

**EAST MIDLANDS REGIONAL ASSEMBLY  
REGIONAL HOUSING, PLANNING & TRANSPORT JOINT BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES OF 16 FEBRUARY 2006**

**Attendance:**Members of the Joint Board

Councillor Jim Harker (Chair)	Northamptonshire County Council
Councillor Katrina Bull (V Chair)	Nottingham City Council
Councillor Robert Parkinson	Erewash District Council
Councillor Terry Freer	Kettering Borough Council
Councillor David Sprason	Leicestershire County Council
Councillor Alan Cox	Amber Valley Borough Council
Councillor Lucy Care	Derby City Council
Councillor J Carter	Nottinghamshire County Council
Councillor D Kelly	Bolsover District Council
Councillor Ric Metcalfe	Lincoln City Council
Councillor Frank Straw	North West Leicestershire District Council
Councillor B Taylor	Peak District National Park Authority
Councillor Ian Fleetwood	West Lindsey District Council
Mr Tony Egginton	Mansfield District Council
Raj Bali	ESEP
Bob Walder	ESEP
Parvin Ali	emda
Matt Doran	ESEP

Officers

Andy Robinson	Leicestershire County Council
Peter White	Derbyshire County Council
Roger Howes	Nottinghamshire County Council
Chris Bentley	GOEM
Colin Chapman	North West Leicestershire District Council
Niles Holroyde	Leicester City Council
Mark Chant	Northamptonshire County Council
Matt Gregory	Nottingham City Council
Geoff Brown	emda
Vaughan Gault	Intel East Midlands

Secretariat

Andrew Pritchard	EMRA
Mary Beasley	EMRA

Peter Williams  
Darren Horn

EMRA  
EMRA

## **1. Apologies:**

Apologies were received from Councillor Neil Clarke Rushcliffe Borough Council; Councillor G Carlile Derbyshire County Council.

## **2. Minutes of last meeting**

2.1 The Minutes were **agreed**.

## **3. Matters arising**

- 3.1 Item 10 - Further to the NEMA presentation the publication of the Master Plan had been delayed and a response to the consultation would be considered at the next meeting in May.  
Item 4 - Housing Market Area Profile work – The Peak/Dales/Park chapter is awaiting comments from the Peak District National Park Authority and the full report will then be added to the EMRA and Intel East Midlands websites.

## ***Items for Decision***

## **4. An Update on the Review of the Regional Plan**

- 4.1 Andrew Pritchard introduced the report. The responses to the Options consultation were summarised in Appendix 1. Officers would be working through the comments and the follow up action would be considered at the Joint Board meeting on 18 May.
- 4.2 Section 2 of the report set out the main points on progress on the Work Areas. A series of Spring Seminars are to be held to allow for consultation and dates of the Seminars were attached at Appendix 3. The Water Seminar would take place on 11 May and the Environmental Infrastructure Seminar on 31 May. All Board Members would receive an invite.
- 4.3 Members raised the following points:
- Concerned that the Housing Seminar was being held the day before local Elections. It was agreed that this date would be looked at again.
  - Asked about the extent of the invites. It was agreed that all Regional Assembly Members will be invited to all the Seminars.
  - Discussed the reference to emda's concerns about the sequential approach and the references to brownfield land. It was confirmed that a meeting would take place to discuss this matter.
  - Questioned the resilience of the region in the event of disruption to energy supplies and the extent to which this could be dealt with in RSS.

- 4.4 Appendix 4 contained the latest version of the Framework text of the revised RSS. Areas where changes were needed were highlighted and the format of the document would be split into Part 1 and Part 2 to reflect the Regional and Sub-Regional Strategy approach.
- 4.5 The situation regarding MKSM was that the High Court had upheld the challenge and as a result all the figures relating to Northampton in the SRS have been quashed. The figures for the rest of Northamptonshire and the remaining policy text and supporting text remain. A report would be brought to the 18 May meeting on how this matter would be progressed in the RSS.
- 4.6 Members **noted** the responses to the Options for Change Consultation.
- 4.7 Members **endorsed** the measures being taken to implement the agreed Review project plan outlined under Section 2 of the report, subject to comments from Members.
- 4.8 Members **highlighted** comments or concerns on the First Draft of the Framework Text in Appendix 4 of this Report.
- 4.9 Members **noted** the rest of the Report

## **5. Agreement of 4<sup>th</sup> RSS Annual Monitoring Report and first MKSM SRS Annual Monitoring Report**

- 5.1 Peter Williams outlined the work which had taken place to produce the 4<sup>th</sup> RSS Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The draft report was attached at Appendix 1. The report included a Sub-area chapter but further work was needed on the data.
- 5.2 Vaughan Gault gave a presentation on the structure of the report and talked about the key points and actions arising from the main Topic Areas. Comments on any aspects of the final draft AMR were invited by Wednesday 22 February 2006.
- 5.3 The MKSM report was attached at Appendix 2. Officers at Northamptonshire were working with the other regions on monitoring but it would take some years for trends to emerge.
- 5.4 Members commented as follows:
- Felt the documents were useful.
  - Found the information on vacant dwellings interesting and that some areas appear to address the issue better than others.
  - Considered that the AMR showed the need for better public transport especially in connection with NEMA. Suggested using the statistics in the response to NEMA.

- Suggested there was scope to use the information proactively e.g. growth in road traffic could be used to get the message to Government about not being successful in managing demand.
- Highlighted the issue of rail links in the East Midlands.
- Referred to the problem of MKSM being infrastructure led and the issue over the Planning-gain Supplement.

5.5 Members **agreed** to give delegated powers to the Chair and Vice Chair to endorse the submission of the 4<sup>th</sup> RSS8 AMR to ODPM once comments received during the current round of consultation have been actioned appropriately.

5.6 Members **endorsed** the submission of the 1<sup>st</sup> MKSM Sub- Regional Strategy AMR.

## 6. **An Update on Government Guidance & Consultations including Agreement of Joint Board responses**

6.1 Mary Beasley summarised the documents which had been issued by the Government in response to Kate Barker's Review of Housing Supply and a number of other documents which had been issued for consultation.

### **Draft PPS3 'Housing'**

6.2 The draft Regional Assembly response was set out in Appendix 1. A couple of points had been raised since the drafting of the response. These included commenting on the reference in para 10 of the PPS to the level of housing provision being considered at the local level and the definition of 'brownfield land'. Members raised the following points:

- Supported the reference to including the sequential approach
- Felt that the term 'affordable' should be added to the 'rural housing' reference and suggested further wording relating to the 'in perpetuity' reference
- Suggested the PPS does not make strong enough connections between housing and sustainability issues especially the pressure to reuse brownfield employment land for housing.
- Recommended that the comments under Design should be strengthened with references in particular to Lifetime Homes

### **Draft PPS25 'Development and Flood Risk'**

6.3 The draft Regional Assembly response was contained in Appendix 2. A further matter had been raised regarding including a reference to the importance of soils in flood management. Members commented as follows:

- Suggested strengthening references to appropriate design in flood risk areas.
- Felt that references to Sustainable Drainage should be added to address the issue of flooding in urban areas

- Wanted an additional comment not supporting the Environment Agency being given powers of Direction
- Suggested an additional comment on Minerals and Waste Local Development Frameworks

### **Code for Sustainable Homes**

- 6.4 A joint Policy Board and HPT Joint Board response was proposed. Members added comments to the Policy Board response attached at Appendix 3 as follows:
- Recommended that the response be substantially strengthened
  - Felt that there needed to be an element of compulsion or change would not take place
  - Suggested that design need to respond to issues of Disability and Lifetime Homes. The demand for adaptations is likely to increase as the population ages and proper design could reduce the need for costly adaptations in the future
  - Disagreed with the statement in the response that access to public transport was outside the developers power and felt this should be deleted
  - Considered that two distinct issues needed to be addressed – firstly matters relating to design of buildings and secondly design of the wider development including issues such as public transport and recycling
  - Suggested including a reference to flexible design to allow for dwellings to be altered as families situations change

### **Planning-gain Supplement**

- 6.5 The Regional Assembly response was set out in paras 6.3 and 6.4 of the report. Members expressed considerable concern about this consultation document as follows:
- Suggested other events in the planning process would also increase land value such as outline permission and these had not been fully recognised
  - Concerned that the Supplement would be a disincentive to the provision of affordable housing
  - Felt that it would be likely to increase costs of affordable housing developed on land owned by RSLs
  - Considered that there is an issue about the redistribution of funds
  - Indicated that the Government had given assurances in growth areas that development would not take place until infrastructure was provided and these assurances are critical to gaining support from local communities. It was not certain that PGS could deliver this commitment.

### **River Basin Planning Guidance**

- 6.6 A joint response from the Policy Board and HPT Joint Board was proposed. The Policy Board comments were attached at Appendix 4. Members made no further comments.

- 6.7 Members **agreed** the draft responses set out in Appendices 1 and 2 and Para 6.3 and 6.4 as the Regional Assembly responses to the consultations on draft PPS3 'Housing', draft PPS25 'Development and Flood Risk' and the Planning-gain Supplement subject to the further comments.
- 6.8 Members **endorsed** the draft responses set out in Appendices 3 and 4 as the Regional Assembly's responses from the Policy and HPT Joint Board to the consultation on 'Code for Sustainable Homes' and 'River Basin Planning' subject to the further comments.
- 6.9 Members **noted** the publication of a number of other documents as set out in the report.

## 7. **An Update on Conformity Issues**

- 7.1 Andrew Pritchard updated Members on the planning applications and Local Development Documents which the Regional Assembly has responded to from the perspective of conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy. Copies of responses to applications were contained in Appendix 1 and the breakdown of Documents received was set out in Appendix 2.
- 7.2 Section 3 of the report outlined a 'Self Certification Checklist' System. In view of the revision of the RSS it is proposed for the time being to continue with a paper based system.
- 7.3 There were no issues raised by Members.
- 7.4 Members **noted** the content of the report and **endorsed** the responses in Appendix 1.

## 8. **An Update on RSS reviews in Neighbouring Regions**

- 8.1 Andrew Pritchard highlighted progress on the RSS in each of the five regions surrounding the East Midlands. The South East Plan would be published for consultation in March and a response would be considered at the next Joint Board meeting.
- 8.2 Yorkshire and the Humber RSS had recently been published for formal consultation. It was a long and complex document and it was proposed that the response would be delegated to the Chair and Vice Chair and this would be ratified at the next Joint Board meeting. Members questioned the urban/rural relationship and whether dispersal away from towns was sustainable.
- 8.3 With regard to the North West the impact of Manchester Airport was raised and it was agreed that any points would be considered when the formal consultation on the RSS took place.

- 8.4 Members **noted** the contents of the report.
- 8.5 Members **agreed** to delegate to the Chair and Vice Chair the submission of comments on the Draft Yorkshire and Humber Plan by the consultation deadline, for ratification at the next meeting of the Joint Board.

## **9. An Update on Transport Issues**

- 9.1 Andrew Pritchard introduced the key transport issues affecting the Region and outlined the proposed responses to consultation. Draft comments on the Birmingham International Airport Draft Master Plan were set out in para 1.3.
- 9.2 Members raised no comments on the response.
- 9.3 The issue of the Transport Innovation Fund and the opportunity to push for behavioural change and other 'softer' issues was mentioned.
- 9.4 Members **noted** the report.
- 9.5 Members **agreed** responses to the BIA Masterplan consultation be submitted based on the comments in paragraph 1.3 of the report.

### ***Items for Information***

## **10. An Update on Housing Issues**

- 10.1 Cathy Jones updated Members on the merger of the Regional Housing Board and Regional Planning Body. A meeting is to be held with GOEM to discuss transitional arrangements. The role will be taken over by the EMRA secretariat in September.
- 10.2 Members **noted** the report

## **11. Any Other Business**

- 11.1 None

## **12. Dates of Future Meetings**

- 12.1 The next meeting would take place on **18 May 2006** at Leicestershire County Council.