



## **SPATIAL PLANNING BOARD**

Monday, 14 December 2009: 2.00pm

LGYH, 18 King Street, Wakefield

### **AGENDA**

1. Welcome and Apologies
2. Minutes of the last meeting - attached
3. Matters arising
4. Key Spatial Planning Challenges and Outcomes for the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy - attached
5. Joining up with other Strategy Workstreams - attached
6. Infrastructure Planning – Developing the Strategic Evidence Base - attached
7. Scale and Distribution of Housing – Doing it Differently - attached
8. Board Work Programme Update - attached
  1. Applications of Regional Significance
  2. Local Development Framework
  3. Sub Regional Planning Assessments Lines of Enquiry
  4. Updates from other Boards
9. Any Other Business

**Date of Next Meeting: 4 March 2010**



**MINUTES OF THE SPATIAL PLANNING BOARD: 12 OCTOBER 2009**

**1. Welcome and Apologies**

The Chair welcomed Julie Kenny, Deputy Chair to her first meeting of the Spatial Planning Board. A full list of attendees and apologies are **noted at Annex A**.

**2. Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes from 29 June 2009 were agreed.

**3. Matters arising**

Cllr Mick Grant said he would contact members to invite them to a tour of the South Bank in December.

Members agreed that 'Applications of Regional Significance' should be added as a standard agenda item for future Spatial Planning Board meetings.

J Jubb

Jenny Poxon told members that they would receive details of an application regarding Robin Hood Airport later that week.

J Poxon

**4. Doing things differently**

Richard Wood provided an overview for the Board on how regional planning work is being done differently.

The following points were raised by members:

- We need to look at the dates of the Board to ensure we are meeting regularly.
- The 'Doing things differently' paper should show the links into the wider picture.
- Officers should look at ways of better communicating between Boards. An A4 sheet of paper with key messages from the other thematic boards should either be emailed to members between meetings or circulated with the papers for the meeting. Relevant updates from other Thematic Boards, the Joint Regional Board and Leaders' Board would be included in papers for the Spatial Planning Board.
- The sub-regions need to make the Board aware of issues they want to raise so the Board isn't missing important sub-regional issues. This is critical to ensure the sub-regional and regional relationship is soundly based and that we are doing the right things at the right 'level'.
- Make sure the agenda for the Spatial Planning Board meetings reflect the points made by the sub-regions and also reflects the different way in which we are now working.

## 5. Board work programme update

Jenny Poxon updated the Board on the progress against agreed work programme priorities, set out the priority work areas of the other Thematic Boards and described the conclusions of the Housing Delivery Enquiry.

Members commented as follows:

- The scale of the 'step up' in housing delivery needed in the Leeds City Region should be drawn out as a key finding in the Housing Delivery Report
- the links between delivering housing and infrastructure planning and delivery need to be fully explored
- Hope that exploring the role of public transport is implicit within the list of key points from the Transport Board.

It was agreed to update Annex A to include timescales. It was noted that supporting sustainable economic growth is about more than providing employment land.

Chris Martin reported that the Regeneration and Housing Board were currently looking how they could link into the work of the other thematic boards.

## 6. IRS sub-regional planning assessments

Richard Wood updated members on the arrangements for producing the sub regional spatial planning assessments and set out a framework for taking the assessments forward.

Members endorsed the framework set out in Annex A as a basis for discussion and refinement with sub regional officer groups and asked that the issue of 'environmental capacity' was focused on.

Members agreed that sub regions should complete the assessments by the end of March 2009.

Members agreed that an overview of key spatial planning challenges/issues should be brought to the next meeting to inform a discussion on 'what we are trying to achieve'.

An update of current progress with LDF preparation was requested.

## 7. Infrastructure Planning

Jenny Poxon updated the Board on the current activities related to infrastructure planning that are supporting the work of local authorities and sub-regions and developing a region-wide strategic infrastructure evidence base.

The Board was informed of the proposed Community Infrastructure Levy and members agreed a response to Communities and Local Government (CLG) on a current consultation.

Board members noted the implications of the new system for local authorities

LGYH  
Officers

J Poxon

J Poxon

and sub-regional and regional bodies regarding the new Infrastructure Planning Commission.

Members voiced concern that funding would need to be stretched further and that there could be competition from developers as to which region they build in, if charges were not consistent across the region. These points were to be incorporated into the response on the CIL consultation.

## **8. Ensuring the Future Supply of Mineral Aggregates**

The Board received a presentation on the report on taking forward planning for the future supply of minerals aggregates. The report drew attention to the overall regional apportionment as set out in the letter from CLG dated June 2009. Members raised concerns that the CLG approach was very 'top down' and didn't reflect the new ways of working that we had agreed. The Board did not agree recommendation 1 in the report to accept the apportionment figures.

LGYH  
Officers

The Board agreed to test and debate both the overall regional apportionment and possible sub regional apportionments through the sub regional spatial planning assessments (fitting in with the arrangements agreed under item 6). To support this approach Members requested that the Regional Aggregates Working Party prepares a supplementary annex to its annual report, setting out the implications of Options "A-C" of the Sand & Gravel Study on a sub regional basis. Officers agreed to write to CLG to inform them of how the Board intended to move forward.

LGYH  
Officers

**Date of the next meeting: Monday 14 December 2009**

Jessica Jubb, Executive Services Officer  
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber



**SPATIAL PLANNING BOARD  
12 OCTOBER 2009**

**ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES LIST**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Andrew Palmer	CBI
Cllr Ann Reid	Local Government North Yorkshire and York
Cllr Anne Hawkesworth	Leeds City Region
Cllr Barry Anderson	Leeds City Region
Cllr Dave Pickering (sub for Cllr Gerald Smith)	Sheffield City Region
Cllr John Fareham	Hull & Humber Ports City Region
Cllr Jonathan Wood	Sheffield City Region
Cllr Peter Box (Chair)	Local Government Yorkshire & Humber
David Slater	Churches Regional Commission
Gill Stride	Campaign to Protect Rural England
Julie Kenny	Yorkshire Forward
Cllr Mick Grant	Hull & Humber Ports City Region
Paul Rogerson	Local Authority Chief Executive
Simon Foy	Yorkshire Forward
Will Fieldhouse (sub for Margaret Jackson)	Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber
<b>Officers</b>	
Jenny Poxon	Local Government Yorkshire & Humber
Richard Wood	Local Government Yorkshire & Humber
Chris Martin	Local Government Yorkshire & Humber
Jessica Jubb (note taker)	Local Government Yorkshire & Humber
<b>Apologies</b>	
Cllr Gerald Smith	Sheffield City Region
Cllr Keith Knaggs	Local Government North Yorkshire and York
David Curtis	Homes & Communities Agency
Margaret Jackson	Government Office for Yorkshire and Humber



## KEY SPATIAL CHALLENGES AND OUTCOMES FOR THE YORKSHIRE AND HUMBER STRATEGY

**Purpose:** To discuss and agree an input on spatial planning outcomes to inform a debate at the Joint Regional Board on what the new Yorkshire and Humber Strategy should be trying to achieve.

1. The Joint Regional Board agreed the Project Plan for the preparation of the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy at its meeting on 23 October 2009. Discussions at the last Spatial Planning Board had significant influence on the Project Plan in particular on the 'Lines of Enquiry' and the co-production model of working (through the Sub Regional Spatial Planning Assessments). Further information is now available at [www.yhstrategy.com](http://www.yhstrategy.com)
2. The project plan outlines a stage of the Joint Regional Board discussing "high level outcomes" for the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy at its December meeting. Whilst the current emphasis is on evidence base development it was agreed that early discussion on 'what the strategy is trying to achieve' would be helpful to frame and direct ongoing work. The purpose of this Report is to agree an input to the Joint Regional Board to ensure that spatial planning outcomes are effectively covered.
3. This report has been based on discussions held with the four sub regional officer groups, which are progressing the sub regional spatial planning assessments. The discussions have **revisited the outcomes set out in the Yorkshire and Humber Plan from a sub regional perspective** – given that the strategy was recently agreed in 2008. Whilst there continues to be debate in some parts of the region on the RSS housing requirements (introduced by the Secretary of State at the proposed changes stage) there has been widespread support for the overall RSS strategy. The responses to the RSS Review consultation documents further re-affirmed this.
4. Both RSS core approach and sub area outcomes have been re-examined in the sub regional officer discussions and this is reflected below for each sub region

### Sheffield City Region

5. Discussions with officers have been able to ascertain the robustness of the existing Yorkshire and Humber Plan (2008) outcomes given current key issues, the draft economic assessment and experience and evidence from the preparation of local authority Sustainable Community Strategies and Local Development Framework Core Strategies. **The following South Yorkshire spatial outcomes are put forward** as a starting point for further strategy preparation work in Yorkshire and Humber. They are based on the outcomes set out in the Yorkshire and Humber Plan, with suggested additions in italics. Whilst discussions across the Sheffield City Region have started to identify what could be high level outcomes for the whole of the City Region, the following outcomes are focussed on South Yorkshire in order to feed into preparation of the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy.

- SY1** Urban centre focussed regeneration has transformed the structure of the economy, *with higher rates of economic growth achieved whilst climate change challenges have been addressed.*
- SY2** *More balanced housing markets* are meeting needs and providing high quality housing.
- SY3** The roles of Sheffield, Sub-Regional Towns, Principal Towns have been strengthened, particularly in terms of their competitiveness, sustainability, complimentary functions and ability to address social disadvantage.
- SY4** The wider Sheffield City Region is recognised as a key driver of a better performing North of England with strong links with both the Manchester and Leeds City Regions.
- SY5** Connectivity within the sub areas and to other sub areas and adjoining regions has been radically improved *through high levels of investment in public transport and through the role of high speed rail connections.*
- SY6** Environmental quality of the sub area has been enhanced.

### **Hull and Humber Ports City Region**

6. There was clear consensus amongst the Humber Planning Officers Group that the new strategy should start and remain with the existing Yorkshire and Humber Plan outcomes as much as possible because: to do otherwise could jeopardise progress on LDFs and undermine the importance of the city/ sub region taking an urban-transformational approach to development (when other functional sub-areas could favour a more market-led or other approach in IRS, and thereby jeopardise the prospects for recognition in the Humber).
7. However, officers felt that a limited number of important additions/ variations could be made to the existing 'core approach' outcomes. More specifically it was considered that there was scope to introduce a new high level outcome providing for the population to have greater choice in terms of housing and affordable homes, especially in areas of low market demand. Similarly a new high level outcome regarding Sustainable Waste Management principles is needed. The 'core approach' outcomes also require a greater emphasis on climate change so that the outcome reads "the region has responded pro-actively to adapt to the effects of climate change, and environmental quality raised and resource demand, from development minimised". It was also proposed that 'Local Service Centres' to be added to 'Principal Towns' in terms of fulfilling their role as focal points for rural communities
8. The Group considered that the existing sub area outcomes remained valid. There was continued support for the existing **outcomes for the Hull and Humber Ports City Region** as follows:
  - HH1** The internationally recognised environmental and biodiversity qualities of the Humber Estuary have been protected and enhanced.
  - HH2** The regeneration and urban renaissance of Hull has improved its role, performance and quality. Hull has become a strong focus for development opportunities and the provision of services and facilities. The role of Grimsby and Scunthorpe have been enhanced and urban quality has been improved. Goole, Beverley, Driffield and Bridlington have also been enhanced and their urban quality improved.
  - HH3** The potential of the Humber Ports as one of the UK's global gateways has been realised and the sub area's ports and associated activities have

been supported significant regeneration and growth. This has been achieved without damage to the quality of the Humber Estuary.

9. Members of the Humber Planning Board are further considering these officer comments at the Humber Planning Board meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> December, and a verbal update will be given.

### **Leeds City Region**

10. At a recent meeting of the Leeds City Region officers group there was strong support for existing RSS outcomes as they are underpinning approved and emerging LDF Core strategies. However the discussions recognised that the evidence we are now gathering may show there is a need to revise these outcomes. In particular we need to think about the implications of how the debate on climate change and low carbon futures has moved on and how this may change outcomes. The group also recognised that we should use work on the functional relationships between places to inform the outcomes and express delivery much more clearly in the outcomes. There was also recognition that a key question for the FSR is the future economic role of Leeds. Finally there was a recognition that the 'forerunner' status recently awarded to the city region includes some important aspirations such as becoming an eco centre of excellence which may well have implication for the emerging outcomes.
11. However with the caveats set out above the group concluded that there is continued support for the existing outcomes for the Leeds City Region, which are:
  - LCR1** Leeds City Region is the most significant economic driver of the regions economy with long term stability and the benefits of a strong economy are equitably spread through the city region and wider region. In particular, this has helped to address labour market disparities.
  - LCR2** The roles of sub regional cities and towns and principal towns have been strengthened by developing complementary functions and maximising their links and connectivity with each other and to Leeds.
  - LCR3** There has been significant shift towards more sustainable modes of transport and connectivity has been radically improved.
  - LCR4** The role and function of Leeds City Region sub area complements and supports the role and function of places in the overlapping South Yorkshire and York sub areas.
  - LCR5** The environmental quality of the sub region has been protected and enhanced.

### **York and North Yorkshire**

12. The York and North Yorkshire Technical Officers Group were strongly of the view that the outcomes in the current Yorkshire and Humber Plan were the most up to date reflection of sub-regional needs and were still highly relevant. Officers were concerned that unless these outcomes were the "starting point" for debate around the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy there was a danger that "starting with a blank sheet" would seriously undermine the preparation of Local Development Frameworks and their delivery.
13. However, officers welcomed the opportunity to revisit the outcomes in light of LDF preparation experiences and felt that a limited number of important additions/variations could be made to the existing 'core approach' outcomes. These include: a specific high level outcome on the need to address climate change, a recognition of the current economic situation and the impact that this is having/will

continue to have on delivery, the need to “secure new” as well as “optimise current” infrastructure, and the need to match housing growth with employment growth in a functional sub-region.

14. The group also commented on the number of sub-area outcomes that are relevant to the FSR, as compared to the other FSRs. In the Yorkshire and Humber Plan five sub-areas (Leeds City Region, York, Vales and Tees Links, Coast and Remoter Rural) covered the sub-region of North Yorkshire and York. There was recognition that these sub-areas should not automatically be replaced by an overall sub-region, but that different strands of work would necessitate a focus on different spatial levels both within and across the boundaries of North Yorkshire and York. Overall, the group felt that while there was potential to pull together some of the outcomes on Vales and Tees Links, Remoter Rural and Coast sub-areas (which have a certain commonality), there was a consensus to retain a separate set of sub-area outcomes for York within the framework of the wider North Yorkshire and York FSR.
15. Subject to the discussion on sub-areas above, there was a consensus that the existing sub-area outcomes remained valid (as set out below) but that there was scope to highlight that Science City York has impacts outside of the City of York.

- LCR 1** The role and function of Leeds City Region complements and supports the role and function of places in the overlapping York sub-areas.
- LCR 2** Investment programmes have delivered infrastructure and other requirements necessary to accommodate development.
- Y1** York’s role has been strengthened, achieving significant population, housing and economic growth without detriment to the historic and natural environment of the city.
- Y2** Principal Towns of Selby and Malton have been developed to compliment the role of York and serve the needs of their hinterlands.
- Y3** The role of Local Service Centres has been supported by small scale development to mainly meet local affordable housing needs and economic and business diversification, without detriment to the quality and character of the natural and built environment.
- VTL1** Growth pressures have been controlled and out-commuting reduced to support urban regeneration in the adjoining city regions and safeguard quality of life, environmental values and the character of the sub area.
- VTL2** Within the context of safeguarding the quality and character of the sub area, a more robust and diverse economy has been achieved by supporting the roles of the Principal Towns, building on the potential benefits of a growing Catterick Garrison and maximising the contribution of small scale economic commercial uses
- VTL3** Outside the Principal Towns, new housing provision has focused mainly on meeting local housing needs.
- C1** The coastal environment, quality and character of the area has been protected and enhanced and its assets have been a driver to improve the quality of places and diversify their economic role.
- C2** Within the context of safeguarding the quality and character of the area the role of Scarborough and Whitby has been strengthened through an appropriate scale of housing development and economic diversification and the roles of the Local Service Centres have been supported by small scale development, to meet local housing needs and small scale economic diversification.
- RR1** The sub area’s outstanding environmental and built assets have

- been safeguarded and enhanced through a conservation-led approach
- RR1** There has been diversification of the local economy to one based on predominantly small scale local enterprises and housing provision has focused on meeting local affordable needs.
- RR3** To safeguard the quality of the sub area, facilitate complimentary economic diversification and enable accessibility to opportunities and facilities, there has been an emphasis on establishing links and networks both within this sub area and to adjoining sub areas. This has enhanced the long-term sustainability of communities services and the sub areas as a whole.

## Conclusions

- 16.** All the officer groups made it very clear that the outcomes expressed above are focussed on 'what' needs to be achieved but are not about 'where' and 'how' these can be brought about. Such matters can only be addressed when further evidence base work is complete through the sub regional spatial planning assessments. The further evidence base work may require a change to these outcomes.
- 17.** The Yorkshire and Humber Plan sets out a series of 'core approach' outcomes. These aims to give an overall sense of direction and cohesion as to what we are trying to achieve across the whole of the Yorkshire and Humber region. The recent discussions further re-enforce these overall outcomes – with their emphasis on intervention to help transform cities and towns and to support more concentrated patterns of development. Discussions have provided early food for thought as to how they might need to evolve as highlighted in italics below:
- a. The long-term trend of population and investment dispersal away from the regional and sub regional cities and towns has been reversed.
  - b. Cities and towns have been transformed and are attractive, cohesive and safe places where people want to live, work, invest and spend time in.
  - c. Principal towns (*and local service centres?*) are fulfilling their role as focal points for rural communities.
  - d. Urban and rural economies are more diverse and competitive, creating more and better jobs (*and matched with housing growth?*)
  - e. Inequalities have been reduced, the health and well-being of the population<sup>2</sup> has improved, and currently excluded communities and areas requiring regeneration have benefited from development and investment.
  - f. People have better accessibility to opportunities and facilities, the use of public transport and walking and cycling has increased, and growth in traffic congestion and transport related emissions has been addressed.
  - g. Environmental quality has been raised, resource demands from developments minimised, and the region is responding pro-actively to the global and local effects of climate change.
  - h. The use of the regions land and existing social, physical and green infrastructure has been optimised *and new infrastructure secured*
  - i. (*The region has responded pro-actively to adapt to the effects of climate change, and environmental quality raised and resource demand, from development minimised?*)
  - j. (*A significant reduction in waste production has been achieved and a significant increase in the quantity of waste reused and recycled in the Region?*)
  - k. (*A greater choice of housing has been provided to address the needs of local communities?*)

18. **Board Members are not being asked to agree the outcomes in this report as a final set of outcomes.** Much evidence work remains to be done for spatial planning and across other work streams for the new strategy. The value of having a debate and discussion on the Yorkshire and Humber Plan outcomes at this stage is to help re-establish what we are generally trying to achieve through spatial planning across the Yorkshire and Humber area.
  
19. **The interim picture at this early stage is that there remains strong support for the existing overall and area based spatial outcomes (within a clear recognition that some changes might be required in response to evidence). The Board is asked to consider this picture and endorse the indicative outcomes included in this report as a starting point for the development of the new spatial planning approach that the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy will need to set out (specifically the outcomes set out under paragraphs 5,8, 11, 15 and 19)**

Richard Wood, Head of Planning Strategy  
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber



## JOINING UP WITH OTHER STRATEGY WORKSTREAMS

**Purpose:** To discuss and agree key inter-linkages with the development of other work streams for the preparation of the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy.

### Introduction

1. This report sets out for discussion some of the key links between the spatial planning and the other 5 work streams being progressed for the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy. The Spatial Planning work stream is being taken forward through the sub regional spatial planning assessments and each is examining the following eight lines of enquiry:
  - What are the implications of transport, physical, green and social infrastructure constraints, capacities, and opportunities on the future scale and location of development?
  - How many and what types of homes will be required to meet future population, economic, sustainability and regeneration needs?
  - What type, location, quantity and quality of employment land and approach to town centres is needed for our future competitive and sustainable economy?
  - How should flood risk, water quality and water resource management shape future development patterns and help the response to climate change?
  - Where and what is the capacity to increase the provision of renewable energy?
  - What type and location of waste infrastructure is needed to reduce the reliance on landfill, costs and the effects on our climate?
  - How do we ensure a continuous supply of minerals to support the regional economy, reinforce distinctiveness and increase the use of renewable or alternative materials?
  - What roles should different settlements play across the region, and what are the associated patterns of development that will best address climate change, environmental, social and economic needs?

### Economy and Skills Work Stream

2. Spatial planning has a key role to play in delivering sustainable economic growth and supporting a competitive economy. All the spatial planning lines of enquiry have an 'economic dimension' and there are strong links with the Initial Economic Assessments being prepared for each functional sub-region. In particular:
  - The economic focus of the Strategy needs to shape the type, quality and quantity of **employment land** required in different areas – there is a key and early link to be made between the economic assessments in the sub-regions and the planning for employment land supply work specified in the sub-regional planning assessments;
  - The **future roles of places** will be heavily influenced by their envisaged economic role and function – this will need a clear place based steer from the initial economic assessments and the economy/skills work stream (for example drawing in recent work on economic resilience and city relationships).

## Climate Change and Environmental Resources Work Stream

3. Board Members have repeatedly stressed the key role of spatial planning as a long term response both to climate change, mitigation (slowing it down) and adaptation (responding to predicted threats). The integration of land use and transportation will be vital to meeting the UK's binding target of an 80% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> by 2050. Key links included are:
  - The Strategy's overall scale of ambition to be **low carbon** will have a major bearing on development strategies with a likely greater emphasis required on locating development where it supports the greater use of public transport, cycling and walking as modes of travel;
  - **Flood risk** appraisal and **water cycle** studies being undertaken as part of the spatial planning work stream need to inform the whole Strategy approach (feeding them into the Integrated Appraisal will enable this);
  - The overall approach to **environmental limits** and **land management** across the region will have a major bearing on the future location of development.

## Transport Work Stream

4. Joint spatial and transport strategies have been a feature of region-wide working. Recent work with sub regions on the DFT Initiative 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport System' (DaSTS) is underpinning the development of the transport work stream. Transport infrastructure is highlighted as a key area of strategic infrastructure under the spatial planning work stream:
  - Constraints, clear opportunities and future investment plans for **transport corridors and networks** need to inform and pro-actively shape future development patterns.

## Quality of Life and Inequalities Work Stream

5. Spatial planning has a key role to play in place making and offers a practical means to achieve social and environmental justice for people and communities across Yorkshire and Humber. A focus of reducing inequalities may result in different development patterns in contrast to a 'market led' approach. Access to services, employment and facilities remains vital to urban, rural and coastal communities. The Yorkshire and Humber Strategy presents a key opportunity to make the link between:
  - Green infrastructure and health and well being;
  - The threats that urban heat islands, flooding and other effects of climate change have on people's health.

## Housing and Regeneration Work Stream

6. The scale and distribution of new housing has been a continuous focus for strategic planning work for many years. The new Strategy provides a key opportunity to rethink the approach to new housing requirements (see agenda item 7) and to place a key emphasis on the type of housing needed and the nature of the existing housing stock. This work stream is drawing on the sub regional housing strategies as a key starting point. There is a key need to draw together outputs from all the work streams to look at the need for housing (e.g. job growth, climate change impacts).

## **Conclusion**

7. Progress will continue on the sub regional planning assessments for each sub region (see agenda item 8c). This report demonstrates that this process will need to be continuously interactive with other work streams. Whilst significant evidence can be brought together for the Planning Assessment by March 2010 - the further development of strategy and policy will be shaped by priorities emerging from the sub regions and the direction established through other work streams.

## **Comments**

8. Members are invited to offer their comments on the linkages identified above and to suggest any further work areas that would benefit from early and stronger cross-stream working.

Richard Wood, Head of Planning Strategy Service  
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber  
December 2009



## **STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE – DEVELOPING THE EVIDENCE BASE**

**Purpose:** To outline work to date on developing an evidence base for strategic infrastructure, and seek approval of the proposed approach for the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy.

### **Introduction**

1. The purpose of this report is to get the right focus to the development of an evidence base on strategic infrastructure to inform the sub-regional spatial planning assessments.
2. The Yorkshire and Humber Strategy (YHS) should seek to optimise use of existing infrastructure and ensure that development takes place in areas with adequate future infrastructure capacity to sustain such development. In considering this, the following issues arise:
  - What infrastructure should we consider for strategic planning?
  - Who provides infrastructure, and are they engaged in YHS?
  - How should we assess capacity of assets and networks?
  - What are the evidence gaps?

### **What infrastructure should we consider for strategic planning?**

3. Although there is no statutory guidance on the types of infrastructure to consider for the YHS, guidance elsewhere refers to four broad categories:
  - Transport (eg ports, roads, rail, canals, cycleways, taxi ranks)
  - Physical or “critical” (eg gas, electricity, water supply, wastewater treatment, telecoms, flood defences, waste facilities)
  - Green or “environmental” (eg river corridors, nature reserves, national parks, town parks, paths, walking trails, woodlands)
  - Social or “community” (eg schools, hospitals, health centres, police stations, libraries, theatres, post offices, cemeteries).
4. These broad categories contain many “types” of infrastructure, some of which have a cross-boundary dimension (eg paths, taxi ranks), but not all of which would need to influence strategic planning decisions. Advice from the Planning Advisory Service identifies over 70 types of infrastructure. Discussions with officers from across the region (through the Infrastructure Steering Group) highlighted the clear need to focus on those types of infrastructure which should have a critical influence on patterns of development and broad locations for future growth across the region and city/sub-regions. The Group agreed on three groupings of strategic infrastructure :

**A1. ESSENTIAL STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE** without which no decisions on locating growth can be made, “absolute show-stoppers” requiring an up-front evidence base – focussing on 4 types of infrastructure:

- public transport,
- flood defences,
- water supply, and
- wastewater treatment networks.

**A2. STRATEGIC SERVICES** which can be supplied *after* a decision to locate growth has been made, unless material considerations indicate otherwise i.e. “potential show-stoppers” for which evidence and providers’ views could be gleaned— focussing on 8 types of infrastructure

- gas,
- electricity,
- telecoms,
- education,
- healthcare,
- police,
- waste facilities, and
- green infrastructure

**B. STRATEGIC FACILITIES** which do have a cross-boundary dimension and but have a broader affect on the role of settlements rather than on particular broad locations for growth (i.e. “place-shapers” such as theatres, libraries and stadia which would also be examined through LDF work).

## **Who provides infrastructure, and are they engaged in YHS?**

5. Providers of the infrastructure types set out above under categories A1 and A2 across the region and in the sub-regions include:

- Public transport: Network Rail, local highway authorities
- Flood defences: The Environment Agency
- Water supply: Yorkshire Water, Anglian Water, Severn Trent
- Wastewater treatment: Yorkshire Water, Anglian Water, S Trent
- Gas: Northern Gas Networks (NGN), National Grid Gas
- Electricity: National Grid, CE Electric (CEE)
- Telecoms: BT Openreach, Virgin, Kingston Communications
- Education: Universities, local authorities
- Police: the four sub-regional police forces/authorities
- Healthcare: NHS, Primary Care Trusts
- Waste facilities: licensed waste management operators
- Green infrastructure: Forestry Commission, Sustrans

6. Providers’ level of engagement in YHS varies. Some are established RSS stakeholders (eg Environment Agency, Yorkshire Water). Many others are quite new to statutory planning (eg NGN,), but are increasingly willing to talk and share data (subject to confidentiality/security factors). For many providers

the RSS housing numbers are used to inform their investment plans (as approved by regulators like Ofgem and Ofwat), and the provision of infrastructure within these plan timeframes (usually five years).

### **How do we assess capacity of assets and networks?**

7. We need to establish areas of operations for providers (which tend to be on a regional/sub-regional scale), and identify strategic assets and networks. However, it is very difficult to obtain up-front evidence and formally assess capacity of utility networks, for two reasons. Firstly, many providers are private sector entities, and therefore have understandable concerns about the potential perception of customers, investors and competitors in relation to network capacity. Secondly, the legal remit of many providers is to provide infrastructure as needed; their investment plans (as approved by the regulator) are then deemed sufficient for that area for the given time period (usually five years). This means that, in theory at least, there is always sufficient network capacity at any given time. Any counter view would therefore amount to a challenge to the regulator, and could be difficult to sustain.
8. The approach to strategic infrastructure planning therefore needs where possible to be 'pro-active' – by identifying capacities and constraints on assets and networks and using this information 'upfront'. A 'reactive' element is also required. Providers maybe better placed to respond to different propositions about locations for growth and housing requirements. Views gained on different propositions can then help shape the approach taken. The consultation stage on "policy options" for the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy (programmed for summer 2010) will be a key means to achieve a 'reactive' input.

### **What are the main evidence gaps?**

9. Close working with providers and the other YHS workstreams will be necessary to develop an effective evidence base on strategic infrastructure. The Regional Utilities Group (hosted by Yorkshire Forward) is providing a key means of engagement with the utilities and this network is being used to establish and confirm information on areas of operation and key assets and networks. Sub regional transport studies/visions, the regional Transport Opportunities and Capacity Study and the ongoing Regional Flood Risk Appraisal work are all providing upfront evidence on transport and flood defences.
10. The key gaps identified through discussions with city/sub regions, the Environment Agency and other partners are Sub-regional Water Cycle Scoping Studies. The purpose of these studies would be to identify key issues in relation to water supply, waste water infrastructure and the water environment in terms of the potential effects of development on the natural water cycle. This would inform water supply/wastewater treatment capacity in the long term and ensure that the region is responding to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. The Environment Agency and Anglian Water are keen to undertake this work, and Yorkshire Water already provides comprehensive input to local planning authorities at EiP; as such, it is unlikely to be

problematic and ensure that water issues effectively inform decisions on patterns and distribution of development.

## **Conclusion and Recommendations**

11. Infrastructure is a key issue for development potential, and covers a range of functions with varying implications. We therefore need to: focus on genuinely strategic infrastructure types; ensure engagement of relevant partners; glean maps and views accordingly; and undertake specialist evidence base work in a way that delivers economies of scale for each sub region.
12. The Board is asked to consider and agree the approach set out above on developing an evidence base on strategic infrastructure to inform the sub-regional spatial planning assessments. In particular Members are asked to endorse that the approach should:
  - a) focus on the 12 types of strategic infrastructure set out in Categories A1 and A2 under paragraph 4
  - b) continue to actively engage with the related providers set out under paragraph 5 (and to respect their confidentiality)
  - c) glean evidence on areas of operations and assets/networks through both pro-active and reactive working, and
  - d) include sub-regional water cycle scoping studies.

Will Kemp, Planning Policy Manager  
Local Government Yorkshire & Humber

## AGENDA ITEM: 7

### SPATIAL PLANNING BOARD 14 DECEMBER 2009

Local Government  
Yorkshire and  
Humber



## DOING THINGS DIFFERENTLY – HOUSING DISTRIBUTION

**Purpose:** To provide an outline of the proposed methodology for the distribution of new housing in the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy and seek the Board's support for the principles and their advice on choices concerning some aspects of the methodology. Secondly to explore ways of working on this matter with the Regeneration and Housing Board

### Introduction

1. At the last Board meeting members endorsed a paper that set out how we will be 'doing things differently' with respect to the development of the Integrated Regional Strategy. That paper described how the Sub Regional Planning Assessments will drive the development of the evidence base for the Planning workstream.
2. One of the key pieces of work for that Sub Regional Planning Assessment is set out in the key lines of enquiry for the Spatial Planning Workstream as follows: -

- How many and what types of **homes** will be required to meet future population, economic, sustainability and regeneration needs?

In addition the Housing workstream key lines of enquiry set out a related piece of work as follows: -

- What are the **future needs** arising from additional households and to stabilise the housing market?

Clearly these two closely related lines of enquiry need to be developed together.

3. This paper sets out the principles of a methodology to address these two related lines of enquiry and outlines how the Spatial Planning Board will need to work with the Regeneration and Housing Board to address these matters.

### Housing distribution methodology

#### RSS methodology

4. Board members who were involved with the development of the RSS may recall that we used a complex Excel based model to develop the housing distribution at that time. Whilst the principles underpinning the use of the model were generally supported, it was seen by some as complex and

unwieldy. In response to this and the new ways of working we are proposing a quite different approach

#### The new housing distribution methodology

5. The methodology has been developed using an approach which will bring together the evidence from local authorities and Functional Sub Regions (FSR) and explore how that evidence relates to the region wide evidence arising from work done by LGYH and Yorkshire Forward and by the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit. It will then use scenarios to explore with the FSRs the implications for them and their constituent local authorities of different overall amounts of new housing. Early thinking on a new methodology has been shared with housing lead officers from the spatial planning assessment groups in the Functional Sub Regions
6. There are some 'givens' that the FSRs will need to work with in testing the implications of overall amounts of new housing. National planning policy requires us to test some specific pieces of evidence. These are:
  - The regional and local authority trend based household projections produced by CLG
  - The National Housing and Planning Advice Unit (NHPAU) advice to the region on the supply range of new housing required to address long term affordability of market housing
7. The scenarios we are proposing are developed in part from these givens along with work we have done with Yorkshire Forward that has examined how the scale and pattern of economic growth influences household formation.

#### Steps in the proposed methodology

8. The methodology breaks down into the following steps:
  - Set out a series of headline region wide figures for the scale of household growth which draw on the national givens referred to above and the work on economic growth – the scenarios
  - Apportion the region wide figures in the scenarios to the FSRs
  - Invite the FSRs to explore different patterns of distribution within their sub region that they can test against key policy considerations such as addressing affordability and economic growth, local demographic trends, available land supply and delivery of market and non-market housing
  - The FSRs provide a number of scenarios for the scale and pattern of housing growth for their sub region that can inform the development of the policy options and be further tested through the 'Integrated Appraisal' of the Strategy.

#### Shaping the approach

9. There are a number of decision areas that will shape the final methodology where we need guidance from the Board. These are set out below with a brief commentary on the pros and cons for the alternatives.

10. There are **two options for apportioning the region wide figures to the FSRs**. These are:
- i. to use evidence/trend based distribution figures from the CLG projections,
  - ii. or to use a policy based approach based on the proportions from the RSS distribution. The key difference between these options is the extent to which we wish to embed current policy in the development of policy options. Clearly current policy is embedded in approved and emerging LDF Core Strategies and this is an important consideration. However we need to understand the extent to which the evidence that has emerged since we developed the approach in the approved RSS is suggesting we need to reconsider policy.
11. We have a choice regarding the **‘planning unit’ to which we distribute additional housing**. We can continue to use local authority geography or use housing market geography. The key difference here is that we have developed the sub regions to reflect functional geography e.g. travel to work and housing markets are the functional geography for housing. However there are significant data availability constraints for housing markets. This is primarily because many of the government’s data sets are only available for local authority areas. However should we choose to use the local authority geography we can seek to build into any distribution a recognition of housing market geography. For example the distribution to Sheffield and Rotherham would need to have regard to the common housing market that Rotherham and a large part of Sheffield share.
12. The final decision area is **how we address the local authority areas that are within more than one Functional Sub region** and as a consequence will be contributing to the development of scenarios in two different sub regional planning assessments. These are Barnsley, Craven, Harrogate, Selby and York. Here the options are to either:
- i. leave authorities to contribute to the different sub regional assessments but with advice that encourages authorities to provide a comparable input to each assessment,
  - ii. or alternatively ask one FSR to take the lead.

### **Further Research – Effective demand for market housing**

13. Board members may recall previous discussions about the future prospects for increasing the current very low delivery rates for market housing. To improve our evidence base on this very uncertain area of work we have commissioned ECOTEC to review the evidence and develop scenarios for future rates of delivery based on a variety of economic and fiscal circumstances. This work will be completed in early March. We will use the outcomes of this work to further test the realism of our housing distribution scenarios.

## **Working with Regeneration and Housing Board**

- 14.** Addressing the future housing needs in the different parts of the region is a matter that is of great concern to this Board and the Regeneration and Housing Board. There are some real challenges in the evidence that is now being brought together, for example, the demographic pressures of household formation and the likely delivery of new housing as we emerge from recession and face declining availability of public finance.
- 15.** There are a number of different ways that the Boards can work together on the challenges. These include common reports, electronic discussions, joint meetings or meetings of a smaller joint group with representatives from each board.

## **Conclusions**

- 16.** The Board are invited to agree the principles for the methodology and to provide a steer on the three aspects of the methodology set out in paragraphs 9-12 above where there are options concerning its final shape. The outcome from working through the methodology will provide a range of different figures that can be brought back to the Board in the spring and then tested through the development of and consultation on policy options.
- 17.** The Board are invited to offer views on approaches to working with the Housing and Regeneration Board and if possible identify a preferred approach.

Andy Haigh, Planning Policy Manager  
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber  
December 2009

## AGENDA ITEM: 8

### SPATIAL PLANNING BOARD 14 DECEMBER 2009

Local Government  
Yorkshire and  
Humber



### WORK PROGRAMME UPDATE

**Purpose:** To provide an update on key parts of the work programme.

#### Introduction

1. The Board has established that its work programme will focus on developing the spatial planning evidence base in the region and supporting local authorities to prepare and implement spatial planning policies. This report provides an update on the key tasks arising from these areas.

#### Applications of Regional Significance

2. Since October no applications of regional significance have been received.

#### Local Development Framework

3. Concerns were raised at the last meeting of the Board on the progress of Core Strategy preparation and the impact that the forthcoming General Election might have. It was agreed that the stages of Core Strategy preparation would be summarised. **Annex A** shows that of the 22 local authorities, five have an adopted Core Strategy. It also shows that six authorities intend to publish their Core Strategies (i.e. for the purposes of an Examination in Public) before May 2010.

#### Sub Regional Planning Assessments / Lines of Enquiry

4. At its last meeting in October the Board endorsed the sub-regional planning assessments as an important means of ensuring a co-production framework and a “built from local” approach for the Integrated Regional Strategy. The model of co-production, below, has been updated to reflect staffing changes within LGYH and the finalisation of York and North Yorkshire arrangements.

<b>FSR</b>	<b>LGYH Dedicated Co-ordinator</b>	<b>Sub Regional Officer Group</b>	<b>Member Body</b>
Humber	Will Kemp	Planning Officers Group	Spatial Planning Board (& Economic Partnership Board)
North Yorkshire	Martin Elliot	Technical Officer Group	Local Government NY&Y Spatial Planning Board
Leeds City Region	Andy Haigh	LDF Leads Group (reporting in to Directors of Development Group)	Leaders Board
South Yorkshire	Jenny Poxon (seconded to Sheffield City Region)	Planning Officers Group	Forum of Leaders

5. Two officer meetings have now been held in each of the functional sub-regions. One to establish working arrangements and identify lead officers to support specific lines of enquiry, the other to discuss the robustness of current RSS headline and sub-regional outcomes to shape further work on strategy development (see **Agenda Item 4**).
6. Sub-regional officer groups and Member bodies (where they have met) have welcomed the approach to co-production and have already identified significant sub-regional issues, challenges and evidence gaps.
7. A detailed region-wide update showing progress on the key lines of enquiry can be found in **Annex B**.

### **Updates from other Boards**

8. Joint Regional Board met on 23 October and approved the IRS Project Plan.
9. Regeneration and Housing Board met on 4 December. The key points to emerge were:
  - a discussion on the future role of the Board and in particular how it should develop its regeneration remit (this included a discussion concerning joining up the Board's work with that of other thematic Boards);
  - Members asked that LGYH, H&CA and YF develop a paper on the region's Housing 'asks' for the incoming government; and
  - an update of work on the IRS including a presentation from Nevin Leather Associates on some work that they have been commissioned to carry out which will examine how well the evidence available particularly from the functional sub regions is able to address the Key Lines of Enquiry for the housing strand of the IRS.
10. Transport Board met on 30 November. The key points to emerge were:
  - the Regional Funding Advice transport programme has a big over programming spike in 2014/15;
  - recent peer review of schemes shows good project management but didn't reveal any significant re-profiling options;
  - agreed on the need to develop a methodology to prioritise/re-profile the programme (not remove any schemes);
  - agreed to have an additional January meeting to agree the methodology and then consider the re-profiling in February; and
  - other items included discussion on IRS outcomes and updating on HS2 (similar to JRB discussion).
11. Economy and Skills Board met on 3<sup>rd</sup> December. The key points to emerge were:
  - a discussion on the impact of the recession on young people and a review of activities to mitigate longer term unemployment of young the people;
  - a review of City Region / Functional Sub Region work and skills strategies and how these will shape and inform regional skills strategy development. With City Region/FSR representatives on the Board being

invited to make presentations for this item, to emphasise the distinctive local and sub- regional challenges; and

- a “balanced scorecard” is being developed to assess performance and progress.

- 12.** Invitations for membership of the Sustainable Development Board have now gone out. Interviews for the Chair of the Board will be held in January 2010.
- 13.** The ways in which the Yorkshire and Humber Strategy workstreams and work programmes of these Boards inter-link with spatial planning concerns are drawn out in **Agenda Item 5**.

Martin Elliot, Planning Manager  
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber

## Annex A – Status of Core Strategy

Local Authority	Current Stage	Current Stage Dates	Next Stage	Next Stage Dates
<b>Barnsley</b>	Drafting (Revised Preferred Options)	May 2009 - Aug 2009	Publication	Feb 2010
<b>Bradford</b>	Drafting (Further Issues & Options)	Jan 2009 - May 2009	Drafting (Preferred Options)	Mid 2010
<b>Calderdale</b>	Drafting (Issues and Options)	Nov 2008 - Jan 2009	Drafting (Refined Issues and Options)	Nov 2009/Jan 2010 (on hold)
<b>York</b>	Drafting (Preferred Options)	Aug 2009	Publication	Early 2010
<b>Craven</b>	Drafting (Preferred Options)	Oct 2007 - Nov 2007	Publication	Apr/May 2010
<b>Doncaster</b>	Drafting (Further Options)	Aug 2007 - Sep 2007	Drafting	Mid 2010
<b>East Riding</b>	Drafting (Issues and Options)	Apr 2008	Drafting (Preferred Options)	Early 2010
<b>Hambleton</b>	Adopted	Apr 2007	Review	Mid 2010
<b>Harrogate</b>	Adopted	Feb 2009	n/a	n/a
<b>Hull</b>	Drafting (Issues and Options)	Jun 2009	Drafting (Preferred Approach)	Feb 2010
<b>Kirklees</b>	Drafting (Options)	Jan 2009 - April 2009	Drafting (Preferred Options)	Sep 2010
<b>Leeds</b>	Drafting (Preferred Approach)	Oct - Dec 2009	Publication	Sep/Oct 2010
<b>North East Lincolnshire</b>	Drafting (Revised Options)	Dec 2008 - Jan 2009	Publication	Feb 2010
<b>North Lincolnshire</b>	Drafting (Preferred Options)	Oct 2006 - Dec 2006	Publication	Feb 2010
<b>North Yorkshire Moors Park</b>	Adopted	Nov 2008	n/a	n/a
<b>North Yorkshire County</b>	Drafting	TBC	TBC	TBC
<b>Richmondshire</b>	Drafting (Issues and Options)	Nov 2009	Drafting	Mar 2010
<b>Rotherham</b>	Drafting (Revised Options)	May - Aug 2009	Drafting (Further Final Draft)	Jun/Jul 2010
<b>Ryedale</b>	Drafting (Options )	Dec 2009 - Jan 2010	Publication	Mar 2010
<b>Scarborough</b>	Drafting (Preferred Options)	Dec 2009	Drafting (Pre-Submission)	Jun 2010
<b>Selby</b>	Drafting (Further Options)	Nov - Dec 2008	Drafting (Draft Strategy)	Feb/Mar 2010
<b>Sheffield</b>	Adopted	Feb 2009	Drafting (City Policies & Allocation)	Early 2010
<b>Wakefield</b>	Adopted	Apr 2009	n/a	n/a
<b>Yorkshire Dales National Park</b>	Not yet started	Not yet started	Evidence gathering	From Feb 2012

Information gathered from LDF Managers in November 2009.

## Annex B – Update on Key Lines of Enquiry

Line of Enquiry	Progress
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalising evidence on 12 types of strategic infrastructure. Draft for officer consultation in early Dec.</li> <li>• Work on areas of opportunity for utilities networks progressing.</li> <li>• Ensuring continued buy-in from Regional Utilities Group at December meeting.</li> <li>• Finalising green infrastructure study (Natural England) and sharing lessons from Leeds City Region study.</li> <li>• Events in New Year on social and green infrastructure to ensure liaison between providers and LAs; and with Janice Morphet (lead national consultant) to help address specific LA challenges in preparing Infrastructure Delivery Plans.</li> <li>• Infrastructure Hub which shares good practice and signposts guidance is now up and running.</li> </ul>
Water Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Flood Risk Appraisal now being pulled together to feed in to sub-regional spatial planning assessments.</li> <li>• Scoping Report on Water Cycle Studies in preparation aiming to pick up specific sub-regional messages and direct where further more detailed work is required.</li> </ul>
Employment Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand side study being led by Yorkshire Forward is nearing completion. Beginning an assessment of consistency across local Employment Land Reviews to ensure sub-regional messages are clear.</li> <li>• Working to ensure that Local Economic Assessments are feeding appropriate outputs into Employment Land Reviews.</li> </ul>
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devised new means of determining housing distribution.</li> <li>• Commissioned work on effective demand.</li> <li>• Commissioned work to review the evidence available, particularly from the sub regions, to support the lines of enquiry for the Housing and Regeneration strand of IRS.</li> </ul>
Renewable Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secured funding from Department of Energy and Climate Change to undertake a region-wide study into the potential for renewable and low-carbon energy generation. This involves looking at a wider range of energy options.</li> <li>• Brief being worked up so as to ensure clear outputs to enable local authorities to support Core Strategies with an emphasis on delivery and implementation as well as target setting.</li> <li>• Renewable Energy Toolkit for local authority planners has been launched and well received.</li> </ul>
Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalising Regional Technical Advisory Body report which will pick out key sub-regional messages.</li> <li>• Draft Waste Planning Toolkit for Local Authorities agreed by RTAB.</li> </ul>
Minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Aggregates Working Party advice being fed in to the sub-regional spatial planning assessment.</li> </ul>
Settlement Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with Yorkshire Forward Renaissance Team on identifying key messages from renaissance and rural capitals programme.</li> <li>• Awaiting outputs from other lines of enquiry so as to gain picture of impacts on settlements.</li> </ul>