

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PANEL 1**

**Held on Tuesday, 23 September 2008 at 10.00 am in  
The Norfolk Rooms, Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mr J.D. Rogers (Chairman)	Mr K. Martin
Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen	Mr I.A.C. Monson
Mr R.P. Childerhouse	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mrs L.S. Turner
Mr A.P. Joel (Vice-Chairman)	

**Also Present**

Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr J.P. Labouchere
Councillor Claire Bowes	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Mrs A.L. Steward
Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris	

**In Attendance**

Paul Harris	- Senior Planning Policy Officer
Andrea Long	- Environmental Planning Manager
Phil Mileham	- Senior Planning Policy Officer
Darryl Smith	- Principal Housing Officer (Strategy and Enabling)
David Spencer	- Principal Planning Policy Officer
Elaine Wilkes	- Senior Member Services Officer

**56/08 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2008 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**57/08 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs. P. Quadling and Mr. M. Broughton (Member Development & Scrutiny Officer).

**58/08 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made:

1. Mr. W.P. Borrett – Personal and prejudicial interest in regard to LDF matters relating to North Elmham as landowner and a family member has land submitted under the LDF.
2. Mr. R. Childerhouse – Personal and prejudicial interest in relation to Weeting Local Service Centre allocation.
3. Mr. P.J. Duigan – Personal interest as a Member of Dereham Town Council in relation to LDF matters.
4. Mrs. D. Irving – Personal interest as a Member of Dereham Town Council in relation to LDF matters.
5. Mr. A.P. Joel – Personal interest in regard to LDF matters as a

**Action By**

**Action By**

- member of Old Buckenham Parish Council and has a friend and knows others who have submitted applications under the LDF.
6. Mr. J.P. Labouchere – Personal and prejudicial interest in regard to LDF matters pertaining to Hermitage Ward.
  7. Mr. I.A.C. Monson – Personal and prejudicial interest in relation to LDF site specifics relating to Oxborough.
  8. Mr. J.D. Rogers – Personal and prejudicial interest in regard to LDF and site specifics matters as landowner in Carbrooke and submitted land application in LDF.
  9. Mrs. L. Turner – Personal interest as a Member of Dereham Town Council in relation to LDF matters.
  10. Mr. A.C. Stasiak – Personal interest as a close associate of the above-named Members.

**59/08 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING**

The following Members were in attendance for agenda item 6:

- Mr. W.P. Borrett
- Councillor C. Bowes
- Mrs. D. Irving
- Mr. M. Kiddle-Morris
- Mr. J.P. Labouchere
- Mr. A.C. Stasiak
- Mrs. A. Steward – Executive Member (Planning & the Environment)

**60/08 SUBMISSION CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

The Environmental Planning Manager introduced this item.

Members' views were sought on the content of the revised Core Strategy and Development Control Policies as amended in the light of the comments received on the Preferred Options document, which was the subject of consultation between January and March 2008.

The purpose of this stage in the process was to refine the document for submission to the Secretary of State to reflect the responses to the consultation and to ensure the document was sound.

The Inspector would examine the submitted Strategy and Policy documents as to their soundness, effectiveness, justification per the evidence base and were procedurally correct.

No fundamental matters had arisen from the comments received under the consultation process which would require the documents to be set aside.

The statutory consultees had responded that they found the documents sound, although some amendments had been requested.

Members were reminded that the Core Strategy Issues and Options had been considered firstly in 2005, followed by the Preferred Options in the same year. Subsequently, the evidence base had been firmed up and the Issues and Options had gone out to consultation in 2007, with further consultation on the proposed policies in 2008. The results of the consultation had been reported back at each stage.

**Action By**

Amendments to the draft submission documents were highlighted within the document in bold type or strikethrough. Many of the amendments were of a minor nature but changes of any significance would be highlighted during the Panel's consideration.

It was the officers' view that the submission documents were sound and procedurally correct.

Following the Panel's consideration today, the matter would go forward to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 2<sup>nd</sup> October, Cabinet on 14<sup>th</sup> October and concluding with Council on 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2008. Adoption on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2008 would confirm that the submission documents were considered to be sound by the Council.

The documents would then be published for public consultation for a period of six weeks during December 2008 and January 2009, giving a further period for public comment, following which the documents would be formally submitted to the Secretary of State in February 2009. Public examination was expected to take place around September 2009.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that Appendix A to the report was a schedule of the Preferred Options policies and Submission policies. Appendix B contained the revised Core Strategy and Development Control Policies incorporating changes in response to the comments made at the Preferred Options stage in accordance with Regulation 26. Each of the policies in the Appendix was preceded by a copy of the comments received.

The Panel then proceeded to consider each policy in turn and the Panel's comments and recommendations are given in the schedule appended to these minutes. A summary of the consultation comments received and the officers' response was given in respect of each item.

The Executive Member recorded her thanks to all the Environmental Planning Team and to Members for their hard work in the production of the Core Strategy and Policies document.

**RECOMMEND** to the Overview and Scrutiny Commission that the report be noted and the revised Submission Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document be recommended to the Cabinet, subject to the following amendments as set out in the attached appendix:

- (1) **Revised Spatial Vision** (page 23) – Delete the words “making it the District's second largest settlement by 2026” from the new fourth paragraph;
- (2) **Revised Spatial Strategy** (pages 72-76) – Confirm the allocation for 50 new homes in the Local Service Centre Villages of Weeting and Harling as proposed.
- (3) **Revised Policy CP1 Housing** (pages 108-111) – Cabinet be asked to review the 25 dwellings threshold for Local Service Centres in conjunction with the question of a community infrastructure levy for every house. (Illustrative scenarios to be

**Action By**

- worked up for Cabinet and Council's consideration.)
- (4) **Revised Policy CP3 Employment** (pages 125-128) – Cabinet be asked to consider strengthening the reference to the rural areas in this policy;
  - (5) **New Policy CP5 Developer Obligations** (pages 144-145) – Amend paragraph 3 to read: “Site specific infrastructure requirements to be addressed through developer obligations **may** include the following ...”
  - (6) **Revised Policy CP8 Natural Resources** (pages 165-166) – Amend the wording in paragraph 3.52 to clarify its meaning and to make reference to statutory requirements;
  - (7) **Revised Policy CP11 Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape** (pages 183-184) – Insert cross-references and amendments to strengthen the reference to mineral extraction and river valley landscapes and to include reference to the Dereham Green Infrastructure Study;
  - (8) **Revised Policy CP14 Sustainable Rural Communities** (pages 209-211) – Delete item 4 on page 209 and replace all references to “food shop” with “convenience store for the supply of day to day goods”;
  - (9) **Revised Policy DC2 Principles of New Housing** (pages 223-225) – Delete the word “exceptionally” in paragraph b. and amend the wording in paragraph d. to make the meaning clearer;
  - (10) **Revised Policy DC3 Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside** (pages 227-228) – Delete paragraph a. on page 227;
  - (11) **Revised Policy DC4 Affordable Housing Principles** (pages 236-238) – Reduce the affordable housing target from 40% to 35%;
  - (12) **Revised Policy DC5 Affordable Housing on Exception Sites** (pages 241-242) – Clarification to confirm whether an exception site has to physically adjoin a settlement boundary;
  - (13) **Revised Policy DC16 Design** (pages 294-295) – Further strengthening of the wording as proposed;
  - (14) **Revised Policy DC19 Community Facilities, Recreation and Leisure** (pages 305-306) – Replace the term “food shop” by “convenience store for the supply of day to day goods” to be consistent with Policy CP14 and amend the term “bus station” to “bus interchange” (page 306);
  - (15) **Revised Policy DC21 Parking Provisions** (pages 312-313) – Further amendments as indicated.

Note: Mr. R. Childerhouse left the meeting during discussions in regard to Weeting Local Service Centre in regard to paragraph 3 on page 74 of Appendix B.

**Action By**

**61/08 WORK PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

Items for future meetings remained to be confirmed.

**62/08 NEXT MEETING**

The arrangements for the next meeting on 28 October 2008 were noted.

The meeting closed at 5.10 pm

CHAIRMAN

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**  
**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PANEL 1 – 23 SEPTEMBER 2008 ON THE**  
**SUBMISSION BRECKLAND CORE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
<p>Revised Spatial Vision (page 23)</p>	<p>The consultation responses gave general support for this policy as written, although some organisations had indicated they would like to see more growth.</p> <p>A new paragraph had been inserted (paragraph 4, page 23) to recognise the substantial housing and employment growth proposals for Attleborough. In this connection, some Members expressed concerns about the deliverability of the growth for the town and its impact and whether the town could cope with such substantial growth.</p> <p>It was explained that this was the 'Vision' statement and that the details of the towns would be considered separately.</p> <p>In answer to a question, it was affirmed that all the proposals, including those for Attleborough, assumed that the plans in the Regional Spatial Strategy would take effect, including the A11 dualling.</p> <p>It was also explained that the separate Area Action Plan for Snetterton and Attleborough, as for Thetford, would define the issues around infrastructure, housing and relief roads. The town needed growth if it was to achieve the better facilities it required and the elevation of the town in the longer term, as well as taking account of the competing expansions in Norwich, Wymondham and Thetford areas.</p> <p>A member suggested the reference to Attleborough as becoming the second largest settlement in the District by 2026 should be deleted.</p>	<p>Delete the words "making it the District's second largest settlement by 2026" from the new paragraph 4.</p> <p>Subject to the above amendment, recommend adoption of the revised Spatial Vision.</p>

Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
<p>Revised Spatial Strategy (pages 72-76)</p>	<p>Note further amendment to paragraph 4, lines 1 &amp; 2, page 72, to read: "It will provide at least 6,000 homes over the period between 2001 and 2021 and at least a further <b>1,500 to 2,000</b> new homes between 2021 and 2026 ..."</p> <p>Consultation responses in regard to Local Service Centre Villages had been addressed by the Panel at its meeting in August. There was support for the strategy for Thetford as a key centre for development and change, and some developers and landowners wished to see more growth in Dereham and Swaffham above that proposed in the strategy. There had been few comments received on the alternative options in the Preferred Options document.</p> <p>So far as the comments received in regard to Dereham were concerned, it was explained that the evidence base for growth highlighted two key constraints: i) the High School capacity, and ii) sewage treatment works capacity. While these capacity issues could be resolved, the consequence would be that around 6000 new homes would be needed to generate the required number of pupils and income. Such a level of growth was not supported by the town, which was comfortable with the current proposals.</p> <p>In answer to questions, it was noted that there was funding for Thetford through the Growth Point funding and other sources. In this regard, there was close working with Norfolk County Council and the Learning and Skills Council regarding schools provision, including post-16. With regard to health facilities, a Member highlighted concerns in Thetford on the need for more GP provision, since existing GP surgeries needed further capacity and resources.</p> <p>It was explained that the Core Strategy identified the needs that other providers would have to take account of in their own Strategies and Plans and the Inspector would wish to examine their responses in relation to Breckland's Submission Document. It was the officers' view that the Council's Submission Document was supported by the other providers. A Member drew attention to the fact that the Norfolk County Council was seeking an infrastructure levy on Section 106 Agreements and it was pointed out that the Breckland Submission Document included a reference to community levies, so that it would be</p>	<p>Confirm the allocation for 50 new homes in the Local Service Centre Villages of Weeting and Harling as proposed.</p> <p>Recommend adoption of the revised Spatial Strategy as amended.</p>

Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
	<p>possible to consider this aspect in the light of anticipated future guidance from the Government. Members were also referred to Core Policies CP4 and CP5, which dealt in more detail with developer obligations through the use of a Supplementary Planning Document, which would reflect land values. Any impact beyond the 15 year life of the Plan Document was likely to relate to land values rather than impact on developers. An up-lift in agricultural land values was also thought likely to help infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>In looking at the amended policy on Local Service Centre Villages (page 74), clarification had been obtained from Weeting Parish Council on the number of new homes that would be supported. The Parish Council had confirmed it would be willing to consider up to 100 new homes over the Plan period but that it would expect to achieve a number of enhanced facilities in return, including an extra classroom in the primary school, a play area, refurbished village hall, outreach GP surgery, affordable and sheltered housing.</p> <p>Officers remained of the view that 50 new homes, as proposed, was the preferred option for Weeting and it was questionable that growth of 100 homes would deliver all of the additional facilities which the Parish Council had identified. It was not thought that any contributions through Section 106 Agreements would realise sufficient infrastructure funding for them.</p> <p>A further key issue against greater development in Weeting was that of the nearby designated European environmental habitats and the impact of growth on them.</p> <p>The Panel agreed its support for 50 new homes for Weeting as proposed in the Submission Document on the grounds that this was consistent with the other LSC villages (with the exception of Shipdham, where 100 homes was proposed and supported).</p> <p>The proposed allocation of 50 new homes for Harling was supported, bearing in mind the current constraints from sewage and traffic capacity, subject to review after five years as previously proposed. Members asked for a reference to this proviso to be included in the Submission Document and it was advised that this would be included in the general review of the Plan.</p>	



Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
<p>Revised CP1                      Housing                      (pages 108-111)</p>	<p>This policy had been substantially reformatted since the original consultation to give a more complete picture between 2001 and 2026 to show what had already been built and what was planned. The figures were as given in Table 3.1 on page 108.</p> <p>The revisions to this policy reaffirmed that the housing allocations in Thetford would be for growth to the north and east of the town and for Attleborough, growth would be to the south of the A11 and south and north of the railway.</p> <p>So far as the section on Phased Delivery was concerned, the target had been amended to 25% of new housing on previously developed land (i.e. brownfield), with the majority on greenfield sites. The limited brownfield development target was not unusual in rural areas and the Submission Document recognised there was a variance in brownfield targets across the rural eastern region. An additional sentence had been included relating to the case of Local Service Centres. A correction to this sentence was noted to read: "...sites of <b>not</b> less than 25 dwellings..."</p> <p>In the section on Housing Need, it was noted that the currently permitted development figure for Watton included one site subject to a Section 106 Agreement, which it was understood had now been signed. Similarly with the site at Swaffham, the Section 106 Agreement was understood to be close to completion.</p> <p>Discussion took place on how Phased Delivery would be controlled. There was a concern that a single developer could take up all the allocations in the first year of the Plan Document. Other concerns were that the allocations target of not less than 25 dwellings in Local Service Centres would be to create an urban setting in a rural village. However, it was also noted that villages did vary in their approach to the size of developments, with some welcoming an estate development within their settlement boundaries, rather than a number of small or piecemeal developments.</p> <p>Other concerns related to fears that the wording would stop those villages who did not want large developments from having smaller development sites.</p> <p>It was explained that the policy section in question related to Local Service</p>	<p>Recommend to Cabinet to review the 25 dwellings threshold for Local Service Centres in conjunction with the question of a community infrastructure levy for every house.</p> <p>Illustrative scenarios to be worked up for Cabinet and Council's consideration.</p>

Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
	<p>Centres only. The threshold of 25 was included to ensure delivery of infrastructure requirements by developers (e.g. open space).</p> <p>In answer to a question, it was confirmed that the introduction of a community infrastructure levy would make a difference as it would apply to every house.</p> <p>In the light of this, it was suggested that Cabinet should be asked to look at the question of the threshold number of 25 in conjunction with the question of a community infrastructure levy for every house. The Environmental Planning Manager undertook to work up some scenarios on this option for the Cabinet and Council to consider.</p>	
<p>Revised CP2                      The Travelling Community                      (pages 115-117)</p>	<p>The policy had been widened to include provision for travelling show people in conformity with CLG Circular 04/2007, although there was no evidence of need in Breckland in this regard at present.</p> <p>It was explained that this policy was aimed at the temporary accommodation needs of the gypsy and travelling community (i.e. over winter) and did not relate to permanent bases. The policy also did not cover sites for fairs etc.</p> <p>It was also confirmed that the Strategic Housing Team, who worked closely with Gypsy and Traveller liaison officers, supported the provision for 15 pitches on a single site as more effective to manage than several smaller sites.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of Policy CP2 as amended.</p>
<p>Revised CP3                      Employment                      (pages 125-128)</p>	<p>The key issue under this policy was the balance between jobs and homes. Some minor textual amendments had been made. There was no change to the job numbers set out in Table 3.2 but it was explained that these were subject to the receipt of awaited further evidence on housing and employment provision for Snetterton and Attleborough. This information was anticipated to be to hand in time for consideration by Cabinet.</p> <p>The main change in the policy related to paragraph (f) on page 126, correcting the strategic employment land area at Snetterton to 20ha (from 30ha) and the previously agreed amendment to refer to the Area Action Plan for Attleborough and Snetterton.</p>	<p>Recommend to Cabinet that there should be a stronger reference to the rural areas in this policy.</p>

Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
	<p>A member queried whether employment land would be delivered at the same time as housing and it was explained that this would be managed through the Site Specifics process.</p> <p>Another member felt that the allocation of 5-10ha of land for employment development in Attleborough was insufficient to meet the demand for 4000 new homes.</p> <p>The position on energy supply was also questioned. It was felt that the 20ha land allocation at Snetterton would not be realistic if the energy supply was not resolved. In response, it was explained that this was covered under paragraph 3.24. There were other mechanisms and contingencies to deliver development if necessary, for example along the A11 corridor and possibly including Attleborough.</p> <p>Members were concerned that there was no reference in this policy to the rural areas. It was explained that this policy related to strategic land release for development and development at Shipdham Airfield and Roudham was included. Other policies provided for development elsewhere in the rural areas. Planning Policy Statement 7 was relevant to this, as it allowed consideration for business and employment in rural areas to meet service areas or operational demand, etc.</p> <p>While noting the position, Members remained of the view that the reference to rural areas in this policy should be strengthened.</p>	
<p>Revised CP4                      Infrastructure                      (pages 141-143)</p>	<p>This was an enabling framework and in the main was unchanged.</p> <p>Key issues from the consultation comments received related to the community infrastructure levy approach, where there was support for a levy on every new house, health care in the market towns, travel plans (covered under a separate policy) and green infrastructure (also covered elsewhere).</p> <p>This policy would link into the more specific Area Action Plans.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of Policy CP4 Infrastructure as amended.</p>

**Policy Development and Review Panel 1**  
**23 September 2008**  
**Minute 60/08**  
**APPENDIX**

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>New CP5  Developer Obligations  (pages 144-145)</p>	<p>This new policy was included to provide clarity in this area and to reflect Government guidance and include areas not otherwise covered under Policy CP4.</p> <p>It was an enabling policy which would be supported by the Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>One amendment was proposed to change the word “will” to “may” in line 2 of paragraph 3 on page 144.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of Policy CP5 Developer Obligations, subject to the amendment of paragraph 3 to read: “Site specific infrastructure requirements to be addressed through developer obligations <b>may</b> include the following: ...”</p>
<p>New CP6  Green Infrastructure  (pages 151-154)</p>	<p>This policy had changed from being a Development Control policy (DC11) to become a Core Policy in the Submission Document as it had a more strategic role than that of the Development Control process and took account of the fact that strategic core policies were enacted through more than one mechanism.</p> <p>The content of the policy remained broadly the same as previously but with some textual amendments for clarity and to take account of comments received regarding trees and landscape.</p> <p>A number of other comments received from the consultation were covered under other policies.</p> <p>An objection received about the use of the Thefford Green Infrastructure Study to inform requirements at a later stage was noted and it was explained that exact standards would be met through subsequent Development Plan Documents. However, the Thefford Study was an important evidence base and it would be appropriate to consider this when looking at specific standards later in the process.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of Policy CP6 Green Infrastructure as revised.</p>
<p>Revised CP7  Town Centres  (pages 159-161)</p>	<p>A number of aspects of this policy had been clarified, including the role of Attleborough in the retail hierarchy as shown in Table 3.3 on page 159.</p> <p>A new paragraph 3.46 had been inserted into the supporting statements to cover the period beyond 2018.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP7.</p>

**Policy Development and Review Panel 1**  
**23 September 2008**  
**Minute 60/08**  
**APPENDIX**

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Revised CP8  Natural Resources  (pages 165-166)</p>	<p>There had been some significant wording changes in this policy but its purpose remained unchanged. The amendments took account of comments received from the consultation, including those of GO-East who felt the sequential test had not been sufficiently clear. The revisions also removed a number of duplications. A reference had been included to highlight the need to consider the effect of developments on natural sites.</p> <p>Issues of development on flood plains and flood risk were discussed by the Panel. It was explained that there was a need to justify building on flood plains and to assess their impact. It was noted that the Environment Agency took a stronger line than that contained in this policy.</p> <p>It was suggested that the meaning in paragraph 3.52 was not clear. It was accepted this could be more tightly worded to explain its strategic role.</p> <p>It was also suggested that the supporting text should contain a reference to statutory requirements.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP8, subject to amendments to the wording in paragraph 3.52 to clarify its meaning and to make reference to statutory requirements.</p>
<p>Revised CP9  Pollution and Waste  (pages 169-170)</p>	<p>Textual changes had been made to take account of comments received from the consultation, to remove duplication and for clarity.</p> <p>The reference in this policy to renewable energy had been removed as this was covered under separate core and development control policies.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP9  Pollution and Waste.</p>
<p>Revised CP10  Natural Environment  (pages 175-179)</p>	<p>It was noted that all comments received in regard to this policy had been in support.</p> <p>Minor textual changes had been made for clarity and to include reference to European Protected Habitats.</p> <p>It was noted that County wildlife sites were managed by Norfolk Wildlife Trust.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP10  Natural Environment.</p>

Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
<p>Revised CP11                      Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape                      (pages 183-184)</p>	<p>Key changes in this policy had been made to include reference to the protection of the Brecks landscape, the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment and the river valleys. A further paragraph was to be inserted to cross-reference the policy with other related policies.</p> <p>A member felt that the policy needed to make a stronger reference to protection from mineral extraction and to make the distinction between county mineral extraction proposals and the normal development control process.</p> <p>It was explained that this policy identified the most important areas and any proposals would need to take account of the policy. Relevant to this policy was the supporting details making up the Landscape Character Assessment. However, it was accepted the policy could be amended to include specific reference to mineral extraction and the need to retain undisturbed river valley landscapes.</p> <p>A member also wished to see the Dereham Green Infrastructure Study included in this policy.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP11 Protection and Enhancement of the Landscape, subject to insertion of cross-references and amendments to strengthen the reference to mineral extraction and river valley landscapes and to include reference to the Dereham Green Infrastructure Study.</p>
<p>Revised CP12                      Energy                      (page 191-193)</p>	<p>Minor changes to the policy and supporting text had been made for clarity.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP12 Energy.</p>
<p>Revised CP13                      Accessibility                      (pages 198-200)</p>	<p>Minor amendments had been made in relation to travel plans for major developments, demand responsive public transport and the rural areas and to corridors of movement.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the policy took account of future needs in regard to corridors of movement.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP13 Accessibility.</p>
<p>Revised CP14                      Sustainable Rural Communities                      (pages 209-211)</p>	<p>Revisions to this policy had been made for clarity. The main changes related to the sections on housing (to cover the 3000 homes windfall allowance), rural settlement boundaries and protection of key local services.</p> <p>In referring to protection of local services (page 210), Members suggested it was more appropriate that this policy should refer to “convenience store for the</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy CP14 Sustainable Rural Communities, subject to the deletion of item 4 on page 209 (i.e. delete the words “it provides a site for gypsy and travellers or travelling show people”) and to replace all</p>

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	<p>supply of day to day goods" rather than "food shop", as it was felt the term 'food shop' was vague and would be difficult to define.</p> <p>It was also proposed that item 4 on the housing list on page 209 should be deleted, as it was a duplication of other policies. It was confirmed that this could be covered by inclusion of a statement to recognise national guidance on provisions for gypsies and travellers or travelling show people.</p>	<p>references to "food shop" with "convenience store for the supply of day to day goods".</p>
<p>Revised DC1 Protection of Amenity (pages 215-216)</p>	<p>There were two revisions to this policy – the words "or other forms of disturbance" had been added to item b. on page 215, and an additional sentence had been inserted at the end of paragraph 4.9 for clarity in regard to forms of disturbance.</p> <p>Some general discussion took place in regard to issues of overlooking and privacy.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC1 Protection of Amenity.</p>
<p>Revised DC2 Principles of New Housing (pages 223-225)</p>	<p>Two changes had been made to avoid duplication with Policy DC1. In line with national policies, the amended paragraph c) retained the requirement for evidence on the appropriate mix and type of housing.</p> <p>A member proposed that the word "exceptionally" in paragraph b. should be deleted as too strong. It was also felt the meaning in paragraph d. could be made clearer.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC2 Principles of New Housing, subject to the deletion of the word "exceptionally" in paragraph b. and to the amendment of the wording in paragraph d. to make the meaning clearer (page 223).</p>
<p>Revised DC3 Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside (pages 227-228)</p>	<p>There was a fundamental change in that this policy had reverted to the Alternative Option from the Preferred Options document. It was explained that the policy had reverted to an alternative option because the Strategic Housing Market (SHIMA) had identified that there was a need for smaller housing and that the policy as proposed would protect the stock of smaller housing outside settlement boundaries. An objection had also been received to the departure from the alternative policy during the consultation on the Preferred Options.</p> <p>Some members were concerned that this effectively stopped the replacement of small cottages with larger and forcing like for like developments.</p> <p>It was explained that this was not a new option, as it was an alternative in the Preferred Options document. Furthermore, there was no evidence of demand</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC3 Replacement Dwellings and Extensions in the Countryside, subject to the deletion of paragraph a. on page 227 (i.e. delete the words "the scale of the replacement is not disproportionate to the original dwelling").</p>

**Policy Development and Review Panel 1**  
**23 September 2008**  
**Minute 60/08**  
**APPENDIX**

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<p>Revised DC4  Affordable Housing Principles  (pages 236-238)</p>	<p>for replacement of smaller buildings with larger. The Policy applied exclusively to properties outside settlement boundaries. Properties within settlement boundaries were covered by Policy DC2.</p> <p>Other Members felt that the requirement for dwellings to be “appropriate” was key to the policy and a proposal was made to delete paragraph a. on page 227, which it was felt would alleviate Members’ concerns.</p> <p>This policy remained unchanged, including the affordable housing provision of 40% on sites of five or more dwellings, which was supported by the existing evidence of need and viability. The regional affordability figure was 35% and Breckland’s own assessment study supported a figure of 45%. The policy figure of 40% was therefore a balance between these figures and was the figure previously considered by the Panel.</p> <p>Members were unconvinced that the figure of 40% could be supported by developers and felt that it would have a detrimental impact, particularly in the current economic climate.</p> <p>Members were reminded that, although the housing market was ‘soft’ at present, this was unlikely to continue to be the case during the 15-year life of the Plan. The evidence obtained by Breckland had been consistent in supporting need and viability of a 40% affordable housing target. There was provision within other policies in the Document to reduce this figure where it could be justified by a developer. There was no evidence to suggest that developers would be disadvantaged by this policy.</p> <p>A proposal to reduce the affordable housing target to 35% was supported.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC4 Affordable Housing Principles, subject to the reduction of the affordable housing target from 40% to 35%.</p>
<p>Revised DC5  Affordable Housing on Exception Sites  (pages 241-242)</p>	<p>Minor amendments had been made for clarity.</p> <p>A member sought clarification on whether an exception site had to physically adjoin the settlement boundary. It was agreed to confirm the matter and clarify the wording as appropriate.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC5 Affordable Housing on Exception Sites, subject to clarification to confirm whether an exception site had to physically adjoin a settlement boundary.</p>



**Policy Development and Review Panel 1**  
**23 September 2008**  
**Minute 60/08**  
**APPENDIX**

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Revised DC6 General Employment Areas (page 246)	Some minor amendments had been made for clarity.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC6 General Employment Areas.
Revised DC7 Employment Development outside Protected Sites (pages 248-249)	In addition to some minor textual amendments, an additional paragraph c. on page 248 had been inserted in response to comments received from the consultation.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC7 Employment Development outside Protected Sites
Revised DC8 Tourism related Development (pages 251-252)	No changes had been required to be made to this policy.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC8 Tourism related development.
Revised DC9 Proposals for Town Centre Uses (pages 255-256)	Some detailed comments had been received from the consultation relating to provisions to be applied to secondary retail developments. In response, a new paragraph i. had been inserted to provide that change of use proposals to shops retain or provide windows and entrances which relate well to the design of the host building and to the street-scene and its setting.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC9 Proposals for Town Centre Uses.
DC10 Telecommunications (pages 258-259)	No changes had been required to be made to this policy.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC10 Telecommunications.

**Policy Development and Review Panel 1**  
**23 September 2008**  
**Minute 60/08**  
**APPENDIX**

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Revised DC11 Open Space (pages 264-268)	Significant changes had been made to this policy consequent upon the comments received from the consultation, in particular that there was limited evidence to support 3.0 hectares open space provision per 1000 population and this figure had accordingly reverted back to 2.4ha, which was the existing adopted Local Plan figure.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC11 Open Space.
Revised DC12 Trees and Landscape (pages 273-274)	There had been some significant rewording of this policy but its focus was retained on natural features and to enhance new development.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC12 Trees and Landscape.
Revised DC13 Flood Risk (pages 278-279)	<p>Revisions to the policy had been made in response to comments received, in particular from GO-East that the policy needed to show more consistency with national guidance on PPS25.</p> <p>In regard to the Zone 3b classification, the Council's evidence base supported the case that development needs could be met without the need to apply the exceptions test and this was reflected in the policy.</p> <p>Other changes had been made in the supporting text to expand or clarify particular points.</p> <p>It was confirmed that sequential tests would apply to all development in flood risk areas.</p> <p>In regard to the additional paragraph 4.90 of the revised policy, it was noted that further clarification was to be made to supporting text in relation to SUDS. This would be developed for Cabinet.</p> <p>In regard to Water Cycle Studies, that for Thefford had been completed and the District-wide Study was due to be completed at the end of October and the results would be reported during the November Committee meetings cycle.</p> <p>There was some discussion of the need for water agencies and the Environment Agency to fulfil their obligations to dredge and keep watercourses clear. A Member referred to the fact that the Council had representatives on Internal Drainage Boards and suggested there were opportunities for the</p>	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC13 Flood Risk

Submission Policy	Comments	Recommendation
	<p>Council to undertake a scrutiny review of these bodies. Mention was also made of the forthcoming Pitt Report into the recent national flooding disasters and that the recommendations from this Report could introduce changes for a single responsible body to be established to oversee the national water network.</p>	
<p>Revised DC14                      Energy Efficiency                      (pages 285-286)</p>	<p>It was reported that most comments received had supported this policy. Some changes had been made in response to comments received and for clarity. It was explained that the 10%+ threshold was a starting point.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC14                      Energy Efficiency.</p>
<p>Revised DC15                      Renewable Energy                      (pages 289-290)</p>	<p>This policy remained largely unchanged other than to clarify certain wording and to avoid duplication with other policies.                      Paragraph 4.99 had been amended by the insertion of additional text to refer to the Wind Turbine Development Landscape Character Assessment. There was also a new paragraph 4.100 with cross-referencing details.</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC15                      Renewable Energy.</p>
<p>Revised DC16                      Design                      (pages 294-295)</p>	<p>The vast majority of comments received from the consultation had agreed with this policy.                      The previous core policy (CP10) on design had been removed to avoid duplication.                      Textual changes had been made to aid clarity and three new paragraphs had been inserted at 4.103, 4.105 and 4.106.                      Issues of sustainability and parking requirements and standards were covered by other policies.                      Members of the Panel wished to see some further strengthening in the wording of the policy to highlight the need for good design detailing in planning applications, which was considered often to be quite poor. It was suggested reference needed to be included in the policy to materials, detailing, the look and form of buildings and giving more emphasis to the design element. This should also, it was felt, relate to the street scene and encourage buildings to be enhanced, even if those either side of a development were of a lesser</p>	<p>Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC16                      Design, subject to further strengthening of the wording as suggested.</p>

**Policy Development and Review Panel 1**  
**23 September 2008**  
**Minute 60/08**  
**APPENDIX**

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	design quality. It was also suggested more emphasis could be placed on the use of the Council's Design Guide by applicants.	
Revised DC17 Historic Environment (pages 298-299)	Some revisions to strengthen wording had been made but otherwise this policy remained largely unchanged. A Member enquired whether the Council still issued leaflets to people moving into the District to inform them of conservation area requirements on works to buildings. It was agreed this would be checked.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC17 Historic Environment.
Revised DC18 Conversion of buildings of particular historical or architectural merit (page 301)	This policy remained unchanged.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC18 Conversion of buildings of particular historical or architectural merit.
Revised DC19 Community facilities, recreation and leisure (pages 305-306)	The majority of respondents had supported this policy. Some amendments had been made, in particular by the insertion of an addition paragraph to refer to Local Service Centres (page 305). Members recommended the replacement of the term "food shop" on page 306 by "convenience store for the supply of day to day goods" to be consistent with policy CP14. It was also proposed that the term "Bus stations" be amended to "Bus interchange".	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC19 Community facilities, recreation and leisure, subject to the replacement of the term "food shop" by "convenience store for the supply of day to day goods" to be consistent with Policy CP14, and the term "bus station" be amended to "bus interchange" (page 306).
Revised DC20 Highway Safety (page 308)	Minor amendments had been made to the supporting text.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC20 Highway Safety.

**Policy Development and Review Panel 1  
23 September 2008  
Minute 60/08  
APPENDIX**

<b>Submission Policy</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Revised DC21 Parking Provisions (pages 312-313)	It was noted that Appendix 3 Parking Standards of the Preferred Options document would be appended to this policy and that additional text to refer to cycle parking provision for houses was also to be considered for insertion. Additional supporting text, along with some other minor amendments, had been included in response to comments received from the consultation. In answer to a question, it was confirmed that the policy still provided for two car parking spaces per house.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC21 Parking Provisions, subject to the further amendments as indicated.
Revised DC22 Corridors of Movement (pages 315-316)	Minor amendments had been made for clarity and to provide cross-references. In response to questions, Members were advised that protection and changes to corridors of movement would be covered in the Site Specifics process and generally through the LDF.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC22 Corridors of Movement.
Revised DC23 Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside (pages 318-319)	No changes had been made to this policy, other than the inclusion of an additional paragraph at 4.137 to cross-refer to Policy DC18.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC23 Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside.
Revised DC24 Farm Diversification (pages 321-322)	Other than minor amendments to remove duplication, no other changes had been made to this policy. It was clarified that paragraph c. was intended to prevent supermarket/warehouse retail development rather than farm shop development.	Recommend adoption of revised Policy DC24 Farm Diversification.