

# Public Document Pack



Rory Ringer – Democratic Services Team Leader  
General Enquiries: Telephone No. 01362 656870  
Member Services Fax No. 01362 690821  
DX743950 Dereham 2

To The Members of the Council

Our Ref: JB/L.18  
Contact: Julie Britton  
Direct Dial: 01362 656343  
E-mail: [julie.britton@breckland.gov.uk](mailto:julie.britton@breckland.gov.uk)  
Date: 01 August 2011

## **AGENDA SUPPLEMENT**

Dear Sir/Madam

### **COUNCIL - THURSDAY 4 AUGUST 2011**

I refer to the agenda for the above-mentioned meeting and enclose the following items:

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Report Title</b>	<b>Page Nos</b>
5.	<b>Cabinet - 26 July 2011</b> Unconfirmed minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 26 July 2011.	65 - 75
14.	<b>Moving Thetford Forward Board - 14 July 2011</b> To note the Minutes of the Moving Thetford Forward Board meeting held on 14 July 2011.	76 - 84

Yours faithfully

*Julie Britton*

Committee Officer



**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**CABINET**

**Held on Tuesday, 26 July 2011 at 9.30 am in  
The Anglia Room, Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham NR19 1EE**

**PRESENT**

Mr J.W. Nunn (Chairman)	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr S. Askew	Mr A.C. Stasiak (Vice-Chairman)
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mrs L.S. Turner
Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris	

**Also Present**

Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mr R.G. Kybird
Mr J.P. Cowen	Mrs L.H. Monument
Mr R.F. Goreham	Mr W R J Richmond
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Mr R R Richmond
Mrs E M Jolly	Mr M A Wassell

**In Attendance**

Laura Apps-Green	- Community Development Officer
Natalie Beal	- Planning Policy Officer (Growth Point)
Ralph Burton	- Strategic Property Manager
Keith Eccles	- Building Control & Development Services Manager (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Zoe Footer	- Land Management Officer
Lloyd Gibson	- Commercial Solicitor
Terry Huggins	- Chief Executive
Helen McAleer	- Senior Committee Officer
David Spencer	- Principal Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland)
Mark Stokes	- Deputy Chief Executive
Vicky Thomson	- Assistant Director - Democratic Services
Robert Walker	- Assistant Director of Commissioning

**Action By**

**55/11 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 31 May 2011 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**56/11 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

Mr Kybird declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 11 (TAAP Submission Version) by virtue of being a member of the Town Council, Moving Thetford Forward Board and the Thetford Society and a local builder.

**Action By**

**57/11 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Mr G Bambridge, Mr P Cowen, Mr R Goreham, Mrs D Irving, Mrs E Jolly, Mr R Kybird, Mrs L Monument, Mr R Richmond, Mr W Richmond and Mr M Wassell were in attendance.

**58/11 REDEVELOPMENT OF SWEYN CLOSE/FULMERSTON ROAD, THETFORD - RELEASE OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANT (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development introduced the report which sought the release of covenants which might impede redevelopment.

Mr Kybird, speaking as a Thetford Member, supported the scheme as an exemplar regeneration project and a key element of Moving Thetford Forward.

Mr Goreham asked for a brief outline of what the restrictive covenants said.

The Land Management Officer advised that the covenants were imposed on all right-to-buy properties. They restricted development and maintained specific boundaries. The restrictions would prevent the layout of the redevelopment scheme.

Mrs Monument urged Members not to keep the restrictions which were very good when they applied to the original site, but not for the new layout. The question was on what terms should they be parted with?

The Vice-Chairman said that housing was a major priority for the Council and Cabinet should do what it could to assist more homes being built.

The Chairman agreed. The release of the covenants amounted to a gift of £100,000 towards the scheme but he did not want to jeopardise its progress.

**Options**

- (1) To agree to release each and every restrictive covenant (insofar as the Council has power to do so) contained in the relevant Conveyances in respect of the properties identified in the report, at nil consideration, as per the request from Flagship Peddars Way. Please refer to paragraph 3 of the letter attached, as to the reasoning the Housing Association feels the covenants should be released at no premium; or
- (2) To agree to release each and every restrictive covenant (insofar as the Council has power to do so) contained in the relevant Conveyances in respect of the properties identified in the report but negotiate with the Housing Association as to an appropriate market value and/or a claw back arrangement.

**Reasons**

**Action By**

1. To deliver 67 affordable dwellings of which 33 will be additional to the re-provision of 34 cross-walled properties; and
2. The development of Sweyn Close forms part of the regeneration of the Barnham Cross Estate.

**RESOLVED** to release each and every restrictive covenant, (insofar as the Council has power to do so) contained in the relevant Conveyances in respect of the properties identified in the report, at nil consideration.

**59/11 ACTIVE LAND MANAGEMENT - TRANCHE 3 (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development outlined the background to the Active Land Management programme. Each piece of Council land was being investigated for potential uses, using a 'top down' approach which provided a clear audit trail and ensured that the Council's assets achieved their best value.

Members received a presentation on each of the ten sites in the third tranche and were advised of the options available.

The following comments were made with regard to each site:

Attleborough – Blenheim Drive

In response to representations received from Ward Members, the Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development suggested that the site should be retained for consideration in the wider planning context of the ASHAAP.

It was clarified that the Open Space had been provided as a condition of the initial planning permission but noted that the Council had given the Town Council an additional 22 acres of Open Space.

Snetterton – North End

Snetterton Parish Council supported Option 4.

Thompson – Tottington Road

Thompson Parish Council preferred affordable housing with a degree of openness retained.

The Chairman was pleased that the proposal was for the authority to build its own houses to rent as there was a huge need across the district for rentable accommodation.

Watton – Mill Road

Mr Wassell noted that Watton was already densely populated. He supported the Town Council's view that the land should remain as Open Space.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development said that to ensure best value the development potential had to be looked at first.

Gressenhall – Rougholme Close

The Parish Council were in support of the development of starter homes – preferable three bedroomed so that families would stay in the village.

**Action By**

Whissonsett – Church Close

The Parish Council were keen for open market housing for local people.

Bintree – Cubitts Close

Mr Cowen suggested that there was clearly value in the site which could be developed for a single dwelling as the access was adequate for that. The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development agreed and modified the recommendation to investigate that option.

Dereham – Waples Way

Mr Goreham, speaking as Ward Representative, said that both this and the following site were on the Moorgate Estate which had already been extensively developed. This site had drainage issues and also formed part of a nature walk. It was a long way from the town centre and residents would have to use a car to access services which would add to the traffic burden. He suggested that the land should be retained as Open Space by the Council and asked why that was not an option.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development advised that the option to retain the sites had been removed due to cost implications and that if land was transferred to town or parish councils there would be no commuted sum for maintenance.

Mr Goreham accepted that all Councils had to maximise their assets but said that sometimes, in terms of amenities to the ratepayers, the best option was to leave it as it is – money would not replace amenity.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development explained that under the Active Land Management Framework they had a duty to look at all options and in this case he felt development should be investigated. If it turned out to be too costly other options would be considered.

The Vice-Chairman pointed out that the Council had to represent the whole district. He suggested that two additional dwellings would be a compromise.

Mr Goreham reiterated that as Ward Representative he completely opposed the recommendation.

Dereham – Howlett Close

Mr Goreham noted that as the option for status quo had been removed it seemed the Council was determined to dispose of the land one way or another. This very small piece of land had been Open Space for nearly 60 years and was an amenity enjoyed by the predominantly elderly residents. Development would cause them a lot of stress – he had received representation from almost every resident. The estate was well balanced, further development would be inappropriate and would cause chronic parking issues. Both he and the other Ward Representative, Mr Monument (who could not attend the meeting) were implacably opposed to the site's development.

The Chairman ensured Mr Goreham that his comments were not being disregarded. The Council was trying to get best value for its land. If a planning permission was submitted Ward Representatives and residents would have the opportunity to object. If the planning permission failed

**Action By**

Cabinet would take a secondary view on the use of the land.

Mr Cowen suggested that the cost of moving the high voltage cables should be investigated first as that might negate any residual value.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development accepted that in some cases it would be impossible to fulfil planning application requirements, but said that all potential uses had to be investigated.

**Dereham – Castell Road**

Mr William Richmond, Ward Representative, spoke against the recommendation. The residents of Highfield Estate had no access to Open Space which was why this site was designated as such in the Local Development Framework. Dereham already had its allocation for affordable housing and 200 residents wanted to retain the site as Open Space.

Mrs Monument, also a Ward Representative for the estate said that when Open Space was provided in new developments it was bound by legal agreement. This site was too old for that but exemplified the reason for the policy. It would make a travesty of Open Space policy if it was built on. The land served about 250 houses and also linked to a narrow strip of green land which (if owned by the Council) should be included if the land was transferred to the Town Council.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development felt that Options 1 and 2 were both worth investigating and he would recommend a combination of the two.

Mrs Monument was concerned that there should be no road linking the two estates as local people feared a rat run from Quebec Road to Highfield Road.

If the two sites were developed together the Vice-Chairman wondered if the Open Space provision could be met on the Castell Road site. He acknowledged however that that might not be the best area within the scheme and said that should be left open for investigation.

Mr Cowen suggested that the developers could be given a steer that the presumption would be that the existing space to the east would form the bulk of the Open Space provision as that was what the people of Dereham wanted.

**Options**

To decide on the alternative/future uses of each of the 10 sites processed in the third tranche of the Active Land.

**Reasons**

- (1) To ensure the diverse interests that exist around land usage are realised; and
- (2) To provide a source of funding for both the Council's revenue and capital spending.

**Action By**

**RESOLVED** that the alternative/future use of each of the 10 sites processed in the third tranche of the Active Land Management Programme be determined as follows:

- (1) Attleborough – Blenheim Drive  
Land to be retained and its future use to be considered as part of the wider Attleborough & Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan.
- (2) Snetterton – North End  
Whole site offered for affordable housing. Any development to include an area of Open Space for transfer to the Parish Council.
- (3) Thompson – Tottington Road  
Land to be developed for affordable housing with RSL partner or by design and build.
- (4) Watton – Mill Road  
Land to be developed for open market housing on a design and build basis.
- (5) Gressenhall – Rougholme Close  
To be developed as design and build to rent out as affordable housing.
- (6) Whissonsett – Church Close  
To be developed for open market, design and build housing for rent or sale.
- (7) Bintree – Cubitts Close  
Investigate the possibility of development for single dwelling on design and build basis for sale.
- (8) Dereham – Waples Way  
Develop part of site for two affordable houses (extending existing line of housing).
- (9) Dereham – Howlett Close  
Submit planning application for open market sale for design and build housing.
- (10) Dereham – Castell Road  
Hold dialogue with purchasers of adjoining (swimming pool) site to discuss potential to develop both plots of land as one site, with the preference that the area to the east of the site forms the bulk of the Open Space provision required.

**60/11 COMMUNITY CAR SCHEMES (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

The Deputy Chief Executive introduced the report which recommended setting a deadline for car schemes operating in the Breckland area to sign up to the new governance arrangements for funding.

Mr Cowen, Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Commission advised

**Action By**

that Scrutiny Members supported the recommendation to set a deadline.

The Community Development Officer advised that following further meetings it had been agreed to produce a template letter for GPs and to introduce a grace period of six months, to comply with requirements, for those that signed up by 1<sup>st</sup> October. The Council's Commercial Solicitor noted that the grace period had been introduced after the report had been written. He requested an addition to the recommendation to make its terms clear.

Mr Goreham understood the need for governance but did not want to negate the usefulness of the schemes, the vast majority of which were well run. He didn't want legal red tape to get in the way of a valuable service.

The Chairman agreed that he was absolutely right but said that litigation was the key word. It was a sad state of affairs but it was necessary to have a scheme to protect drivers.

Mr Bambridge said he had been involved with the scheme since day one. He congratulated the officers on the work they had done and fully supported the recommendation.

**Option 1**

To continue to discuss the issues with each car scheme individually without a time constraint – this will cause further delays and continue to expose Breckland Council. This option is not recommended as all the community car schemes have had more than enough time to reach agreement as to whether or not to accept Breckland Council's funding under the new conditions.

**Option 2**

Keep the funding agreement as originally formatted and set a deadline of 1<sup>st</sup> October to sign the agreement, after which time Breckland Council funding will be suspended. This option is recommended.

**Reasons**

The new governance procedures demonstrate best practice, and implementation should be a matter of priority to protect all parties

**RESOLVED**

- (1) to set a deadline of 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011 for the car schemes operating in the Breckland area to sign the funding agreement, after which time Breckland Council funding would be suspended; and
- (2) to allow six months, from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011, for those schemes that signed up to the agreement to implement the changes required. If they remained non-compliant after six months, funding would be withdrawn.

**61/11 META: HEALTHY THETFORD (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

The Assistant Director Commissioning introduced the report.

**Action By**

Funding had been allocated to the Council from the Area Based Grant Settlement 2008-2011 and release of £32,000 was requested to provide match funding to NHS Norfolk in support of the META Scheme which was part of the Healthy Town: Thetford project.

A detailed breakdown of the figures was provided in the appendix to the report.

**Options**

- (1) to approve funding of £32,000 from the Area Based Grant Settlement 2008-2011 to NHS Norfolk for the META scheme (part of the Healthy Town: Thetford project); or
- (2) not approve funding of £32,000 from the Area Based Grant Settlement 2008-2011 to NHS Norfolk for the META scheme (part of the Healthy Town: Thetford project).

**Reasons**

Thetford: Healthy Town is a significant project within Breckland – aligned to Council priorities – and is addressing the health inequalities that exist within the district. The META scheme has and continues to be an integral part of the project's success. Breckland Council funding for this project will be an important contribution to the overall match funding required to satisfy the Department of Health.

**RESOLVED** to approve funding of £32,000 from the Area Based Grant Settlement 2008-2011 to NHS Norfolk for the META scheme (part of the Healthy Town: Thetford project).

**62/11 THETFORD AREA ACTION PLAN (TAAP) (SUBMISSION VERSION) (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development introduced the report and handed over to the Principal Planning Policy Officer and the Planning Policy Officer (Growth Point) to present the details.

Members were advised that the document was ready for submission and the six week publication period would provide an opportunity for representations on its soundness.

When adopted, the Council would have in excess of eight years Housing Land Supply which would allow greater control over future development.

The evidence base was comprehensive and there had been numerous meetings with stakeholders. The full suite of documents was available on the website.

The main changes to the document were pointed out and explained. A key change was to re-order the document placing town-wide policies, including Town Centre regeneration, at the start of the plan. Flexible policies would allow estate regeneration and encourage investment in commercial areas. There had been improvements to the text and maps. Policies had been strengthened where necessary. Two new policies had

**Action By**

been introduced on Biodiversity Management of Key Sites and Settlement Boundary.

The projected timeline was to publish the document for six weeks and following analysis of comments received and any amendments necessary to submit the document around November. An Examination in Public would be held in early 2012 with the Inspector's report expected around June and adoption by full Council around July 2012.

Mr Kybird noted that there were a significant number of policies and that growth and regeneration went hand in hand. The contentious issues were Stone Curlews and the Bus Interchange. He gave support to the detailed consideration of Thetford's heritage. He noted that there were no objectors present.

Mr Goreham asked how additional GPs would be attracted to Thetford and was advised that services would be competitively commissioned by NHS Norfolk either by existing practices expanding or the introduction of new practices.

Mr Cowen suggested that the Draft Masterplan should be amended to show the location of the proposed bus station, academy and additional railway station. The Planning Policy Officer (Growth Point) Officer said that the Masterplan gave an indicative and strategic indication of proposals and that details would be made clear in the text.

Mr Cowen said he had not intended to criticise but wanted to help other people to understand the proposals. He also raised the subject of Stone Curlews saying that they had created a lot of tension and had a huge impact on the shaping of Thetford. The Inspectors had been keen for more work to be done as not enough was known about the impact of development on the birds.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer acknowledged that the Inspectors had made reference to the need for urgent research on Stone Curlew nesting densities near development. It was difficult to mitigate until more was known and it would be a two to three year process to carry out the necessary study. Officers had interpreted the Inspector's comments to mean an urgent need to get on with the work. There were various research options and Cabinet had agreed to go with a re-analysis of the existing data, together with the additional two years of data now available. The work was being investigated and it was hoped to share the research with Forest Heath and maybe other affected authorities. There were also a number of developers keen to contribute to the research.

Various other issues were discussed, including water abstraction. Mrs Jolly was concerned about the potential effect of abstraction on the Meres which were European Protected Habitats. The Officers advised that the detailed water cycle study had confirmed that there would be sufficient groundwater available assuming lower water demands were achieved in the new developments and that relevant policies sought reduced water demand as well as emphasising the need to protect habitats. The Habitats Regulation Assessment had investigated the effect of water abstraction as well.

Mr Cowen asked if the adoption of the TAAP in 2012 would conclude the

**Action By**

LDF process and it was pointed out that the Attleborough & Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan would still be outstanding.

The Chairman asked if the item on the Scrutiny agenda in September regarding development in Thetford was still required. Mr Cowen said that he had attended the Cabinet meeting to gain further understanding and he did not feel that the matter needed to be scrutinised.

**Option A**

To agree to the publication of the TAAP document, including any amendments, for a period of at least six weeks. To further agree to submit the TAAP document to the Secretary of State for an Examination in Public, unless comments received during the six weeks of pre-submission publication indicate that the document is unsound and should be withdrawn.

**Option B**

Not agree to the publication of the TAAP document, including any amendments and to further not agree to the submission of the TAAP document to the Secretary of State for an Examination in Public.

**Reason**

To allow the timely progression of a sound development and regeneration framework for Thetford.

**RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL** that the TAAP document be published for a period of at least six weeks.

**63/11 REFERENCE FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

No references were made.

**64/11 ANGLIA REVENUES AND BENEFITS PARTNERSHIP (AGENDA ITEM 13)**

The Executive Member for Internal Services presented the Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the ARP Joint Committee and noted that Mr Moakes from East Cambridgeshire had been appointed as Chairman and Mrs Gower, from St Edmundsbury, had been appointed as Vice-Chairman.

The budget surplus of £189,000 had been distributed to Partners.

The Chairman suggested that the changes to Housing Benefit should be included in the Information Bulletin for all Members to note. The Executive Member for Planning & Environmental Services pointed out that the information was changing all the time but that there were a few consistent items that could be shared.

The item was noted.

**65/11 BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AND PROJECTS SUB-COMMITTEE  
(AGENDA ITEM 14)**

**Action By**

- (a) Report of the meeting held on 24 May 2011

This meeting had been postponed and re-arranged for 7 June 2011.

- (b) Report of the Meeting held on 7 June 2011

- (1) Introduction to New Business Improvement & Projects Sub-Committee (Minute No 46/11)

**RESOLVED** to add the following clause to the Sub-Committee's Terms of Reference:

- To identify and promote business improvement opportunities and improving service delivery.

- (2) Adoption

**RESOLVED** to adopt the Minutes of the Business Improvement & Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 7 June 2011.

- (c) Report of the Meeting held on 5 July 2011

**RESOLVED** to adopt the Minutes of the Business Improvement & Projects Sub-Committee meeting held on 5 July 2011.

**66/11 MEMBER DEVELOPMENT PANEL: 2 JUNE 2011 (AGENDA ITEM 15)**

The Minutes were noted.

**67/11 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 16)**

The arrangements for the next meeting on 6 September 2011 were noted.

The meeting closed at 11.40 am

CHAIRMAN

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**MOVING THETFORD FORWARD BOARD**

**Held on Thursday, 14 July 2011 at 10.00 am in**  
**Keystone Innovation Centre, Thetford**

**PRESENT**

Mr J.W. Nunn (Chairman)	Mr P. Rabbetts
Mr P.D. Claussen (Vice-Chairman)	Mr M. S. Robinson
Mr J. Connolly	Mrs A.L. Steward
Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris	Mr N. Stott
Mr R. King	Mr T. Trotman
Mr R.G. Kybird	Mr A. Witton
Mr T. Poulter	

**Also Present**

Mrs S Armes	Mr T J Jermy
Mr C S Clark	Mrs P.A. Spencer

**In Attendance**

Miss N. Beal	Planning Policy Officer (Growth Point)
Mr B. Canham	Thetford Town Council
Miss A. Cherry	Work Experience (Breckland Council)
Mr D. Chessum	Joint Marketing & Communications Team Leader
Mr J. Bamford	Funding and Claims Officer
Mrs M. Bailey	Senior Accountant Capital and Treasury
Mrs J. Britton	Senior Committee Officer
Mr R. Burton	Strategic Property Manager
Mr E. Chambers	Town Clerk
Mrs M. Chapman-Allen	Norfolk County Council
Mr D. Cox	Economic Development Officer
Mr T. Edmunds	Developer and Travel Planning Services Manager
Mrs S. Glossop	Town Manager – Thetford Town Council
Mr S. Greener	Homes & Communities Agency
Mr C. Hey	Norfolk County Council (Children's Services)
Ms F. McDiarmid	Norfolk County Council
Mr D. Spencer	Principal Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland)
Mr M. Spencer	Thetford Town Council
Mr M. Stanton	Economic Development Manager
Mr M. Stokes	Deputy Chief Executive
Mr P. Tracey	Keystone Development Trust
Mr K. Ward	Growth Programme Manager

**Action**  
**By**

**21/11 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

Mr Paul Rabbets from Flagship Housing Group was welcomed to his first meeting. Mr Rabbets said that he was only attending in an interim capacity and would probably be replaced by someone else in the near future. He would, however, take forward any actions for his predecessor.

The Deputy Chief Executive asked if the Parish Poll, in relation to the location of the bus station, could be discussed as an urgent item.

It was agreed that this matter would be discussed as an urgent item under agenda item 8(b).

**22/11 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr D Murphy, Mr M Goulding, Mr T Gilbert-Wooldridge and Mr R Cooper.

**23/11 MINUTES AND ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

(a) Bus Interchange (Minute No. 16/11)

A Member pointed out that TE had not sent the Board graphics of the bus interchange as previously agreed. Members were informed that copies would be sent forthwith.

(b) Empty Shops (Minute No. 18/11 (c))

SG stated that Members were actually shown pictures of window muriels not of the empty shops.

(c) Any Other Business (Minute No. 19/11)

Referring to the first paragraph with regard to the rough piece of ground across the river at Arlington Way, TP informed the Board that Brettenham and Kilverstone Parish Council (not the Town Council as stated in the Minutes) would be willing to take over the said land and build a walkway from the A1066 roundabout from Arlington Way to Nunn's Bridges.

The land was currently owned by Thetford Town Council at the Nunn's Bridges end and the other end, at the A1066 roundabout, was jointly owned by Abbey Homes and the British Trust of Ornithology (BTO). The BTO, which already had a permissive footpath, and Abbey Homes were willing to transfer the said land but without any endowment under a S106.

As the Abbey Homes part included a number of dangerous trees, TP asked the Board if it would be willing to fund the work in the first instance and the Parish Council would take on the maintenance.

**Action  
By**

It was agreed that the Deputy Chief Executive would take this forward as an action.

**MS**

**24/11 THETFORD AREA ACTION PLAN (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

NB and DS were in attendance and took Members through the latest version of the Thetford Area Action Plan (TAAP).

Breckland Council had the benefit of an adopted Core Strategy that provided the framework for finalising the TAAP document. The TAAP looked in detail at the land allocations and policies that would guide the growth and regeneration of Thetford.

The document had already benefited from three rounds of public consultation. The next stage was the six week public consultation which represented the last opportunity for representations to be made on the soundness of the document before it was submitted and considered at an Examination in Public by a Government Inspector which hopefully would take place before or just after Christmas 2011. The above process was, however, dependent upon the nature of the representations received during the final six week statutory consultation period. It was noted that, at this stage, the Council might have to provide additional resources to demonstrate a commitment to the successful delivery of these sites proceeding and during the Examination process, particularly in light of any responses received during the six week publication period.

The main parts of the TAAP were highlighted which included the comments that had been made from the final draft version which had been put out to consultation earlier in the year. The principles of the TAAP had remained valid and had not substantially changed from those comments.

The Submission TAAP sought to allocate land for 5,000 dwellings over the period to 2026 instead of 6,500. These dwellings would be located on greenfield land within the urban extension to the north and north-east of the town. The infrastructure would be delivered in a timely manner to keep pace with the rate of development. The map shown to the Board highlighted the environmental constraints which had reduced some of the housing allocation within these particular areas.

In relation to transport, modal shift from single occupancy car use was essential. Improvements would be required to the A11 junctions as a result of the new growth. Particular care would have to be taken at the Brandon Road/A11 junction where these changes could impact on the protected habitat and species in the area.

The infrastructure needs that would arise from the growth and regeneration would influence the timing and phasing of development to ensure that existing and new communities in Thetford were not compromised. A phasing map was shown which highlighted the order of development.

RK felt that the Health and Healthy Lifestyles provision under Policy

**Action  
By**

TH7 was weak and needed to be looked at again. TT said that he would take this back for further review. NB explained that in the Plan period eight GPs and six dentists were required to support the growth. The Policy in question related to a new health facility in the Urban Extension to accommodate three GPs and the six dentists. The existing Healthy Living Centre could accommodate five GPs.

RKg thought it would be useful if the changes could be highlighted. DS pointed out that there was a covering report going to Breckland Council's Cabinet meeting that highlighted all the changes that had been made. It was agreed that this report would be emailed to Board Members for information.

**DS**

TP had concerns about the new Police facilities referred to in Part 10 of the document and felt that such facilities would not help to reduce the crime in the area and felt that a strategy should be developed. DS pointed out that such a strategy would have to be developed by the Police and not by the Planning Policy Team.

In response to a question about the amount of floor space in the town centre, Members were informed that the retail information had been based on information gathered in 2010 and that retail studies would be updated every three years. The starting point for any new additional retail would start from this document which would be backed up by Breckland Council's Retail and Town Centre Study. In the short term there would be a relatively modest level of need but as more people came in to the town the retail floorspace would be increased accordingly with growth. RK felt that a statement to highlight that fact should be included in the document. DS said that Policy TH1 already reflected this specific town centre reference but that he would look into the Town Centre section.

RK had a number of detailed comments that he wished to discuss with NB outside of this meeting.

NS felt that that the wording within the Policies for community buildings with regard to the sharing of school facilities, and in relation to tackling the imbalance in the town and social inequality, should be tightened up and strengthened. It was agreed that NS would contact NB regarding these concerns.

It was agreed that all comments received from the Board would be verbally reported to Cabinet.

The report was otherwise noted.

**25/11 EMPLOYMENT PAPER (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

DC the Economic Development Officer from Breckland Council presented the employment paper which he had been asked to prepare for the Board.

The purpose of the paper was to provide a detailed and comprehensive forecast of the potential employment growth of Thetford during the

**Action  
By**

period of growth and regeneration in line with the Strategic Objective 2 (SO2) of the TAAP; concentrating on the Sustainable Urban Extension and the Thetford Enterprise Park.

The background, key objectives and analysis were explained.

In response to a question as to whether existing employers had been considered in the document, Members were informed that a questionnaire would be sent out to them once completed.

The Chairman felt that the education and skills base needed to be raised for the businesses in the area. He hoped that the Academy would teach the correct skills as there was nothing in this Employment Paper to ensure that all these matters came together. MSt, Breckland Council's Economic Development Manager, stated that Thetford did have youth unemployment problems and he wanted to make sure that apprenticeships and internships were available whilst the development was on-going. This would mean that the youth of Thetford would be building their future. MCA informed the Board that the new Principal of the Academy had already been tasked to work with businesses in the town to find out exactly what skills were required. JC stated that local businesses at the moment were very pro apprenticeships. NS pointed out that he had completed a piece of work with around 120 people highlighting the aspirations of youngsters in Thetford; this piece of work would be published shortly.

A Member felt that an inward growth strategy was required to prevent the people who would be buying or living in the 5,000 new homes from commuting to nearby cities to work. MSt reported that such a strategy had already been developed – the necessary infrastructure would be put in place before development.

AS stated that Norfolk County Council and Breckland Council were already working collectively and all these concerns would be brought together in a Growth Strategy.

The report was otherwise noted.

**26/11 GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

A revised Governance Structure had been circulated which replaced the original draft sent out with the agenda.

The document had been produced at the request of the Moving Thetford Forward Board in response to concerns being voiced by the current Board Members. The report covered the governance of the Moving Thetford Forward programme which was moving from the funding allocation phase to the delivery phase. The report sought to retain Breckland Council's accountability, as required by the CLG, whilst improving transparency and scrutiny of the projects being delivered. The recommendations in the document were intended to replace the project approval sections of the governance document and the other sections and obligations remain unchanged.

**Action  
By**

KW, the Council's Growth Programme Manager, said that he had had many conversations with various people about how the Board should be developed. The first suggestion was to have an Overview & Scrutiny Board (see Schedule 1 – Option1 of the report) and the second suggestion was to have a Moving Thetford Forward Delivery Partnership with various consultative groups underneath (see Schedule 1 – Option 2 of the report). Both ideas were the main ones that seemed to be working across the country. Both options would provide the Programme Delivery Group (PDG) more powers so that the Board itself, or as it would soon be called if either option was chosen, the Stakeholder Group, would not have to meet so often. The first option was preferred as the second was not quite so open and transparent. The financial process would not be changed. The final option was to keep the Board as it was.

The pros and cons of each option were highlighted.

Members were informed that this report had been presented to the PDG which had supported option 1.

NS preferred the scrutiny option, option1, as it was much more transparent and had a much clearer reporting mechanism. It also gave the PDG the right to choose who it wanted to talk to.

Referring to transparency, AS pointed out that the Moving Thetford Forward Board Minutes already went through to Full Council but she also supported option1.

TP was concerned about not having any parish representation in the preferred option.

RK supported the above concern. Parish representatives were needed as much of the major development was in the outlying areas of Thetford and certain parishes would be affected. He pointed out that the Board currently had 18 Members, and if the Board favoured option 1, the membership would be decreased to 8; therefore, he could not see why it could not be increased to either 9 or 10. KW explained why no parish representatives had been included. The Chairman stated that only the 8 would have voting rights but the Parish Council could attend as it would be a public meeting. He felt that it would be safer for the Parish Council just to be there rather than having a seat on the new Board. RKg mentioned the localism agenda and had very strong views in support of two parish council representatives sitting on the new Board and having voting rights.

A vote was taken on whether the Moving Thetford Forward Board favoured option 1 or option 2. Option 1 was agreed.

A further vote was taken on whether one or two parish council representatives should have a seat on the new Board and have voting rights. Two parish Council representatives were favoured.

The Deputy Chief Executive highlighted the PDGs intentions now that the new governance arrangements had been agreed.

**Action  
By**

**RESOLVED** that Option 1 of the report be adopted as the governance structure for the delivery phase of the Moving Thetford Forward programme, subject to adding two Parish Council representatives to the membership.

**27/11 FINANCIAL REPORT (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

KW reported that a new programme had been agreed for the Thetford Bus Interchange and was now back on target.

A Member wished to know how the targets were measured; for example, if a project was off target, it was not clear how far off it was and by what; and whether it had met or not met the milestones.

Members were informed that an updated action plan, which would include the above detail, would be sent out with the Minutes.

**KW**

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted and an updated Action Plan be sent out with the Minutes.

**28/11 URGENT ITEM - BUS INTERCHANGE (AGENDA ITEM 8B)**

The Deputy Chief Executive, as the Returning Officer for Breckland Council, reported that the decision to hold a referendum on where the bus station should be sited had been supported at a Parish meeting that had been arranged by Thetford Town Council on Monday, 11 July 2011. The majority of the attendees had voted in favour of moving the bus station from its current location, the Anchor/Bridge Street site to St Nicholas Street. Kevin Cooper from Building Partnerships Ltd had been in attendance.

The Poll would take place on Tuesday, 9 August between the hours of 4.00pm and 9.00pm.

The bus station was a Moving Thetford Forward Board initiative but as the Town Council had called for the Poll the cost would be the Town Council's responsibility.

The Chairman had been surprised at the level of interest against the bus station remaining at the Anchor/Bridge Street site particularly as Kevin Cooper had made it clear to the Town Council that the St Nicholas Street site remained untested. Further to this, a hotel operator, a cinema and a popular coffee chain had expressed an interest in locating to the Bridge Street site as part of the regeneration.

NS asked if a Parish Poll carried much weight. The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the results would not be legally binding and would have no legal standing in the eyes of the law.

Cllr Jermy explained the legal process under the 1972 Local Government Act. He pointed out that Thetford Town Council would not have to be spending £6,000 if there had been adequate consultation in the first place. PC advised that a great number of consultations had been carried out and asked NB to enlighten the Board. NB explained that in 2008, 1000 responses had been received from an Issues and Options consultation document of which 75% had been in support of

**Action  
By**

relocating the bus station to the Minstergate site; further consultations had been carried out since.

Referring to the current proposals for the new bus station, RK stated that the Coach Services Company had said it would be interested in having a booking office incorporated as part of the facilities. He pointed out that most of the concerns related to vital missing elements within the proposal such as a booking office, a waiting room and parking for taxis. TE acknowledged the concerns being expressed but reminded the Board of the financial limitations that had been imposed on local authorities as a result of the new Coalition Government's focus on reducing national debt, and warned against wishing to raise expectations that could not be maintained going forward. TE commented on the need for community groups to become more involved going forward as the role of the 'state' reduced. TE confirmed that the Bus Interchange Project Team was seeking to address the concerns expressed and would be discussing ways to deliver facilities like a booking office, waiting room and café with those groups, like the Town Council and Keystone Development Trust, who had previously expressed an interest in the future use of the listed building.

AS drew attention to page 10 of the Thetford Area Action Plan document under the summary of comments – Approach to the Town Centre – which highlighted the fact that youngsters would benefit from the bus station being moved to the proposed site as one of the concerns related to Thetford lacking a cinema and restaurants. She felt that the youth of Thetford should be further involved.

JC reminded the Board that the idea of the town's regeneration was to attract new businesses to the town and therefore agreed that the bus station should remain as proposed.

RK disagreed and was in favour of the bus station being moved but with more facilities included.

Cllr Armes asked if there could be a covered area at the Minstergate site for people to take shelter whilst waiting for a bus. Members were reminded that the new bus station would be an unmanned Norfolk County Council facility.

TE said that he had seen many changes over the years - not just to the scope of the facilities but financially as well. What he had been proud of, however, was that the quality of the new bus station had remained. Norfolk County Council was seeking to deliver a quality building that could be sustained. For him, the challenge was how to get the community on board, and what it wanted at the moment was over and above what this project could provide.

Cllr Armes suggested having a general presentation at the Carnegie Rooms before the Poll.

The Deputy Chief Executive felt that this Poll would send out the wrong message to investors. The Chairman agreed and felt that the Board needed to get the public on side and promote the facts for both sites and promote the opportunities going forward in Thetford regardless of the Poll. In this respect, Kevin Cooper would be asked to assist.

Susan Glossop reminded Members that the planning application for the bus station had recently been submitted.

**Action**  
**By**

**29/11 ANY OTHER BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

None.

**30/11 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

The next meeting of the Board would be held on Thursday, 1 September 2011 at 10.00am at the Innovations Centre, Thetford.

The meeting closed at 12.00 pm

CHAIRMAN