

**Report to** Norfolk Strategic Planning Member Forum  
4<sup>th</sup> Dec 2017

**Report of** Norfolk Strategic Framework Project Manager

**Subject** Norfolk Strategic Framework, Public Consultation  
Outcome and Finalisation of Framework

---

### **Purpose**

To update members on the representations made on the NSF during its consultation and to seek endorsement for a draft final version of the document amended in light of the consultation response and new information to be recommended to authorities for agreement.

### **Recommendation**

- 1) Endorse the amended version of the NSF and recommend it is agreed by constituent authorities
- 2) Delegate authority to the NSPG, in consultation with the chair of the Norfolk Strategic Planning Member Forum, to make:
  - a. Any agreed amendments arising from this meeting;
  - b. Presentational and factual amendments to the NSFPrior to it being considered for agreement by authorities

### **Financial implications**

No financial implications and no additional budget required.

### **Contact officers**

Trevor Wiggett, Project Manager: 01603 212557

### **Further Information**

None.

## **Report**

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to update members on the representations made on the NSF during its consultation and highlight the amendments made in light of the consultation response and new information, this includes updates following the publication of the government consultation 'Planning for the right homes in the right places', update for the New Anglia LEP Economic Strategy and Norfolk County Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

### **NSF Consultation Summary**

The Norfolk Strategic Framework consultation ran from the 2<sup>nd</sup> August to the 22<sup>nd</sup> September. Just under 100 responses were received with the vast majority being supportive of the idea of the NSF and collaborative working between authorities. The responses were from a wide range of interested parties including Town/Parish Councils, Residents, Community Groups, Local Authorities, Public Bodies, Developers Businesses and Agents.

An extensive review of the comments received has been completed since the consultation closed. All comments were categorised into the sections/subjects they referred to and were then reviewed at meetings of each of the task and finish groups. Further extensive reviews of the comments have been conducted by the chairs of each task and finish group with the support of the NSF Project Manager and amendments to the NSF have then been made.

All comments received have been individually reviewed, answered and any changes made to the NSF have been logged. The comments and responses are available in detailed spreadsheets for each section which will accompany this report and will be published on the NSF consultation website once agreed. The updated NSF has also been provided with tracked changes and information about why each change has been made, the format of the document has been temporarily amended to landscape to show these change. Once finalised the format will be changed back to portrait.

A number of new agreements have been included in the NSF for discussion:

- The water section includes two proposed new agreements around water efficiency and future collaboration between the water authorities and LPAs.
- A new agreement has been added to the conclusion section highlighting the on-going support for joint working.
- There is a proposal to have a transport agreement in future versions of the document

### **NSF Consultation Review**

#### **Vision and Objectives**

##### **Key Themes**

There was good support for the vision and objectives, a small number supported them as they were and a small number said that they were unrealistic. There was an array of amendments suggested but key themes included greater references to dealing with infrastructure issues, greater emphasis on environment aspects of the county and greater emphasis on the importance of the economy and tourism to the county.

Amendments have been included where they have been supportable however a number of comments were specific or localised issues which are not considered cross boundary in nature.

### **Key changes**

A number of amendment suggested through the consultation have been included in the updated NSF. These include adding references to:

- Strengthening Norfolk's competitiveness through the delivery of well-planned balanced new developments
- Recognising the role of our city centre and town centres as a focus for investment
- recognising that the long term conservation of Norfolk's natural environment and heritage
- Ensuring that new homes are served and supported by adequate social infrastructure

The environmental comments have been included with through a significant number of changes to the environmental objective.

### **Understanding the county**

#### **Key Themes**

There was support for the approach taken to understanding the county but a small number of responses highlighted issues with snapping housing market areas (HMA) and travel to work areas to district boundaries. However whilst there are localised issues with this it is felt that this is the best approach to dealing the HMA and TTWA over the county. There was again support for districts working closer together where they share HMAs. A small number highlighted the lack of reference to the impact of Cambridge on the west of the county but it was felt that this area was suitably covered within this section.

#### **Key Changes**

A small number of changes have been made including highlighting the role of the Marine Management Organisation and to include information on the recent government consultation 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'.

### **Projections for Growth**

#### **Key Themes**

The vast majority of comments about this section are around the lack of consideration for the aging population, the NSF currently says that this is not considered further other than around the housing section and there may be benefits of further work in this area going forward however they was not enough time to effectivity deal with this issue without delaying the NSF further.

#### **Key Changes**

No changes have been made to this section other than to make some wording clearer and to include some additional information on a recent Health profile for England.

## **The Economy**

### **Key Themes**

There was some support for the economic section particular for the emphasis on supporting high quality/ high tech jobs growth but there were a number of key issues raised including:

- Conservation/Environmental impacts of increased employment growth
- More to encourage employment variety and focus on rural areas
- Need for adequate infrastructure and housing provision around the tier 1 sites
- More emphasis on the importance of tourism to the county
- Importance of the Cambridge economy to West Norfolk
- The lack of digital connectivity in the county

### **Key Changes**

It was felt by the group that most of the issues raised, while important at a distinct level were not strategic cross boundary issues (as defined in the Duty to Cooperate), changes have been made to this section to highlight that these will be addressed at district level.

The economic section has also been updated to reference the new Economic Strategy completed recently by the New Anglia LEP and to update any other information which is now out of date.

## **Housing**

### **Key Themes**

There was good support for the housing section but there was a range of views around the proposed 10% buffer with an even mix suggesting it is right/too high/too low. There a number of mentions around the issues of affordable housing and second home ownership in some parts of the county and more could be included in the NSF to address these issues. There were also comments on addressing the needs for certain groups within the population including the elderly, students and the armed forces. Finally the environmental issues of housing development were raised in a number of responses.

### **Key Changes**

The buffer agreement has had to be removed because it doesn't align to Breckland's recently submitted Local Plan. Although the comments on the buffer were mixed, there was also concern about the impact the new government methodology may have on each authorities ability to meet its housing needs.

The issues of certain groups within the population including the elderly, students and the armed forces in some parts of the county have been addressed by highlighting that these issues vary across the county and are better dealt with within local plans. The comments for affordable housing and second home ownership have been addressed with wording highlighting the difficulty in addressing these under the current legislative framework.

Importantly a significant section has been rewritten to take into account the recent government consultation 'Planning for the right homes in the right places'. This included details of the impact to Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) calculation using the new government methodology. It has been highlighted that when the new methodology is finalised this section will need to be reviewed.

Finally the section has been enhanced to include some initially proposals from the recently completed Housing Delivery study however further work may be required in this area going forward.

## **Infrastructure**

### **Key Themes**

There were a large number of comments received on the infrastructure section with many themes being raised. There was a wide range of views on the many aspects of transport as well as the rural issues including the issues regarding public transport, environmental and telecoms. Significant feedback was also received on the water section by Anglian Water and education section from the County Council. There were also many comments on the environmental section.

### **Key Changes**

The infrastructure section has been updated to align to the County's recently completed Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The water and flooding sections have been significantly updated following feedback from Anglian Water and the same applies to the education section following feedback from the county's education department. The telecoms section has also been enhanced following feedback in the consultation.

The water section also includes two proposed new agreements around water efficiency and future collaboration between the water authorities and LPAs.

There were a large number of comments received on the transport sections of the NSF and there is a proposal to have a transport agreement in future versions of the document.

Finally there were many comments around the Green Infrastructure section and this has been updated accordingly and GI corridor map has also been updated following the work of this study.

## **Conclusions**

### **Key Themes**

There was strong support for continued joint working between authorities and 6 groups requested to be involved in further joint working. It was suggested that this forum could be used to work more closely with local people through 'roadshows' and with parish and neighbourhood teams, however due to the size of the county and the cost involved in this work it is not considered to be practical.

### **Key Changes**

Following agreement at the last Member forum, a new agreement has been added highlighting the on-going support for joint working. The section has been updated to provide more details of this joint work.