



# **Report to the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Date: **18 December 2018**

Report of: **Claire Upton-Brown Assistant Director City Development**

Subject: **Implications of the revised NPPF for PUSH Position statement.**

This Report was considered by the Joint Committee on the 04 December 2018.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is RECOMMENDED that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

1. NOTES that the Joint Committee authorises the use of unallocated balances to enable the commencement of the necessary work;
2. AGREED to bring forward to the next PUSH Joint Committee, the budget report proposals that would enable sufficient funding through re-allocation and/or subscription to meet the cost of the additional work that will be necessary; and
3. NOTES that the Joint Committee authorises the commission of work looking at the core 6 Authorities and (the original geography of PUSH); the core 6 Authorities plus the entire waterside area of the New Forest; the existing PUSH boundary including the entire waterside area of the New Forest, the new Solent LEP boundary and the Hampshire-wide boundary.

## **INTRODUCTION**

At the PUSH Joint Committee meeting of 15<sup>th</sup> October 2018 it was agreed that the PUSH authorities should work together under the Duty to Co-operate, to seek to produce a Statement of Common Ground. This would need to include looking at the potential for a Green Belt in the South Hampshire. It also gave authority to explore the production of an Infrastructure Investment Plan with a report to come back to the Joint Committee to give an overview of the scope of the work needed, budget, and suggested governance arrangements. Whilst authorities are at different stages of Plan preparation all current PUSH authorities will derive benefit from this work.

This report sets out further details on what needs to be done to inform a Statement of Common Ground and Infrastructure Investment Plan and the resource implications for PUSH together with scope of work required for the both pieces of work with the Statement of Common Ground informing the infrastructure Investment Plan.

## **BACKGROUND**

Whilst there is still a lack of guidance for MHCLG on the template for the Statement of Common Ground the following matters will need to be considered to inform the work:

- The rationale behind the geographical area covered
- Clarification of the strategic issues for the area to be covered by the Statement
- Alignment with the Industrial Strategy

New strategic developments for;

- Housing with LPAs agreeing housing need figure and buffer and agree the distribution - this work will involve understanding options for meeting unmet need then assess impact to evidence whether they are deliverable options.
- Employment - revisit the work already done and reassess need and distribution, this work will also include some areas not included in the previous work such as looking at Logistics needs.
- Retail/leisure/other commercial development- looks at the existing retail hierarchy and consider whether this is still correct or whether this opens up other options.

The Infrastructure work will need to consider:

- Transport and associated work on Sub Regional Transport Model (SRTM)- understand whether the network can support the level of growth, what further transport infrastructure needed to support sustainable growth
- Telecommunications
- Utilities -waste/water/water quality
- Flood risk - update to Strategic flood risk model
- Coastal change management
- Energy
- Community facilities (health, social care, education, culture)
- Green infrastructure - net ecological gain

- Air quality
- Community resilience

Evidence on the infrastructure needed to support growth may demonstrate that the level of growth is not deliverable.

To achieve appropriate governance and ensure delivery it is suggested that there is a MoU between authorities setting out how co-operation will be managed and the ways agreement will be reached or differences resolved.

The PUSH authorities now need to agree a work programme and a consistent approach to conducting Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) with a timetable for each authority completing this work to inform the distribution of development and the amount of unmet need to enable options to be identified and tested. Given the NPPF suggests undertaking a study which looks at Urban Living Capacity of Retail-Residential New build and conversions, there may well be an agreement that this is also done quickly to further inform housing distribution.

There remains uncertainty over housing numbers. A further consultation that runs until 7 December 2018 about how the government propose to alter the standard method for assessing local housing need to ensure that it is consistent with increasing the supply of homes. Within the consultation it has been confirmed that recent household projections, published by the Office of National Statistic (ONS) has led some areas to reconsider the number of homes they were planning. However the Office for National Statistics (ONS), has confirmed lower household projections do not mean fewer homes need to be built. Work therefore needs to proceed on the bases that this will be the outcome of the consultation.

Whilst a considerable evidence base was produced to support the PUSH Position Statement this work needs to be reviewed and further work commissioned quickly. The timetable for doing this work needs to stretch over months rather than years.

## **Resources**

Given the volume of work that is required for the Statement of Common Ground and the Infrastructure Investment Plan, there is a need for a dedicated Project co-ordinator supported by a Project Manager to ensure that work is progressed within agreed timescales. These staff will need to have a significant knowledge of the subject area and be able to commission further technical work. Ideally PUSH would look to for authorities to explore secondment opportunities.

Whilst there has been a PUSH subscription holiday for the last two years, with activity funded through the use of unallocated balances, this was always done on the basis that there could be a need to resource future significant work. Subject to the outcomes of the NPPF and central government's approval to housing numbers we now know that this work is required. This means that all authorities will need to commit financial and staffing resource at a senior level and prioritise this work to ensure that it progresses at speed. It is estimated at this stage that there needs to be a budget stretching over 2 years for this work. The first year (2019-20) will be when

the bulk of the work will be undertaken and it is estimated that this will need a budget in the region of £250,000, significantly reducing in the second year to below £100,000. Whilst this is only an estimate, similar work carried out in other areas has needed significant resource to ensure that the work is completed within a short time period.

In order to meet such a budget requirement it is estimated that PUSH Councils would need to prepare to contribute the similar amount as the previous annual subscription in the first year reducing to a half subscription in the second year. A paper on this will be brought to the next Joint Committee Meeting for decision by which time more accurate costs will be available.

## **Governance**

Given the need to maintain momentum there needs to be a regular reporting mechanism. It is recommended that the Chairman of the PUSH Planning Officers' Group together with the PUSH Co-ordinator meet and report monthly to the lead Chief Executive for Planning and Infrastructure. The lead Chief Executive will provide an update report to Joint Committee every 3 months, or more frequently if there is a need for the PUSH Joint Committee to make a key decision.

## **CONCLUSION**

There is considerable overlap with this work and the discussion relating to Housing Growth Deal(s). All the work required to inform the Statement of Common Ground and Infrastructure investment plan would be needed to inform any Housing Growth Deal(s) going forward, a Housing Growth Deal(s) could not progress without this evidence and understanding. As my earlier report advised there is an urgent need for all PUSH authorities to seek to achieve an up to date position on Duty to Co-operate and a Statement of Common Ground. This work will inform any future work on any Housing Deal(s).

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is RECOMMENDED that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

1. NOTES that the Joint Committee authorises the use of unallocated balances to enable the commencement of the necessary work;
2. AGREED to bring forward to the next PUSH Joint Committee, the budget report proposals that would enable sufficient funding through re-allocation and/or subscription to meet the cost of the additional work that will be necessary; and
3. NOTES that the Joint Committee authorises the commission of work looking at the core 6 Authorities and (the original geography of PUSH); the core 6 Authorities plus the entire waterside area of the New Forest; the existing PUSH boundary including the entire waterside area of the New Forest, the new Solent LEP boundary and the Hampshire-wide boundary.

**Background Papers:**

None

**Reference Papers:**

None

**Enquiries:**

For further information on this report please contact:-

Claire Upton-Brown Assistant Director of City Development Portsmouth City Council

T: 02392834299

E: [Claire.upton-brown@portsmouthcc.gov.uk](mailto:Claire.upton-brown@portsmouthcc.gov.uk)