

BROADLAND COMMUNITIES, HOUSING AND PLANNING POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL

Minutes of a meeting of the Broadland Communities, Housing and Planning Policy Development Panel of Broadland District Council, held on Wednesday, 13 December 2023 at 6.00 pm.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: J Bailey (Chairman), E Laming (Vice-Chair), K Leggett, M Murrell, D Thomas and S Ward

Apologies for Absence: Councillors: L Douglass, M Goodman and R Potter

Substitute: Councillors: F Whymark (In place of L Douglass)

Cabinet Member in Attendance: Councillor: S Beadle and N Harpley

Officers in Attendance: C Bennett (Senior Heritage and Design Officer), P Harris (Place Shaping Team Manager) and J Overy (Democratic Services Officer)

12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs L Douglass, M Goodman, and R Potter.

13. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

14. APPROVAL AND ADOPTION OF THE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL FOR HALVERGATE AND TUNSTALL CONSERVATION AREA

The Senior Heritage and Design Officer presented the report, which recommended the adoption of a Conservation Area Appraisal for Halvergate and Tunstall Conservation Area by the Council.

Members were informed that the Conservation Area had been designated in 2007 when the existing Conservation Area Appraisal had been also carried out.

The Broads Authority had produced and adopted the Conservation Area Appraisal for Halvergate and Tunstall on 15 September 2023 and, as part of the Conservation Area fell within the Broadland District area, it also required adoption by the Council. No changes to the Conservation Area boundary had been proposed.

The Appraisal assessed the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, reviewed the boundaries, identified buildings of local heritage significance that positively contributed to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and set out proposals as to how the Conservation Area could be managed and further enhanced.

The Senior Heritage and Design Officer informed the meeting that the Area Assessment included a section on Management and Enhancement which identified sites where enhancement would be desirable, however this did not place any liability on owners to undertake the works outlined.

He added that the Broads Authority had undertaken a rigorous consultation process for the Area Assessment, which included contacting all properties within the area and holding a public meeting/drop-in session. Feedback from the consultation had appended to the report.

A member noted that a consultee had suggested the inclusion of an Article 4 Direction in the Area Assessment, which would remove permitted development rights within the area, and asked why this had not been considered necessary. In response Senior Heritage and Design Officer confirmed that it was not considered appropriate to impose further restrictions on an area that was already protected by its Conservation Area status.

In answer to a further query, it was confirmed that clarification on the respective roles of the Broads Authority and Broadland District Council as Planning Authorities had been clarified at the public meeting and a section had been added to the Area Appraisal.

It was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

That Cabinet and Council approve and adopt the Conservation Area Appraisal for Halvergate and Tunstall Conservation Area (Appendix C).

15. GREATER NORWICH FIVE YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PLAN AND ANNUAL GROWTH PROGRAMME

The Place Shaping Manager introduced the report, which sought Council approval of the Greater Norwich Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan and the allocation of funding to projects identified in the Annual Growth Programme. The report also sought approval of the payment of a project management fee to the Greater Norwich Projects Team and the signing of a deed of variation to the agreement entitled 'Partner Draw down and Borrowing Authorisations'.

Members' attention was drawn to the following typographical errors in the covering report:

Para 2.9 As the IIF has matured, the scope of how the fund supports the delivery of infrastructure within the Plan has broadened. There is now a variety of ways in which funding can be allocated to projects, some of which require pre-approval (recommendations ~~i~~ and ~~ii~~ **3** and **4**) which are further detailed within Annex A ~~B~~.

Para 4.1 ~~2023/24~~ 2024/25 Annual Growth Programme.

Para 4.2 In addition to these three projects, it is proposed that ~~Children's Services~~ Norfolk County Council's **Capital Programme** receive £2.5million to support the development of their education capital programme within Greater Norwich. It is expected that this funding will help support the final expansion at Wymondham High Academy.

The Place Shaping Manager advised the meeting that the report and the recommendations in it had been considered and agreed by the Greater Norwich Growth Board and that the Leader of Council had a seat on the Board.

Members were reminded that the majority of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts were pooled for use via the Greater Norwich's Infrastructure Investment Fund. Five percent was retained for administration purposes and either 15 percent or 25 percent, if a Neighbourhood Plan was in place, was allocated to parishes.

The Greater Norwich Projects Team, which was based at the County Council, worked for the partnership to administer the Infrastructure Investment Plan and each year the Five-Year Infrastructure Investment Plan and Annual Growth Programme was updated to include projects considered to be a priority for delivery over the next five years as well as those projects which were proposed to receive funding in 2024/25. All the projects had been sponsored by the constituent local authorities of the Greater Norwich Growth Board and the three CIL charging authorities were required to separately agree to the recommendations within the report for them to take effect.

Two additional categories had been added to the Infrastructure Investment Fund last year. The first was Major Projects, which would be used for longer-term projects. No Major Projects had been proposed this year. The second new category was Match Funding, which was allocated £4M of CIL funding at the time it was created and is used to lever in additional external funding. This year £650,000 was allocated for a further phase of development at The Nest from the Match Funding pot. In accordance with delegations agreed in creating the Match Funding category, the decision of whether to allocated funding to the Nest had been taken by the GNGB. It was not proposed to allocate further CIL funding to the Match Funding pot this year. For 2024/25 the Annual Growth Programme proposed that funding be allocated to three projects including, Aylsham Gym and Fitness Hub, which would receive £400,000 out of a total allocation of £928,000.

An allocation of £2.5m to support Norfolk County Council's Education Capital Programme was also proposed. Both the agreement of Annual Growth Programme and contribution to Education were decisions before the committee. The 5 Year Infrastructure Investment Plan also refers to an additional £4.5m that would be drawn down as a loan via the City Deal Borrowing Fund to support the delivery of the Long Stratton Bypass. Whilst referred to within the Investment Plan the decision to allocated additional funding to Long Stratton was taken by the GNGB on 23 September under delegated powers.

Members were informed that forecasting CIL income had become more difficult to calculate in recent years with a drop in income expected from 2024/25. This was mostly attributed to the planning delays caused by Nutrient Neutrality, as well as the transition from the old Joint Core Strategy to the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

In response to a query about risks in Broadland, the Place Shaping Manager confirmed that some of the mitigation being developed by Norfolk Environmental Credits would support development schemes in Broadland and also that some large developers were making their own arrangements to mitigate Nutrient Neutrality and would not require environmental credits from Norfolk Environmental Credits Ltd. However, the Five-Year Infrastructure Investment Plan had taken a realistic view that delays would be likely to occur. Members would be able to monitor the progress of the Plan as it was considered on an annual basis.

In answer to a question about the education allocation, it was confirmed that, in accordance with agreements made by the Council last year, this contribution no longer needed to be allocated to specific projects and instead allowed the County Council the additional flexibility to use the funding to support their capital borrowing to deliver school improvements in Greater Norwich. Although this year the funding was earmarked for a specific project. It was emphasised that the education allocation was a sum that it was hoped could be maintained, but that this would always be dependent on CIL income.

In answer to a query about match funding, the meeting was informed that discussion took place with parishes as part of CIL discussions around planning applications and also through dialogue with the Economic Growth Team. Members were encouraged to bring forward any suggestions for projects that they wished to see considered by the Greater Norwich Projects Team to the Place Shaping Manager.

A member noted that several parishes had considerable CIL receipts and that, for example, Aylsham Town Council could have afforded to fund the Gym and Fitness Hub without the assistance of the contribution from the Annual Growth Programme.

In response Place Shaping Manager informed the meeting that whilst he could not comment on this individual project, he acknowledged that going forward efforts would need to be made to draw in external funding to maximise the return on investment of the CIL receipts.

Members' attention was drawn to recommendation 3 and the details that supported it at Appendix B, which explained that the workload of the Greater Norwich Projects Team had expanded over recent years and an increased Team resource was requested with the additional contribution to fund it. It was proposed that a percentage of the pooled CIL receipts, (around £115,000) be used to fund this further resource.

For recommendation 4 it was requested that a further variation in the loan to increase the borrowing for the Long Stratton bypass, as set out in detail in Appendix B.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

Cabinet to recommend to Council that it:

1. approves the Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 2024-29 and the proposed 2024/25 Annual Growth Programme as set out in Appendix A;
2. includes the Aylsham Gym and Fitness Hub (totalling £400,000) and the Nest multi-sport indoor community hub (totalling £650,000) into the council's capital programme commencing in 2024/25;
3. approves a new programme management fee within the draft Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan and delegates authority to the Director for Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Policy (Leader) to agree the final fee. This fee will supplement the cost of the Greater Norwich Project Team and the fee for 2024/25 will be in the region of £115,000. The amount for future years will be confirmed within each subsequent version of this Plan. Details related to this recommendation are set out as Appendix B to this report;

and,

4. agrees that the Deed of Variation to the agreement entitled 'Partner Draw down and Borrowing Authorisations', that was originally signed by all partners on 21st October 2015, can be signed. This is required to progress the establishment of the already agreed City Deal Borrowing Loans Fund. Details related to this recommendation, including the Deed of Variation itself, are set out as Appendix B and Appendix C to this report.

(The meeting concluded at 6.52 pm)

Chairman