



Sustainable development panel

Date: Wednesday, 15 July 2015

Time: 09:30

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

Committee members:

Councillors:

Bremner (chair)
Herries (vice chair)
Bogelein
Grahame
Jackson
Lubbock
Thomas (Va)
Woollard

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 no

- 1 **Apologies**

To receive apologies for absence
- 2 **Declaration 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)
- 3 **Minutes** 3 - 6

To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2015.
- 4 **Planning policy update** 7 - 14

Purpose - This report updates members on recent government changes to the planning system and gives an indication of the likely focus of the new government in terms of planning. It highlights some potential implications for planning policy and the local plan which will be addressed more fully in a later report to this committee, anticipated in September, which will inform the future planning workload.
- 5 **Heritage Interpretation SPD – draft for consultation** 15 - 24

Purpose - This report concerns the draft Heritage Interpretation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Members are asked to comment on the draft document and recommend any necessary amendments before publication as a draft for consultation. The document provides guidance and requirements to support local plan policies on this issue.
- 6 **Norfolk Non Statutory Strategic Framework – update report** 25 - 42

Purpose - This report informs sustainable development panel members about progress on the Non Statutory Strategic Framework considered by the Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum on 9 July 2015.

Date of publication: **Tuesday, 07 July 2015**

Sustainable development panel**09:30 to 11:00****24 June 2015**

Present: Councillors Bremner (chair following appointment), Herries (vice chair following appointment), Bogelein, Grahame, Jackson, Lubbock and Thomas (Va) and Woollard

1. Appointment of chair

Two nominations were received for chair, Councillors Bremner and Jackson, and on being put to the vote it was:

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

2. Appointment of vice chair

Two nominations were received for vice chair, Councillors Herries and Jackson, and on being put to the vote it was:

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

3. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 March 2015.

5. Draft Norfolk Local flood risk management strategy – Norwich City Council consultation response

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

During discussion, members noted that the county council as the Lead local flood authority (LLFA) provided expert advice to the seven district councils in Norfolk and that it made sense that this specialist service was centralised. The city council did not have the expertise or resource to implement the policy approach (DM5) without the support of the LLFA. There were resource implications for the LLFA but it was noted that the county council had strongly promoted the policy approach adopted by the city council. Members also noted that the county council as the lead local authority was the first point of contact when flooding occurred.

Members considered that the council's consultation response should emphasise the importance of ensuring that gullies (drains) were kept clear. The panel expressed concern that the schedule of gully clearance had slipped and that some there were some gullies which appeared to be permanently blocked. The chair explained the difference in cost for the programme of gully cleaning and the additional costs for one-off gully cleaning. The panel considered that there needed to be clarification of who was responsible for cleaning gullies, monitoring and reporting blocked gullies and ensuring that it was carried out. The panel noted that there were regular street cleans in the areas of the city defined by the LLFA as critical drainage catchments (CDSs) Nelson/Town Close wards and Catton Grove/Sewell wards.

In reply to a question the planning team leader explained that since 2008, national regulations have required planning permission to be obtained to pave front gardens greater than five square metres unless paving is permeable (permeable paving was suitable in Norwich except in parts of the city where there was a heavy clay soil). The council contacted contractors to raise awareness and ensure compliance with the legal requirements. It was noted that the city council was one of the first in the country to produce guidance for developers on front garden paving.

Discussion ensued on the officer response to the consultation which sought clarification on the role of the city council in bringing forward "shovel ready" projects to take advantage of funding opportunities and in carrying out its emergency planning functions.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) approve the officer response to the Draft Norfolk local flood risk management strategy, subject to:
 - (a) strengthening the comments relating to the resource implications on the county council as the lead local flood authority (LLFA) and the city council's policy approach (paragraph 11) and pointing out that the LLFA provides support to all the county's district councils;
 - (b) emphasise the need for regular gully cleaning and clarification on the responsibilities for gully cleaning, monitoring and receiving reports of blocked gullies;
 - (c) endorse the need to clarify the role of the city council, as set out in the council's consultation response, under the heading *Measures and funding*.
- (2) ask the head of planning to submit the panel's comments to the county council for consideration as part of the consultation on the Draft Norfolk local flood risk management strategy;
- (3) ask the planning team leader (policy) to circulate a copy of the plan showing flood risk areas in the city.

6. Trees and landscape supplementary planning document (SPD) – draft for consultation

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

During discussion the landscape architect explained that when a planning application required a condition for landscaping, the applicant would be asked to provide details of planting and usually a five year maintenance schedule, to enable plants to become established. The council would write to developers if there was a breach of compliance with the conditions and the council could take enforcement action. Some people had purchased properties and were unaware that the council did not adopt public spaces. The responsibility for landscape maintenance transferred from the developer to the residents' management company and therefore the cost was borne by the residents not the council.

In response to a member's question, the landscape architect confirmed that the costs for planting and establishing a street tree were correct. The costs were reviewed annually.

A member referred to paragraph 29 of the draft consultation document and suggested that tree surveyors should be required "to record any evidence of bats, nesting birds or endangered species" rather than stating that it "is advisable". The planning team leader said that tree surveyors were not necessarily qualified in wildlife ecology and therefore he undertook to review the wording and check the legality of making it a requirement for them to record "bats, nesting birds and endangered species".

RESOLVED to approve the draft Trees and landscape SPD for consultation for a period of six weeks, commencing as soon as reasonably practicable after the date of this meeting, subject to asking the head of planning services to review paragraph 29, as minuted above.

7. Open space and play supplementary planning document (SPD) – draft for consultation

The planner (policy) presented the report.

During discussion it was agreed that there needed to be further explanation of the definition of "child bed spaces" in the text of the SPD.

The planner (policy), together with the head of planning services and the planning team leader (policy), referred to the report and answered members' questions. Members were advised that the council engaged the services of the district valuer to provide independent arbitration on viability assessments. There needed to be some flexibility in negotiations on developer obligations to ensure that vacant sites came forward for development, particularly for sites where viability was marginal. It was also noted that government initiatives to change national planning rules were likely to increase permitted development and exempt certain types of housing (starter homes) from community infrastructure levy (CIL) contributions or site specific

planning obligations. Members were advised that cabinet would be considering a report on the council's business plan for CIL at its meeting on 8 July 2015.

During discussion members were advised that open space officers had confirmed that the average lifetime of play equipment was 15 years and that developer contributions for maintenance would thus normally cover a 15-year period. This would be clarified in the document text. A member suggested that where developers were asked to upgrade existing play areas within 400 metres of their scheme, the developers' contributions could also be used to extend the maintenance of an existing play space. Officers said that the legalities of this would need to be investigated but confirmed that contributions could be used to provide additional facilities to meet the demand generated by the new development.

The panel considered that the document should reinforce the need to provide level access to open spaces and play areas.

The head of planning services said that there would be an opportunity for the panel to consider the consultation responses to this SPD and the Trees and landscape SPD, considered in the previous item, and make recommendations to cabinet before the SPDs were referred to cabinet for adoption.

RESOLVED to approve the draft Open space and play SPD for consultation for a period of six weeks, commencing as soon as reasonably practicable after the date of this meeting, subject to asking the head of planning services to include:

- (1) text to explain the definition of "child bed spaces";
- (2) additional text to reinforce the requirement for level access to open spaces and play areas.

CHAIR

Report to Sustainable development panel

Item

15 July 2015

Report of Head of planning service

4

Subject Planning policy update

Purpose

This report updates members on recent government changes to the planning system and gives an indication of the likely focus of the new government in terms of planning. It highlights some potential implications for planning policy and the local plan which will be addressed more fully in a later report to this committee, anticipated in September, which will inform the future planning workload.

Recommendation

That members note the contents of this report.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority a prosperous city and the service plan priority to implement the local plan for the city, and to respond appropriately and effectively to ongoing legislative changes.

Financial implications

None

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and Sustainable Development

Contact officers

Judith Davison, planning policy team leader (projects) 01603 212529

Graham Nelson, head of planning service 01603 212530

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. The previous coalition government made a number of reforms to the planning system, with the stated aims of promoting housing and economic growth, deregulating the planning system and removing unnecessary bureaucracy, and enabling local communities to exert more influence over development affecting them.
2. Major changes were made to the planning system in the early years of the last government commencing with the Localism Act 2011, which included the abolition of regional planning and introduction of the duty to cooperate and neighbourhood planning, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 which streamlined the former planning policy statements into one document. Further changes were made through the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013 and Infrastructure Act 2015, with the aim of speeding up the planning process. The government has consulted on several separate rounds of changes to the planning regulations and the General Permitted Development Order over the past four years, as well as issuing ministerial statements on various individual reforms. Some but not all of the measures proposed have been enacted to date.
3. The purpose of this report is to update members on the broad outcomes of previous consultations, highlight any outstanding changes, and to give an indication of the current government's approach to planning in this parliament as far as is possible. It highlights the implications of changes already made for the implementation of planning policy, and flags up potential future changes which could have even more significant impacts. The report provides the context for further work that will need to be done to respond to these changes, and will help inform the review of the Local Development Scheme (which will set out the work programme for the production of development plan documents) later in the year.

Summary of previous consultations

4. Many of the government's proposals have been reported to this committee over the past four years, with reports highlighting the council's concerns about the potential impacts on planning policy and in particular on the ability to implement the recently adopted local plan. The council has responded to most of these consultations, with limited success to date. A brief summary of key consultations and their outcomes to date is set out below.
 - *Relaxation of planning rules for commercial to residential changes* (April 2011). This consultation proposed new permitted development (PD) rights for office, light industrial premises and warehouses enabling change of use to residential. (Permitted development rights allow certain changes to a building to be made without the need to apply for planning permission.) The Council response raised a number of concerns including impacts on the amenity and quality of development.
 - *Technical consultation on extending permitted development rights for homeowners and businesses* (October 2012): this proposed measure was largely concerned with increasing the permitted size thresholds for residential and commercial extensions. The Council's response was reported to SD Panel in January 2013 and raised concerns about loss of democratic accountability and potential adverse impacts on neighbouring residents.

- *Greater flexibilities for changes of use* (August 2013): this proposed a series of reforms introducing new PD rights, including allowing for change of use from small shops and financial and professional services to housing, and for change of use of shops to banks and building societies within size limits. The council's response was reported to Sustainable Development Panel in September 2013 and noted concerns about some of the proposals, for example concern about the unintended consequences of encouraging change of use from retail to housing which could, for example, drive out viable local shops.

For a brief summary of the outcome of the above three consultations related to changes of use and permitted development rights, see paragraph 5(a) below.

- *Housing design standards review* (August 2013): this proposed rationalising national housing standards by reviewing and consolidating building regulations and code for sustainable homes provision and reviewing the scope of local design standards. The council response was reported to Sustainable Development Panel in September 2013 and argued that the proposed new standards should enable the policy approach currently in operation to be continued.
- This was followed up by a further consultation *Housing Standards Review* (September 2014) on possible consolidated standards. The council's response was reported to SD Panel in November 2014 and included concern at the potential to implement JCS policy 3 in relation to reducing water consumption on sites of 500+ units.

For a summary of the outcome of these two consultations related to housing standards, see paragraph 5(b) below.

- *Technical consultation on Planning* (July 2014): this sought further deregulation in relation to PD rights including new PD rights to change light industrial and warehouse premises to housing, to change amusement centres, casinos, nightclubs and launderettes to housing, and to enable greater flexibility in changes of use between a range of high street uses including retail. It also proposed to streamline the process for neighbourhood plan making, improve the use of planning conditions, change and speed up processes for statutory consultation on planning applications, reduce the need for environmental impact assessment for industrial and other urban development projects, and amend aspects of the recently introduced national infrastructure planning regime. The council's response, reported to Sustainable Development Panel in January 2015, was opposed to many of the measures which would weaken or otherwise reduce the effectiveness of adopted planning policy. It expressed concern that reform of the planning system through a series of piecemeal changes is misconceived and the cumulative impact of proposals is poorly thought through. Concerns were also raised about deficiencies in the new prior approval regime. *For a summary of the overall outcome in relation to permitted development rights see paragraph 5(a) below.*
- *Delivering sustainable drainage systems* (September 2014). This proposed the delivery of SUDs through changes to the planning regime. The council's response was reported to SD Panel in November 2014 and expressed concern that the proposed measures removed the previously envisaged responsibility of Lead Local Flood Authorities (in our case, Norfolk County Council) to deal with SUDs and would fragment responsibility, create confusion for developers, and add to

costs. *For a summary of the outcome of this consultation see paragraph 5(d) below.*

- *Planning and Travellers* (September 2014): the government consulted on a new definition of gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople for planning purposes, which would exclude people who have given up travelling permanently for whatever reason. The council's proposed response was reported to SD Panel in November 2014; the change was not supported on the basis that it would discriminate against the travelling community, would lead to reduced provision, and is likely to be difficult to operate in practice. *The government has not yet published the outcome of this consultation.*
- *Right to build: supporting custom and self-build* (October 2014). This proposed giving prospective custom and self-builders a right to a plot of land from their local council. The council submitted a response to government in December 2014 and reported on this to SD Panel in January 2015. Although it acknowledged that the Right to Build might have a role in contributing to housing supply, the response considered this to be unlikely to be significant, judged the proposals to be difficult to implement and to place a major burden on local authorities out of proportion to likely increased housing supply. *For a summary of the outcome of this consultation, see paragraph 5(e) below.*
- *Stepping onto the property ladder: enabling high quality starter homes for first time buyers* (December 2014). This consultation proposed to secure a supply of sites suitable for starter homes, discounted by 20% on market value. The council response was reported to SD Panel in January 2015 and set out a number of significant concerns namely that: the proposals are potentially arbitrary and bureaucratic; they may have an adverse impact on economic development; they may lead to a poor standard of residential development; they may impact on the general housing market; and may increase pressures on infrastructure. *For a summary of the outcome of this consultation, see paragraph 5(c) below.*
- *Building more homes on brownfield land* (January 2015). This consultation proposed a new requirement for local authorities to bring forward local development orders (LDOs) on brownfield sites suitable for housing with the objective that by 2020 there should be LDOs in place on over 90% of brownfield sites suitable for housing which do not already have planning permission. The council submitted its response to this consultation in March 2015 and set out a number of serious concerns including potential impacts on the council's ability to secure high quality design, influence the mix of development on sites, secure delivery of affordable housing and other infrastructure, and potential impact on planning workload and resources. *The government has not yet published the outcome of this consultation.*

Summary of outcome of consultations

5. A brief overview of the changes made to date by the government following these consultations is set out below:

(a) The government amended the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) in May 2013 to extend permitted development (PD) rights for homeowners and businesses, and to enable the change of use of existing buildings without the need for planning permission, on a temporary basis. This enables office buildings to

change to residential use and for greater change of use to assembly and leisure uses. In April 2015 further changes to PD rights were enacted (following the Technical consultation on planning in July 2014). These changes include moving betting and payday loan shops into the 'sui generis' use class which means a planning application is needed before a building can be converted to those uses; new PD rights to allow changes of use between shops, banks, and building societies without the need for planning permission; and removing PD rights which allow a public house to be demolished or changed into a supermarket when it is listed as an Asset of community value. Many of the PD rights for extensions to offices, shops industrial buildings and schools introduced in May 2013 have now been made permanent. The PD right allowing office to change to residential use is due to expire in May 2016. It is not yet known whether the new government will extend this or let it lapse.

(b)The outcome of the Housing Standards Review was published in March 2015 through a ministerial statement and sets national technical standards including optional building regulations standards for water efficiency and access, and a new national space standard. These will replace local plan policies although it will still be possible to implement fairly demanding standards for water efficiency locally. The review also signalled the government's intention to restrict the use of local energy policies in 2016 as increased Building Regulations standards will be introduced.

(c)The outcome of the Starter Homes consultation ('Stepping onto the property ladder, December 2014) was published in March 2015 via a written ministerial statement. This confirms that the scheme would go ahead. This will seek to secure a supply of sites suitable for starter homes, discounted by 20% on market value. The national planning practice guidance has been amended accordingly and should be taken into account in plan making and planning decision taking. The statement makes clear that the government will seek to amend the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations in the current parliament to exempt discounted starter home developments from the levy.

(d)The outcome of the consultation on sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDs), September 2014, was published in December 2014 and came into force in April 2015. This makes changes to the planning system to ensure delivery of SUDs through the planning regime, and provides for SUDs in new developments of 10 dwellings or more and in major commercial development. As a consequence, Norwich City Council has requested that Norfolk County Council provides expertise and support to enable the city to implement SUDs policies effectively.

(e) The outcome of the consultation on the Right to Build was published in March 2015. This stated that the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act, which received Royal Assent on 26 March, provides the legislative framework for the first part of the Right to Build, requiring local authorities to establish local registers of custom builders who wish to acquire a suitable site to build their own home. The Government stated its intention to prepare regulations and guidance setting out the detailed operation of the local registers in this parliament (for consultation), and to carry out an assessment of the additional cost of the local registers for local government. The government intends to bring forward the second part of the Right to Build in the current parliament, requiring local authorities to bring forward plots of land for registered custom builders within a specified time.

6. The main outstanding proposals from previous government consultations noted above relate to proposals to get more brownfield land back in to use, and amendment of the definition of gypsies and travellers for planning purposes.

Current government approach

7. The Conservative Party manifesto contained several planning-related commitments including: giving local people more a say about local planning and letting them vote on local issues; a commitment to ensuring that 90% of suitable brownfield sites will have planning permission for housing by 2020; and support for locally led garden cities.
8. The Queen's Speech on 27 May 2015 introduced two new bills which will make changes to planning law. These include a Housing Bill which will:
 - Introduce a statutory register for brownfield land to achieve the manifesto target;
 - Provide the statutory framework required to support the delivery of 200,000 starter homes available to the under 40's at a 20% discount;
 - Take forward the 'Right to Build', requiring local planning authorities to support custom and self-builders in their area by identifying plots of land to build or commission their own home; and
 - Simplify and speed up the neighbourhood planning system to support communities that seek to meet local housing and development needs.

Possible implications

9. Although we are only a couple of months into the new administration and the scale of further planning reform is still uncertain, it is clear that the new government has placed a renewed emphasis on neighbourhood planning and is committed to increasing housing supply through measures to bring forward significant development on brownfield sites, increase the supply of starter homes, and through self-build. This underlines the government's continuing emphasis on the role of the planning system to enable and encourage development rather than to prevent it.
10. The implications for Norwich of the increased emphasis on neighbourhood plans are uncertain; to date we have had some interest in this but no firm proposals. However the introduction of detailed measures requiring local development orders (LDOs) for suitable brownfield sites could have major implications for the council's ability to secure high quality development, and secure delivery of affordable housing and other infrastructure, as reported to SD Panel in February 2015. As a tool to bring forward development of brownfield sites, LDOs are unproven and would do nothing to address the real problems of housing delivery which lies with the economics of developing brownfield sites and the lack of adequate regeneration funding to unlock them. The introduction of LDOs is likely to have serious financial implications for the council through a reduction in planning fee income, and the requirement to produce evidence (including viability, understanding of constraints etc) required to inform the LDOs, whilst at the same time requiring major staff resources for their production. Given the lack of detail in the consultation paper it will be important to await the publication of detailed proposals before we can assess potential impacts for Norwich.

11. The duty to cooperate is now firmly embedded in the local planning process and a number of inspectors' reports of local plan examinations have underlined this by not allowing plans to proceed to examination which have not met the duty. This effectively means the re-emergence of a form of strategic planning, though less comprehensive than under the former regional spatial strategies, within the context of devolution and a potentially evolving local government structure. A separate report is provided for this committee meeting to brief members on strategic planning matters in Norfolk.
12. We have expressed significant concerns about planning deregulation in reports to SD Panel over the past couple of years, as reported above, and the way in which this reduces the ability of the system to positively shape development, protect amenity and manage change to support sustainable growth. It is not clear how much further planning deregulation is likely to go in this parliament. Constant extension of the range of development that no longer needs planning permission can only erode democratic accountability and runs contrary to the government's aim of increasing the involvement of local people in the planning process.
13. Deregulation to date and changes to planning policy have affected both the content of the adopted local plan, and the ability to implement it, particularly in relation to office and retail development. For example the ability to implement some aspects of the adopted JCS has been significantly weakened, in particular its requirement to promote and retain office employment in the city centre. This has also affected the adopted Norwich Development Management (DM) Policies Plan, which was amended to keep pace with legislative changes and to ensure that the plan would be found sound and legally compliant through examination.
14. In particular policy DM19 (Office Development) was amended during the plan preparation process to reflect the temporary PD right for changes of use from office to residential use. This change was made on the advice of the local plan inspector to ensure that the plan would be found sound. The effect of this is that, if the PD right is terminated in May 2016 as planned, the council will have limited policy basis in the DM Policies plan for regulating changes of use from office to residential use. This is a serious issue of concern given the JCS aspiration to retain a substantial office base in the city centre.
15. Recent changes to PD rights also impact on the implementation of policies to support retailing (DM20 Protecting and supporting city centre shopping; and DM21 Protecting and supporting district and local centres). For example changes of use can now be made freely between shops, banks, and building societies without the need for planning permission, which makes it difficult to implement both policies and the recently adopted Supplementary Planning Document (Main town centre uses and retail frontages SPD), in particular maintaining the minimum proportion of frontage in retail use at ground floor level. These changes make it difficult for local authorities to apply the NPPF in relation to ensuring the vitality of town centres.

Conclusion

16. The implications set out above are not exhaustive but do give a flavour of the issues that will need to be addressed over the next few months, particularly in relation to review of the Local Development Scheme. As part of this officers are currently considering options for addressing the impacts of recent changes on the implementation of the local plan, and seeking clarification where possible about

potential future changes. The latter may include changes to the PD right for changes of use from office to residential, and proposals for LDOs on brownfield sites.

17. Potential future changes and challenges may become clearer over the next couple of months. The Housing and Planning minister Brandon Lewis is speaking at the Planning Convention in London on 7th July which may provide a further indication of the government's intentions, as may the Budget announcement on 8th July.
18. The implications for a number of local plan policies and an assessment of how these may be addressed will be discussed in greater detail in a forthcoming report to SD Panel (anticipated in September). This will then help to inform the future planning work programme and a review of the Local Development Scheme, due to be reported to SD Panel later in the year.

Report to	Sustainable development panel	Item
	15 July 2015	
Report of	Head of planning services	5
Subject	Heritage Interpretation SPD – draft for consultation	

Purpose

This report concerns the draft Heritage Interpretation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Members are asked to comment on the draft document and recommend any necessary amendments before publication as a draft for consultation. The document provides guidance and requirements to support local plan policies on this issue.

Recommendation

To comment on the draft Heritage Interpretation SPD before publication as a draft for consultation, for a period of six weeks, commencing as soon as reasonably practicable after the date of this meeting.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority prosperous city and the service plan priority to implement the local plan for the city.

Financial implications

None directly

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and transport

Contact officers

Lara Emerson, Planner (policy): 01603 212500

Mike Burrell, Planning Team leader (policy), 01603 212529

Background documents

None

Report

1. The Heritage Interpretation SPD (attached at Appendix 1) has been prepared to enable cost effective, efficient and consistent implementation of adopted Norwich local plan policies on heritage interpretation in new development. It will help to ensure that Norwich's heritage is acknowledged and our understanding and appreciation of the historic environment is enhanced through new development. The SPD has been prepared with input from Norwich Heritage Environment and Regeneration Trust (HEART).
2. The SPD relates to Joint Core Strategy Policies JCS2: Design and JCS11: City Centre and JCS20: Implementation. The SPD also supplements more detailed Development Management policies DM3: Design and DM9: Heritage. These promote high quality design and require development to respond to the historic environment and heritage assets.
3. The document sets out the policies to which it relates, the circumstances under which heritage interpretation is likely to be necessary and gives examples of successful schemes in Norwich. Finally, it gives a rough indication as to the potential financial contributions which could be required for off-site heritage interpretation schemes.
4. The SPD will help developers to understand what is meant by heritage interpretation and to inspire creative and successful schemes. It will also help the council to interpret its policies in a consistent and effective way. Overall, its aim is to promote imaginative heritage interpretation schemes and in turn to aid the public's understanding of Norwich's rich history.
5. It also aims to encourage greater awareness of the importance of heritage interpretation in development in general and to ensure due weight is given to heritage interpretation so that development will have a stronger sense of place and character and will help to achieve a higher quality cultural environment.
6. Sustainable development panel members are asked to comment on the draft document in appendix 1 and suggest amendments before publication as a draft for consultation for a period of six weeks. Following consultation responses will be reported back through sustainable development panel before the SPD is reported to cabinet for adoption.

Appendix 1 - Heritage Interpretation Supplementary Planning Document

Draft version June 2015

Contents

Introduction	2
<hr/>	
The need for heritage interpretation	4
<hr/>	
Examples of heritage interpretation	5
<hr/>	
Off-site heritage interpretation - financial contributions	7

Introduction

1. The purpose of this Heritage Interpretation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is to provide additional guidance to those involved in developments in historic areas, such as developers, architects, conservation professionals and planners.
2. This SPD has been prepared to give an indication of the circumstances under which a heritage interpretation scheme may be required. Several examples of successful heritage interpretation schemes in Norwich are presented, as well as a rough approximation of the financial contribution that might be sought if heritage interpretation is to be provided off-site.
3. This SPD aims to support a number of Norwich local plan policies in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the Development Management (DM) policies plan: JCS2 - Design; JCS11 - City Centre; JCS20 - Implementation; DM3 - Design; DM9 - Heritage.
4. The JCS policies are available [here](http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/planning/joint-core-strategy) or <http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/planning/joint-core-strategy> and the DM policies [here](http://www.norwich.gov.uk/Planning/PlanningPolicy/LocalPlan/Pages/theDMpolicies.aspx).or <http://www.norwich.gov.uk/Planning/PlanningPolicy/LocalPlan/Pages/theDMpolicies.aspx>
5. Heritage interpretation is dealt with directly in DM9 - Heritage. The relevant part of the DM9 and its supporting text are quoted below.

DM9:

“...[*Development*] will also promote recognition of the importance of the historic environment through heritage interpretation measures...”

Supporting text:

“...The city council attaches considerable importance to the need for people to be able to understand and interpret the heritage of Norwich. The council will continue to negotiate for the provision of heritage interpretation within new development schemes where they will have community value. This will be secured either through direct provision on-site or by means of an agreed financial contribution to providing or enhancing interpretive measures elsewhere in the vicinity. There is considerable potential to provide heritage interpretation in imaginative and creative ways with the scale and location of such provision depending upon the size of the scheme proposed and the significance of the asset affected...”

6. Where historic artefacts or ruins are discovered on a site, and where the heritage asset's significance is affected by development, and where the asset cannot be retained, the asset is expected to be recorded in the Historic Environment Record. If the asset's community or cultural value is affected, the following applies:

“...Where the loss of significance concerns [*a heritage asset's*] community or cultural value, elements of that significance should be either preserved on-site through appropriate interpretation, or financial contribution must be provided, to allow that significance to be reinstated elsewhere in the vicinity...”

7. Within this SPD, heritage interpretation is defined as:

“A means of disseminating information on the historic environment to the general public using physical measures.”

8. Within this SPD, cultural or community value is defined as:

“A building or land identified by a local community as being of importance to their social well-being, or a building or land which has some significant and special cultural history”

The need for heritage interpretation

9. Heritage interpretation measures will be necessary when a development affects a heritage asset's community or cultural value. The type and scale of heritage interpretation required will depend on: the significance of the heritage asset affected; and the size of the development.
10. Some form of heritage interpretation will be required as part of any development proposals on the following sites which are allocated for development within the Site Allocations Plan:
 - a. CC4: Land at Rose Lane and Mountergate;
 - b. CC6: St Anne's Wharf and adjoining land;
 - c. CC7: Land at Hobrough Lane, King Street;
 - d. CC17b: Whitefriars;
 - e. CC22: Barn Road Car Park;
 - f. CC23: Pottergate Car Park;
 - g. CC26: Former Mecca Bingo site, All Saints Green;
 - h. CC30: Westwick Street Car Park;
 - i. R4: Hewett Yard, Hall Road;
 - j. R9: The Deal Ground; and
 - k. R17: Van Dal Shoes, Dibden Road.

NB: This list is not exhaustive and as such, heritage interpretation may be necessary on other allocated and unallocated sites.

Examples of heritage interpretation

11. Heritage interpretation can take many forms dependent on the nature of the site including plaques, information boards, public art, sculptures and reminiscent building or street naming. It will be essential for the heritage interpretation measures to relate directly to a site's history and to be provided on or very close to the asset affected by the development. Past experience has demonstrated that heritage interpretation schemes need to be carefully designed to be robust and lasting.
12. Below are some examples of creative and successful heritage interpretation schemes which have been incorporated into recent developments in Norwich.

Chapelfield Shopping Centre - illustrative stone reliefs (see photos below) placed at the St Stephens Street entrance depict the site's industrial past as a chocolate and soft drinks factory and its importance to the social and economic history of the city. The factory, erected in 1890 by Caley's and later operated by Rowntree Mackintosh and then Nestle, covered over 7 acres of the city centre and employed over 1,100 people at its height. Largely destroyed by bombing in the Second World War and re-built subsequently, it closed in 1996 and was demolished in 2004.



13. Paper Mill Yard - metal plaques provide cultural and historical information about the site itself and the neighbouring area. These include Carrow Bridge, the Carrow Works factory and the Boom Towers which form part of the medieval City Wall. The plaques were initially placed within the hard landscaping along the Riverside Walk but became slippery when wet and illustrations were wearing off. The plaques have now been re-erected on walls.



14. Quayside – match funding with external funding sources enabled the Quayside development to deliver a prominent heritage interpretation feature along with an improved pedestrian environment which forms part of the Wensum riverside walk in the city centre. The bales here are evocative of the river's important past as a key trade route. The bales act as public art and functional street furniture as well as heritage interpretation.



Off-site heritage interpretation - financial contributions

15. A financial contribution may be necessary when development affects a heritage asset's community or cultural value but where it is not possible to provide any form of heritage interpretation on site. It is usually preferable for heritage interpretation to be provided on-site, and it will only be on heavily constrained sites that off-site schemes will be utilised.
16. The level of finance required will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and will depend on:
 - a. The significance of the heritage asset affected;
 - b. The scale of the development; and
 - c. The type and scale of heritage interpretation necessary for a particular development.

As an indication, figures could range from one hundred pounds for a basic plaque to several thousand pounds for a public sculpture.

17. Financial contributions allocated to heritage interpretation will be used for schemes directly related to that development.

Report to Sustainable development panel

15 July 2015

Report of Head of planning service

Subject Norfolk Non Statutory Strategic Framework – update report

Item

6

Purpose

This report informs sustainable development panel members about progress on the Non Statutory Strategic Framework considered by the Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum on 9 July 2015

Recommendation

To note the update on the Non Statutory Strategic Framework and comment on any issues arising before the updates to the framework are considered by cabinet on 9 September 2015.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priorities decent housing for all and a prosperous city, along with the service plan priority to implement the local plan for the city.

Financial implications

Each Norfolk district has agreed to contribute up to £25,000 over an 18 month period to the project. In Norwich these costs will be met from the Local Plan budget.

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Bremner – Environment and transport

Contact officers

Graham Nelson, Head of planning services 01603 212530

Mike Burrell, Planning team leader (policy) 01603 212529

Background documents

None

Report

1. On 25 February 2015 a Duty to Cooperate Options paper, previously considered by the Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum in January 2015, was reported to the Sustainable development panel. This paper recommended formal cooperation on strategic planning issues through a shared non-statutory strategic framework. The Sustainable development panel noted the report and recommended that cabinet support the principle of formal cooperation through a shared non-statutory strategic framework.
2. Cabinet subsequently considered the report at its meeting on 11 March 2015. It resolved to agree to co-operate on strategic planning matters through a shared non-statutory strategic framework, subject to revised terms of reference for the member forum, budget provision and detailed arrangements for framework production being agreed.
3. On 16 March 2015 the Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum agreed to:
 - endorse the broad focus, structure and timetable of the Strategic Framework;
 - recommend that each authority formally agrees to participate in the preparation of the framework and agree to contribute up to a maximum of £15,000 in 2015/16 and £10,000 in 16/17 to cover the anticipated costs;
 - write formally to the LEP and the all Suffolk authorities to request confirmation of whether or not they wish to participate in preparation of the framework and whether they are prepared to share costs.
4. This paper is in appendix 1.
5. The Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum on July 9th 2015 considered an update report on the Non Statutory Strategic Framework.
6. The report is in appendix 2. It recommended that the forum agrees to:
 - (a) Amend the title of the proposed document to Norfolk Strategic Framework
 - (b) Agree that Norwich City Council acts as host and employing authority. This would involve two members of staff being employed to assist in the production of the strategic framework for approximately 18 months.
 - (c) Amend the scope of the framework document as outlined in Table 1 of appendix 1. These amendments were made to reflect previous comments made by the Norfolk district councils and the Broads Authority.
7. Officers will verbally report the outcome of the Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum to the sustainable development panel.
8. A report will be taken to cabinet on 9 September 2015 covering these issues.

Appendix 1

Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum – March 16th 2015

Non Statutory Strategic Framework – Content and Process

1. Purpose of report

1.1 The purpose of this report is to take forward the recommendations agreed when the Forum met on 14th January to consider options for how to discharge the duty to co-operate on an on-going basis. The Forum agreed to:

1. Endorse the principle of option 3 - formal cooperation through preparation of a shared non-statutory strategic framework.
2. Recommend that each constituent authority agrees formally to take forward option 3 at its earliest convenience subject to later agreement of:
 - A) Amended terms of reference for the member Duty to Cooperate Forum;
 - B) Appropriate officer and member working arrangements; and
 - C) Budget and timetable to support preparation of the shared non-statutory framework.
3. Instruct officers to prepare detailed reports on matters 2 A-C for consideration at the next member Duty to Cooperate Forum meeting.

1.2 Individual endorsement by each authority of option 3 is still ongoing. By the time of the meeting on 16th March it is expected that most, but not all, Norfolk authorities will have formally endorsed this approach. At the time of writing no authority has refused to endorse what was agreed at the last meeting. A verbal update will be given to the meeting on progress. This report seeks to address recommendation 3 and in particular 2B and C.

1.3 The NPPF states (paragraph 181) that *“Local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having effectively cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination. This could be by way of plans or policies prepared as part of a joint committee, a memorandum of understanding or a jointly prepared strategy which is presented as evidence of an agreed position”*. It also should be recognised that joint working on strategic planning issues can also lead to improved outcomes for Councils in terms of resource efficiency and delivery of sustainable growth.

1.4 In the light of the NPPF and the previous agreement this report seeks to identify a preferred approach on how best to prepare a non-statutory Strategic Framework. In order to consider the process for preparation of the framework it has been necessary to consider the possible content of the framework. To some extent this is an iterative exercise. If the Forum decides to address a more comprehensive range of issues thoroughly in the framework this will have implications for the working arrangements, budget and timetable. In practice there are a multiplicity of

options that could be taken but discussion amongst the officers has resulted in a single recommended preferred approach being proposed for discussion.

- 1.5 Revised Terms of Reference for the Forum have been prepared (separate report) in the expectation that agreement will be reached in relation to the preparation of a framework document. These may require further amendment after this meeting, following which they will be recommended to member authorities for approval.

2 Purpose, Scope, and Content of the Framework

- 2.1 A Framework document is not a statutory development plan and it will not include development plan policies or be subject to independent examination. Unlike the formal plan making process a non-statutory framework document is not subject to any specific regulatory requirements and it need not be subject to public consultation or sustainability appraisal although there is nothing to preclude these being done. The content of the Framework and the process for its preparation are matters for the Councils to collectively decide. The Framework is intended to guide and inform the preparation of individual Local Plans and ensure that strategic land use issues of cross boundary significance are properly addressed.

- 2.2 The NPPF states (paragraphs 156 and 162) that Local Plans should include strategic policies, and LPAs should work with other authorities and providers to meet forecast demands and deliver:

- homes and jobs;
- retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management;
- minerals and energy (including heat);
- health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities;
- climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape;
- nationally significant infrastructure.

- 2.3 As a guide this list is indicative of the type of subject areas where there is an expectation that a co-operative approach *may* be desirable. At an early stage a decision needs to be reached about which of these raise genuinely strategic issues and are likely to have cross boundary implications, which would necessitate, or be best addressed, via a co-operative approach. It is not necessary for *all* cross boundary issues to be addressed in a strategic framework document; for example, depending on the issue it might be equally appropriate for authorities to produce bi lateral agreements (memorandums of understanding or similar) or to separately evidence how a co-operative approach has been taken. Whilst the Framework is initially intended to be prepared on behalf of the Norfolk planning authorities it will need to demonstrate how issues of cross boundary significance beyond Norfolk are being considered.

2.4 Table 1 below outlines those issues which: officers consider are most likely to raise strategically important cross boundary considerations and where a co-operative approach would therefore be helpful; and identifies the key evidence that will be required to understand and address the issue and suggests how this might be prepared. This should not be regarded as an exhaustive list and the final content of the document must be kept under review as evidence is prepared. The aim would be that the resulting Framework would provide a set of agreed *objectives* which would influence the subsequent spatial distribution of growth in the next round of Local Plans.

Table 1. Potential Content of Framework Document

Topic Area	Framework to address	Evidence needed to support	Preparation process
Spatial Vision	<p>What is the overall spatial vision for the area (to include Norfolk, Suffolk and the wider region as necessary) and to identify and describe the key drivers and constraints in relation to growth. To include a spatial portrait and overall direction of travel addressing:</p> <p>Quality of life; response to challenge of climate change; key headlines in terms of what is being aimed for in relation to role of settlements and key growth locations. Summary of impacts of broad population, economic, environmental, social trends and implications of</p>	<p>Mainly drawn from review of local and national policy documents and further evidence sources referred to below plus census and ONS/CLG projections of population and households. Climate change and coastal changes. May be a need to commission some further work to fill any gaps or interpret evidence.</p>	<p>Initially prepared by existing Strategic Planning Officer Group to identify any information gaps and revised as Framework preparation progresses and additional evidence becomes available.</p>

	known national and local policies. To have a longer term vision – will need to look beyond 2036.		
Homes	<p>What is the overall quantity of homes to be provided between 2016 and 2036?</p> <p>What is the proposed distribution of housing growth between District Council administrative Areas? If there are constraints to growth how could these be addressed?</p> <p>Information on types and tenures including possible shared approaches to meeting affordable needs?</p>	<p>SHMA – assessment of objectively assessed housing need and demand factors.</p> <p>Housing Growth Strategy. SHMAs and other evidence to be drawn together to derive an agreed Housing Growth Strategy.</p> <p>SHLAAs – Assessment of ‘unconstrained’ housing capacity.</p> <p>Constrained Capacity–Need to consider and address other capacity/constraint considerations not covered in SHLAAs.</p>	<p>Five District SHMA nearing completion. Possible reconciliation/consistency checking if others’ SHMAs are within area of Framework.</p> <p>SHLAAs to be completed to a consistent methodology and open to mutual scrutiny and challenge across the entire area covered by the Framework. Work to be undertaken by relevant LPA staff to an agreed timeframe (<i>with consultant support if necessary/appropriate?</i>).</p>
Jobs	Demonstrate understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the local economy, likely growth areas, patterns of distribution and inter-relationships. Reference to the SEP and investment/economic strategies.	<p>Employment Growth Study.</p> <p>Further runs of EEFM.</p>	<p>Externally commission via consultancy to a brief produced involving County Council(s) and LEP.</p> <p>County Council to arrange EEFM runs (possibly to inform above study).</p>

	Identification of indicative job growth targets and land supply implications/spatial implications for planning policy.		
Infrastructure	<p>Are there any key infrastructure constraints or opportunities (physical, social and/or environmental) which are likely to impede growth or influence its distribution <i>at a strategic scale</i>?</p> <p>To address transport infrastructure (road, rail and other sustainable modes), green infrastructure, water issues (both supply and disposal), and flooding.</p> <p>Potential to include high level statement in relation to other physical and social infrastructure approach – health, education, broadband etc if significant and cross boundary.</p>	Analysis of current evidence base to identify possible constraints and opportunities, and whether further work is necessary to inform high level strategy.	To be produced by officers working with staff from key agencies such as EA and NE.
Delivery	Is the development market in the area likely to be sufficiently strong to support	High level market forces/viability assessment focussing on issues associated with	Externally commissioned

	<p>delivery of the growth needs identified in a sustainable manner?</p> <p>Is any further stimulus necessary to deliver?</p>	<p>strategic scale growth proposals as opposed to more dispersed/smaller scale development.</p>	
--	--	---	--

2.5 There are a wide range of other topic areas where cross boundary issues may arise as Plan preparation proceeds but at this stage it is considered that the Framework should focus on those issues which are likely to influence the broad spatial distribution of growth.

3 Preparing a Framework - Process

- 3.1 Given the relatively focussed content of the framework listed above and the financial constraints on local authorities the option of seeking to recruit a new planning resource to lead the work is not favoured. The view was taken that existing local authority staff were likely to be best placed to draft the Framework itself from the evidence base available and a small number of commissioned studies. External work will only be commissioned where absolutely necessary and the initial expectation was that this may only be required in relation to employment and viability/delivery studies.
- 3.2 This would mean that the financial contribution needed for the work would be minimised but there would be a significant resource required in terms of officer time. There is currently little spare capacity within the policy teams of the partner authorities as a number are heavily engaged in finalising local plan documents although this situation has the prospect of easing over time as plans are adopted. Some of the work that will be required could be regarded as 'mainstream activities' such as the preparation of Strategic Land Availability Assessments and will just require re-phasing of existing local plan work programmes to deliver what is necessary in accordance with an agreed timetable.
- 3.3 Experience from working on Local Plans in the Greater Norwich area suggests that joint working of local authority staff can be highly efficient and effective but that in order to be successful it requires a level of dedicated project management and administrative support to ensure that appropriate responsibilities are assigned, meetings organised, progress reports prepared, external consultancy commissioned and remedial action taken where milestones are missed. This will be required to support a series of task and finish working groups to do the work needed. A possible structure in relation to the member forum is illustrated in Table 2.
- 3.4 In order to put these structures in place a number of steps would need to be taken. Due to the time taken to recruit an early step will need to be recruitment to project manager and admin support post. The current expectation is the project manager post would only be part time (possibly 0.5fte) although having the scope

to alter working hours throughout the period of employment would be an advantage. The administrative support is anticipated being full time. These staff would need to be hosted in one of the LPA offices (there would be advantages if the hosting authority was the one which provided the LPA lead officer). Another authority would need to agree to be the employing authority for the staff involved (this could be either another LPA or a County or the LEP). The employing authority would be responsible for drafting the job description, person specification and grading for the post, agreeing with the partner authorities and holding the shared budget for the production of the framework.

- 3.5 Establishing the membership of the officer groups should be more straightforward. The membership of the task and finish groups and the level of work involved will vary. All LPAs will not need to be involved in all of the task and finish groups. However, each task and finish group will need to report back regularly to the steering group and at key stages to the member forum. It is suggested that reports will be needed to the Member Forum prior to briefs being issued for external commission and on draft evidence reports before they are finalised and published.

Table 2: Possible Structure

Duty to Co-operate Member Forum			
Strategic Planning Officer Group(s) As existing – membership depending on coverage of the strategy			
Framework Officer Steering and drafting Group Comprising: LA lead officer (chair) Project manager Lead Officer from each working group			
Housing task and finish group To produce SHMA reconciliation and SHLAAs Comprising LPAs and County Council(s) LPA lead officer	Economy task and finish group To produce modelling forecasts, agree brief for employment study and act as client for study Comprising LPAs, County Council(s) and	Infrastructure task and finish group To produce evidence related to infrastructure and environmental capacity Comprising LPAs, County Council(s), stat agencies (EA, NE	Delivery task and finish group To agree brief delivery/viability study and act as client for study Comprising LPAs, County Council(s) and LEP (if involved) LPA lead officer

	LEP (if involved) LEP lead officer (if involved)	if involved) County Council lead officer	
--	---	---	--

Possible Budget implications

3.6 The budget remains uncertain at this stage. Key variables in determining this will be the coverage of the Framework (the greater the coverage the lower the cost to each authority involved), and the willingness of the partners such as the County Council(s), LEP and statutory agencies to assist with the process both in terms of the financial contribution and staff resources to assist with the work. However, the following costs have been estimated:

- Staff Project Manager £40,000pa (including on-costs, assuming 0.5fte)
- Admin support £30,000pa (including on-costs assuming 1fte)
- Economic Evidence - initial estimate c£40,000
- Strategic Infrastructure and viability/deliverability – initial estimate c£30,000

3.7 The above costs would mean under a conservative scenario of the work being financed solely by the District level LPAs across Norfolk the costs faced by each authority should be a maximum of c£15,000 each in the next financial year (2015/16) with no more £10,000 each in the following financial year, assuming there is no decision to commission further work.

Timetable

3.8 Assuming the Forum is content to endorse the recommendations in this report it will take some time to gain a formal decision from each of the participating authorities about participation on the joint exercise. In practice it will be the early part of the summer before endorsement is gained (June/July 2015). This will inevitably delay the process of appointing the project manager, establishing working groups, and drafting briefs for external commissioned work. In practice it is considered that September 2015 will be the earliest post holders and lead officers will be in place and work is able to commence in earnest.

3.9 The primary research phase and production of the key evidence base is considered likely to take at least six months (complete by March 2016). Spring 2016 is likely to be a period of fairly intense work for the staff involved in the steering and drafting group to produce the first draft of the framework in the light of the Forum's reaction to the evidence base produced.

3.10 Notwithstanding the absence of any legal requirement for consultation it is suggested that the process will need to feature the ability for the public and interest groups who have not been directly involved in the process to have their say on the emerging framework. This will add at least 3 months to the preparation timetable.

3.11 Allowing for time to analyse and consider any comments received on the draft document and for engagement with each of the adopting authorities on the

final content of the document the earliest possible date that the Forum may be in a position to recommend adoption of a framework to the adopting authorities is likely to be the first meeting in 2017. In order to minimise any impact of this timetable, Local Plans are likely to need to be developed in parallel (if preparation is not already underway).

Recommendation

It is recommended that the forum agrees to:

- 1) Endorse that the Strategic Framework should in the first instance focus on those areas identified in Table 1 and be produced using a structure outlined in Table 2 and the timetable outline in paras 3.8-11;
- 2) Recommend that each authority formally agrees to participate in the preparation of the framework and agree to contribute up to a maximum of £15,000 in 2015/16 and £10,000 in 16/17 to cover the anticipated costs;
- 3) Write formally to the LEP and the all Suffolk authorities to request confirmation of whether or not they wish to participate in preparation of the framework and whether they are prepared to share costs.

Report prepared by Mark Ashwell (NNDC) and Graham Nelson (Norwich City)

Appendix 2

Norfolk Duty to Cooperate Member Forum July 9th 2015

Non Statutory Strategic Framework – Update

1. Purpose of report

1.1 At the meeting on the 16th of March the Forum considered a detailed report on the recommended scope and content of the proposed Non Statutory Strategic Framework and the suggested practical arrangements for its preparation. There was discussion about the scope of the document and a limited number of amendments were suggested. The Forum resolved to:

- 4) Endorse that the Strategic Framework should in the first instance focus on those areas identified in Table 1(see below) and be produced using a structure outlined in Table 2 and the timetable outlined in paras 3.8-11;
- 5) Recommend that each authority formally agrees to participate in the preparation of the framework and agree to contribute up to a maximum of £15,000 in 2015/16 and £10,000 in 16/17 to cover the anticipated costs;
- 6) Write formally to the LEP and the all Suffolk authorities to request confirmation of whether or not they wish to participate in preparation of the framework and whether they are prepared to share costs.

1.2 This report provides an update on progress since the 16th of March.

1.3 Since the meeting in March, all of the Norfolk district councils, along with the Broads Authority and Norfolk County Council, have agreed the principle of progressing a non-statutory strategic framework, along with the funding to progress that work.

1.4 Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk may need to take further reports to their councils to agree the detail of their in principle decisions, whilst the remaining councils are not expected to need to consider any further reports at this point.

1.5 In considering whether to endorse the preparation of a framework some Council's raised additional issues for further consideration:

- North Norfolk requested that a mechanism should be established to enable cross boundary shared settlement planning, particularly in relation to Hoveton and Wroxham;
- The Broads Authority requested that some changes be made to anticipated work on the evidence base for the framework to ensure that climate change, water quality, landscape, tourism and conservation issues are adequately covered;
- Great Yarmouth requested that Waveney should be included in strategic considerations.

1.6 In the interests of simplification, and in recognition of the very limited likelihood that neighbouring authorities outside Norfolk being directly involved in the production of the framework, officers recommend that the non-statutory strategic framework should be known as the Norfolk Strategic Framework from now on.

1.7 Subject to final clarification from all partners, it is proposed that Norwich City Council will be the employing and hosting authority for the two employees to be appointed, the project manager (0.5 part time) and the project assistant (full time). Both will be employed on a fixed term basis for 18 months by the hosting authority.

1.8 Norwich is proposed by officers for this role firstly due to its highly accessible location both for the partner authorities and the employees and secondly because the City Council is not proposing to chair the group, thus sharing responsibilities. For the same reasons, whilst less accessible, Breckland's offices in Dereham are also considered to be a suitable alternative should members not favour Norwich as the host.

1.9 Acting as the employer and host authority will require the chosen Council to take on responsibilities for the employees such as line management, pay and pensions.

1.10 In order to progress matters as quickly as possible, draft person specifications and job descriptions are being drawn up using the city's templates to enable grading of the positions to be done and adverts to be produced. It would be possible to amend these specifications if necessary, with a slight delay to the employment process.

1.11 Discussions are on –going with both the LEP and the Suffolk Authorities. The Suffolk Authorities have welcomed the engagement to date and will continue to be involved as appropriate but do not currently anticipate joining the Forum.

2. Budget and timetable

2.1 Each district has agreed to contribute up to £25,000 over an 18 month period to the project. Costs should be a maximum of c£15,000 in the next financial year (2015/16) with no more than, £10,000 in the following financial year. It is anticipated that the framework will be complete during the 2016/17 financial year.

3. Revised Scope and Content

3.1 Table 1 below is an amended content description of the Framework incorporating those changes suggested at the March meeting and the subsequent further suggestions made by each Council. For ease of references suggested changes are highlighted in italics and under-lined. As previously stated the final content of the Framework is likely to evolve as it is prepared but initially the work will focus on the workstreams identified in the table. As previously agreed the work will be progressed by four task groups reporting via a steering group to the Forum.

Table 1. Potential Content of Framework Document

Topic Area	Framework to address	Evidence needed to support	Preparation process
Spatial Vision	<p>What is the overall spatial vision for Norfolk <i><u>taking account of cross boundary issues with Waveney and adjoining Counties (Suffolk, Cambs, Lincs) and the wider region as necessary</u></i> and to identify and describe the key drivers and constraints in relation to growth. To include a spatial portrait and overall direction of travel addressing:</p> <p>Quality of life; response to challenge of climate change; key headlines in terms of what is being aimed for in relation to role of settlements and key growth locations. Summary of impacts of broad population, economic, environmental, social trends and implications of known national and local policies</p>	<p>Mainly drawn from review of local and national policy documents and further evidence sources referred to below plus census and ONS/CLG projections of population and households. Climate change and coastal changes. May be a need to commission some further work to fill any gaps or interpret evidence.</p>	<p>Initially prepared by existing Strategic Planning Officer Group to identify any information gaps and revised as Framework preparation progresses and additional evidence becomes available.</p>

	<p><i>to include water quality, landscape, tourism and conservation. To have a longer term vision – will need to look beyond 2036, <u>and will need to ensure that full account is taken of economic, environmental and social aspects of sustainable development.</u></i></p>		
Homes	<p>What is the overall quantity of homes to be provided between 2016 and 2036?</p> <p>What is the proposed distribution of housing growth between <u>LPA</u> administrative Areas? If there are constraints to growth how could these be addressed?</p> <p>Information on types and tenures including possible shared approaches to meeting affordable needs <i>and other forms of housing. <u>The potential need for gypsy and traveller accommodation would be considered outside of the preparation of the framework in the first instance.</u></i></p>	<p>SHMA – assessment of objectively assessed housing need and demand factors.</p> <p>Housing Growth Strategy. SHMAs and other evidence to be drawn together to derive an agreed Housing Growth Strategy.</p> <p>SHLAAs – Assessment of ‘unconstrained’ housing capacity.</p> <p>Constrained Capacity–Need to consider and address other capacity/constraint considerations not covered in SHLAAs.</p> <p>Review of GTAAs and existing planned provision.</p>	<p>Five District SHMA nearing completion. Possible reconciliation/consistency checking if others’ SHMAs are within area of Framework.</p> <p>SHLAAs to be completed to a consistent methodology and open to mutual scrutiny and challenge across the entire area covered by the Framework. Work to be undertaken by relevant LPA staff to an agreed timeframe (<i>with consultant support if necessary/appropriate?</i>).</p> <p>Consideration of whether further joint work to assess needs of Gypsies and Traveller is required to plan for appropriate provision</p>
<u>Jobs Economic Development and Growth</u>	<p>Demonstrate understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the local economy, likely growth areas, patterns of distribution and inter-</p>	<p>Employment Growth Study.</p>	<p>Externally commission via consultancy to a brief produced involving County Council(s) and LEP.</p> <p>County Council to</p>

	<p>relationships. Reference to the SEP and investment/economic strategies.</p> <p>Identification of indicative jobs <u>employment</u> growth targets and land supply implications/spatial implications for planning policy.</p>	Further runs of EEFM.	arrange EEFM runs (possibly to inform above study).
Infrastructure	<p>Are there any key infrastructure constraints or opportunities (physical, social and/or environmental) which are likely to impede growth or influence its distribution <i>at a strategic scale</i>?</p> <p>To address transport infrastructure (road, rail and other sustainable modes), green infrastructure, water issues (both supply and disposal), and flooding.</p> <p>Potential to include high level statement in relation to other physical and social infrastructure approach – health, education, broadband etc if significant and cross boundary.</p>	Analysis of current evidence base to identify possible constraints and opportunities, and whether further work is necessary to inform high level strategy.	To be produced by officers working with staff from key agencies such as EA and NE.
Delivery	<p>Is the development market in the area likely to be sufficiently strong to support delivery of the growth needs identified in a sustainable manner?</p> <p>Is any further stimulus necessary to deliver?</p>	High level market forces/viability assessment focussing on issues associated with strategic scale growth proposals as opposed to more dispersed/smaller scale development.	Externally commissioned

4. Recommendation

4.1 It is recommended that the forum agrees to:

1. Amend the title of the proposed document to Norfolk Strategic Framework
2. Agree that Norwich City Council acts as host and employing authority
3. Amend the scope of the framework document as outline in Table 1

Report prepared by Mark Ashwell (NNDC) and Mike Burrell (Norwich City)
June 2015

