National planning policy

9. As reported to this panel in March, the National Planning Policy Framework and guidance on Developer Contributions were published for consultation in early 2018, alongside associated documents including draft planning practice guidance. The city council's response to both consultations was informed by the panel debate and was issued under delegated powers in advance of the 10 May deadline. Copies of both responses are appended (NPPF response appendix 1, developer contributions response appendix 2).
10. It is expected that the final NPPF will be published on 26 July, a timetable which suggests that the scale of change to the emerging document may not be great. The council's response to the revised NPPF will be dependent on its content and this may involve either reporting back to this panel in the autumn and/or training sessions being run for members of sustainable development panel and planning applications committee.

Local policy issues

11. Work is currently underway on several housing policy issues namely affordable housing, student housing, and housing in multiple occupation (HMOs). Given that these are related issues, it is important that they are considered in the round and that reports are taken to the sustainable development panel in relatively close proximity.

Affordable Housing

12. A council resolution in September 2017 stated that Norwich is losing out on affordable housing due to developers producing viability assessments that allow them to avoid affordable housing obligations. It asked cabinet to consider, amongst other things, that the supplementary planning document (SPD) makes viability assessments publicly accessible online and therefore

open to public scrutiny, and for the SPD to clarify what is meant by 'reasonable profit' of a developer.

13. A review of the current SPD is underway. This is required to address any changes to policy that arise out of the NPPF, in addition to addressing the issue of viability. It is anticipated that a report will be taken to sustainable development panel in the autumn, likely to be October. This timing should enable the revised SPD to take full account of any revisions to the NPPF.

Student Housing

14. Given the major growth in planning applications and requests for pre-application advice for purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) in the last couple of years, there is a need to better understand current and future need for new student housing in Norwich in order to inform planning policy implementation and planning decision-making.
15. Planning practice guidance states that local planning authorities should plan for sufficient student accommodation whether it consists of communal halls of residence or self-contained dwellings, and whether or not it is on campus. Student housing provided by private landlords is often a lower-cost form of housing. Encouraging more dedicated student accommodation may take pressure off the private rented sector and increases the overall housing stock however it is important that this is informed by an up-to-date assessment of the need for this form of accommodation.
16. The council is currently working with UEA and NUA to better understand the current and future need for PBSA, with a view to providing guidance for student accommodation to inform planning decision making. It is anticipated that draft guidance will be reported to the sustainable development panel in late 2018.

Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

17. A cabinet resolution in September 2016 asked the sustainable development panel to reconsider the approach for managing HMOs across the city taking account of a number of issues including take-up of the voluntary accreditation scheme for HMO properties, the impact of planned welfare reform, and plans for the growth of academic institutions and implications for number of students and purpose built student accommodation.
18. Although HMOs can impact on residential amenity, they are an important element of supply for the student housing population and may be an increasingly important housing choice for those affected by welfare and tax reforms given the reduction in social and affordable rented opportunities.
19. Work on HMOs will help inform work on the student accommodation issue. National planning practice guidance requires plan-makers to 'consider options which would support both the needs of the student population as well as local residents before imposing caps or restrictions on students living outside of university provided accommodation'.

20. It is anticipated that a report will be taken to the sustainable development panel by the end of 2018 considering a policy response to HMOs.

Monitoring

21. A review of Norwich's retail monitor is current underway based on a survey of retail uses carried out in June 2018. This will be reported to sustainable development panel in the autumn and will update the most recent retail monitor which was published in 2016. The retail monitor will report on vacancy rates and changes of shop type across the city and will help ensure that the council can measure the implementation of retail policies.
22. The Joint Core Strategy Annual monitoring report (JCS AMR) is produced by the GNLP team on an annual basis and is likely to be reported to the sustainable development panel by the end of 2018 or early 2019. This will report progress on implementation of JCS policies and Norwich's local planning policies.

Local Development Scheme (LDS)

23. As referred to in the GNLP report, changes to the GNLP timetable will require revisions to the LDS for the Greater Norwich districts. The intention is to prepare a revised LDS for Norwich for discussion at September's meeting of the sustainable development panel.

Consultation response form

This is the response form for the consultation on the draft revised National Planning Policy Framework. If you are responding by email or in writing, please reply using this questionnaire pro-forma, which should be read alongside the consultation document. The comment boxes will expand as you type. Required fields are indicated with an asterisk (*)

Your details

First name*	Judith
Family name (surname)*	Davison
Title	Planning policy team leader
Address	City Hall
City/Town*	Norwich
Postal code*	NR2 1NH
Telephone Number	01603 212529
Email Address*	JudithDavison@norwich.gov.uk

Are the views expressed on this consultation your own personal views or an official response from an organisation you represent?*

Organisational response

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select the option which best describes your organisation. *

Local authority (including National Parks, Broads Authority, the Greater London Authority and London Boroughs)

If you selected other, please state the type of organisation

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Please provide the name of the organisation (if applicable)

Norwich City Council

Chapter 1: Introduction

Question 1

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 1?

No comment

Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development

Question 2

Do you agree with the changes to the sustainable development objectives and the presumption in favour of sustainable development?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 3

Do you agree that the core principles section should be deleted, given its content has been retained and moved to other appropriate parts of the Framework?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 4

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 2, including the approach to providing additional certainty for neighbourhood plans in some circumstances?

No comment

Chapter 3: Plan-making

Question 5

Do you agree with the further changes proposed to the tests of soundness, and to the other changes of policy in this chapter that have not already been consulted on?

Not sure

Please enter your comments here

The consultation states that the revised NPPF tightens the evidence expected to support the production of a 'sound' plan, which is welcomed, however it would be helpful to provide further information in paragraphs 25 and 33 as to what would be considered 'proportionate'. This could include some examples or case studies for different types of evidence.

The Council welcomes revisions to the 'positively prepared' and effective' tests of soundness to make more specific reference to joint working and statements of common ground. The Council also welcomes the 'justified' test which now refers to 'an appropriate strategy'. This should help speed up local plan production by helping local planning authorities to better judge evidence requirements and potentially reducing local plan examination timescales.

Question 6

Do you have any other comments on the text of chapter 3?

Norwich City Council welcome the requirement to produce a SOCG in accordance with the approach set out in the draft planning practice guidance. It is considered a proportionate way to manage the duty to co-operate in the absence of any democratic mechanism to prepare genuinely strategic plans in most of the Country. We would point to the recently adopted Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework as an example of good practice in how such documents may be delivered in practice. Details of this document can be seen at:

<https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/policy-performance-and-partnerships/partnerships/norfolk-strategic-planning-member-forum>

The approach to viability assessments is an area of great concern to Norwich City Council, in particular the proposed greater emphasis on viability at plan-making stage and to a lesser extent at decision-making stage. It is considered that the emphasis on assessing viability at plan-making stage will result in a lengthier plan process, given the level and site-specific detail of evidence required, but is very unlikely to prevent the need for later assessment of viability at decision-making stage. Many factors can change between the adoption of a local plan and subsequent decision-making on a planning application, for example, land values, build costs, market conditions, changes in national policy, infrastructure provision etc. Provision of viability assessment at plan-making stage is unlikely to avoid potential challenge from developers on viability at application stage.

Most of the content of the draft Planning Practice Guidance is helpful with the exception of the comments on viability being assessed at plan making stage, discussed above, and the section on developer's' profit. The guidance suggests that the latter is fixed at 20% of GDV for plan making viability assessments however this should be revised to refer to 17.5-20% of GDV depending on the risk profile of the development.

Chapter 4: Decision-making

Question 7

The revised draft Framework expects all viability assessments to be made publicly available. Are there any circumstances where this would be problematic?

Not sure

Please enter your comments here

The proposal to make all viability assessments publicly available is welcomed.

Question 8

Would it be helpful for national planning guidance to go further and set out the circumstances in which viability assessment to accompany planning applications would be acceptable?

No

Please enter your comments here:

It would be counter-productive to set out specific circumstances where viability assessments to accompany planning applications would be acceptable – the current proposal allows for some flexibility.

Question 9

What would be the benefits of going further and mandating the use of review mechanisms to capture increases in the value of a large or multi-phased development?

Please enter your comments below

Norwich City Council supports the use of review mechanisms in appropriate circumstances where they can help to deliver sites that would otherwise stall, for example large or multi-phased development with marginal viability, in order to capture increase in values over time. Use of review mechanisms in these circumstances could help increase development viability and result in greater benefits to residents through provision of infrastructure. It is important that there is local flexibility about how to apply this approach. However there is not much detail in the Planning Practice Guidance about how to achieve this without impacting on developer certainty and potentially on the deliverability or viability of schemes.

Question 10

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 4?

The text of paragraph 54 is unclear. The wording should be changed to make clear that article 4 directions should be capable of being used to promote the well being of an area i.e.

not simply to protect something existing but also to do something positive to deliver a strategy, such as ensuring a good level of supply of commercial premises suitable for new business. There is also little point in restricting the demolition of local facilities if the use of the facility cannot be protected. It is therefore suggested that this section is reworded as follows:

“The use of Article 4 directions to remove national permitted development rights should be limited to situations where this is necessary to promote the wellbeing of the area or to protect local amenity (this could include the use of Article 4 directions to require planning permission for the demolition or change of use of local facilities).”

Chapter 5: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Question 11

What are your views on the most appropriate combination of policy requirements to ensure that a suitable proportion of land for homes comes forward as small or medium sized sites?

Please enter your comments here

This approach does not make sense, is overly prescriptive, and is likely to be counterproductive. Small and medium sized sites can contribute significantly to housing delivery, however the proportion of such sites will vary dependant on the nature of different local authority areas and local circumstances including housing need. Focusing on this requirement may also be to the detriment of the delivery of larger brownfield sites. Therefore the introduction of a minimum percentage requirement is considered a crude tool and is not supported.

Question 12

Do you agree with the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where delivery is below 75% of the housing required from 2020?

No

Please enter your comments here

Norwich City Council does not support the proposed measures including the housing delivery test as a means to increase housing completions. The housing delivery test would penalise councils for the failure to build enough houses but does not acknowledge that it is the house building industry that is not delivering. Indeed the Letwin Review identifies that the fundamental driver for build-out of large sites with planning consent is the ‘absorption rate’ – the rate at which homes can be sold into the local market without materially affecting the price. In order to increase output of the housing industry, greater intervention is required in the housing market alongside revisions to the planning system. Norwich City Council repeats its comments made in previous consultations that councils require additional powers to enable them to intervene in situations where land is not coming forward for development, for example through land-banking, allowing them to challenge landowners who are not

seeking to bring forward underused and vacant development sites, or where sites are stalled. The consultation documents overall do not include robust mechanisms to really address these key issues affecting housing delivery, including delivery of significant levels of affordable housing.

Furthermore applying a delivery test based on %age of need delivered without any regard to capacity of areas to deliver is considered to be inappropriate. In the case of Norwich, an underbounded small urban authority, we do not have the capacity to meet our needs within our boundaries and have a joint local plan in place with our neighbours ensuring that our overall need for housing can be met outside our boundary. In such circumstance the new NPPF should be clear that any housing delivery test should be capable of being applicable across the joint plan area rather than the individual Council area. To fail to do this would risk to undermine joint planning which the remainder of the NPPF appears to seek to encourage.

A further comment on the Housing Delivery Test is that the Draft Rule Book states that the HDT does not apply to National Parks, but excludes reference to the Broads Authority. This is at odds with the Government's response to the 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places' consultation where it specifies that the HDT will not apply in 'National Park Authority and Broads Authority areas'. This omission needs to be rectified. This could be achieved by including a definition of national park authorities in the glossary which clarifies that the Broads Authority is included in the definition.

Question 13

Do you agree with the new policy on exception sites for entry-level homes?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 14

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 5?

Norwich City Council strongly objects to the requirement in para 65 for at least 10% of homes on major sites to be for affordable home ownership. To apply such a crude target based approach nationally is nonsensical and potentially counter productive. It completely ignores regional and local housing market conditions and may result in housing being built for which there is locally little demand or need. In Norwich for instance many of our development sites are centrally located and those with waterside locations frequently command values at least 50% in excess of similar properties that are already on the market in other parts of the city (often fairly nearby). To force the delivery of affordable homes for ownership on such sites will simply serve to extend the choice available to those already able to buy in the City (and therefore not considered to be in housing need) at the expense of those in housing need. The impact will be particularly acute in regions where prices are relatively low as these areas may have lower proportionate affordable housing targets. It may also prejudice viability on certain schemes.

If this proposal is introduced it should be amended so that any target is expressed as a percentage of overall affordable housing to be delivered and conditioned to ensure that housing is affordable in perpetuity. At least this may reflect local conditions in some respects and not prejudice overall deliverability of schemes.

Para 65(c): what is the justification for excluding self-build from the requirement for affordable home ownership?

Para 69 (d): concerned at the artificial subdivision of large sites. This could impact on the level of affordable housing provision depending on how sites are subdivided, and may not actually result in increased rates of delivery - developers may be reluctant to speed up the rate of development as this may depress values (as per the previous comments on the outputs of the Letwin Review (see answer to Qu 12). Also it is not clear from the NPPF how the subdivision would be achieved, particularly on sites which already have consent.

Para 74 refers to the annual position statement. This has to be consulted on and endorsed by the SoS – timescales are an issue here in that by the time we have been through the consultation process and submitted to the SoS and PINS have considered it the evidence could well be out of date. This looks like a 12 month process each year, in which case annual position statements could still be challenged at appeal by developers if the evidence on which they were based is no longer relevant. Whilst fixing the 5 year land supply position for a year is a good idea in principle, the mechanisms are somewhat flawed.

In relation to Build to Rent, the draft practice guidance suggests that 20% would be a suitable benchmark for affordable private rent homes to be provided in any build to rent scheme. Again this statistically based approach is unlikely to reflect local need, may not sit well with adopted local policies (which may for example require a higher proportion of affordable housing), and is likely to be an area which developers will seek to exploit. In addition further detail is required in the practice guidance on the mechanisms that will ensure that the affordable private rent homes will be secured in perpetuity.

Chapter 6: Building a strong, competitive economy

Question 15

Do you agree with the policy changes on supporting business growth and productivity, including the approach to accommodating local business and community needs in rural areas?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 16

Do you have any other comments on the text of chapter 6?

No comment

Chapter 7: Ensuring the vitality of town centres

Question 17

Do you agree with the policy changes on planning for identified retail needs and considering planning applications for town centre uses?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 18

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 7?

No comment

Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities

Question 19

Do you have any comments on the new policies in Chapter 8 that have not already been consulted on?

No comment

Question 20

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 8?

No comment

Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport

Question 21

Do you agree with the changes to the transport chapter that point to the way that all aspects of transport should be considered, both in planning for transport and assessing transport impacts?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 22

Do you agree with the policy change that recognises the importance of general aviation facilities?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 23

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 9?

No comment

Chapter 10: Supporting high quality communications

Question 24

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 10?

No comment

Chapter 11: Making effective use of land

Question 25

Do you agree with the proposed approaches to under-utilised land, reallocating land for other uses and making it easier to convert land which is in existing use?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

On para 119 Norwich City Council maintains that the range of proactive measures described are grossly inadequate to make any meaningful difference to the problems that are being experienced in delivery (see answer to Qu 12 above).

Para 120 should recognise that not all allocated sites may be capable of alternate use and particularly with regard to strategic employment uses it may be necessary to

take a long term perspective. For instance parts of Norwich Airport are allocated specifically for aviation uses providing the potential scope for new engineering based aviation operators to locate in Norwich. Such long term potential on sites with unique locational advantages should not be sacrificed just because of no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward. Landowners may be driven by short term financial pressures to release site for other forms of development when the public interest is best served by safeguarding these sites for higher value uses in the long term.

Question 26

Do you agree with the proposed approach to employing minimum density standards where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 27

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 11?

No comment

Chapter 12 : Achieving well-designed places

Question 28

Do you have any comments on the changes of policy in Chapter 12 that have not already been consulted on?

No comment

Question 29

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 12?

No comment

Chapter 13: Protecting the Green Belt

Question 30

Do you agree with the proposed changes to enable greater use of brownfield land for housing in the Green Belt, and to provide for the other forms of development that are 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 31

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 13?

No comment

Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Question 32

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 14?

Does the chapter implicitly place greater emphasis on climate change adaptation (Para 149a) rather than on mitigation measures (149b)? This appears to be a change in emphasis from the existing NPPF.

Question 33

Does paragraph 149b need any further amendment to reflect the ambitions in the Clean Growth Strategy to reduce emissions from building?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

No comment

Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Question 34

Do you agree with the approach to clarifying and strengthening protection for areas of particular environmental importance in the context of the 25 Year Environment Plan and national infrastructure requirements, including the level of protection for ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 35

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 15?

No comment

Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment**Question 36**

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 16?

No comment

Chapter 17: Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals**Question 37**

Do you have any comments on the changes of policy in Chapter 17, or on any other aspects of the text in this chapter?

No comment

Question 38

Do you think that planning policy in minerals would be better contained in a separate document?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 39

Do you have any views on the utility of national and sub-national guidelines on future aggregates provision?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Transitional arrangements and consequential changes

Question 40

Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 41

Do you think that any changes should be made to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites as a result of the proposed changes to the Framework set out in the consultation document? If so, what changes should be made?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 42

Do you think that any changes should be made to the Planning Policy for Waste as a result of the proposed changes to the Framework set out in the consultation document? If so, what changes should be made?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Glossary

Question 43

Do you have any comments on the glossary?

No comment

Developer Contributions Consultation response form

If you are responding by email or in writing, please reply using this questionnaire proforma, which should be read alongside the consultation document. You are able to expand the comments box should you need more space. Required fields are indicated with an asterisk (*)

This form should be returned to
developercontributionsconsultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Or posted to:

Planning and Infrastructure Division
Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
2nd floor, South East
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
LONDON
SW1P 4DF

By 10 May 2018

Your details

First name*	Judith
Family name (surname)*	Davison
Title	Planning Policy Team Leader
Address	City Hall
City/Town*	Norwich
Postal Code*	NR2 1NH
Telephone Number	01603 212529
Email Address*	JudithDavison@norwich.gov.uk

Are the views expressed on this consultation your own personal views or an official response from an organisation you represent?*

Organisational response

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select the option which best describes your organisation.*

Local authority (including National Parks, Broads Authority, the Greater London Authority and London Boroughs)

If you selected other, please state the type of organisation

Click here to enter text.

Please provide the name of the organisation (if applicable)

Norwich City Council

Reducing Complexity and Increasing Certainty

Question 1

Do you agree with the Governments' proposals to set out that:

- i. Evidence of local infrastructure need for CIL-setting purposes can be the same infrastructure planning and viability evidence produced for plan making?

Yes

- ii. Evidence of a funding gap significantly greater than anticipated CIL income is likely to be sufficient as evidence of infrastructure need?

Yes

iii Where charging authorities consider there may have been significant changes in market conditions since evidence was produced, it may be appropriate for charging authorities to take a pragmatic approach to supplementing this information as part of setting CIL – for instance, assessing recent economic and development trends and working with developers (e.g. through local development forums), rather than procuring new and costly evidence?

Yes

Question 2

Are there any factors that the Government should take into account when implementing proposals to align the evidence for CIL charging schedules and plan making?

(i) Norwich City Council can see the advantages in relying on the local plan evidence for CIL-setting purposes and supports this suggestion. (ii) The Council would hope the Government will assist provision of infrastructure through the provision of funding opportunities to ensure the delivery of strategic infrastructure. This will greatly assist local planning authorities to deliver the growth in the numbers of new homes being completed. (iii) While the Council welcomes the proposed pragmatic approach to

responding to significant changes in market conditions, it remains doubtful as to whether the development industry or planning inspectors will follow this approach. It is likely there will still be a requirement to have some form of independent verification. The Council suggests that, when reviewing the CIL Regulations, the Government considers making amendments that would allow a review of a local plan and CIL to be done together, with one examination. This would help streamline the process, and would be a manifestation of the Government's proposals that local plan viability evidence will form the basis of a CIL charging schedule.

Ensuring that consultation is proportionate

Question 3

Do you agree with the Government's proposal to replace the current statutory consultation requirements with a requirement on the charging authority to publish a statement on how it has sought an appropriate level of engagement?

Yes

Question 4

Do you have views on how guidance can ensure that consultation is proportionate to the scale of any charge being introduced or amended?

As set out in the response to question 2, the Council believes there is merit in using the local plan process to meet the statutory requirement of adopting CIL. If local plans and CIL charging schedules were prepared together, and consulted as part of the local plan there would be adequate engagement with all relevant stakeholders.

Removing unnecessary barriers: the pooling restriction

Question 5

Do you agree with the Government's proposal to allow local authorities to pool section 106 planning obligations:

- i. Where it would not be feasible for the authority to adopt CIL in addition to securing the necessary developer contributions through section 106?

Yes

- ii. Where significant development is planned on several large strategic sites?

Yes

Question 6

- i. Do you agree that, if the pooling restriction is to be lifted where it would not be feasible for the authority to adopt CIL in addition to securing the necessary developer contributions through section 106, this should be measures based on the tenth percentile of average new build house prices?

Yes

- ii. What comments, if any, do you have on how the restriction is lifted in areas where CIL is not feasible, or in national parks?

No comments

Question 7

Do you believe that, if lifting the pooling restriction where significant development is planned on several large strategic sites, this should be based on either:

- i. a set percentage of homes, set out in a plan, are being delivered through a limited number of strategic sites; or

The Council suggests both options be available to local planning authorities. It is important to be able to pool contributions to enable strategic sites to deliver essential infrastructure across the local plan area.

- ii. all planning obligations from a strategic site count as one planning obligation?

The Council suggests both options be available to local planning authorities. It is important to be able to pool contributions to enable strategic sites to deliver essential infrastructure across the local plan area.

Question 8

What factors should the Government take into account when defining 'strategic sites' for the purposes of lifting the pooling restriction?

The Council asks the Government to take into account the following factors: The contribution the site(s) make in delivering the new housing allocation requirement. In a place such as Norwich we would suggest that around 500 homes or 10,000sqm of commercial floorspace would be appropriate. In addition, sites that require infrastructure that has benefits across the whole plan area should be considered as strategic. Such infrastructure will have been identified as a requirement through the local plan process.

Question 9

What further comments, if any, do you have on how pooling restrictions should be lifted?

The Council would welcome the lifting of pooling restrictions. It is a member of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership which pools CIL receipts arising from three partner authorities and share a common charging schedule. Allowing pooling of S106 would greatly assist the three local planning authorities to strengthen their collective ability to provide infrastructure across the partnership area. Also, the draft implies that pooling is only an issue where significant development is planned, but it is also an issue for smaller scale development, such as where pooling could allow for the provision of meaningful areas of open space and play provision to be provided for developments which of themselves cannot provide on-site requirements. Therefore, there should be a general lifting of the pooling restrictions.

Improvements to the operation of CIL

Question 10

Do you agree with the Government's proposal to introduce a 2 month grace period for developers to submit a Commencement Notice in relation to exempted development?

Yes

Question 11

If introducing a grace period, what other factors, such as a small penalty for submitting a Commencement Notice during the grace period, should the Government take into account?

In order to simplify the Regs consideration should be given to a 2 month grace for the submission of all commencement notices, not just where exemptions have been agreed. Introducing a penalty would add further complexity, ie is it proportionate to when the notice was submitted within the 2 month grace period (small penalty at the beginning of the 2 months, larger penalty at the end). If 2 months was given for all commencement notices, but the date for payment remained 60 days from the commencement date, the "penalty" would be that those submitting late would have less time in which to pay the liability. Any penalty tends to have more impact on smaller developers due to the maximum surcharge of £2500, so consideration should be given to lifting this.

Question 12

How else can the Government seek to take a more proportionate approach to administering exemptions?

Should remove relief for domestic extensions. This is predominantly an administrative exercise with no clawback provision.

Question 13

Do you agree that Government should amend regulations so that they allow a development originally permitted before CIL came into force, to balance CIL liabilities between different phases of the same development?

Yes

Question 14

Are there any particular factors the Government should take into account in allowing abatement for phased planning permissions secured before introduction of CIL?

If the floorspace from a previous phase could be offset against future phases, this could create difficulties where the payment has already been paid. ie on larger developments, the timing of payments relative to one phase could already have been paid and committed to infrastructure, and a proportion passed to the Parish Council/neighbourhood area. An abatement should not be available where payment has already been made.

Question 15

Do you agree that Government should amend regulations on how indexation applies to development that is both originally permitted and then amended while CIL is in force to align with the approach taken in the recently amended CIL regulations?

Yes

Increasing market responsiveness

Question 16

Do you agree with the Government's proposal to allow local authorities to set differential CIL rates based on the existing use of land?

Yes

Question 17

If implementing this proposal do you agree that the Government should:

- i. encourage authorities to set a single CIL rate for strategic sites?

Yes

- ii. for sites with multiple existing uses, set out that CIL liabilities should be calculated on the basis of the majority existing use for small sites? Yes/No

Yes

- iii. set out that, for other sites, CIL liabilities should be calculated on the basis of the majority existing use where 80% or more of the site is in a single existing use?

Yes

- iv. What comments, if any, do you have on using a threshold of 80% or more of a site being in a single existing use, to determine where CIL liabilities should be calculated on the basis of the majority existing use?

There are likely to be challenges in establishing the extent of different uses, the implications of the extent of the “planning unit” and whether uses are lawful or whether they have been abandoned. The definition of “lawful use” differs in the current CIL regs to planning practice and this could create difficulties in different definitions for the establishment of the relevant CIL rate and subsequently establishing which floorspaces can be offset from liability calculations.

Question 18

What further comments, if any, do you have on how CIL should operate on sites with multiple existing uses, including the avoidance of gaming?

If CIL is to be examined at the same time as the Local Plan to which it relates it should be possible to set out how the existing use is to be assessed in the Local Plan

Indexing CIL rates to house prices

Question 19

Do you have a preference that CIL rates for residential development being indexed to either:

- a) The change in seasonally adjusted regional house price indexation on a monthly or quarterly basis; OR

Yes

- b) The change in local authority-level house price indexation on an annual basis

No

Question 20

Do you agree with the Government's proposal to index CIL to a different metric for non-residential development?

Yes

Question 21

If yes, do you believe that indexation for non-residential development should be based on:

- i. the Consumer Price Index? OR

No

- ii. a combined proportion of the House Price Index and Consumer Prices Index?

Yes

Question 22

What alternative regularly updated, robust, nationally applied and publicly available data could be used to index CIL for non-residential development?

None

Question 23

Do you have any further comments on how the way in which CIL is indexed can be made more market responsive?

No comments

Improving transparency and increasing accountability

Question 24

Do you agree with the Government's proposal to?

- i. remove the restrictions in regulation 123, and regulation 123 lists?

Yes

- ii. introduce a requirement for local authorities to provide an annual Infrastructure Funding Statement?

Yes

Question 25

What details should the Government require or encourage Infrastructure Funding Statements to include?

Norwich City Council very much welcomes the increased flexibility that removing the restrictions in regulation 123 would give to CIL authorities seeking to meet the infrastructure needs of their area. Such needs can change rapidly and can be best successfully addressed by using finance from a number of different sources. We are aware that this proposal has given rise to some concerns from industry and infrastructure providers but would suggest that arrangements that in exist in organisations such as Greater Norwich Growth Board, where CIL revenues are pooled and used to fund a shared infrastructure need across a wide area which are agreed not only by the local three District/City Councils but also the County Council and the Local Enterprise Partnership. We consider that these procedures should be sufficient to address the concerns raised so would request that even if the government does not press ahead with the proposal to remove the restrictions in regulation 123 it does find a way to give the proposed flexibility to authorities such as those within the GNGB who are working co-operatively across boundaries and different tiers of government to prioritise infrastructure spending in order to maximise delivery.

Question 26

What views do you have on whether local planning authorities may need to seek a sum as part of Section 106 planning obligations for monitoring planning obligations? Any views on potential impacts would also be welcomed.

In certain circumstances it is reasonable to local planning authorities to seek contributions via sec 106 agreements to allow for their monitoring by either the local planning authority or third parties (such as County of Parish Councils). It is therefore appropriate that there is scope for a monitoring payment to be required in certain circumstances.

A Strategic Infrastructure Tariff (SIT)

Question 27

Do you agree that Combined Authorities and Joint Committees with strategic planning powers should be given the ability to charge a SIT?

Yes

Question 28

Do you agree with the proposed definition of strategic infrastructure?

Yes

Question 29

Do you have any further comments on the definition of strategic infrastructure?

Consider that there should also be scope to charge a strategic infrastructure tariff in areas where other joint strategic plans are adopted by local authorities working together rather than by Combined Authorities or Joint Committees. The Greater Norwich Development Partnership prepares the Local Plan as a joint planning function and undertakes the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan through the Greater Norwich Growth Board. It is considered appropriate that such a body should be considered as a combined authority for the purposes of CIL and that we should not be excluded from the ability to charge a SIT just because no formal joint committee has been formed.

Question 30

Do you agree that a proportion of funding raised through SIT could be used to fund local infrastructure priorities that mitigate the impacts of strategic infrastructure?

No

Question 31

If so, what proportion of the funding raised through SIT do you think should be spent on local infrastructure priorities?

If a SIT is introduced it should only be used for delivering strategic infrastructure priorities. Local Infrastructure priorities should be funded from CIL and/or sec 106. There should be no need to top slice any of the SIT for local priorities provided a CIL is in place.

Question 32

Do you agree that the SIT should be collected by local authorities on behalf of the SIT charging authority?

Yes

Question 33

Do you agree that the local authority should be able to keep up to 4% of the SIT receipts to cover the administrative costs of collecting the SIT?

Yes

Technical clarifications

Question 34

Do you have any comments on the other technical clarifications to CIL?

No comments

Report to Sustainable development panel
18 July 2018
Report of Director of regeneration and development
Subject Greater Norwich Local Plan Update

Item

7

Purpose

To update members on the progress made on the Greater Norwich Local Plan following the meetings of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) on 19 June and the Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) on 25 June.

Recommendation

To note the contents of this report, which will contribute to the production of the draft Greater Norwich Local Plan in due course.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priorities: a prosperous and vibrant city, a safe, clean and low carbon city, and a healthy city with good services.

Financial implications

None

Ward/s: All Wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Stonard - Sustainable and inclusive growth

Contact officers

Graham Nelson, head of planning services 01603 212530

Judith Davison, planning policy team leader 01603 212529

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. The Regulation 18 consultation on the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) took place in early 2018. Separate reports were taken to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership on 19 June 2018 providing high level feedback on the consultation, and setting out a revised timeline for preparation of the plan.
2. This report summarises both GNDP reports for information. The full text of the reports is available:

<http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/planning/greater-norwich-local-plan/>

High level feedback on the Regulation 18 consultation

3. The consultation took place between January and March 2018 and sought comments on a number of documents, including the Growth Options document, Site Proposals document, Interim Sustainability Appraisal, and the evidence base.
4. Nearly 1,400 people attended 29 roadshow events and over 8,000 representations were submitted, evenly spread between sites and strategy. 180 new sites were submitted and 22 revisions to existing sites were proposed.
5. The key findings arising from the consultation responses were:
 - (a) There was greater support for the concentration of development around Norwich and in transport corridors than there was for more dispersed growth;
 - (b) Mixed views were expressed on the potential for a new settlement;
 - (c) There was more support than opposition to a new Green Belt, with a wedge based approach being favoured. However, a significant minority stated that the 'exceptional circumstances' required by Government for a Green Belt do not exist;
 - (d) Further consideration will need to be given to housing numbers. Contrasting views were expressed that higher numbers are required to meet needs or that the number should be lower as existing allocations should be developed first and any new sites should be held in reserve.
 - (e) Similarly, there were mixed view on jobs growth, with a small majority favouring 'enhanced growth';
 - (f) The approach taken to the settlement hierarchy will also need to be considered further. There was broad support for retaining the current approach to the settlement hierarchy tiers, with the concept of 'Village Groups' having limited support;
 - (g) The vast majority argued that additional infrastructure would be required as a result of growth, with some stating that this was a reason to limit

growth. Many responses focussed on health, transport, schools and water and the need for a comprehensive infrastructure evidence base was identified.

6. The 180 new sites and 22 revised sites will be subject to an initial HELAA assessment to inform a focused public consultation in autumn/ winter 2018. Key points about these sites are:
 - (a) Of the new and revised sites, 70 are in Broadland, 122 in South Norfolk and 10 in Norwich;
 - (b) 65 new sites are under 1 hectare, with 10 sites between 0.4 and 0.5 hectares;
 - (c) 8 new sites are between 10 and 20 hectares. These are in Horsham St Faiths/Newton St Faiths, Bawburgh, Mulbarton, Little Melton, Tivetshall St Mary, Norwich and Rackheath;
 - (d) 18 sites are over 20 hectares. These include a redrawing of the land at Honingham Thorpe, as well as sites at Rackheath, Horsford, Acle, Diss, Costessey and Wymondham. A 50 hectare site east of Harford Tesco has been put forward for employment use;
 - (e) One new settlement site (394 hectares) has been submitted at Silfield and the previous Spooner Row submission has been expanded so that it is effectively a new settlement scale proposal;
 - (f) Of the new sites in Norwich, 3 are significant sites in the city centre: the Archant offices/car park (for mixed use development); Chapelfield (for intensification of current uses) and Riverside (for intensification of uses, including additional housing). While no submission has been made on Carrow Works, the future of this strategic site will need to be considered through the GNLP. Two new sites, south of the Sainsbury Centre and the Congregation Hall, are within the UEA.
7. The new sites submitted will provide more choice for strategy development. In the case of the Norwich urban area, the emergence of new sites will enable more housing growth to be allocated on brownfield land within the existing urban area of Norwich. The key impact on the strategy will be the future of the Carrow Works site.
8. Over the coming months the GNLP team will:
 - (a) Publish full consultation responses for all documents on the website once final checking and formatting has been done;
 - (b) Take new/revised sites through the HELAA process, plus revisit the HELAA assessment for existing sites based on comments received through the consultation;
 - (c) Produce a more detailed Statement of Consultation for publication in September/October 2018, including detailed analysis of responses to the Growth Options document;
 - (d) Hold a focussed consultation on new, revised and small sites in Autumn/Winter 2018.

9. Reports will be taken to the Greater Norwich Development Partnership meeting in September 2018 on (a) more detailed feedback from the Regulation 18 consultation, and (b) the content of the consultation on new / revised sites. It is anticipated that the latter report will be verbally presented at Sustainable Development Panel in September to provide members with information about the proposed sites prior to the start of the consultation in October.

Revised timeline for the preparation of the GNLP

10. The original timeline for preparation of the GNLP was for a single Regulation 18 consultation in 2017 on favoured options and reasonable alternatives for the strategy, topic policies and sites, moving to a Regulation 19 pre-submission publication in summer 2018. This timescale was not achieved and the content changed from the original timetable due to the time taken to build consensus leading to programme planning and resource issues, and changes in Government policy in relation to housing numbers.
11. The changes to the plan's content meant that the recent Regulation 18 was effectively an issues and options consultation and was not a draft plan with preferred options as originally envisaged. The current (unrevised) timeline envisages Regulation 19 pre-submission publication in summer 2019 and adoption by December 2020.
12. The report to the GNLP states that the case for a full second round of Regulation 19 consultation has become compelling for two main reasons: firstly the forthcoming production of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and secondly, how best to minimise the risks of the submitted GNLP being found unsound, its examination being delayed, or it being legally challenged. An extended timetable will allow the implications of the revised NPPF to be fully consulted on and integrated into the local plan. Also, it is now clear that failure to consult on preferred policies and sites at the Regulation 18 stage would entail significant risks and the GNLP could be found unsound or legally challenged.
13. Two options were explored for the revised timeline. Option 1 extends the adoption to September 2021 while option 2 extends it to March 2022. The GNLP at its meeting on 19 June agreed option 1 which is set out below.

Production milestones	
Focussed consultation on newly submitted sites	Oct. – Dec. 2018
Complete and publish draft (Regulation 18) plan for consultation: to include preferred policy options, growth strategy and site allocations	Sep. – Oct. 2019
Complete and publish pre-submission draft (Regulation 19) plan for consultation: to include agreed strategic policies, sites and site-specific proposals	Feb. - March 2020
Formal submission of GNLP to Secretary Of State (Regulation 22)	June 2020
Public Hearings	January 2021

Production milestones	
Consultation on Proposed Main Modifications	March – April 2021
Publication of Inspector's Report	July 2021
Adoption of the Greater Norwich Local Plan	September 2021

14. The detail of the report relating to the revised timeline is available through the link at paragraph 2 above. In conclusion the revised timeline is considered necessary to allow for a full second Regulation 18 consultation on the emerging plan. The decision to agree option 1 (above) will reduce the risk of issues of soundness or procedure being raised through the examination process or legal challenges, whilst minimising the delays to adoption. This is still a very challenging timetable, particularly between the second Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages.

15. Changes to the GNLP timetable will also require revisions to the Local Development Schemes for each District. The intention is to prepare a revised LDS for Norwich for discussion at September Sustainable Development Panel.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

16. The GNGB met on 25 June. The papers from this meeting are available on the Greater Norwich Growth Board website:

<http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/growth-board/papers/>

Among other things the meeting considered issues related to the timing of the review of the CIL which was adopted by Norwich City Council in July 2013. The meeting supported undertaking a full review of CIL in parallel with production on the GNLP. This will have implications for the production of the GNLP in terms of resource implications and potentially the nature of policy coverage. This will need to be reflected in the revised Local Development Scheme which will be produced for consideration by sustainable development panel in September and endorsement by cabinet in October.

17. The meeting also agreed to seek legal advice on the potential and process for an interim review of the current operation of CIL once revised CIL Regulations are published (which is expected over the summer).

