

**EAST MIDLANDS REGIONAL ASSEMBLY
REGIONAL HOUSING, PLANNING & TRANSPORT JOINT BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES OF 18 MAY 2006**

Attendance:Members of the Joint Board

Councillor Jim Harker (Chair)	Northamptonshire County 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 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
Councillor G Carlile	Derbyshire County Council.
Councillor Neil Clarke	Rushcliffe Borough Council;
Elizabeth Donnelly	ESEP
Bob Walder	ESEP
Parvin Ali	emda
Ian Atkinson	ESEP

Officers

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
Roy Bolton	Northamptonshire County Council
Geoff Brown	<i>emda</i>
Richard Cooper	Nottinghamshire County Council
Rob Salmon	Derby City Council
Sharon Wiggins	Leicestershire County Council
M Kempson	Leicestershire County Council
Phil Hughes	Lincolnshire County Council
Christina Howick	Roger Tym & Partners
Richard Pestell	Roger Tym & Partners

Members of the Public

J Hockley	NEMA
Oliver While	OLHA
Neil Arbor	DPDS
J McCallion	Harris Lamb

Secretariat

Andrew Pritchard	EMRA
Mary Beasley	EMRA
Barry Davies	EMRA
Darren Horn	EMRA
Cathy Jones	EMRA

1. Apologies:

Apologies were received from Councillor Katrina Bull (V Chair) Nottingham City Council; Councillor J Carter Nottinghamshire County Council; Councillor D Kelly Bolsover District Council; Councillor Ric Metcalfe Lincoln City Council; Matt Doran ESEP.

2. Minutes of last meeting

- 2.1 Record Elizabeth Donnelly's apologies for the last meeting. The Minutes were **agreed**.

3. Matters arising

- 3.1 Item 6 – The final responses to Government Consultations were set out on pages 8, 12 and 16.

4. Presentation by the Consultants undertaking the Employment Land Supply Study

- 4.1 Christina Howick gave a presentation on the current position on the Employment Land Provision Study. She set out the Study brief, the employment forecasts, some provisional conclusions and further issues arising. She then answered Member's queries.
- 4.2 Members raised the following points:
- Queried the distribution of job growth. In response it was explained that there were several reasons including a long term urban/rural shift away from the cities because of population loss, physical constraints and fall in transport costs.
 - Raised the concerns that the redistribution assumed jobs would match housing provision and was not the other way round. It was agreed that this needed to be unpicked.

- Suggested that need to consider other regions work
- Established that Northamptonshire was included in the figures
- Referred to the difficulty of factors such as warehousing

4.3 The Chair thanked Cristina Howick for her presentation and answering questions.

Items for Decision

5. An Update on the Review of the Regional Plan

5.1 Andrew Pritchard introduced the report. Section 1 of the report set out the formal responses to the issues raised in the consultation. The changes to the 3 key areas were discussed.

Development Form Policies - the revised wording was set out in Appendix

1. Members made the following comments:

- Clarified *emda's* comment on brownfield land
- Suggested that the definitions of Urban Areas needed to be clarified so that the differentiation between larger Urban Areas and Market Towns was clear

• Felt that reference to previously developed land should be changed
Andrew Pritchard explained that it would be necessary to look at number of issues when the final Plan was drafted.

Sub-area boundaries – para 1.12 set out the 3 areas at issue. Andrew Pritchard had spoken to the Districts involved and no changes were recommended to Melton and Rutland but a specific statement on Hucknall was proposed. Members made no comments.

Preferred Housing Option – this was contained in Appendix 2. The figures were 'benchmark' figures for each HMA and there was no 'Regional control total'. This was in line with the guidance in draft PPS3. Members raised the following points:

- Asked for assurances that a review of the housing provision would be undertaken if the figures were not being achieved. Monitoring would be the key to trigger a review
- Queried how the findings from the Employment Land Study were being taken into account
- Suggested that there was an ambiguity in the wording (Appendix 2 para 5.2) reference to 'this' should be clarified
- Felt that some good points had been made on water and flood issues in the Water seminar and that these should apply to all housing
- Considered that with regard to transport implications a review should take place earlier than 5years
- Referred to the jobs/housing relationship

- Mentioned that past figures were below trend and concerned at lack of housing provision in the Peak and Derby areas
 - Received confirmation that the Counties working with the Local authorities would define the role and function of the towns
 - Expressed concerns about the provision of affordable housing
- 5.2 Section 2 of the report set out the progress on the individual Work Areas in particular the series of Spring and Sub-regional Seminars. These had been very successful with around 1,000 people attending.
- 5.3 Members **agreed** revised text and policy in Appendix 1 in response to comments raised on the 'sequential approach', subject to the comments from Members.
- 5.4 Members **agreed** the text under paragraph 1.12 in response to comments raised on the proposed HMA and sub-area boundaries.
- 5.5 Members **agreed** the Preferred Housing Option paper in Appendix 2, subject to comments from Members.
- 5.6 Members **endorsed** the measures being taken to implement the agreed Review Project Plan outlined under Section 2 of the report.
- 5.7 Members **highlighted** no comments or concerns on the Framework Text contained in Appendix 5 of the Report.
- 5.8 Members **noted** the rest of the Report.
- 6. Agreement of Process for Addressing the Legal Challenge to the Milton Keynes and South Midlands SRS**
- 6.1 Andrew Pritchard updated Members on the implications of the legal challenge to the MKSM SRS. The North Northamptonshire HMA was unaffected by the challenge and it was recommended that Option NB be taken forward for the period 2021 – 2026.
- 6.2 For the Northamptonshire Implementation Area Section 2 of the report proposed two options. Option A - an Alteration process would be a slower alternative whereas Option B would make use of the EiP process. The proposed timetable for B was set out in Appendix 2. Discussions with DCLG had indicated that Option B could work. Soundings had also been taken from the EiP Panel Chair.
- 6.3 Members indicated that the quicker process was preferred. Members also raised the issue of the number of acronyms throughout the Board reports. It was **agreed** that a Glossary of terms should be produced for the next meeting.

6.4 Members **agreed** the way forward to resolve the 'policy vacuum' resulting from the MKSM legal challenge based on the Option B outlined under Section 2 of the Report and the related Appendices.

6.5 Members **agreed** Option NB for the North Northamptonshire HMA for the period 2021-2026.

7. **Agreement of Procedures for Developing the 5th RSS Annual Monitoring Report**

7.1 Andrew Pritchard outlined the details of the publication and implications arising from the 4th RSS Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Appendix 2 identified the key actions and a letter to GOEM which indicated which actions will need to be undertaken by the Government was contained at Appendix 3.

7.2 The report also set out the requirements for the 5th AMR. A draft brief to employ consultants to produce the first stage of the AMR was attached at Appendix 1.

7.3 Members commented on Appendix 2 as follows:

- Highlighted re page 54 (Economy) that little weight was being attached to rural deprivation
- Queried para 2.06 and what the 2% related to
- Considered that the increase in bus patronage should not be at the expense of walking and cycling
- Suggested putting reference in the points to the Freight Strategy
- Highlighted the issue of lorry traffic travelling back from deliveries empty
- Mentioned the increasing importance of damage from lorries and more foreign freight.

7.4 Members **noted** the timescale and arrangements for producing the 5th RSS Annual Monitoring Report.

7.5 Members **approved** the brief at Appendix 1 as the basis for employing consultants or other interested parties to assist the Assembly produce the 5th RSS Annual Monitoring Report.

7.6 Members **approved** the letter at Appendix 3, which sets out the actions arising from the 4th Annual Monitoring Report requiring a lead from Government, to be sent to the Government Office for the East Midlands.

7.7 Members **agreed** that local authorities and organisations represented by Board Members take all reasonable steps to supply the requested data to the Regional Assembly to support the Annual Monitoring process.

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 East of England EiP had concluded and the Panel report was expected in mid 2006.
- 8.2 The North West Plan had been issued for consultation in March. The Peak District National Park had raised the issue of the impact of Manchester Airport. The draft response was set out in Appendix 1. Members commented that the response on the Airport should be strengthened to promote investigation of the environmental impacts and proposed solutions eg alternative flight paths.
- 8.3 The South East Plan had been published for consultation on 31 March and a draft response was attached at Appendix 2. This focused on the undersupply of housing provision.
- 8.4 Formal consultation on the Yorkshire and the Humber RSS had recently ended. At the Joint Board meeting on 16 February it was agreed that the response would be delegated to the Chair and Vice Chair and would be ratified at this Joint Board meeting. The submitted response was contained in Appendix 3 for endorsement.
- 8.5 Members **agreed** the draft responses set out in Appendices 1 and 2 as the Regional Assembly's responses to the consultations on the Draft North West Plan and the Draft South East Plan, subject to Member comments.
- 8.6 Members **endorsed** the Regional Assembly response to the Draft Yorkshire and Humber Plan as set out in Appendix 3.
- 8.7 Members **noted** the contents of the Report.

9. An Update on Conformity Issues

- 9.1 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.
- 9.2 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.
- 9.3 There were no issues raised by Members.

9.4 Members **noted** the content of the Report and **endorsed** the responses in Appendix 1.

10. An Update on Transport Issues

10.1 Councillor Terry Freer introduced the key transport issues affecting the Region and reported on the debate at the Transport Group. On the NEMA recommendation there had been a thorough discussion and the response was commended for the Board's approval. Section 8 on the Transport Innovation Fund highlighted the 6 schemes that *emda* have suggested. This included the A46 and five rail schemes. *emda*'s letter to Government was attached at Appendix 3.

10.2 The work the Highways Agency was doing on the A14 had been discussed. There were issues around congestion and the timetable for the growth area agenda. It would be worked up in the Transport Innovation Fund. The Transport Group had also discussed the High Speed Rail issue.

10.3 Barry Davies then explained in more detail the background to the NEMA response. The Assembly Environment Group feedback suggested that there should be a mitigation Strategy.

10.4 Members raised the following comments on the response:

- Generally supportive of comments but considered that they needed to go further
- Should address the issue of designation and say why they are not doing it and what their alternative approach will be
- Suggested strengthening the references to the fixed transport link and exploring both heavy and light rail
- Felt that a site travel plan should be prepared to address issues
- Considered that the Airport should set out a commitment to funding surface access as part of the growth plans
- In the light of the progress on the Parkway Station proposed that the surface access targets should be more challenging and therefore those set out should be minima and be regularly reviewed
- Expressed concerns relating to the environmental aspects including climate change and advised that environmental targets needed strengthening. This should be linked to the monitoring implications on noise, pollution etc

10.5 Members were given the opportunity to submit any further comments on the NEMA response to Barry Davies as soon as possible.

10.6 Members discussed the Community Rail designation of the Matlock branch. Para 4.3 of the report did not reflect the position of the Peak District National Park and they could not endorse the recommendation in para 10.4. The Bypass could not be supported in its present form unless other

restrictions were introduced. It was agreed that wording should be added to recommendation 10.4 noting the concerns expressed by the Peak District National Park Authority.

- 10.7 Members expressed some concern about the M1 Improvement of junctions and the need to fund modal shift.
- 10.8 With regard to the Transport Innovation Fund Members raised the issue about the A46 and the approach taken to allocation.
- 10.9 Members **endorsed** the comments made on the Draft NEMA Master Plan under Section 1 of the Report and in Appendix 1, subject to the further comments agreed at the meeting.
- 10.10 Members **endorsed** the concept of High Speed Rail and authorised the Secretariat to actively pursue opportunities to promote the case including routes to serve the East Midlands.
- 10.11 Members **endorsed** the proposed response to the Community Rail designation of the Matlock branch particularly noting the concern of the Peak District National Park Authority.
- 10.12 Members **agreed** responses to be made to the M1 and A628/A57 consultations in line with the comments in the Report.
- 10.13 Members **endorsed** the *emda* submission for the Productivity TIF Fund.
- 10.14 Members **noted** the rest of the report.

11. An Update on Housing Issues

- 11.1 Cathy Jones updated Members on the merger of the Regional Housing Board and Regional Planning Body. Confirmation has been received and the budget agreed and this was set out in the letter in Appendix 1. The proposals and nominations to the Regional Housing Group would be agreed at EMRA's July AGM.
- 11.2 Section 2 reported on the Affordable Housing Study. The Consultants would attend the July Joint Board meeting to present progress. Section 3 updated Members on the Regional Housing Board meeting. The Regional Housing Strategy Action plan was attached at Appendix 2. Appendix 3 contained the Draft Regional Work Programme which would form the basis of the work the Regional Planning Body would be doing. Section 4 set out the progress being made on HMA studies and a schedule of progress was contained in Appendix 4.

- 11.3 Members commented:
- Referred to other RHS related issues and how other groups could feed in.
 - Emphasised the need for the promotion of Lifetime and sustainable homes

11.4 Members **highlighted** comments on the draft Regional Work Programme for Housing 2006-8 contained in Appendix 3.

11.5 Members **noted** the report

12. Any Other Business

12.1 None

Items for Information

13. Dates of Future Meetings

13.1 Members raised the issue that the date of the next meeting coincided with the LGA Conference and requested that an alternative date be canvassed.

13.2 The next meeting would now take place on **Monday 17 July 2006** at Northamptonshire County Council.