
JOINT DELIVERY COMMITTEE FOR NORTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

**Meeting held: 15 March 2018
at Borough Council of Wellingborough**

Present:

Councillor	Russell Roberts (Kettering)	Chair
Councillor	Jean Addison (Corby)	
Councillor	Elise Elliston (Corby)	
Councillor	Bob Eyles (Corby)	
Councillor	David Jenney (East Northamptonshire)	
Councillor	Steven North (East Northamptonshire)	
Councillor	Lloyd Bunday (Kettering)	
Councillor	Martin Griffiths (Wellingborough)	

Also Present:

Councillor Lesley Thurland	Kettering Borough Council
Liz Elliott	Managing Director, Borough Council of Wellingborough
Martin Hammond	Executive Director, Kettering Borough Council (KBC)
Barbel Gale	Democracy Officer, NCC (Minutes)
Simon James	Planning Policy Manager, NNJPDU
Andrew Longley	Head of the NNJPDU
Jenn Bell	NNJPDU
Norman Stronach	Chief Executive, Corby Borough Council
Julie Thomas	Head of Planning & Local Development, Borough Council of Wellingborough
Paul Woods	Senior Planner, NNJPDU

18.JDC.01 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

- Councillor Tom Beattie (Corby)
- Councillor David Brackenbury (East Northamptonshire)
- Councillor Tom Partridge-Underwood (Wellingborough)
- Councillor Brian Emerson (Wellingborough)
- Charles Amies
- Hilary Chipping (SEMLEP)
- Corrie Harris (Tresham Institute)

18.JDC.02 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the

Joint Delivery Committee No. 7

15.3.18

Action

Committee held on 23 November 2017 be approved and signed by the Chair.

18.JDC.03 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were none.

18.JDC.04 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman announced that the current Deputy Chairman, Councillor Tom Beattie would be nominated for election to become Chairman from the next meeting.

18.JDC.05 FUTURE MEETING DATES

It was noted that the next meeting would be held on Thursday 14 June 2018 and it would be the Annual General Meeting. The venue for the meeting would be notified in due course.

In respect of the next item the Committee agreed to hold a joint discussion with members of the Joint Planning Committee and it was agreed by both Committees that Councillor Russel Roberts, Chairman of the Joint Delivery Committee would chair the discussion as no other nominations for chairman were put forward.

The meeting was adjourned for 5 minutes to allow the Joint Planning Committee time to consider and agree to hold a joint discussion. The meeting then reconvened.

18.JDC.06 CAMBRIDGE – MILTON KEYNES – OXFORD CORRIDOR

At the Chairman's invitation the Executive Director, KBC explained that caution was expressed when the idea of the C-KM-O Corridor was first presented by the National Infrastructure Commission. However it was clear that the Government wanted North Northamptonshire authorities to sign up to the corridor and that a significant focus would be on economic development, alongside accelerated housing growth. At the same time, the government was now asking authorities to collectively sign up to bespoke housing and growth deals, and has accepted doing so on the scale of North Northamptonshire.

Given the commitment of the four authorities to work together and collectively be either inside or outside the corridor, this report had therefore looked at the arguments for and against membership of the corridor and for instigating a negotiation around a growth deal for North Northamptonshire.

At the invitation of the Chairman the Head of the NNJPDU

Andrew
Longley &
Martin
Hammond

introduced the report, copies of which had been circulated prior to the meeting, and made the following points:

- Geographically North Northamptonshire (NN) was part of the Corridor linking Cambridgeshire and Oxford and had important road connections;
- NN had a lot to offer in terms of potential for housing growth and economic development, based on an up-to-date Joint Core Strategy (JCS) to deliver housing growth;
- One of the benefits of inclusion in the Corridor and its emphasis on economic development was that it could drive the UK economy forward and have the potential to boost jobs and growth;
- There was a risk that by being outside of the Corridor that NN would miss out on investment in infrastructure and economic development;
- A Growth Deal with Government could mean committing to housing delivery above objectively assessed need which it would be suggested should initially be based on accelerating existing sites rather than focusing on new sites given that existing sites could be completed quicker;
- Existing strategic commitments had the physical capacity to delivery 30% above objectively assessed need as listed in the JCS;
- There was a fear that growth could be shifted to NN even if it was outside of the Corridor;
- It was felt that any uplift in the housing need should be treated in the same way as in the current JCS as a 'strategic opportunity', rather than the requirement against which 5 year supply is assessed;
- There was a need to know what claw back mechanisms existed if third parties did not deliver the housing;
- It was considered that NN had a better prospect of achieving the adopted JCS vision and associated outcomes if it was within a nationally important growth Corridor;
- It was felt that all four NN authorities should be included within the C-MK-O Corridor; and
- NN's involvement in the Corridor should be subject to the arrangements and safeguards outlined in the main report to retain current joint working arrangements, safeguard the preparation of Part 2 Local Plans and provide the resources and autonomy needed to achieve accelerated delivery of the JCS.

During discussions the following points were raised:

In response to a query regarding which part of the planning system would be amended to accommodate growth the Head of the NNJPDU explained that if the economy was right then houses could be built faster than already outlined in the plan

and could reduce the need to identify new sites. The conditions needed to be provided to enable it to be done quicker. He explained that a Corridor wide vision could lead to a review of the JCS for the period post 2031.

If was felt that the benefits of joining the Corridor outweighed the risks. The inclusion of the A43 Corridor scheme in NN's expression of interest for HIF Forward Funding was welcomed however there was a concern that the A6003 northwest of Corby had not been included and it was felt that it should be added. The use of the word 'discrete' in recommendation one was queried because it sounded like NN was a minor part of the corridor and would not be outwards-looking. The Head of the NNJPDU explained that the list of schemes shown at section 6.8 of the report had been submitted for a funding bid with Northamptonshire County Council (NCC). The A6003 could be added to the list for future consideration. He explained that the word 'discrete' had been used to indicate that it was separate. The word 'distinct' could be used instead.

It was queried how sure officers were that a NN growth deal would find favour with the Government. The Executive Director, KBC said that the proposal had been tested extensively and Government was supportive. He was fairly confident that it would be accepted.

This proposal would accelerate housing growth by addressing infrastructure constraints (10/15 years too late), however the housing industry had shrunk in the last decade there was a concern that the housing industry did not have the capacity to deliver the growth. The Head of the NNJPDU explained that it was a national issue. The Government was promoting modern methods of construction and encouraging growth in SME house-builders and custom and self-build housing. If NN signed up to the Corridor there was a need to safeguard NN around non delivery through no fault of its own.

It was felt that housing developers tended to hold on to sites and could take many years to completely develop that site therefore it was felt there was a risk around ensuring the targets were met. It was felt that utilities should be considered as part of the necessary infrastructure. The Head of the NNJPDU confirmed that this would be the case and further work would be required.

It was noted that planning permission to deliver 3000 houses at Glenvale Park, Wellingborough had been granted.

There was a concern that NN could gain more infrastructure

through joining the Corridor but it could also mean taking more housing.

Joining the Corridor was welcomed however there was a need to be aware of the potential risks. There was a shortfall in electricity and gas capacity to accommodate the growth agenda currently and both would be significant costs that would need to be managed. The water supply would be fine but there could be issues regarding sewage. Additional powers were required from Government to assist local authorities to get a grip of the build rate for example East Northamptonshire Council had a target of 8,400 homes and planning permission for most of those had been granted but the delivery was slow.

It was felt that the Government was keen on housing growth and local planning authorities were keen on creating communities but there was a concern that dormitory towns should not be created.

There was a need to ensure that the current infrastructure was not affected by joining the Corridor e.g the Midland Mainline. One of the key aspects of the C-MK-O Corridor was how the East and West communications connected with the North and South, there was a need for different government departments to work together (e.g. to abandon the current unacceptable rail franchise plans). The situation regarding a possible unitary council needed to be considered because the Secretary of State for Local Government was also the Secretary of State for Housing creating a need for joined up thinking and working.

It was again suggested that the word 'discrete' in recommendation one should be altered to 'distinct'.

RESOLVED that: the Joint Delivery Committee:

- 1. Confirmed that all North Northamptonshire local authorities should be part of the C-MK-O Corridor, subject to NN being recognised as a distinct delivery area within the Corridor;**
- 2. Supported officers initiating discussions with Government and Homes England over a bespoke Housing and Growth Deal for NN, based on the acceleration of existing growth commitments to 2031 and subject to the safeguards set out in this report;**
- 3. Agreed that the JPDU should commission further work in respect of the prioritisation of infrastructure projects and other investment needed to accelerate the delivery of existing commitments, in order to**

provide a robust basis for a Housing and Growth Deal and/or other bidding opportunities.

At this point the meeting was adjourned to allow the Joint Planning Committee time to consider their recommendations for this report.

Signed

Chair

(The meeting started at 7.00 pm and ended at 7.55 pm)