

---

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Joint Meeting of the**

**CABINET AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK TASK & FINISH GROUP**

**Held on Monday, 26 April 2010 at 10.00 am in  
Watton Sports Centre, The Gallery Bar, Watton**

**PRESENT**

Mr J.W. Nunn (Chairman)	Mr B. Rose
Mr W.H.C. Smith	Mr K. Martin
Mr S. Askew	Mr D.S. Myers
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen
Lady Fisher	Mr P.J. Duigan
Mrs T. Hewett	Mr A.P. Joel
Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris	Mr I.A.C. Monson
Mr A.C. Stasiak	Mr F.J. Sharpe

**In Attendance**

Julie Britton	- Senior Committee Officer
Phil Daines	- Development Services Manager (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
David Spencer	- Principal Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland)
Mark Stokes	- Deputy Chief Executive
Trevor Holden	- Chief Executive
Jamie Smith	- Environmental Planning Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Phil Mileham	- Senior Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Robert Leigh	- Marketing and Communications Manager
Sarah Robertson	- Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Jon Durbin	- Capita Symonds

**Action By**

**38/10 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs A Steward and Mrs L Turner.

**39/10 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

The following declarations were made:

- Mr F. Sharpe – personal and prejudicial interest as a member of Swaffham Town Council in relation to a parcel of land the Town Council had an interest in for proposed retail units which would be situated near to his own unit.
- Mr W. Smith – personal and prejudicial interest in Gt Ellingham as

**Action By**

- he lived in the village and had submitted land for consideration.
- Mr S. Askew – personal and prejudicial interest in Old Buckenham as he lived in the village and had submitted land for consideration.
- Lady K. Fisher – personal interest in relation to land ownership within the stone curlew buffer zone.
- Mr P. Duigan – personal and prejudicial interest as a member of Dereham Town Council that had an interest in land.....
- Mr I. Monson – personal and prejudicial interest as a landowner in Oxborough.
- Mrs T. Hewett – personal and prejudicial interest on land in Shipdham that she had withdrawn from the LDF process.

**40/10 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

None.

**41/10 SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES & PROPOSALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT 2001-2026: PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

The Chairman, William Nunn explained that this document had been put together by Capita Symonds Planning Policy Team which incorporated the findings of the eight meetings of the LDF Task & Finish Group and the views of the Towns and Parish Councils.

The joint meeting sought Members' endorsement for the document to be published for a six week consultation period starting towards the end of May 2010. Following the consultation, the Preferred Options document would then be brought back to Cabinet for formal approval. A final document would be submitted for a further period of public consultation in October 2010, prior to proceeding to Public Examination.

The Chairman felt that the document was very clear and concise. Members were not therefore being asked to go through every map and report page by page as this work had already been completed by the Task & Finish Group.

Members were provided with a presentation highlighting the key points contained in the document (presentation attached).

Officers from the Planning Policy Team were introduced and were in attendance to make their presentations and answer questions.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer provided the meeting with a brief background to the process which covered 108 rural parishes and three market towns. The remaining towns, Attleborough and Thetford would be discussed and addressed through Area Action Plans.

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

A range of reasonable alternative options had been considered for housing and employment and these had been presented in the document

**Action By**

at Appendix A. Officers had advised that there was a reasonable prospect that these allocations could come forward and as a result should be consulted on in the preferred options stage.

The draft Sustainability Appraisal report (Appendix C) which was a large 300+ page document was available for Members to view at the meeting if they so wished.

**1. DEREHAM**

In terms of housing, the preferred allocations for new housing in Dereham comprised three sites all allocated to the east of the town along Norwich Road. This was land at the former Maltings, land off Greenfields Road and land adjacent to Windmill Avenue (reference D1, D2 and D3). The preferred sites for employment development were at Rash's Green and land at Dereham Business Park, adjacent to the Breckland Council building (ref: D4 and D5).

Reference D12 – Georges Road/Nunn's Way to Cowper Road was land that had been identified as an area of search that could accommodate a balance of around 5,000m<sup>2</sup> retail allocation.

Reference D15 – land east of Dereham Town Football Club was identified as open space for a new cemetery.

The preferred options were endorsed as recommended.

Referring to the alternative sites, revised options were presented, the first being at Dumpling Green and the second off Draytonhall Lane, Scarning (site reference D.7R and D.8R). It was agreed that site D.7R should remain as a reasonable alternative option and site D.8R be excluded from the document as it was considered unreasonable particularly in regard to the impact of increased traffic onto the trunk road network at an access point with know safety concerns. The remaining alternative sites on page 26 of the document were being put forward as reasonable alternative options and were agreed as proposed.

**2. SWAFFHAM**

The preferred option for new employment development was for an extension to the existing Ecotech business park to the north of the town referenced at SW.2 and SW.3.

The preferred allocation for new housing in Swaffham comprised one site at reference SW.1 to the south of the town on the Brandon Road which would bring together the existing permitted housing development on the former Redlands Rooftiles site. However, the LDF T&F Group had not endorsed this option and had recommended an alternative approach - to split the allocation of housing. This included a reduced area at Brandon Road and a new allocation to the north of the town on former allotment land off New Sporle Road, located on the map at SW.9. Officers had advised that this alternative was presently undeliverable. Objections had

**Action By**

been received from the Highways Department on this proposal for SW.9. No highways objections had been received for the preferred site SW.1.

The Deputy Leader advised that the proposal should be changed in line with the Officers recommendations. A Member said that he opposed any development near to main trunk roads and if the site was to be split, dwellings should be reduced on the outer edges of the site and a buffer zone should be included.

The Executive Member for the Economic and Commercial Services Portfolio suggested that Members adopt the Officers proposal and delete SW.9 from the document as it was undeliverable.

It was agreed, however, that SW.9 should still remain in the document as a reasonable alternative site.

**3. WATTON**

The Strategy originally required that allocations were made for approximately 300 dwellings. However, this figure had been reduced to 252 to take account of 48 units that had been granted outside the settlement boundary. There was sufficient infrastructure capacity to accommodate the proposed 250 new dwellings.

WAT.1 to WAT.15 proposed changes to Watton's settlement boundary and had all been agreed by the LDF T&F Group. Proposed residential allocation at Watton (sites W1 to W5) had all been agreed by the LDF Task & Finish Group. However a suggestion had been made to present W1 and W6 as a larger preferred option site to facilitate the future expansion and enhancement of Wayland High School.

It was agreed that W1 and W6 be amalgamated as mentioned above and that this be presented as an amended preferred option for 11 dwellings and six acres for the High School.

**4. HARLING**

Page 99 of Appendix A highlighted the preferred sites for Harling and page 103 highlighted the alternative sites. All of the alternative sites had been agreed by the LDF T&F Group.

The Executive Member for the Communities and Benefits Portfolio pointed out that the option of smaller pockets of development should be considered in villages rather than larger ones. She felt that the alternative sites were smaller and would therefore sit more comfortably in such surroundings.

The Chairman of the Cabinet highlighted an interesting development that was being suggested in the Conservative Manifesto; the public would be able to choose where they thought dwellings should be situated in their villages.

**Action By**

As well as HAR.1, it was agreed that a new site at reference HAR.2 on the West Harling Road should be included as an additional amendment (see Appendix F).

The Executive Member for the Environmental Well-Being and Customer Contact Portfolio who was also one of the Ward Members for Harling said that the Parish Council had been very keen for this piece of land (HAR.2) to be included as an additional amendment to the boundary. She highlighted the fact that the site was not a disused pit as mentioned in the report and further highlighted that the trees that were subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) should not affect any future development of the site.

The Development Services Manager reminded Members that the planning application on this particular site had been refused on the grounds that it was outside the settlement boundary. As far as the latter was concerned, the TPO would have to be considered as part of the Development Control process.

**5. NARBOROUGH**

The preferred residential development site at land west of Chalk Lane (reference NAR.1) was agreed as proposed. The revised settlement boundary was also agreed which included an area of floodplain to the rear of the Maltings and the Surgery from the settlement boundary – to limit opportunities for development that would be at high risk of flooding (see Appendix B).

Sites NAR.2, land off Meadow Lane and NAR.3, land to the south of Swaffham Road which were alternative sites for residential allocation were also agreed.

**6. SHIPDHAM**

Preferred sites for residential were being considered at reference: SH.1, SH.2 and SH.3 – 50 dwellings were allocated for SH.1, 30 dwellings for SH.2 and 20 for SH.3. However, the LDF T&F Group had requested that further consideration be given for SH.2 to be retained as open space and should not be developed.

Reasonable alternative sites for development at site reference SH.4 to SH.13 had also been endorsed by the LDF T&F Group.

A Member had always advocated that Shipdham would eventually expand but felt it to be very important that the green space at reference SH.2 should be retained in the centre of the village. He questioned the decision to build on this site which would only leave 576 sqm of children's play space on site.

The Executive Member for the Communities and Benefits Portfolio also felt that this green space was crucial for the village. She also questioned the linear of the proposed changes to Shipdham Settlement Boundary which in her opinion stretched out too far.

**Action By**

The Executive Member for the Communities and Benefits Portfolio highlighted the recent permissions that had been granted and asked if the overall allocation should be decreased as mentioned for Harling. In response, Members were informed that Shipdham was different as all the development would be within the settlement boundary.

There was some discussion about the restrictive covenant on SH.2. Members were informed that this would be picked up in the consultation.

The aforementioned sites were agreed as proposed.

**7. SWANTON MORLEY**

Site reference SM.4 – land at Rectory Road, was agreed as the preferred site for 50 dwellings and the remainder from SM.1 to SM.7 were agreed as alternative sites.

Members' attention was drawn to the revised settlement boundary maps at Appendix F of the document.

**A. BEESTON**

The Officer recommendation to the LDF T&F Group on the 19<sup>th</sup> January 2010 was for Beeston's settlement boundary to be amended. The proposal included eight amendments.

BEE.1, BEE.2, BEE.3 and BEE.6 had been endorsed. BEE.4, BEE.5, BEE.7 and BEE.8 were not fully endorsed by the Group.

It was agreed to exclude the whole Public House site (BEE.4) from the settlement boundary as a reasonable alternative to the recommendation and to include additional land extending to Back Lane from the rear of the Old Post Office site (BEE.5) as a further reasonable alternative option.

It was further agreed to keep the boundary as it was at BEE.7 and BEE.8.

**B. CROXTON**

It was agreed that the settlement boundary from around 'Loudain' on The Street at site reference CRO.4 be removed.

It was agreed to tighten the settlement boundary to the back of properties of 41-44 The Street – site reference CRO.5.

It was agreed to tighten the settlement boundary to the back of the properties between 99 The Street and Ty Cae Cottage – site reference CRO.6.

It was agreed to tighten the settlement boundary to the back of 7 Church Avenue - site reference CRO.7.

**Action By**

The remaining three amendments - CRO.1 to CRO.3 were also agreed for consultation to ensure the settlement boundary followed logical features on the ground.

**C. EAST TUDDENHAM**

It was agreed to amend the settlement boundary at site reference ET.1 to land north and west of property, The Green, which was situated north of The Street resulting in the removal of this part of the settlement boundary.

It was agreed to remove properties 32 and 33 Mattishall Road from the settlement boundary north of Mattishall Road, site reference ET.2, to provide consistency with the removal of ET.1 to protect the form and character of this part of the settlement.

It was agreed to redraw the settlement boundary on land to the north of property 'The Beeches' on the east side of Common Road at site reference ET.3, to limit the potential of over development of this site which could cause harm to the character of this part of East Tuddenham village.

**D. GARVESTONE**

Site reference GV.2 – it was agreed to remove land to the rear of 'Greenways', 'Sunnydene' and 'Accra' on the Dereham Road to limit opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference GV.3 – it was agreed to re-draw the boundary to exclude the undeveloped frontage to Street Farm, Dereham Road to limit the opportunities for infill development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference GV.4 – it was agreed to re-draw the boundary to exclude land to the rear of 'Bardon', Dereham Road to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference GV.5 – it was agreed to re-draw the boundary to remove land at Manor Farm, Town Lane to limit opportunities for infill development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference GV.6 – it was agreed to amend the boundary at Greenfield, Town Lane to reflect the planning permission granted and regularise the boundary.

Site reference GV.7 – it was agreed to amend the boundary to exclude rear gardens of properties to the east of Town Lane to limit opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

**E. GOODERSTONE**

**Action By**

Gooderstone lied completely within the 1,500m of Special Protection Area (SPA) supporting or capable of supporting Stone Curlew (the orange diagonal hatching on the map on page 228 of the document depicted the stone curlew buffer zone). The green areas on the map highlighted the protected European habitat sites.

Site reference GOOD.9 and GOOD.10 – it was agreed that the land adjacent to ‘Ivy Nook’ and the settlement boundary at Church Farm be amended to reflect the full extent of recent planning permissions.

The Executive Member for the Communities and Benefits Portfolio felt that some of the settlement boundary lines were extremely close to dwellings and asked if this would in any way restrict the residents from extending their homes.

Ian Monson, Ward Member for Gooderstone pointed out that the Parish Council would have liked to see a less restrictive boundary that would allow for further growth. He was glad that this document had got further to run and hoped that the disparity would be brought out in the public consultation and would go some way to meet the Parish Council’s proposals.

**F. GREAT HOCKHAM**

Site reference GTH.1 – it was agreed that the boundary to include ‘Springfield’, off School Square be re-drawn to reflect development and features on the ground.

Site reference GTH.2 – it was agreed that the boundary to include additional garden land at ‘St. Christopher’, be re-drawn to allow for a smaller scale site which could provide for additional infill development.

It was noted that the Parish Council had considered other options but only the aforementioned two above had been agreed.

**G. HARLING**

See 4. above.

**H. SAHAM TONEY**

Site reference ST.5 – agreed to include the amended settlement boundary for consultation.

**I. YAXHAM**

Following a meeting with representatives of the Parish Council, further recommendations for the boundary to be tightened had been put forward. Members endorsed the three original amendments along with the following:

Site reference YA.4 – it was agreed to exclude the land at Station Road from the settlement boundary to limit the opportunities for

**Action By**

further infill development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference YA.5 – it was agreed to remove the land to the rear of properties along ‘Pinebanks’ from the settlement boundary to limit opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference (YA.6) – it was agreed to re-draw the boundary to exclude the rear garden of the property to the south of Norwich Road to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference (YA.7) – it was agreed to re-draw the boundary to exclude the rear garden land of properties at Church Lane to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

Site reference (YA.8) – it was agreed to re-draw the boundary to exclude ‘The Elms’, Norwich Road to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village.

**J. SHROPHAM**

A number of suggested changes had been made by the Parish Council to include the land surrounding sites 4 and 7 in the consultation.

Ian Monson stated that the residents of Shropham seemed extremely enthusiastic about these changes particularly in regard to being close to the A11 corridor.

It was agreed that the land surrounding the ‘Green’ at site reference 086(004) and 086(007) be included in the consultation.

At the conclusion of the meeting a Member stated that it was vital that Breckland Council did everything in its power to raise awareness that this consultation was taking place.

The Chairman agreed with the aforementioned statement and said that local people must be made aware of the details that affected their communities - and that they had their say. It was about the public taking ownership and stating where they wanted and did not want development to take place as the shape of some villages and towns would be changed. It was also important for the Ward Members to call meetings in their parishes to inform their communities of any potential impact.

Members were assured that notices would go out in the local press.

The Executive Member for the Communities and Benefits Portfolio pointed out that her land was still included in the document on page 148 and would like it removed.

**Action By**

Almost half the villages in Breckland would have their settlement boundaries removed and it was asked whether this would be part of the consultation. Members were informed that it would.

**OPTIONS**

There were essentially two options presented in respect of the report.

- A) To consider the contents of the report and agree it, subject to any changes, for consultation for a period of six weeks commencing as soon as practicable after this meeting.
- B) Not to agree the document for consultation.

Officers recommend that option A above be endorsed. Members were also advised that Option B presented considerable risks to the Council as failure to make expedient progress with Site-Specific Allocations could result in the location of housing being determined through early applications for development.

**REASONS**

The recommendation to endorse Option A was to ensure the Site Specific Policies and Proposals document was presented for public consultation in accordance with the Council's adopted Local Development Scheme timetable.

Delivering this document was important in making timely progress towards securing a five year supply of housing land in the District in accordance with Government guidance contained in PPS3. This would help to ensure development in the District was managed through the Development Plan process.

**RESOLVED** that Option A of the report be endorsed and the Preferred Options document be published for a six week consultation period starting in May, subject to the following amendments:

- 1) Dereham – land at Dumpling Green – site reference D.7R – to remain as a reasonable alternative option;
- 2) Dereham – land west of Drayton Hall Lane, Scarning - site reference D.8R - to be excluded from the document as has been classified as an unreasonable site;
- 3) Beeston - site reference BEE.4 – to exclude the whole Public House site from the Settlement Boundary (see Appendix F) as a reasonable alternative;
- 4) Beeston - site reference BEE.5 – to include additional land extending to Back Lane from the rear of the Old Post Office site as a reasonable alternative;
- 5) Croxton - site reference CRO.4 – to remove the settlement

**Phil  
Mileham,  
David  
Spencer**

**Action By**

- boundary from around Loudoun on The Street to prevent infill which could harm the form and character of the village;
- 6) Croxton - site reference CRO.5 – to tighten the settlement boundary to the back of properties 41-44 The Street to prevent infill which could harm the form and character of the village;
  - 7) Croxton - site reference CRO.6 – to tighten the settlement boundary to the back of properties between 99 The Street and Ty Cae Cottage to prevent infill which could harm the form and character of the village;
  - 8) Croxton - site reference CRO.7 – to tighten the settlement boundary to the back of 7 Church Avenue to prevent infill which could harm the form and character of the village;
  - 9) East Tuddenham - site reference ET.1 – to amend the settlement boundary to land north and west of property, The Green, which is situated north of The Street resulting in the removal of this part of the settlement boundary;
  - 10) East Tuddenham - site reference ET.2 – to remove properties 32 and 33 Mattishall Road from the settlement boundary north of Mattishall Road to provide consistency with the removal of ET.1 to protect the form and character of this part of the settlement;
  - 11) East Tuddenham - site reference ET.3 - to redraw the settlement boundary on land to the north of property 'The Beeches' on the east side of Common Road to limit the potential of over development of this site which could cause harm to the character of this part of East Tuddenham village;
  - 12) Garvestone - site reference GV.1 – to exclude garden land at Reymerton Lane to limit opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 13) Garvestone - site reference GV.2 – to remove land to the rear of 'Greenways', 'Sunnydene' and 'Accra' on the Dereham Road to limit opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 14) Garvestone - site reference GV.3 – to re-draw the boundary to exclude the undeveloped frontage to Street Farm, Dereham Road to limit the opportunities for infill development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 15) Garvestone - site reference GV.4 – to re-draw the boundary to exclude land to the rear of 'Bardon', Dereham Road to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 16) Garvestone - site reference GV.5 – to re-draw the boundary to

**Action By**

- remove land at Manor Farm, Town Lane to limit opportunities for infill development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
- 17) Garvestone - site reference GV.6 – to amend the boundary at Greenfield, Town Lane to reflect the planning permission granted and regularise the boundary;
  - 18) Garvestone - site reference GV.7– to amend the boundary to exclude rear gardens of properties to the east of Town Lane to limit opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 19) Gooderstone - site reference GOOD.10 – the settlement boundary at Church Farm be amended to reflect the full extent of recent planning permissions;
  - 20) Gooderstone - site reference GOOD.9– that the settlement boundary at ‘Ivy Nook’ be amended to reflect the full extent of recent planning permissions;
  - 21) Great Hockham - site reference GTH.1 – to re-draw the settlement boundary to include ‘Springfield’, off School Square to reflect development and features on the ground;
  - 22) Great Hockham - site reference GTH.2 – to re-draw the settlement boundary to include additional garden land at ‘St Christopher’, Harling Road to allow for a small scale site which could provide for additional infill development;
  - 23) Harling - site reference HAR.2 – the settlement boundary be amended to include HAR.2 as recommended by the LDF Task & Finish Group;
  - 24) Saham Toney - site reference ST.5 – the existing settlement boundary be amended as recommended by the LDF Task & Finish Group;
  - 25) Yaxham - site reference YA.4 – to exclude the land at Station Road from the settlement boundary to limit the opportunities for further infill development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 26) Yaxham - site reference YA.5– to remove the land to the rear of properties along ‘Pinebanks’ from the settlement boundary to limit opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 27) Yaxham - site reference (YA.6) – to re-draw the boundary to exclude the rear garden of the property to the south of Norwich Road to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
  - 28) Yaxham - site reference (YA.7) – to re-draw the boundary to

**Action By**

exclude the rear garden land of properties at Church Lane to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;

- 29) Yaxham - site reference (YA.8) – to re-draw the boundary to exclude 'The Elms', Norwich Road to limit the opportunities for backland development that could harm the form and character of this part of the village;
- 30) Shropham – to include the land surrounding the 'Green' at sites 4 and 7 in the consultation.

The meeting closed at 11.45 am

CHAIRMAN