

**Action
By**

Ian Martin, representative for Yaxham's Neighbourhood Plan pointed out that Norfolk County Council was not the admissions authority for the school, the Church was. He also mentioned the housing numbers for the village and the fact that, in his view, the distance between Clint Green and Yaxham made for two different settlements and therefore felt the village did not meet the LSC requirements. *The Chairman said that the issue of Yaxham as an LSC should be 'parked' for a further review of services audit. Yaxham Parish representatives present offered to assist the services audit review and to meet the Members of the LPWG if that would assist.*

b. page 5 paragraph 3

Roger Atterwill, the *Chairman* to Swanton Morley Parish Council....

The Parish did not want the recommended alternative sites but wanted others instead, as long as *Hoe Road East* could be widened.

The Parish Council was looking to put 5 year review dates in its Neighbourhood Plan but at the backend of the 20 year plan 237 dwellings would become available.

c. Page 6 paragraph 1 - to add the following wording to the end of the paragraph to read:

The Chairman said Neighbourhood Plans were the chance for communities to shape how they develop in the future and Councillor always respected, and put great value by communities that clearly showed how they wished to develop through developing their own Neighbourhood Plans.

2/17 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Councillor Robinson.

3/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 3)

None.

4/17 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

None.

5/17 NON MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Councillors Marion Chapman-Allen, Pablo Dimoglou, Phillip Duigan, Keith Gilbert, Adrian Joel, Keith Martin, Robert Richmond, Nigel Wilkin and Peter Wilkinson.

**Action
By**

6/17 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) (AGENDA ITEM 6)

None.

7/17 BRECKLAND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME (AGENDA ITEM 7)

Stephen Ottewell (SO), the Director of Capita Planning & Building Control presented the report.

Local authorities were required to prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS) through Section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011). An LDS was effectively the Council's public facing timetable against which the Local Plan were prepared. Significant progress had already been made on the preparation of the Local Plan, including three rounds of public consultation. Future milestones for the Local Plan, as set out in the LDS, were as follows:

- Pre-submission Publication (regulation 19): May to June 2017
- Submission to the Planning Inspectorate: July 2017
- Examination in Public: October 2017
- Adoption: December 2017

Option 1 of the report had been recommended.

Councillor Duigan asked a question on the process in relation to who would have the final say if Breckland Council disagreed with any potential/proposed amendments to the scheme. Members were informed that the Council would have to consult on those changes but the Planning Inspectorate would have the final say.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen asked the Strategic Planning Manager to expand on the meaning of neighbouring authorities. Members were informed that most Local Plan Working Groups had a duty to co-operate and were engaged with partner authorities to develop a high level agreement and that work was still on-going. Breckland Council was the first in the area with a single Local Plan and therefore was engaging with those authorities on the key issues.

Councillor Wilkinson drew attention to section 2 of Appendix A where it referred to changes to National Planning Policy and mentioned the Government's White Paper that was due to be published. He believed that this Paper would put a different stance on many issues and therefore a great deal of work would most probably be required. In response to a concern, SO advised that this matter had already been included on the Risk Register.

RESOLVED that Option 1 of the report be endorsed – to agree the revised LDS (as Appendix A) with effect from December 2016.

8/17 PROGRESS REPORT ON PRE-SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN PREPARATION (AGENDA ITEM 8)

SO presented the report which informed Members on the progress of the Local Plan including housing distribution, local service centres and rural areas policy; each would be addressed in turn.

**Action
By**

Members were reminded of the LPWG session held on 14 December 2016 where a great deal of debate had been had on these matters and additional work had been undertaken.

Local Service Centres (LSCs)

An LSC topic paper had been prepared to support the preferred directions consultation which had been carried out in January and February 2016. The topic paper used the criteria to assess villages within Breckland in a consistent manner. Following consultation, further work had been undertaken looking into the services and facilities within the villages to ensure consistency in the designations. The designations as LSCs for the villages of Yaxham, Bawdeswell and Garboldisham were being re-considered as the respective Parish Council's had objected to the designations based on public transport, employment opportunities. The parish of Yaxham had objected for the same reasons including incorporating the three separate settlements.

a. Bawdeswell

The Chairman highlighted the concerns that had been raised by the Parish Council; however, the criteria had been met.

It was

RECOMMENDED to Cabinet that the parish of Bawdeswell remains as Local Service Centre.

b. Garboldisham

Councillor Marion Chapman-Allen was in attendance to represent the Parish Council. She explained that the Parish Council was still unhappy but reluctantly accepted the designation. She mentioned the two preferred sites in the Local Plan 004 and 005 of which there had been over 50 responses on-line to the consultation in support of these sites. There had not been any alternative sites put forward; however, it had been brought to her attention that a further site was being considered. She asked Officers for assurance that this Back Street site, which was neither preferred nor alternative, and had not been included due to severe highway constraints, would not come forward. SO advised that no other sites, only the preferred sites, would go forward in the Local Plan.

It was

RECOMMENDED to Cabinet that the parish of Garboldisham remains as a Local Service Centre.

c. Yaxham

Many parishioners from Yaxham were in attendance.

The issues and concerns previously expressed by the Parish Council

**Action
By**

were highlighted these included the separation of the settlements which formed Yaxham parish, where the responsibility lied in relation to school admissions employment and facilities. To aid Members a number of presentation slides were provided that highlighted the comparison between for example, North Elmham's area of overlap which was clearly more significant in terms of schools facilities and shops. SO read aloud a paragraph from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which stated that 'housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities; for example, where there were groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

Mrs Margaret Oechsle JP, a resident advised that Yaxham did function as a village and wished to remain as such and not as an LSC as Yaxham itself was very separate from the settlements of Clint Green and Brakefield Green. She had been surprised that there had been no mention of Yaxham's Neighbourhood Plan in the report as this proposal for LSC status was completely against what was being proposed. Also, the methodology that was supposed to be used in gaging whether a village met with the criteria of LSC status and the judgement of Members needed to be consistent to avoid subsequent challenge. She gave Saham Toney as an example which had been demoted from LSC status by the former Chairman for the very same reasons. She also mentioned a High Court judicial review and the need to take the Neighbourhood Plan and the parishioners' views into consideration. Further to this she mentioned the additional 98 dwellings that had been proposed in the village and she asked how this could be sustainable. The Chairman explained that the decision would be based on the evidence heard.

Ian Martin Vice Chairman of the NHP Working Group was also present to speak on this matter. He pointed out that the report made no reference to the LSCs 5 criteria in the report and the test at paragraph 2.11 in the consultation document that was not set by Yaxham but had been set by the Local Plan Working Group and agreed by Cabinet which he felt was being ignored. He asked for the slide of the overlaps for Yaxham to be shown again. He pointed out the discrepancies in relation to the overlap and the 800m buffer zone which had formed part of the distributed argument between the Officers and parishioners of Yaxham over the past 10 months – there was not an overlap; therefore, the facts; in his opinion, were not true in the consultation document unlike the slide presented to Cabinet in August which was correct - there was no overlap in main services between these two settlements. He was very disappointed to hear the repeat of the description of the County's position for the reason that as far as Yaxham Primary School was concerned, being a voluntary aided school, it had its own admission authority. A meeting of the schools' Governors had recently taken place of which it had been reconfirmed that the planned admission number of 12 would remain and the number would be met from the existing and already permitted development in the village; it could not and would not cope with the idea of an additional site with an additional 25 homes being built in the village. On employment, three locations had been mentioned one of which was relocating out of the village and should

**Action
By**

not be counted as part of this calculation. Finally, absolute consistency had been the phrase used many times by the former Chairman and soundness in planning terms was seen as critical; with this in mind, the LPWG had already agreed to remove LSC status from at least two villages – Mundford and Saham Toney; therefore, there should be some consistency between the ones that the LPWG had demoted and the ones that it was promoting. In employment terms, Mundford had 11 centres of employment, a greater school capacity and more facilities all of which were significantly greater than Yaxham. Also, the village of Saham Toney had a shop, post office and a public house very similar to the village of Bawdeswell. All Yaxham was asking for was consistency and soundness and he urged the LPWG to reject the proposed recommendation and to agree that Yaxham not be designated as a Local Service Centre.

Roger Atterwill, the Chairman of Swanton Morley Parish Council, pointed out that having LSC status was actually a benefit to the village. Swanton Morley's school admissions policy was the responsibility of Norfolk County Council and the school could expand if the capacity was in place. He was puzzled by the fact that Yaxham School was so different. In response, Mr Martin advised that it was the Diocese that set the admissions policy which was co-ordinated by NCC and the Governors had taken a perfect legitimate decision to remain with the aforementioned admission rate.

The Chairman reminded the Yaxham representatives that this proposed additional housing would be built over the next 20 years – the life of the Plan.

Councillor Marion Chapman-Allen stated that elsewhere in the District at East Harling the school was full and up to capacity and many pupils whether they lived in the village or not had to attend other schools.

Councillor Dimoglou, Ward Member for Yaxham, disagreed with Mr Martin on a number of matters; as far as he was concerned there were places available at the school and there was land around it to allow for some expansion. On employment, he was looking to employ around 45 people at his business, Yaxham Waters. Another point that he found interesting was in relation to Yaxham's Neighbourhood Plan which highlighted the fact that the village had an obvious need for a school a shop, local facilities and housing. He mentioned one of the priorities in Breckland Council's Corporate Plan which was to allow the District to develop and thrive.

Mr Philips, a Yaxham resident was passionate about democracy and had moved to the village 6 years ago and had voted for Councillor Dimoglou as he represented Yaxham but was the only person that he knew of that wanted the village to become an LSC.

Mr Martin read aloud the public consultation responses from the Neighbourhood Plan one of which stated that 78% of residents believed that Yaxham and Clint Green were two distinct settlements.

**Action
By**

The distance of the school was clarified.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen had been a Member of the LPWG since April 2016 and had been privileged to hear Yaxham's concerns over this time. Referring to the 5 required LSC criteria all Members and Officers were in agreement that public transport, employment, the shop and the school for a rural area had met with the necessary criteria; however, on the position of reasonable walking distance of 800m and how the community was fragmented there was no overlap and for that reason felt that he could not support Yaxham going forward as an LSC based only on the fact that there was not a recognised reasonable walking distance between those communities. Councillor Webb had also considered this issue and could not recommend Yaxham as an LSC.

It was

RECOMMENDED to Cabinet that Local Service Centre status is not designated to the parish of Yaxham.

The Chairman informed the meeting that Dereham would not be discussed but would be discussed at the next LPWG meeting.

As an aside, and as there were many of the town's representatives in the room, the Chairman of Planning, Councillor Nigel Wilkin, advised that the two major applications for Dereham which was supposed to be considered at the Planning Committee meeting on 6 February 2017 had been deferred.

Housing Distribution

Members' attention was the drawn to page 26 of the agenda pack at paragraph 1.18 onwards in relation to the Housing Distribution. SO advised that in terms of key issues there were some elements through the consultation where sufficient sites were unable to be found and also a small number of the settlements where some of those key bodies in the Plan making process were raising issues around flooding and highways. The proposed way forward where sufficient sites were unable to be found was that the Plan should retain the original targets and provide for a criteria based policy along the lines of PD05 as applied to the rural areas which could also to apply to the Service Centres.

Since the interim consultation, various planning applications continued to be received and approved which would have a material impact on the 5 year land supply and housing numbers would be looked at again to ensure that some areas were not being over supplied in any one location and how we can address some of those site issues. Members' attention was drawn to page 31 of the agenda pack. Table 2 highlighted the revised housing distribution, this included updates to the commitments and completions and also changes to the allocations.

Councillor Joel pointed out that the allocation requirement for Old Buckenham was incorrect and should be for 35 dwellings not 50. It was noted that this figure would be corrected accordingly.

**Action
By**

Roger Atterwill asked why Swanton Morley had been marked with asterix. He also asked about the earlier additional allocation for Yaxham and asked where these houses would re-located. In response to the first question, Members were informed that this was due to there being the well documented desire for more housing in the village and the Policy would be worded accordingly. In response to the latter, a Development Strategy was being proposed as it did not necessarily mean that these numbers would be pushed out. The Chairman advised that Yaxham would be reduced to a PD05A status.

Tony Needham, the Clerk to Dereham Town Council raised a concern about the increased allocations in the market towns and he challenged the way that this had been justified. The Chairman explained that Dereham would be considered in more detail at the next LPWG meeting. In response, Mr Needham advised that the town's Neighbourhood Plan was progressing so an early discussion on these matters would be welcomed.

Mr Philip Spencer, a resident of Beachamwell referred to the figures on table 2 relating to rural areas and had noticed that these areas had 150 new allocations over the next 20 years. He asked if it could be clarified if this figure would now include Yaxham. SO explained that the Planning Policy Team had tried to estimate the number of dwellings and 150 seemed a sensible figure and the correct allowance. The Chairman reminded the meeting that PD05B was an allowance for housing to be built in the smallest of areas but with restrictions; this was why the housing numbers were so low.

Focusing on a number of changes, SO mentioned the Appeal in Watton and explained that the outcome for the 177 dwellings would not be known until after the Local Plan was due for publication and it would be necessary to reconsider the reasonable alternatives prior to Cabinet. Councillor Duigan mentioned the Appeal for the 105 dwellings in Toftwood and asked if it would be in time for the Planning Inspectorate to change the numbers for Dereham. Phil Mileham, the Strategic Planning Manager advised that this would be taken into account with the Inspectorate.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen wanted clarification that the Planning Policy Team was going to engage with Watton Members asking for reasonable alternative sites. PM explained that there were quite a number of reasonable alternative sites to choose from those any balance could be found on those that had been consulted on and were subject to public consultation and that LPWG Members had already considered.

Attention was drawn to Table 1 of the agenda pack which highlighted the comments from the Parish Council and Officers on housing distribution including the recommendations. A slide presentation was also shown and each Local Service Centre was discussed.

Ashill

Additional sites had come forward.

Banham

**Action
By**

Councillor Joel raised concerns in relation to site no. 0005 and asked if additional land could be gained from the land owner. SO stated that this additional land could not be taken into account as it had not been subject to public consultation.

Gt Ellingham

The preferred site would not be progressed due to the increased level of housing commitments granted through planning applications.

Litcham

Norfolk County Council Highways had objected to the preferred site. Additional sites had been proposed through the consultation period. Feedback had been received from the Parish Council who remained keen to have an allocation in the village.

Mattishall

Site 015 had been classified as unreasonable. Due to the additional windfall permissions in Mattishall the preferred site 019 could meet the remaining allocation requirement.

Necton

A written representation had been received from Necton Parish Council to assist the LPWG in their deliberations on changes to the housing distribution and proposed allocations.

The Chairman of the Parish Council was also in attendance to express the Parish Council's views. A number of meetings had been had with Breckland Council's Planning Officers, the Ward Member for Necton, Councillor Nigel Wilkin and George Freeman MP on the future development and the desperate need for improvements to the infrastructure in the village in particular the access into and the egress onto the A47. The MP was attempting to arrange a site meeting to establish what could be achieved.

The Parish Council had proposed the following site selections:

LP[067]005 & LP[067]003 Ramm's Lane – that these two sites be removed from the Local Plan allocations.

LP[067]010 North Pickenham Road - that this site be maintained as a 'preferred' site but with the inclusion of conditions to protect and preserve the historical assets.

LP[067]007 Hale Road - that this site be maintained as an alternative site.

LP[067]011 North Pickenham Road - that this site remain as a preferred site.

LP[067]008 adjacent to A47 - that this be upgraded to a 'preferred' site should there be a requirement to include more housing allocation within Necton.

**Action
By**

The above site selection provided the following proposed new allocation potential of 94 dwellings significantly more that contained within the Officers report.

Councillor Wilkin stated that Necton was a thriving village with many amenities but lacked employment as the garage, garden centre and café had since closed. Site nos. 005 and 003 was the last bastion of the countryside where the village stopped and the countryside began. Necton had a transient employment population and the pressure on the aforementioned junction was incredible some even chose to go through Bradenham and Shipdham a much longer route because it was safer and caused less aggravation. The Parish Council, in his opinion, had worked very hard on where they wanted development to be and should be listened too and had more acceptability to the Local Plan.

The Chairman asked the Officers concerned for their response to the Parish Councils proposals.

To aid discussions, SO advised that the current requirement allocations of 75 dwellings still remained. LP(067)007 could be replaced but a with a comparable number of houses that was acceptable. LP004 not sure what the views of the Parish Council were additional 25 units between those two sites

The Parish Clerk mentioned Site no. LP(067)008 referenced as NC10 in the SHLAA which was viable for 19 dwellings.

Councillor Wilkin urged Members to remove site 004 and mentioned the site constraints, as it was nipped on three sites surrounded by community facilities.

Councillor Chapman-Allen clarified that the Parish Council wanted to discount site nos. 005 and 003 and bring forward 010, 007, 011 and 008 equalling 94 above the 75. 007 had been discounted due to flood risks bringing it down to a total of 74 short of one and comments from Historic England were still awaited to come back on site no. 010. The Parish Council Chairman reminded Members of the planning application that had been submitted for 14 dwellings.

SO clarified the numbers and pointed out that the site mentioned by the Parish Clerk could come back into the process.

Following much discussion, and as the Parish Council had been very proactive, it was agreed that Officers would continue to work with the Parish Council to thrash out these concerns.

Councillor Wilkinson as a neighbouring Ward Member fully understood the Parish Council's concerns and fully supported the representations made by them. His Ward would also put pressure on the A47 issues. The Chairman agreed, the A47 was the most important road in Norfolk and a letter should be sent to George Freeman MP.

Mark Mendham mentioned the Badley Moor SSI site in Toftwood and was concerned that the document made no reference to this site at all.

**Action
By**

Councillor Webb assured Mr Mendham that Officers would discuss this matter in due course. SO stated that this particular site would be in relation to the flood risk assessment and he assured Members that the proposals plan would show these constraints.

North Elmham

The Chairman declared an interest in relation to North Elmham.

Discussions had been had with the Parish Council who had raised concerns about access to any further development in Eastgate Street and had no parking. Development on Back Lane was now being considered a road to the south of Eastgate Street – speed limits would need to be altered. A policy approach would be required.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen felt at this late stage of the Plan an open and transparent conversation needed to take place as North Elmham could hold up the process and as Highways information was still awaited.

Old Buckenham

Councillor Joel as Chairman of the Parish Council explained that the Parish Council was not happy with site no. 006 going forward due to highways issues. The 15 dwellings remaining should come via the planning process. SO advised that he would not want to see this site removed.

A Parish Councillor was in attendance and explained where the new access for the school was going to be located and a site for development near there would not be suitable. Councillor Joel asked if Highways had come back on this matter. Members were informed that Highways had not objected to this site.

SCA said that the Parish Council wanted this site to be deleted leaving 15 dwellings to be allocated. Someone else could submit a planning application for the same amount of dwellings and with no objections from Highways this would be difficult to defend in the Local Plan process.

It was agreed that further clarification on the Highways response was required.

Following a short break it was confirmed that the Highways Authority did not have any concerns. The Parish Council's concerns were noted and it was agreed that Councillor Joel would be provided with a copy of the letter from the Highways Authority.

Rural Areas Policy

At the last LPWG comments on the Rural Areas Policy PD05 received during the consultation period were discussed. This Policy had been revised to take into account those comments received and the steer provided at the last meeting. A revised version of the Policy had been appended at Appendix A on page 37 of the agenda pack.

Members' attention was drawn to Table 3 on page 33 of the agenda pack

**Action
By**

and each issue was discussed.

Under the heading 'Identified economic and/or local need' and referring to the proposed change it was agreed that the words 'in consultation with' be removed and replaced with the word 'and' to read:“through a process which has been agreed by the Local Planning Authority **and** the Town and Parish Council”.

Under the heading 'Local Support' it was agreed that the proposed change should remain subject to the words 'in consultation with' being removed and replace with the word 'and' to read: “through a process which has been agreed by the Local Planning Authority **and** the Town and Parish Council”.

Under the heading 'Scale and Design' to remain as proposed.

Under the heading 'Limits to Development – PD05A 10% increase in housing stock and PD05B 5% increase in housing stock' to remain as proposed.

Under the final heading 'Closely Knit Cluster' to remain as proposed – it was noted that the numeric reference had been deleted.

Tony Needham, the Clerk to Dereham Town Council asked SO to clarify what type of hamlets would be included in PD05B. He also queried the 5% increase and PD05A both of which undermined the Neighbourhood Plans. Members were informed that PD05B would be based on the distance from the services. Mr Needham said that this could be easily resolved by adding the following wording to the end of the issue, to read: 'Limits to Development – PD05A 10% increase in housing stock and PD05B 5% increase in housing stock **which has been agreed with the Local Planning Authority and the Town and Parish Council**'. The Chairman explained that these policies had been put in place to protect those communities and allow some form of small development in hamlets.

Mr Spencer advised that his village, Beachamwell, came under PD05B and was very disappointed with what he believed to be very unsatisfactory wording for both PD05A and PD05B. He drew attention to the fact that the wording was different to that in the Preferred Directions Policy (PDP) which had been generally favourable and felt that the text in that document should have remained. He offered to send his comments in writing to the Officers concerned. The Chairman accepted Mr Spencer's offer.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen pointed out that PD05B came from Breckland Members and was supportive of the adaptation where small scale development would be allowed in smaller hamlets. Mr Spencer reminded Members that the PDP dated December 2015 allowed just that. The Chairman agreed that this would be looked at.

Mr Chris Garrod representing Gt Hockham Parish Council could not identify the settlement boundary changes that he had previously requested to allow further development. SO advised that the dialogue had been had and the wording of the policy needed to be right; all the information received would be considered. The Chairman suggested a small sub-committee should be

**Action
By**

organised to look at all PD05 issues. Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen suggested a further meeting of the LPWG should be held where the revised policy would be reconsidered. Members should also be encouraged to go and discuss these issues with their constituents. Mr Needham wondered how many communities were aware of these policies and asked that an email be sent to all parishes.

It was **AGREED** that the revised rural areas policy PD05 be deferred for further discussion.

9/17 DRAFT INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN (AGENDA ITEM 9)

Jemma March, the Principal Planning Officer presented the draft version of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and the key findings were highlighted.

Councillor Duigan mentioned the Thetford Strategic Urban Extension (SUE) which in his opinion until completed the recommended number of dwellings could not be built.

Mr Atterwill alluded to the sewage works in Dereham which he had heard was now going to be diverted to Swanton Morley instead of Mattishall. He asked when the Parish was going to be informed of this change and when they would see sight of the proposals. Members were informed that the Water Cycle Study was still awaited. Councillor Webb explained that meetings had been held between the Council and Anglian Water and Swanton Morley had been considered as one of the alternative options; a response should be received in next few weeks.

Mr Needham asked when the power supply would be delivered in Thetford as he felt that the whole Plan relied on this matter. Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen pointed out that a funding bid had been made to the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership and should be released once the 300 dwellings that could be built had been completed.

The report to date was otherwise noted. The report would be brought back to a future meeting. Comments were invited from the Town and Parish Councils.

10/17 LOCAL PLAN AND CIL VIABILITY ASSESSMENT (AGENDA ITEM 10)

JM, the Principal Planning Officer presented the report.

Breckland Council commissioned HDH Planning and Development Ltd to produce the Local Plan and Viability Assessment to consider:

- a. the level of affordable housing in terms of quantum and mix that could be delivered
- b. the balance of contributions sought by developers, including affordable housing, other policy requirements and the costs of infrastructure and mitigation; and
- c. the effect that CIL could have on development viability in the District.

Members' attention was drawn to the key findings in the report and it was

**Action
By**

noted that a lower target in relation to affordable housing had been considered and a watching brief would be kept on this as well as extra care housing.

SO was aware that there was a great deal of technical information contained in the report and highlighted the tables on page 116 of the agenda supplement and explained the meaning of the different colours within the table. He referred Members to page 153 of the supplement to the column that a residual value of £50 per square metre and the numbers highlighted in red which related to brownfield sites.

Faye LeBon representing Swanton Morley Parish Council queried the recommendation in the report as, in her opinion, it was not clear that the approach in relation to affordable housing was being considered. GM explained how the flexibility approach had been reached based on market conditions in future but was still subject to consultation.

Mrs LeBon wanted to know how the Council expected to resolve the evidence of need and the evidence of viability.

There was much discussion on the issue of CIL, the tenures in relation to social rent or shared ownership and the lack of one/two bed properties in the Breckland area and when this particular process would come to an end.

PM explained that the original CIL assessment document had been prepared a number of years ago and the financial climate had changed. He also indicated that there was an expectation that CIL was calculated based in the adopted policies of the time, in view of the Local Development Framework and its requirement for 40% affordable housing that made CIL largely unviable. He further indicated that the Council was not achieving the 40% element on every site and the new Local Plan would identify a new requirement. Currently, the Council was still going through the preparation process but effectively this would stop when the Local Plan was adopted post examination.

Mr Atterwill said that he would support a 20% affordable housing target if a CIL was introduced.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen did not feel informed enough to be able to make a recommendation on this important matter.

It was **AGREED** that the report be deferred to enable Officers to prepare further information on the options available to Members regarding the balance between affordable housing, other policy requirements and developer contribution.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED

**11/17 STRATEGIC FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT AND SEQUENTIAL TEST
(AGENDA ITEM 11)**

To be discussed at the resumed meeting, the date of which was to be arranged.

Action
By

**12/17 INDOOR AND BUILT SPORTS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
STUDY (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

To be discussed at the resumed meeting, the date of which was to be arranged.

The meeting adjourned at 3.55 pm

CHAIRMAN