

WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 30 March 2010 at Northampton

PRESENT: Councillor Tony Woods (Chair); Councillor Chris Millar (Deputy Chair);
Councillors Wendy Amos, Stephen Clarke, Richard Church, Robin Brown,
Keith Davies, Andrew Grant, Brian Markham, Dennis Meredith, Chris Over,
and John Townsend

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillors Barnes, Bass, B Hoare and De Savage and Mr D Dickinson.

2. MINUTES

Subject to the correction of the spelling of Councillor Stephen Clarke's name the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2009 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(1) Councillors Millar and Woods declared personal interests as members of the WNDC Board.

(2) Councillor Over declared a personal interest as an ICON Board member.

(3) Councillors Amos and Woods declared personal interests as WNDC Daventry Planning Committee members.

4. MATTERS OF URGENCY

The Chair was of the opinion that the following item be discussed as a Matter of Urgency due to the undue delay if consideration of it were deferred:-

Decision on Daventry Appeals

Councillor Millar reported that the Planning Inspectors' decisions on the three Daventry appeals had now been announced. In respect of Monksmoor the planning application had been approved which would lead to the development of approximately 1,000 homes. However the other two appeals had been dismissed. He commented that the decisions had vindicated Daventry District Council's position and supported infrastructure led development and therefore planned growth, rather than being developer led. He recognised that there was still a shortfall of housing provision within Daventry but that was why the Joint Core Strategy was needed to provide a planning framework for additional development around Daventry and West Northamptonshire.

RESOLVED: That the position be noted.

5. WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT PLANNING UNIT FORECAST BUDGET OUTTURN 2009/10

The Head of the JPU submitted a report which updated the Joint Committee on the forecast outturn of the JPU's budget for 2009/10. He proposed that recommendation 2 be amended to read "That £135,000 be carried forward"

RESOLVED: (1) That the forecast budget outturn for the financial year 2010 be noted.
(2) That £135,000 be carried forward to the financial year 2010/11 to enable the Joint Core Strategy Work programme to remain on track

and on target as set out in paragraph 36 of the Fifth Schedule to the recently adopted legal agreement between the partners.

6. WEST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT PLANNING UNIT BUDGET 2010/11

The Head of the JPU submitted a report which updated the Joint Committee on the budget for the JPU for 2010/11. He reminded partners that the prompt raising of invoices would lead to more accurate actual spend figures. In answer to a question the Head of the JPU commented that in respect of the 2011/12 budget a report would be submitted to the Joint Committee in October.

A brief discussion ensued in respect of the level of financial detail contained in the report it being noted by Members, that appropriately, the Business Sub-Group looked at the financial position of the JPU in considerable detail.

RESOLVED: (1) That the budget for the financial year 2010/11 for the JPU and the confirmation by the partners of their full contributions be noted.

(2) That the Head of the JPU write to partners to remind them of the financial management requirements set out in the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit – Finance and Procurement Protocol to raise all invoices in a timely manner.

7. EMERGENT JOINT CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION

The Head of the JPU submitted a report which provided a summary of the consultation that had been undertaken for the West Northamptonshire Emergent Joint Core Strategy; explained the approach that was being taken to the analysis of the consultation responses and reporting those responses to the Joint Committee; and provided details of the total number of responses, their geographical distribution, form and proportion of responses in support, not in support, unspecified and did not know. The Head of the JPU commented that it was intended to report a summary of the actual responses to the consultation to the Joint Committee at its meeting on 26 July and then at its meeting on 29 September the Joint Committee would be asked to consider its formal response to those representations as an integral part of consideration of the pre-submission plan. This approach had been confirmed by Counsel as appropriate.

The Joint Committee expressed its congratulations to the JPU for the success of the consultation exercise in terms of its variety, effectiveness and the response from the public.

A discussion ensued concerning Appendix 4 of the report which provided an analysis of the responses. It was noted that the vision did not appear to be supported however from this analysis there was nothing to say what people did not like about it. This needed to be understood before any consideration might be given to changing the vision. The analysis also showed other inconsistencies where respondents had given support to the provision of new schools, higher education opportunities and other facilities but had not supported the need for new infrastructure of which these would form part. Comment was made that people often responded to consultations when they perceived a threat to themselves. Therefore it was no surprise to find that the vast majority of responses came from those areas that were most likely to be affected by the proposals and that their responses may, on further analysis, show negative indications consistently through the questionnaire. It would be no surprise to find that villages outlying Northampton would not wish to see development near their village but the Committee would still need to evaluate the development options so as to allocate sufficient new land for development. Everyone whether they lived in a rural or urban environment should expect a good quality of life. It was noted that following the General Election, should there be a change in national policy there may be a need to review the LDF but the vision in many respects would remain similar as it referred to the quality of place and not numbers.

In response to a question the Head of the JPU described the programme of Member workshops and Committee meetings and further consultation leading up to the submission of the Joint Core Strategy to the Secretary of State in 2011. He also noted that as the analysis of the responses to the consultation progressed any issues that arose from this would be incorporated into the already planned Member workshops.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That the summary of the consultation undertaken for the West Northamptonshire Emergent Joint Core Strategy be noted.
 - (2) That the approach to the analysis of the consultation responses to the Emergent Joint Core Strategy and reporting those responses to the Joint Strategic Planning Committee be agreed.
 - (3) That the details of the total number of responses to the Emergent Joint Core Strategy, the geographical distribution, form and proportion of responses in support, not in support, unspecified and do not know be noted.

8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION- PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SUPPLEMENTARY PROCEDURE RULES

The SNC Head of Corporate Services submitted a report which proposed three amendments to the Joint Committee's public participation procedures so as to clarify:

- (i) In relation to the right to speak to a specific agenda item at a meeting that the speaker's contribution is duly listened to and minuted but that as with petitions and questions no debate ensues;
- (ii) Public participation rights are extended to all members of the public and not just to electors for the West Northamptonshire Area; and
- (iii) A standing agenda item called "Public Participation if any" is included for future meetings of the Joint Planning Committee to make clear that there is a separation between public participation and the Joint Committee's consideration and debate of substantive agenda items.

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That Rule 2 of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee's Supplementary Procedure Rules be amended as set out in the Appendix to the report with immediate effect.
 - (2) That any public participation at future meetings of the Joint Strategic Planning Committee pursuant to Rule 2 of the Supplementary Procedure Rules is dealt with as a specific agenda item prior to the substantive agenda items.

The meeting concluded at 19.28 hours.