

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 5 November 2007 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Councillor E. Gould (Chairman)	Mr R. Kemp
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris
Councillor Claire Bowes	Mr J.P. Labouchere
Mr A.J. Byrne	Mr T.J. Lamb
Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen	Mr B. Rose
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr P.S. Francis	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr M. Fanthorpe	Mr M. Spencer
Mrs S.R. Howard-Alpe	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Vice-Chairman)

Also Present

Mr S. Askew	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mrs A.L. Steward
Mrs S.M. Matthews	

In Attendance

Mike Brennan	- Principal Development Control Officer
Heather Burlingham	- Assistant Development Control Officer
John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Lisa Cutbush	- Assistant Development Control Officer
Phil Daines	- Development Services Manager
Andrew Gayton	- Historic Buildings Officer
Andrew Grimley	- Principal Environmental Health Officer
Ray Johnson	- Acting Operations Manager (Commercial Services)
Andrea Long	- Environmental Planning Manager
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Julie Britton	- Committee Services Officer
Darryl Smith	- Principal Housing Officer (Strategy and Enabling)

171/07 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2007 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to it being noted that Councillor Duffield had spoken on Schedule item 11 on behalf of the Parish Council and not as the Ward Representative.

Following a query by a Member at the recent full Council meeting, the Solicitor informed the Committee that the Watton application that had been part of the Schedule of Applications had not been included in the Development Control Committee Minutes as it had been approved as per the Officers recommendation.

172/07 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Action By

Action By

An apology for absence was received by Mrs D Irving.

173/07 DECLARATION OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

Members and Officers were asked to declare any interests as appropriate at the time the applications were made.

Mrs C Bowes declared a personal interest in Agenda item 9 (Shipdham) as she was a friend of one of the directors.

Mrs A Steward declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 11 of the Schedule of Applications (Hilborough) and left the room whilst this item was being discussed.

Mrs C Bowes declared a personal interest in item 6 of the Schedule of Applications (Dereham) for the reason that she was an employee of Norfolk County Council's Cultural Services.

Mr A Byrne declared a personal interest in item 6 of the Schedule of Applications (Dereham) in his capacity as a County Councillor.

174/07 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

The Chairman advised the meeting of the procedures for public speaking.

175/07 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

The Development Services Manager announced that item 3 of the Schedule of Applications (Attleborough) had been deferred and would come forward to the next meeting.

Item 9 of the Schedule of Applications was deferred at the request of a Ward Member to enable a further representation to be submitted from Quidenham Parish Council.

176/07 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDARD ITEM) (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Environmental Planning Manager provided Members with an update on the Local Development Framework.

The Committee was informed that the Policy Development and Review Panel 1 meeting being held on 8th November 2007 would be looking at issues concerning the Core Strategy document and the Development Control Policies. Due to the size and complexity of the documents, the meeting was expected to last all day following which both reports would be presented to the Cabinet Members on the 20th November with the comments of the Panel meeting for consideration. Members of the Development Control Committee were invited to attend.

The Committee was informed of a number of evening meetings that Ward Members might wish to attend:

Action By

- Mattishall Parish Council – 5 November 2007
- Shipdham Parish Council – 12 November 2007
- Thompson Parish Council – 15 November 2007.

Further to the above, Members were also invited to attend the Breckland Council Town/Parish Open evening being held on 3rd December at the Assembly Rooms in Swaffham and the Business Rate Payers meeting on the 10th December at Elizabeth House. The Environmental Planning Team would be in attendance to discuss any LDF issues that the public might have.

177/07 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)

It was noted that application reference no. 3PL/2007/1319/F – Castle Meadow, Thetford had been withdrawn.

- (a) East Tuddenham: Change of Use and Conversion of Redundant Agricultural Buildings to Provide Two Units of Accommodation for Holiday Letting: Reference 3PL/2006/0812/F (Agenda item 8a)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report that had previously been deferred from the Development Control Committee meeting held on 15 October 2007 (Minute Nos. 162/07 and 164/07 refers).

Members were informed that planning permission had been granted for the change of use of redundant agricultural buildings to holiday accommodation on 7th December 2006. The Committee had approved the application subject to conditions which required, inter alia, the provision of three passing bays.

Since that time the applicant had been working with the Highway Authority to fulfil the requirement and the location of two passing bays had been agreed. However, the third bay could not be provided due to the landowners of these identified sites declining to allow the work to take place.

Four letters of representation had been received; one in support of two passing bays and another letter objecting to all. The remaining two letters, one being from the Parish Council, were both in favour of three passing bays.

Mr Claussen, the Ward Representative, was in attendance for this item.

He informed the Committee that Mr Bell, the applicant, had been the instigator behind the offer of installing three passing bays which residents, at that particular time, and the Parish Council had been in favour of. However, since then objections had been received from local residents, not only towards the installation of the passing bays but also towards any form of business being carried out in Rotten Row. Mr Claussen advised that residents had now requested that the rudimentary/unofficial passing places should remain. As far as the Parish Council was concerned, Members were informed that it was still in favour of the installation of three passing bays.

Action By

The Committee felt that a compromise had been reached, and it was

RESOLVED that the provision of two passing bays instead of three as stated in the condition be accepted.

178/07 SHIPDHAM: LAND OFF CHURCH CLOSE:RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR ABEL HOMES LTD: REFERENCE 3PL/2007/1234/F

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report which concerned a planning application for 43 dwellings on land off Church Close in the village of Shipdham. Subject to the resolution of outstanding issues relating to trees, ecology, drainage and access, it had been recommended that the application be approved.

The greenfield site comprised of an irregularly shaped parcel of undeveloped land which extended to approximately 2.2 hectares and was within the Settlement Boundary and within the Shipdham Conservation area.

Policy HOU.4 only permitted small scale developments in villages such as Shipdham; however, as this policy dated back to 1999, it was considered that greater weight should be given to more recent national policy, as set in PPS3, with its emphasis on the need to accommodate new housing in appropriate locations within existing settlements. It was also relevant to note, that Shipdham had, during the course of the preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), been identified as a potential local service centre and therefore as being suitable for further development.

It was considered that much thought had gone into the layout of the proposed development and had overcome any potential problems of overlooking. Further to this, the designs of the houses proposed would fit in with the surroundings.

Saved Local Plan Policy REC.2 required housing developments of this sort to include public open space to meet the recreational needs of future residents. However, the applicant had offered a commuted sum of £50,000 to develop the existing nearby playing field. The Parish Council, whilst maintaining its objections to the whole scheme, had expressed that this commuted sum would be welcomed to improve existing facilities.

A number of concerns had been raised with regard to flooding on the site; admittedly, part of the site was quite soggy; however, the Environment Agency was now satisfied and had withdrawn its objections as a full Flood Risk Assessment had since been submitted by the applicant in support of the application.

The proposed development had given rise to considerable local concern about highway safety. Objections had been raised by the Parish Council, and local residents, although the Highway Authority was content with the application. Mill Road was not considered to be suitable to cater for any significant increase in traffic; therefore,

Action By

vehicular access to the development had been proposed off Church Close/High Street (A1075), with access to Mill Road being limited to a footway/cycleway link. The new access road onto the A1075 had been designed to the Highway Authority's requirements. Whilst visibility towards the Church Close bend was limited, the achievable splay was considered to be adequate by the County Council given the speed of the traffic. The development would provide a useful pedestrian link between the High Street and Mill Road, avoiding Church Close where there were no footways, but this benefit had been, to some extent compromised by the difficulties associated with crossing the A1075, particularly for parents and children looking for a safe route to the local school. Some form of traffic restraint measures on the A1075 or a formal crossing could perhaps help to address local concerns, but no such measures were currently proposed by the applicant or required by the Highway Authority. Members were asked to recall the previous efforts to secure agreement on traffic restraint measures on the A1075 in connection with a proposed housing development on Mill Road had been unsuccessful. As far as Mill Road was concerned, a short section of new footway was proposed to link with existing paths and further improvements to pedestrian facilities on Mill Road were currently under discussion. This would be a good opportunity for Members to resolve these detailed aspects.

Mr Tindale, an objector to the application, spoke on behalf of the residents of Fen Folgate in Shipdham. He was concerned about the privacy and security of the residents and asked that further screening/fencing be installed before any construction commenced on the site. He also had concerns with regard to the amount of mature trees that would remain on the proposed development. Mr Tindale felt that future residents might feel obliged to reduce the height of the trees to let more light into their properties. Other concerns he put forward related to flooding, noise and the traffic report that had been submitted by the applicant. Mr Tindale informed the Committee that the traffic report had been carried out three years ago and suggested that an updated report should be submitted.

Mr Hill, for the Parish Council was concerned about future development in the village and felt that the 100 dwellings that Shipdham had to accommodate by the year 2020 would be far exceeded if all these developments went ahead. He also had concerns with flooding particularly when the other development on the Mill Road site had been completed. He urged the Committee, if Members were mindful to approve the application, to request that the roads be constructed before the dwellings and that the site and roadways leading to the site be kept clean.

Mr Futter, the Applicant's Agent, put his views forward and stated that this application had taken 7½ years of hard work to end up with this comprehensive scheme. He assured Members that Abel Homes was a considerate contractor and would be very happy to limit the hours of operation. The overall density proposed would, at around 20 dwellings per hectare, be well below the target set by Government; much less than could be achieved by other developers. In terms of the flooding issues, Mr Futter advised that the scheme had been fully endorsed by the Environment Agency and Anglia Water. The dry swale that would be installed adjacent to the site boundary would be

Action By

to the benefit of the residents of Fen Folgate. As far as highway issues were concerned, Members were informed that Abel Homes was aware of the residents concerns and had offered to install a pedestrian crossing. The site was also subject to a full archaeological dig and further investigations were being carried out.

Mr Jordan, a neighbouring Ward Member, acting on behalf the Ward Representative, felt that there were many issues surrounding the site and urged the Committee to visit the site before any decision was made.

A Member asked whether the site used to form the curtilage of Shipdham Place and whether Shipdham Place was listed. He had concerns that this development would affect the historic landscape and suggested that the Historic Buildings Officer should have stated his opinion. In response, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that Shipdham Place was listed and the large mound containing the former ice house used to form the original curtilage but had since been sub-divided. Members were provided with photographs which illustrated how general reasonable distances had been maintained on the site and how it was well screened and quite secluded from Shipdham Place.

Another Member pointed out that it would be difficult to prevent Shipdham from further development as it had been recognised as a Service Centre village. From a personal point of view, he stated that he would rather see development inside the Settlement Boundary rather than adjacent to it and agreed that the recommendation was broadly acceptable.

A Member felt that the applicant had put a great deal of thought into this application, but to satisfy Members' concerns, he recommended that the application be deferred for a site visit.

Accordingly, it was

RESOLVED that the application be deferred for a site visit.

**179/07 THETFORD: ABBEY FARM BARN, MONKSGATE:
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR H G DEVELOPMENTS:
REFERENCES 3PL/2007/1054/F AND 3PL/2007/1055/LB**

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) presented the report which concerned proposals for a development of 26 dwellings at Abbey Farm Barns in Thetford. It was recommended that planning permission be granted.

The site included a range of former farm buildings, which enclosed a central courtyard. Two of the buildings were Grade 1 listed buildings and part of the site was a Scheduled Ancient Monument. The site was currently unused, and was last used as a depot owned by Breckland Council.

A Committee site visit had taken place on 3rd October 2007.

The development would consist of 15 new-build dwellings with a

Action By

further 11 units created by converting existing buildings. The land around the buildings would be laid out for parking and landscaped amenity areas. Vehicular access to the development was proposed via two existing entrances off Monksgate.

The site in more detail was shown and the buildings to be retained had been shaded for ease of identification.

Most crucially, the conversion of the listed buildings had resulted in quite lengthy discussions between English Heritage and the Council's Historic Buildings Officer.

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) felt that the architects involved should be praised for their sensitive approach towards the existing cottages and the new build. The windows and doors of the cottages would be replaced with like for like or repaired to a very high standard. The gardens would not be sub-divided and would be left as open lawned areas.

The Committee was made aware that the Council had received a great deal of representations from local residents. Letters of objection had been received raising concerns about the effect of the development on the historic interest of the site, increased traffic, the scale of the development, loss of amenity and drainage problems. At the time of writing the report, in excess of 60 letters had been received.

In response to these concerns, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that the Highway Authority had raised no objections to the proposal as it was felt that the surrounding network was adequate; therefore, it would be very difficult to substantiate any objections on highway grounds.

Particular attention had been paid to alleviate any possible overlooking problems. Where existing buildings were located hard up against the western side boundary, no window openings were proposed in the elevations facing adjacent dwellings.

In terms of drainage, Anglian Water had confirmed that there was capacity in existing sewers to deal with additional flows from the development proposed.

Members were informed that the scale of the proposed development was such that an element of affordable housing and financial contributions towards local services/facilities would normally be required under current policy. However, the applicant had indicated that a requirement of this sort would threaten the financial viability of the project. It had been suggested that development costs would be high because of existing buildings, the extent of the conservation work required and the standard of design/materials required. The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that the applicant had provided a detailed breakdown of anticipated costs and returns and the evidence had shown that there was very little margin in the development, almost to the point of no profit at all. The figures could be independently verified by the District Valuer if Members so wished.

Action By

It had been suggested by a number of local residents and heritage bodies that it would be more appropriate for the Abbey Farm Barns complex to be re-used as a visitor centre for the nearby Priory than redeveloped for housing. Proposals had been considered by English Heritage several years ago, but had been subsequently abandoned on grounds of economic viability. In the circumstances, it was considered that there was little prospect of the long term future of the Abbey Farm Barns complex being secured by proposals for a visitor centre or other similar use. This proposal however, would preserve the heritage asset the site presented.

The Committee was made aware of one technicality to the application. The separate listed building application referred only to the two listed buildings, and did not include the barn, which could be said to be listed by virtue of being within the curtilage of the other listed buildings. A new separate listed building application would therefore be required for this barn. However, all the necessary information about the proposed works had been included in the planning application.

The Committee was also reminded that if Members were mindful to approve the application, it would be necessary to refer the proposal to the Secretary of State before a decision could be issued.

Mrs Godfrey, an objector to the application, spoke on behalf of local residents who were very concerned with such a high development. The residents were also concerned with losing a valuable asset that would most likely to have brought money into the town. Mrs Godfrey felt that if the development was to be approved, a new application should be submitted with fewer but larger dwellings. She also had concerns with the increase in traffic and the strains on the main sewer.

Mr Wilson, a further objector, was in attendance to speak on this item and had previously circulated a presentation to Members on behalf of the Resident's Group from Monksgate, Abbeygate and Priory Park. The presentation covered density, design and traffic issues as well as concerns with the listed building element.

Mr Sunter, the Applicant's Agent, explained in great detail the historic fabric of the buildings and what had survived and had changed on the site over the years. Members were informed that the high costs of the conservation work would be funded by the development.

A Member agreed that the architects had made a very good effort by proposing to put respectable/reasonable dwellings on the site but felt that there were some details that needed changing particularly with the listed building that was being retained.

The Historic Buildings Officer pointed out that the vast majority of the openings to the listed buildings were being re-used and that the architect might have approached it in a different way if no openings had been present. He explained that he had had an on-going dialogue with various bodies which had instigated much input into this important site. He felt that it was important that the beams be retained in the adapted re-use of these buildings.

Action By

A Member asked about the affordability point of view. In response, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that under current policy the development would require eight affordable dwellings. However, due to the cost of the development if eight affordable units were incorporated the profit margin would be halved. Further to this, the applicant had not put aside any monies for unforeseen matters that might occur during the construction/adaptation phase.

Mr Lamb, the Ward Member, was concerned that if this application was to be approved it would be a desecration of a very fortunate survival of Thetford's past, and to restore the buildings to its former state would be a great inheritance opportunity. The cost to convert these buildings into a visitors centre, in his opinion, would cost much less and he felt that the attitude of English Heritage was very debateable. He hoped that his plea had not fallen on 'deaf ears' and urged Members to consider the potential that these buildings could provide for Thetford; the site was crying out to be cared for and it would be this Council's last chance to save this important site. Mr Lamb was dismayed with English Heritage's attitude of pronouncing that the site was not viable and pointed out that there was a greater opportunity for these buildings rather than housing.

The Historic Buildings Officer, in English Heritage's defence, said that English Heritage had to have regard to finances first. He explained that two buildings within the application site, Abbey Farm Cottages and Abbey Farm Barn, incorporated significant remains of medieval structures that would be retained. However, over the years these buildings had been clad with brick and flint walls when the site had been developed as a manor farm. The Historic Buildings Officer added that, the buildings had evolved over several centuries, and that the internationally renowned architects had strived to conserve the historic fabric of these buildings. To restore them to their original form would be nonsensical.

Mr Stasiak, the former Commercial Services Executive Member, explained the background to the Council's decision to sell the Abbey Farm Barns site.

He could not emphasise enough that, the Council, at the time the decision had been made to sell the Abbey Farm Barns site, had offered the buildings to English Heritage for £1. English Heritage refused the offer as it had considered that the site was not viable as a visitor centre. Breckland Council then put the site on the open market where it was auctioned, following which the Council put every single penny from the sale back into the Abbey Community Centre in Thetford.

A Member said that it was a shame that Thetford Town Council had not grasped the opportunity from Breckland Council to buy the site when it had been refused by English Heritage for such a minuscule amount.

Mr Lamb pointed out that English Heritage had, at that time, asked for a financial contribution from Breckland Council to assist with the

Action By

conversion to a visitors centre. Breckland Council had turned the offer down. He also pointed out that not all of the monies from the sale of the site had been re-invested into Thetford.

A Member said, "What was English Heritage for if not to give advice on English heritage." English Heritage and Breckland Council support this application and from the expert advice that had been sought, Members should support it to.

Another Member had been disappointed when he had visited the site. He felt that the buildings had been left to deteriorate over 500 years and that this proposal was the only way forward to preserve what little remained.

The Development Services Manager explained that the alternative uses for the site had been exhaustively examined over the years. He reminded Members that the application, if approved, would be subject to the Secretary of State's final decision. The Committee was further reminded that the figures for the costs of the works, if Members so wished, could be independently verified by the District Valuer.

The Solicitor quoted the wording of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Concluding the debate, the Committee was asked to vote separately on the planning permission and the listed building consent, and it was

RESOLVED, subject to the costings being verified by the District Valuer, and the applications being referred to the Secretary of State for a final decision, that

- 1) Planning permission be granted for application reference 3PL/2007/1054/F subject to conditions; and
- 2) Listed Building Consent be granted for application reference 3PL/2007/1055/L subject to conditions.

180/07 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 11)

- a) Item 1: 3PL/2007/1054/F: Thetford: Abbey Barns, Monksgate: Change of use from highway depot to residential use creating 26 units, with external works for H G Developments

This item was considered in conjunction with Agenda item 10 – see Minute no. 178/07 above.

- b) Item 2: 3PL/2007/1055/LB: Thetford: Abbey Barns, Monksgate: Conversion of listed buildings on former highways depot to five no. residential units (alteration only) for H G Developments

This item was considered in conjunction with Agenda item 10 – see Minute no. 178/07 above.

- c) Item 3: 3PL/2007/1095/F: Attleborough: Heisker, West Carr Road: Residential development of nine dwellings including demolition of existing dwelling and garage for Bennett Plc

Action By

This item had been deferred (see Minute no. 175/07 above).

- d) Item 4: 3PL/2007/1234/F: Shipdham: Land off Church Close: Residential development, erection of 42 dwellings, garages, access road and ancillary works for Abel Homes Ltd

This item was considered in conjunction with Agenda item 10 (see Minute no. 178/07 above).

- e) Item 6: 3PL/2007/1354/F: Dereham: former Dereham Library, Church Street: Demolition of former library and erection of ten dwellings for Norfolk County Council

Refused, contrary to the recommendation, on design grounds. Members were of the opinion that the building fronting onto Church Street should reflect the adjacent Georgian buildings and its urban setting.

Note: Mrs C Bowes declared a personal interest in this item as she was an employee of Norfolk County Council's Cultural Services. Mr A Byrne declared a personal interest in this item in his capacity as a Norfolk County Councillor.

- f) Item 8: 3PL/2007/1417/F: Attleborough: Bunns Bank Industrial Estate: Erection of two blocks of industrial units (revisions to planning permission ref. no. 3PL/2007/0687/F) for Mr C Mannion

Approved, as recommended, subject to the commuted sum for a pedestrian/cycle link not being paid to Norfolk County Council.

- g) Item 9: 3PL/2007/1419/F: Snetterton: Snetterton Circuit: Construction of a spectator viewing area (part retrospective) for Diacra Industries Ltd

Deferred, contrary to the recommendation (see Minute No. 175/07 above).

- h) Item 10: 3PL/2007/1482/F: Yaxham: Land adjacent to Down Ampney, Well Hill: Proposed dwelling and garage for Mr & Mrs C Smith

Refused, contrary to the recommendation. Members felt that a further dwelling in this area would constitute overdevelopment and would set a precedent.

- i) Item 11: 3PL/2007/1490/F: Hilborough: 33 Westgate Street: Convert existing triple garage and extend to provide kitchen, hall and bedroom for Mr & Mrs S Silvester

Refused, contrary to the recommendation, on the grounds that the application failed to enhance the form and character of the area. Members also felt that the access was unsuitable and that the development would create parking problems for the residents of Westgate Street.

Note: Mrs A Steward declared a personal and prejudicial

Action By

interest on this matter and left the room whilst this item was being discussed.

j) **Item 12: 3PL/2007/1517/O: Swaffham: Land adjacent to 1 Low Road: One dwelling and garage for Mr M Smith**

Deferred, however, the Development Services Manager be authorised to grant outline planning permission subject to a satisfactory contaminated land survey being submitted prior to any development of the site, and subject to a Section 106 Agreement to include:

- i) the cessation of the existing use;
- ii) the site to be cleared prior to any development; and
- iii) the development to be restricted to one dwelling only, siting to be reserved.

Members felt that although the site was outside the Settlement Boundary, one dwelling would, in fact, enhance the area and would form a logical natural end to the cul-de-sac.

Notes to the Schedule

The following persons were in attendance to speak on the following items:

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Speaker</u>
Agenda item 8 (East Tuddenham)	Mr Claussen, Ward Representative, spoke in support of the application
Agenda item 9 (Shipdham)	Mr Jordan, Acting Ward Representative, spoke against the application Mr Hill, Parish Council Mr Tindale, Objector Mr Futter, Applicant's Agent
Agenda item 10 (Thetford)	Mr Wilson, Objector Mrs Godfrey, Objector Mr Sunter, Applicant's Agent
6	Mr Green, Applicant's Agent
7	Mrs Blowers, for the Objectors Mr Wingate, Applicant's Agent
9	Mr Askew, Ward Representative Mr Grimley, Environmental Health Officer
10	Mr Jordan, Ward Representative, spoke against the application Mr Crummett, Parish Council Mr Smith, Applicant

Action By

- 11 Mr Longmate, Objector
Mr Silvester, Applicant
- 12 Mrs Matthews, Ward
Representative, in support of the
application
Mr Wingate, Applicant's Agent

The Committee was made aware of the following amendment to the Agenda:

Item 5: Watton – the allocation reference should have read **E2** and not E3.

Written representations taken into account

<u>Reference No.</u>	<u>No. of Representations</u>
3PL/2006/0812/F	10
3PL/2007/1054/F	54
3PL/2007/1055/LB	1
3PL/2007/1095/F	4
3PL/2007/1234/F	6
3PL/2007/1354/F	1
3PL/2007/1356/F	2
3PL/2007/1419/F	1
3PL/2007/1417/F	2
3PL/2007/1482/F	4
3PL/2007/1490/F	2

181/07 ENFORCEMENT ITEMS (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 12)

This item was noted.

182/07 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MANAGER (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 13)

This item was noted.

183/07 APPEALS DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 14)

This item was noted.

184/07 CURRENT POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING (ADDITIONAL ITEM)

Darryl Smith, the Principal Housing Officer, had been invited to the meeting to discuss matters relating to developers financial contributions and how they were calculated.

The Council had to work within the Affordable Housing Policy PPS3, the relevant Housing Needs Survey and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

It was the Council's duty to use its various powers to aid other

Action By

agencies, particularly housing associations and developers, to provide new affordable housing in the district.

The assistance the Council could offer fell into 3 main categories:

- Financial Assistance
- Mechanisms for the transfer of land/property
- Use of the planning system to achieve affordable housing contributions

In exceptional circumstances where the developer and the Council were in agreement, a commuted sum could be taken in lieu of on site provision.

Commutated payments for off-site provision would be calculated according to the most up to date Housing Corporation Total Cost Indicators (TCIs) (or any subsequent guidance) for Breckland. Commuted sums were calculated and based on providing the equivalent number, tenure and size of dwellings to 30% of on site built unit provision. The cost of land purchase would be included in the calculation of the commuted sum. Darryl advised that the cost of the build was calculated at £150 per square metre.

Darryl gave an example of how the commuted sum would be calculated. The end result would be the Council's starting point for negotiation.

Ultimately, it was considered that the best prerequisite for the Council was an on-site provision as one of the biggest difficulties for off-site provision was the supply of land.

Darryl was happy to answer any questions via email:
darryl.smith@breckland.gov.uk

The meeting closed at 3.20 pm

CHAIRMAN