

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**LDF TASK & FINISH GROUP**

**Held on Friday, 11 December 2009 at 9.30 am in  
The Village Hall, St Leonard's Street, Mundford**

**PRESENT**

Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen	Mr B. Rose
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr F.J. Sharpe (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair)
Mr A.P. Joel	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mr K. Martin	Mrs A.L. Steward
Mr I.A.C. Monson	Mrs L.S. Turner

**Also Present**

Mr J.P. Cowen	Mr J.D. Rogers
---------------	----------------

**In Attendance**

Mark Broughton	- Scrutiny Officer
Phil Mileham	- Senior Planning Policy Officer
Sarah Robertson	- Planning Graduate
Jamie Smith	- Environmental Planning Assistant
David Spencer	- Principal Planning Policy Officer
Elaine Wilkes	- Senior Committee Officer

**35/09 INTRODUCTION**

Introductions round the table were made.

The Chairman then outlined the purpose of the meeting, which was the second of a series of four meetings being convened to consider preferred options for the Site Specific Policies and Proposals Development Plan as part of the Local Development Framework process. Parishes were invited to consider if they wished to put forward any other reasonable alternatives to those being proposed.

A draft document would be submitted through the Overview & Scrutiny Commission and Cabinet prior to its submission for public consultation in April 2010. There would be a further public consultation process, prior to consideration at the Public Examination, when there would be another opportunity to make representations.

Mr. Cowen sought confirmation that the document before the meeting today was not the final document to be submitted to Cabinet and this was confirmed by the Chairman.

**36/09 MINUTES**

A correction in the final paragraph on page 56 was noted amending the reference to Mr. Borrett from Ward Representative to correctly read "Council's Historic Buildings Champion".

The minutes, as corrected, were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**Action By**

**Action By**

**37/09 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr. D. Myers and Mr. R. Childerhouse.

**38/09 URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**39/09 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

The following declarations were made:

- Mr. I.A.C. Monson – Personal interest as County Councillor for the Conifer, Weeting and Wayland Wards.
- Mrs. A. Steward – Personal interest as the owner of property in Hilborough.

**40/09 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING**

The following Ward Members were in attendance:

- Mr. J.P. Cowen (Wayland Ward)
- Mr. J.D. Rogers (Templar Ward)

The following Parish Council representatives were in attendance to make representations:

- Mr. C. Wiltshire (Great Hockham)
- Mr. P. Childs (Stow Bedon & Breckles)
- Mr. R. Rumbsy (Ovington)
- Mr. R. King (Croxtan)
- Mr. M. Eyles (Mundford)
- Mr. F. Ulrich (Griston)

**41/09 SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES & PROPOSALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT 2001-2026 REVIEW OF RURAL SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES - SOUTH-WEST PARISHES (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced the report and explained that it was the second of four reports presenting options for the review of rural settlement boundaries in Breckland as part of the Site Specific Policies and Proposals document.

The purpose of the report was to set out the preferred options for a new set of rural settlement boundaries and to obtain the views of the Task and Finish Group on whether there were other reasonable options that Cabinet should be asked to consider as part of agreeing a Preferred Options document for a further six-week consultation in Spring 2010.

The background information and issues were as fully set out in paragraph 3 of the report.

**Action By**

Rural settlement boundaries were a planning tool, identifying areas where further development was possible without upsetting the nature and character of an area.

There were three broad options to be considered:

- a) To amend existing boundaries to either tighten up development areas to exclude back land or infill plots, loosen boundaries to include small scale development plots, or to update boundaries to take account of inconsistencies and existing permissions.
- b) To keep existing boundaries where they remained fit for purpose but allowing for some slight 'tweaking' for Positional Accuracy Improvement to align with Ordnance Survey mapping (minor amendments of 1 or 2 metres to fit hedge lines, fences).
- c) To delete settlement boundaries from small settlements, i.e. those that have less than two key rural services or where there is either very limited or no capacity within that boundary for further development.

It was explained that this was the first stage in the process. There would be a public consultation on the draft document in April 2010, the results of which would be reported back to the Task and Finish Group. A final document would be submitted for a further period of public consultation in October 2010, prior to proceeding to Public Examination.

The proposals for the following Wards were then considered in turn, details of which were as set out in the appendices to the report.

(a) **Conifer Ward**

Mundford

This was one of two Local Service Centre Villages in the south-west area of the Breckland District. The village was not identified for a positive allocation of growth but the range of services needed to be protected and where possible extended. Five minor amendments to the existing settlement boundary were proposed.

Mr. Eyles of Mundford Parish Council expressed concern that there had been insufficient time for him to consult with the members of the Parish Council.

Mr. Eyles asked whether the proposed removal of the settlement boundary at neighbouring Ickburgh would mean that there could be no further development or extensions to houses in future. The Senior Planning Policy Officer replied that the removal of the settlement boundary would mean the area would be treated as open countryside for planning purposes but that it would not impact on applications for regular domestic housing extensions or conservatories.

The Ward Member added her concern about the length of time available to parishes to consider the proposals and further clarification was sought. She asked how affected individuals would be consulted.

**Action By**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer replied that it was not intended to write to individual property owners but consultation would be notified in the normal way, through statutory and other press notices and in Voice magazine etc. in accordance with Regulations.

The Ward Member asked how Parish Meetings without a Parish Chairman would be consulted. It was replied that the assistance of the Ward Member would be sought in such instances.

A further question related to whether a six week consultation period was sufficient, bearing in mind Christmas holidays etc.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer replied that the material for the next meeting was due for completion by 22 December and that the next meeting was being put back to 19 January 2010.

Furthermore, the letter to parish councils explained that where there was a known strong view from the last consultation in 2008, parishes were invited to bring them forward through this process but there would be a formal six week consultation process in April 2010 for parishes to respond.

The Ward Member responded that the letter to parish councils did not make clear that the nature of the discussion was in relation to settlement boundaries.

A member referred to the proposed amendment MUN.3, which he felt was inconsistent with the approach taken on a similar site considered at the last meeting where the boundary had been extended. He queried whether the amendment was necessary in this case, as there appeared to be no access to enable any development behind the existing property.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer acknowledged that the proposal appeared different to the approach taken at the last meeting. However, the Special Protection Area on this side of Mundford related to the Woodlark and Nightjar species (not the Stone Curlew). In addition, the rear garden areas in this case were larger than in the previous case, so the intention was to tighten the boundary.

Referring back to the issue of the consultation process, the Member Development and Scrutiny Officer read out an extract from the letter to parish councils sent on 30 November, which stated that representatives would have the opportunity to make informal representations from the floor and that the Task and Finish Group would scrutinise details of individual sites and make recommendations as appropriate. A final version of the document would be subject to public consultation in April, so that there would be an opportunity for parish councils to meet during that time to consider the document. The Council was trying to make the process as open and inclusive as possible.

In answer to a further question from a member, it was explained that there should be no problem in giving early information to parishes as the areas to be discussed at the next two meetings of the Task and Finish Group were known.

**Action By**

Mr. Eyles stated that there was only one meeting of his parish council scheduled within the consultation period, which would be the only chance for the matter to be discussed.

A member made the point that it was open to parish councils to call special meetings and he encouraged such an approach for this purpose.

Mr. Cowen then spoke in his capacity as Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and severely criticised the current consultation process. He felt that contrary to what had been said earlier, it appeared that there was little opportunity to influence the content of the document. He firmly stated that nothing should be determined in advance of the Cabinet decision.

Mr. Cowen also criticised that there was nothing in the document to explain the coloured areas on the maps. He felt this was a fundamental flaw and felt that the quality of information needed to be better.

So far as the proposed amendment at MUN.2 was concerned, he noted the reason for this included the flood risk. He felt this was inconsistent with the area to the east.

He stated he would have no hesitation in calling-in this item and felt the meeting should be halted.

The Chairman replied that this meeting would be completed.

Mrs. Steward commended the work of the officers in consulting the public and parishes over the years the LDF had been in progress. She wondered, however, whether the opportunity should be taken to slow down the process slightly to give more time for the public and landowners and the parishes to feel more a part of the process.

Referring to the proposed amendment MUN.2, a member felt that for consistency, the boundary should be moved away from the flood plain.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer explained that the reason the other site had not been excluded was because it had already been developed with residential housing. This was not the case with regard to site MUN.2 and the intention here was to limit any harm from flooding risk. It was not desirable to exclude every existing dwelling in a flood plain. The other site in question was already built-up, with no room for further in-fill.

No further representations were made.

**Cranwich**

There was no existing settlement boundary in this case and no change to this was proposed.

**Action By**

The Ward Member pointed out that Cranwich was a parish meeting without a Chairman.

A member asked whether there was any scope for some development in the village. The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that the only development existing was a small string of houses along the main road. It was not considered feasible to put in a settlement boundary.

Didlington

No representations were made.

Hilborough

The proposal was to delete the existing settlement boundary in this case for the reasons given in the report.

The Ward Member advised that she had spoken with the Chairman of the Parish Council, who had not been aware that the settlement boundary was to be discussed today.

So far as village services were concerned, it was pointed out that the village did have a public house and a local landowner provided local employment for a number of people.

In reply to a question, it was explained that the blue cross-hatched area on the map represented the 1500m protection area buffer zone for the Stone Curlew.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer acknowledged the criticism about the lack of a colour key to the maps and this would be addressed for future meetings.

The other coloured areas on the maps were explained as follows:

- Orange areas – sites with existing planning permissions
- Dark green areas – public open space areas

A member asked whether the buffer zone prohibited all development, including affordable or social housing.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer replied that it did not prohibit or rule out all development. Criteria applied to shield the area from encroachment from existing development. It was also possible to consider applications for the reuse of existing rural buildings, e.g. barns. Affordable housing at the edge of the village was felt unlikely to meet the criteria.

Ickburgh

The proposal was to delete the settlement boundary in this case on the grounds that the village lay within the protection buffer zone and has no services or facilities.

**Action By**

On the issue of village services, the Ward Member referred to the fact that until recently there was a large factory in operation. While it was currently empty, she hoped that it would start up again in the future. There was also a garage operating in the village.

Mr. Stasiak added that the factory was up for sale and previously provided for significant employment. It was hoped it would return to similar operation. In the meantime, he felt that to remove the existing settlement boundary was not to look forward.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer advised that a reasonable alternative for members to consider was to retain the existing settlement boundary.

Most opportunities for further development within the settlement boundary had already been taken. Further opportunities would be limited due to the buffer zone.

Existing planning policies supported the reuse of the factory for employment purposes.

Mr. Stasiak felt that the removal of the existing boundary meant there would be no hope at all of future development.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer responded that the new LDF policies gave more flexibility than previously and did allow for rural exceptions to be made.

Mr. Stasiak felt that was contrary to advice given previously.

No other representations were made.

**Stanford, Sturston and Tottington**

There were no settlement boundaries in these three areas and no changes were proposed.

No representations were made.

**CONCLUSIONS - CONIFER WARD**

Cranwich – Support no change as recommended (i.e. no settlement boundary).

Didlington - Support no change as recommended (i.e. no settlement boundary).

Hilborough - Support deletion of existing settlement boundary as recommended.

Ickburgh - Proposed to retain the existing settlement boundary as a reasonable alternative, contrary to the recommendation.

Mundford - Support the five amendments (MUN.1 – MUN.5) as recommended.

**Action By**

Stanford - Support no change as recommended (i.e. no settlement boundary).

Sturston - Support no change as recommended (i.e. no settlement boundary).

Tottington - Support no change as recommended (i.e. no settlement boundary).

(b) **Templar Ward**

Carbrooke

Two minor amendments to the existing settlement boundary were proposed in this case.

Mr. Rogers, Ward Member, declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he had submitted an application for land in Carbrooke under the LDF.

Mr. Rogers added his strong concerns to those of Mr. Cowen about the current process for considering settlement boundaries. He considered there was a case to be made for the matter to go to judicial review.

No other representations were made.

Caston

Five minor amendments to the settlement boundary were proposed.

No representations were made and it was noted that none had been received from the Parish Council.

Griston

A correction to the report was made in column 2 on page 18 to read "Existing settlement boundary – *Amend settlement boundary*".

Four minor amendments to the settlement boundary were proposed in this case.

Mr. F. Ulrich, Chairman of Griston Parish Council, stated that the Parish Council was very disappointed at the process of consultation. He said the Parish Council had not had the opportunity to consider the proposals and he was unable to speak as he had a submitted application in the LDF. He stated that the previous representations of the Parish Council had not been taken on board.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer outlined the Parish Council's views previously given in relation to three sites.

**Action By**

Mr. Rogers, Ward Member, referred to land to the south of Thorp House. There were existing submitted planning applications for this land. He felt the applicants would be penalised if this land was taken out of the settlement boundary.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that the existing settlement boundary formed part of the saved Local Plan policies contained within the new Core Strategy. Any existing planning application or applications submitted during this process will be considered. The position would change only if and when the final policy document was found sound and adopted, which was not expected to be until mid or late 2011.

The Chairman of the Task and Finish Group advised those present that they should not lose sight of the fact that this was the first stage of consultation in the process and members had the opportunity to put forward amendments to the proposals.

Mr. Cowen expressed concern at the apparent inconsistency in the approach being taken in the proposals. He was also not clear about whether the maps fully detailed areas with existing planning consents or where applications were under consideration. He felt no decisions could be made without such information.

The Chairman noted the point, stating that they could deal only with information as presented.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that the maps did show all sites with planning permission but it would be unreasonable to show sites that were the subject of an application which had yet to be determined.

Mr. Cowen replied that this excluded currently submitted applications or those applications presently the subject of appeal. He felt these needed to be shown on the plans. Without this, he felt it left the matter open to judicial review.

A member asked if the Chairman of the Parish Council was content with the information presented in respect of Griston. Mr. Ulrich replied no.

It was proposed that the meeting adjourn to enable Mr. Ulrich to consult with his Ward Member.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that it was difficult to take into account planning applications yet to be determined. The maps, however, did reflect those areas where planning applications had been approved and/or implemented.

Attention was drawn to Core Policy CP14 in relation to the scale of sites in the rural areas, which excluded developments of sites for more than 5 dwellings.

It was reiterated that this was a first recommendation to members at this stage.

**Action By**

The Principal Planning Policy Officer added that policy CP14 sets out the broad parameters for settlement boundary reviews, which allowed for sites for up to five dwellings, and which was used to inform the process.

A member referred back to the proposed alignment of the boundary at Thorp House. He felt this would unduly curb future expansion of this care home, bearing in mind the current pressures on such services to meet demand.

In noting the concerns being raised, a member stressed the point that this was a scrutiny process of the recommendations being put forward. It was the first stage only in the process and views should not be too judgemental at this point.

Ovington

The proposal in this case was to remove the existing settlement boundary.

Mr. Rumbsy, Chairman of the Parish Council, asked if this would preclude any development at all in the future.

It was explained that the removal of the settlement boundary would limit the possibility of further open market private housing but it would not rule out normal domestic housing extensions, garages, conservatories, etc.

In answer to a further question, it was confirmed that the removal of the settlement boundary would preclude further new development along the main road.

Mr. Rumbsy also stated that, although the Parish Council had not had time to meet to consider the proposals, he felt they were likely to be acceptable to his members.

With regard to the Crown Green area, Mr. Rumbsy advised that this was an open space and children's play area which he felt should be marked as such on the map.

*The meeting adjourned briefly at this point to enable the Griston Parish Council representative and Ward Member to consult on the proposals for that village.*

Griston (continued)

Mr. Rogers, Ward Member, advised that the Parish Council had concerns about the omission of existing planning application development sites on the map, as it was understood there were some 30 application sites not indicated on the map. Applicants would be concerned that their sites were not being included.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that no proposed additions were being recommended for inclusion and confirmed that there was existing information from the 2008 public consultation.

**Action By**

The Ward Member asked if there would be a further opportunity for parishes not present today to make representations, or whether they would have to wait until the formal public consultation period or make an appeal to the Inspector at the public examination.

It was explained that the key period for representations was the six week public consultation scheduled for April 2010. Paper copies of the proposals would be issued with accompanying forms for replies to be made.

It was reiterated that this meeting was a first stage in the process and that the report and findings from the Task and Finish Group would go forward for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission and thence to the Cabinet for consideration and approval, prior to public consultation.

Parishes and interested parties were urged to ensure they responded to the public consultation in April.

Mr. Rogers stated there were thoughts in parishes to consider applying for judicial review and asked when this could be done.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that he understood cases for judicial review related to the reasonableness of the timing of decisions, which in this case would be the Cabinet decision. It was understood the period for review could range between six weeks and six months.

The amendment under GRI.4 was not supported and it was proposed that the existing boundary in that location be retained as a reasonable alternative.

**CONCLUSIONS – TEMPLAR WARD**

Carbrooke – Support proposed amendments to settlement boundary as recommended.

Caston - Support proposed amendments to settlement boundary as recommended.

Griston - Support proposed amendments to settlement boundary - GRI.1, GRI.2, and GRI.3 – as recommended.

Propose to retain the existing settlement boundary in the case of GRI.4, contrary to the recommendation.

Ovington - Support deletion of existing settlement boundary as recommended.

(c) **Wayland Ward**

Great Hockham

The proposal in this case was to maintain the existing settlement boundary.

**Action By**

Mr. C. Wiltshire for the Parish Council disagreed with the recommendation, explaining that the Parish Council had submitted proposals for six small changes as part of the 2008 consultation process.

In support of the Parish Council's views, he explained that the village had key services and, while the parish did not wish to see any large-scale development, there were some inconsistencies that needed to be addressed. A map indicating the six sites in question was displayed, with the sites thereon marked a – f. Mr. Wiltshire explained the reasons for inclusion of these sites within the settlement boundary as follows:

- Site a – there was an existing planning permission.
- Site b – would enable some small development
- Site c – existing children's centre with planning permission
- Site d – to align the boundary which presently runs across a field
- Site e – would allow small development of 2 or 3 houses
- Site f – would tidy up an existing inconsistency

The Parish Council felt these minor amendments would not change or harm the form and character of the village. Furthermore, there was no infill land existing and the inclusion of one or two sites for small-scale development of 2 or 3 houses would support the village's sustainability.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer advised that the report gave the officers' professional opinion but the Task and Finish Group had asked in other instances for a matter to be reviewed with the Parish Council with a view to seeking a reasonable alternative or compromise recommendation on a site.

So far as the Parish Council's proposals on sites b, c and e were concerned, the Principal Planning Policy Officer maintained the views against their inclusion on the grounds relating to landscape, form and character.

Mr. Wiltshire contended that potential development by one or two houses at the location of sites b and c would have no impact. A question of the boundary with the village primary school was also raised.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer stated that the area beyond the school was marked by a strong natural hedgerow boundary, separating the built environment from the rural character.

The Ward Member spoke in support of small scale development in villages. This village had the facilities it needed and account needed to be had of the needs of young families for the future. He felt the Parish Council's views should be heeded and proposed that the matter be reviewed with the Parish Council.

Other members expressed their support for the views of the Parish Council and the case made to amend the existing settlement boundary. One member made the point that the proximity of the area of future growth along the A11 corridor would have an impact on

**Action By**

future housing need in neighbouring villages such as this and some provision within the settlement boundary for extra housing would be beneficial to the whole area.

Mr. Cowen as Ward Member supported the views of the Parish Council and endorsed the comments made above, in relation to the growth area along the A11 corridor, which would create the need for a balance between employment and housing growth that would be required. Villages such as Great Hockham provided that opportunity and needed to be sustained to meet future needs, by allowing them to grow organically as they had in the past. Unless some amendment as proposed by the Parish Council was allowed for, the future sustainability of the village would be at risk.

Mr. Cowen also made the point that it was for the members as the Local Planning Authority who ultimately had the responsibility to determine decisions as to the form and character of the area. If members believed small development would enhance the form and character of some villages, they should support such proposals.

A motion was carried for the officers to review the matter with the Parish Council.

**Merton**

There was no existing settlement boundary in this case and the report recommended no changes be made.

In response to a question from Mr. Monson, it was pointed out that the extent of the protected Stone Curlew buffer zone covered a significant part of the rural south-western part of the District, as shown on the displayed proposals map.

The Ward Member drew attention to the fact that this village was very close to the Peddars Way, Watton High School and Watton High Street. While he did not feel a settlement boundary could be supported, he felt the Council needed to be mindful that even in such cases as small villages as this, they could still be active and sustainable areas.

The Ward Member also felt that the issue of Stone Curlews needed to be kept in perspective, bearing in mind that they survived quite happily in the army training area. The Chairman added that there was some flexibility about development adjoining the buffer zone.

**Shropham**

There was no existing settlement boundary in this case and the report recommended no changes be made.

The position of the Parish Council as stated in the report was noted.

The Ward Member advised that there had been a number of very well attended parish meetings to discuss growth issues in the village.

**Action By**

The village was located close to Snetterton, the largest employment growth area in the area, and was a vibrant farming area.

The parish was keen to protect the village green area and felt this could best be achieved by limited development around its circumference, thus making it the heart of the village.

The parish felt that it would be very contrary to remove the settlement boundary altogether. The village has the opportunity to recapture some of its lost facilities if some growth was allowed for.

Mr. Napier, as Parish Council representative, supported the views of the Ward Member and confirmed that the parish desired to see some growth.

A member concurred with the strength of village views in the matter. There was strong access to the A11 which gave good reason to provide for some limited development as proposed. He felt there was good potential for the future of the village and would support the proposals of the parish.

Other members supported the case made by the parish on grounds of employment opportunities afforded by its proximity to the A11.

Three options were available:

- a) To delete the settlement boundary as recommended in the report
- b) To propose the retention of the existing settlement boundary as a reasonable alternative
- c) To recommend to Overview and Scrutiny and Cabinet to accept the options put forward by the Parish Council

It was pointed out that the area proposed for development by the Parish Council would allow for more than five dwellings, which was above the limit for small scale development in rural areas provided for in the Core Strategy.

**Stow Bedon**

The recommendation was to delete the existing settlement boundary.

Mr. P. Childs, Parish Council representative, read out a statement of the Parish Council views in support of retaining the existing settlement boundary. A housing survey in the village had demonstrated scope for development in the centre of the village, around Chapel Farm, which would beneficially link the two halves of the village. The loss of the settlement boundary would create a detrimental impact from increased infill development. The housing needs survey also evidenced a need for a small amount of additional housing.

The Ward Member stated that all but one of the areas marked yellow on the maps had been developed.

**Action By**

There was a tendency across the district, and nationally, to take garden land to squeeze housing in to areas, which was inappropriate for rural villages and comprised their form and character.

The Chapel Farm site offered potential for a low density development in keeping with the form and character of the village and it was highlighted that planning permission had been granted and development commenced on the adjoining site.

For these reasons, the Ward Member disagreed with the recommendation in the report in this case. He felt that to keep the settlement boundary would protect the village environment.

The Ward Member added that the green coloured area on the plan was in fact an area of ancient woodland open space and pointed out that the green tufted area marked on the map was not a Special Protected Area.

An alternative recommendation was proposed to retain the existing settlement boundary.

**Thompson**

The proposal recommended three minor amendments to the existing settlement boundary.

The Ward Member spoke in support of the recommended amendments and members endorsed this view.

**Wretham**

The proposal in this case was to delete the existing settlement boundary.

The Ward Member made reference to the existing planning permission for 27 houses on the former MOD site, the dispersed nature of the village and the fact that there were existing brownfield sites. The village was also located near to the Thetford growth area. For these reasons, he felt the removal of the settlement boundary did not raise significant issues for the village.

**CONCLUSIONS – WAYLAND WARD**

**Great Hockham** - Refer back for review with the Parish Council.

**Merton** - Support recommendation of no change to the existing settlement boundary.

**Shropham** - Propose alternative recommendation to accept the amendments put forward by the Parish Council.

**Stow Bedon** - Propose to retain the existing settlement boundary, contrary to the recommendation.

		<u>Action By</u>
	<u>Thompson</u> - Support the amendments to the settlement boundary as recommended.	
	<u>Wretham</u> - Support the recommendation for deletion of the settlement boundary.	
(d)	<b>Weeting Ward</b>	
	<u>Croxton</u>	
	Three amendments were proposed to the existing settlement boundary.	
	Mr. R. King for the Parish Council stated that the Parish Council had not had the opportunity to meet to consider the proposals in this case. He felt that while there was little to say against the recommendation, he foresaw a need in future to tighten the boundaries. He was somewhat confused by the previous discussions above to change recommendations and so was unsure how the proposals in this case should be approached.	
	Mr. King sought clarification on the position relating to the separate part of Croxton adjoining the Thetford town boundary.	
	The Principal Planning Policy Officer reiterated the importance for parishes to respond to the formal public consultation period in April and also explained that, as in other cases, there was an option for the proposals in this case to be discussed with the Parish Council.	
	So far as that part of Croxton lying within that part of the Thetford Area Action Plan (TAAP) area, this would form part of the consultation process of the TAAP in April/May next year and through this Task and Finish Group.	
	In answer to a question from a member, it was explained that there would be an opportunity to look at subsequent changes in circumstances as part of the periodic review of the LDF (anticipated in approximately four years' time).	
	A proposal was made to support the amendments as recommended but additionally to further review the position with the Parish Council.	
	<u>Lynford</u>	
	There was no existing settlement boundary in this case and no changes were proposed.	
	No representations were made.	
	<u>Weeting</u>	
	Three minor amendments were recommended to the existing settlement boundary.	
	Mr. Duigan recorded the fact that he had received representations from the Ward Member in this case.	

**Action By**

Mr. Monson referred to views submitted by the Ward Member in respect of amendment WEE.3. It was felt this employment area should be retained within the settlement boundary, bearing in mind that it could potentially benefit from any future development of a bypass for Brandon.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer advised that the matter of the Brandon bypass / relief road was contained within the LDF being prepared by Forest Heath District Council. As a local planning authority, Breckland was not supporting that document until such time as the issues and funding involved in the dualling of the A11 / Five Ways trunk road had been resolved. It was also important to bear in mind that no prospective route for such a bypass had as yet been defined.

So far as the employment area in WEE.3 was concerned, this remained as a defined employment area. However, due to the fact that it lay within a flood zone area, it was not considered suitable for any further additional development, which instead would be directed to the new protected development area as indicated on the map.

The issue had been discussed with Weeting Parish Council and it was understood the parish would not support further expansion of the existing employment area.

A member drew attention to the need to protect the historic rail station building. Mr. Monson was able to advise that the Friends of Brandon Station had acquired the building from Network Rail and were formulating plans for its restoration with assistance from the Brecks Partnership.

**CONCLUSIONS – WEETING WARD**

Croxton - Support the three amendments to the settlement boundary as recommended.

Additionally to further review the position with the Parish Council.

Lynford - Support recommendation of no change (i.e. no settlement boundary).

Weeting - Support amendments to the settlement boundary as recommended.

**42/09 NEXT MEETING**

The change of next meeting date was confirmed as 19 January 2010, to be held at 9.30 a.m. at the Ecotech Centre, Swaffham.

It was also confirmed that the next meeting would consider the following rural north-western Wards in the District:

- Mid Forest
- Nar Valley

- Launditch
- Hermitage
- Wissey
- Haggard de Toni
- Necton
- Shipdham

A member asked that it be ensured that Ward Members received a copy of the agenda and that information was circulated to parishes as early as possible. He also asked that the maps contain a key to the coloured areas used and, if possible, that A3 maps be produced rather than A4 size as at present.

**Action By**

The meeting closed at 12.30 pm

CHAIRMAN