

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

LDF TASK & FINISH GROUP

**Held on Tuesday, 19 January 2010 at 9.30 am in
Merryweather Room, EcoTech, Swaffham**

PRESENT

Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen
Mr A.P. Joel
Mr K. Martin
Mr I.A.C. Monson

Mr D.S. Myers (Chairman)
Mr B. Rose
Mr F.J. Sharpe (Vice-Chairman)
Mr A.C. Stasiak

Also Present

Mrs J. Ball
Mr P.D. Claussen
Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris

Mr N.C. Wilkin
Mr D.R. Williams JP

In Attendance

Capita Symonds for Breckland Council:

Phil Daines - Development Services Manager
Phil Mileham - Senior Planning Policy Officer
Sarah Robertson - Planning Graduate
Jamie Smith - Environmental Planning Assistant
David Spencer - Principal Planning Policy Officer

Breckland Council:

Helen McAleer - Committee Officer

1/10 INTRODUCTION

The Chairman welcomed the members of the public, ward and parish council representatives in attendance. He explained that this was a meeting in public of the Task and Finish Group, rather than a public meeting and therefore only elected parish and district councillors and parish clerks would be invited to speak. The meeting was being held in public for transparency.

The Task and Finish Group would look at the Officers' proposals and make suggestions which would be reported through the Overview and Scrutiny Commission to Cabinet. A six week consultation period would follow when everyone would have the opportunity to make representation.

He reiterated that the meeting was not the end of the process and that there would be more consultation periods during the next 18 months when people could put forward their objections and comments.

The Vice-Chairman then mentioned that at the previous meeting there had been a request to improve the standard of the plans and he thanked the officers for their vastly improved quality.

2/10 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Vice-Chairman (as the Chairman had not attended the previous meeting).

Action By

Action By

3/10 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Mr P Duigan, Mrs A Steward and Mrs L Turner.

4/10 URGENT BUSINESS

None.

5/10 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The following declarations were made:

- Mr I Monson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Oxborough as he lived in the village and had submitted land for consideration.
- Mr F Sharpe declared a personal interest in North Pickenham as he lived in the village.
- Mr M Kiddle-Morris declared a personal interest in Litcham as he lived in the village.

6/10 SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES & PROPOSALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT 2001-2026 REVIEW OF RURAL SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES - NORTH-WEST PARISHES

The Principal Planning Policy Officer introduced the officers and explained that the purpose of the report was to set out the preferred options for a new set of rural settlement boundaries in Breckland and to obtain the views of the Group on whether there were any other reasonable options that Cabinet should consider.

The purpose of rural settlement boundaries was to define and delineate built up areas of villages with some form of service provision. The review would allow for:

- 1) removal of settlement boundaries for small rural communities;
- 2) retention of settlement boundaries as they are; and
- 3) amended settlement boundaries to address anomalies, inconsistencies, the removal of backland and other inappropriate development opportunities and the inclusion of small scale sites (up to five units) on brownfield and other small sites adjacent to settlement boundaries.

The observations of the Group would inform the final content of the Preferred Options document to be agreed by the Council's Cabinet. The document would then be subject to a six week public consultation period starting in early April 2010.

A final version of the Preferred Options document (taking into account the representations received from the public consultation) would then be prepared and was expected to be published in October for another six week public consultation. The document would then be submitted to an Independent Government Inspector and if there were any outstanding objections/issues, these could be raised at the Examination in Public

which would take place in 2011.

(a) **Haggard de Toni Ward**

Bradenham

There had been a change to the recommendation and it was now proposed to retain the Settlement Boundary in its current form.

No representations were made.

Saham Toney

Four amendments proposed to the Settlement Boundary.

A Member said it was an excellent idea to protect the Public House and this was something that should be looked at in other villages.

The Parish Council representative said they were happy with the proposals but surprised that the site at Ovington Road had not been included.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that such a large site could accommodate more than five houses (probably about seven or eight) and extend the village at a well defined settlement edge.

The Parish representative said that there were other houses beyond and that the Parish would welcome housing there as it was a very untidy site.

A Member noted that sometimes landowners allowed sites to fall into disuse and become untidy in an attempt to gain permission for development.

Members felt that the Parish Council's request should be reviewed. The Development Services Manager suggested that further discussions should take place between Officers and the Parish Council and that the site could be put forward for inclusion at a later stage in the consultation.

The Chairman asked why the long, rectangular site with planning permission, close to ST1, had not been included in the Settlement Boundary and was advised that the permission related to existing farm buildings (probably a barn conversion) and that to extend the boundary into farmland there would be a deviation from a well defined limit of development.

Finally it was confirmed that removing the Public House from the Settlement Boundary would not limit any future requests for extensions, etc as there were a number of Policies in the Local Plan which allowed for such development.

No further representations were made.

CONCLUSIONS – HAGGARD DE TONI WARD

Action By

Bradenham – Support recommendation of no change to the existing Settlement Boundary.

Saham Toney – Support amendments to the Settlement Boundary (ST.1 – ST.4) as recommended.

Capita Symonds Officers to hold discussions with the Parish Council, concerning the inclusion of land at Ovington Road at a future stage of the consultation process.

Action By

(b) **Shipdham Ward**

This area had been discussed at a previous meeting on 25 November 2009 and deferred to allow the Parish Council more time to consider the proposals.

At a meeting of the Group on 3 November 2009, Shipdham had received a positive allocation of 100 homes on the Coalyard site and on land to the south of Park Estate. At that meeting it had also been agreed that further consideration should be given to the designation of the former Playing Field site as Public Open Space.

Four minor changes to the Settlement Boundary were proposed.

The Parish Council representative agreed that the changes were all sensible options and asked what the plans were for the Playing Field site.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that the site was not protected as Public Open Space at present although it was used as such on an informal basis. The site could accommodate up to 30 properties. There was a covenant on the site requiring it to be developed for affordable housing only. More discussions would be taking place with the Council's Asset Management Team as Breckland Council owned that site.

The Parish Council thought that the site would be a suitable place for a community centre or village hall.

A Member fully supported the Parish Council and said that the site should be left as Public Open Space. Affordable housing could be provided on exception sites along the edge of Shipdham rather than in the middle of the village.

No further representations were received.

CONCLUSIONS – SHIPDHAM WARD

Support the four changes proposed (SHP.1 – SHP.4) as recommended.

(c) **Hermitage Ward**

Action By

Colkirk

Four amendments were proposed.

A Member asked for clarification of the access to Apple Bough Cottage and agreed that it was totally impractical for development.

Mr Labouchere, Ward Representative, confirmed that he agreed with the removal of the Settlement Boundary around Market Hill.

No further representations were received.

Horningtoft

No change proposed.

No representations were received.

Stanfield

Proposed to remove the existing Settlement Boundary.

The Parish Council representative said that they would prefer to retain the Settlement Boundary. He acknowledged that the envelope was full but he said that two new houses which had been built had brought two young families into the village which is what they wanted.

A Member asked if an existing house in the village could be replaced by more than one if it was knocked down. He was advised that, outside the Settlement Boundary, current policy only allowed for a one-for-one replacement, however inside the Settlement Boundary policy might allow for more than one replacement, depending upon the effect on the form and character of the area.

A Member questioned if villages should be kept as they were, or allowed to grow a little. He said it was a problem because if small villages were not allowed the scope to grow they would barely survive.

Mr Labouchere, Ward Representative, said that many villages were made up of groups of small hamlets and it was difficult to know whether it was an advantage to have a Settlement Boundary or not. If villages were not allowed to grow a little they would die.

A Member proposed that the Group should support the Parish Council and retain the Settlement Boundary. Another asked if this would be reviewed in the next three to five years and this was confirmed.

Another Member asked if it was a 'one way system' or if the Settlement Boundary could be reincorporated. The Development Services Manager explained that this depended upon Policy.

No further representations were received.

Tittleshall

Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.

Action By

The Parish Council representative said that many residents thought it would be a blight on the village to remove the boundary, however, he admitted that there were others who had the opposite view.

A Member said that this was a larger village with a neater cluster of dwellings and he proposed that the Settlement Boundary should be retained.

No further representations were received.

Weasenham All Saints and Weasenham St Peter

No change proposed.

No representations were received.

Wellingham

No change proposed.

Mr Labouchere, Ward Representative, was happy with the arrangements as they were.

No further representations were received.

Whissonsett

Two amendments were proposed.

The Parish Council representative thought the proposals were fine and sensible.

No further representations were received.

CONCLUSION – HERMITAGE WARD

<u>Colkirk -</u>	Support the agreed changes (COL.1 – COL.4) as recommended.
<u>Horningtoft</u>	Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary)
<u>Stanfield</u>	Proposed to retain the existing Settlement Boundary as a reasonable alternative, contrary to the recommendation.
<u>Tittleshall</u>	Proposed to retain the existing Settlement Boundary as a reasonable alternative, contrary to the recommendation.
<u>Weasenham All Saints & Weasenham St Peter</u>	Support recommendation of no change to the existing Settlement Boundary.

Action By

Wellingham Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary).

Whissonsett Support the two amendments (WH.1 and WH.2) as recommended.

(d) **Launditch Ward**

Beeston with Bittering

Eight amendments suggested.

The Parish Council representative said:

- they agreed with the proposed changes at BEE.1, 2 and 3;
- they were concerned about the removal of the car park to the Public House at BEE.4 because it could preclude development which was aimed at providing money to refurbish the pub;
- they had requested the inclusion of additional land at BEE.5 to the rear of the Old Post Office;
- they were concerned at inconsistencies in BEE.6 and BEE.7, and were against any further development along Syers Lane;
- they did not want BEE.7 included in the Settlement Boundary
- they had requested no development at BEE.8 as it could lead to future conflict with the village hall because of noise.

The Ward Representative agreed with the Parish Council. He also asked if the boundary had to be drawn around BEE.2 which was an extant planning permission.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that they had consistently drawn the Settlement Boundaries to include extant planning consents in villages. The site at BEE.2 had been allowed on appeal. If the Settlement Boundary was not drawn around it, it could lead to future revisions.

The Chairman asked why the Public House was being treated differently here to Saham Toney where the whole site had been excluded from the Settlement Boundary. The Principal Planning Policy Officer said that in Saham Toney the Public House had been the only property on that side of the road, whereas here the Public House in Beeston was part of the wider street frontage. They were proposing to take out the beer garden and car park to remove the potential for further development close to the Public House. He agreed that if the Group wished to remove the Public House from the Settlement Boundary it would provide consistency.

The Parish Council representative explained that there was a planning application on BEE.4 at the moment to build two to three dwellings within the curtilage of the Public House, to finance its refurbishment. He said there was a split in the Parish with some residents wanting development and others being against it.

Members felt that they should try to protect village Public Houses and

Action By

one was concerned that if the car park and beer garden were taken outside the Settlement Boundary it might affect the viability of the Public House. However, it was noted that even if those areas were outside the boundary it would not necessarily preclude development associated with the business.

The Chairman suggested that there were three options available to the Group: 1) to leave the Settlement Boundary as it was, 2) to support the Officer's recommendation, and 3) to take the whole site out of the Settlement Boundary.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer explained that if the Settlement Boundary was left as it was, it would maintain the potential for development in the Public House's curtilage in the future.

It was clarified that the pub was closed and that the owner was a developer.

Discussion then moved on to BEE.5. The Parish Council representative said that they had requested the inclusion of all of the land to the rear of the Old Post Office along Back Lane, to allow for development, (in place of BEE.7) otherwise there would be none in the village.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer agreed that there was scope for modest development in the village. The Officers had identified Syers Lane as the most suitable option but if the Parish Council supported land at BEE.5 instead the Settlement Boundary could be left as it was at BEE.7 along Syers Lane and additional land included at BEE.5 in its place.

The Parish Representative said that they had also requested an additional large piece of land to be included on Chapel Lane near to the Public House. He asked if they could apply for that to be included (at a later stage in the process) despite the proposal to exclude the area around the Public House and was advised that they could.

With regard to BEE.8 a Member said that it was important not to develop the site for housing as there would be problems with noise from the village hall. Mr Kiddle-Morris, Ward Representative, agreed and said that the hall was in use five or six nights a week.

No further representations were received.

Great Dunham

Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.

The Parish Council representative told Members that work had started on building a new village hall (costing over half a million pounds) the previous day. The old hall would be replaced by two affordable dwellings. He said they had a vibrant village with a well respected school and one of the largest haulage companies in the County. They had applied for extra parcels of land to be included and felt there should be some capability for expansion. They wanted to keep the Settlement Boundary.

Action By

Mr Kiddle-Morris, Ward Representative, endorsed those comments and added that in the Officer's summary it said that this was a finely balanced case and he suggested that the new village hall might tip the balance.

A Member noted the comment in the report about the absence of key day to day facilities, but he said that the village would not get such facilities unless they had enough people.

No further representations were received.

Kempstone

No change proposed.

No representations were received.

Lexham

No change proposed.

No representations were received.

Litcham

Mr Kiddle-Morris, Ward Representative, declared a personal interest by virtue of living in the village.

Five amendments proposed.

Mr Kiddle-Morris, Ward Representative, said that the Parish Council were amenable to more development on Pound Lane at LIT.1. He agreed with the proposals for LIT.2 and LIT.3 and questioned why the boundary did not go all the way round the property at LIT.4.

The Parish Council representative said that they were in favour of further limited development along Pound Lane.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer pointed out that this referred to allotment land which was protected as Open Space and would have to be declassified before it could be developed.

The Development Services Manager suggested that the Parish Council could discuss this piece of land at a later stage in the process.

Mr Kiddle-Morris said that the village was approximately the same size as Beeston, where an additional ten houses was being proposed, and he felt that Litcham should have the same. He asked if this could be looked into.

The Development Services Manager suggested that that could be taken into consideration in the next phase.

No further representations were received.

Action By

Little Dunham

Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.

The Parish Council Chairman said that the Settlement Boundary was tight with no room to develop within it. They therefore had no objection to its removal. He explained that the Public House in the village was closed and asked if Policies sought to retain such facilities even outside Settlement Boundaries and it was confirmed that they did.

The Parish Council Clerk said that they had requested a small area to be included and asked if the Settlement Boundary was removed, would it make restrictions on development more rigid. He also pointed out that there was another Open Space area within the village.

The Chairman confirmed that if the Settlement Boundary was removed it would be much more difficult to get commercial housing built although there were Policies which allowed for affordable housing.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer acknowledged the additional Open Space area which had been designated quite recently and would appear on the new maps when they were published.

The Parish Clerk confirmed that the additional land had been for private housing as the village already had sufficient affordable housing.

No further representations were received.

Rougham

Proposed to delete Settlement Boundary.

No representations were received.

CONCLUSIONS – LAUNDITCH WARD

Beeston with Bittering - Support the proposed amendments (BEE.1, BEE.2 and BEE.3);
Proposed to exclude the whole Public House site (BEE.4) from the Settlement Boundary, as a reasonable alternative to the recommendation;
Proposed to include additional land extending to Back Lane from the rear of the Old Post Office site (BEE.5), as a reasonable alternative to the recommendation;
Support the proposed amendment to the Settlement Boundary at BEE.6, as recommended;
Proposed to retain the existing Settlement Boundary at BEE.7 and

		<u>Action By</u>
	BEE.8, as a reasonable alternative to the recommendation.	
<u>Great Dunham</u> -	Proposed to retain the existing Settlement Boundary as a reasonable alternative to the recommendation.	
<u>Kempstone</u> -	Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary).	
<u>Lexham</u> -	Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary).	
<u>Litcham</u> -	Support the five amendments to the Settlement Boundary (LIT.1 – LIT.5) as recommended.	
<u>Little Dunham</u> -	Support the recommendation for deletion of the Settlement Boundary.	
<u>Rougham</u> -	Support the recommendation for deletion of the Settlement Boundary.	
(e) Mid Forest Ward		
	Mr I Monson, a member of the Task & Finish Group, explained that he was Ward Representative for this area. He declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Oxborough as he lived in the village, and said he would leave the room whilst it was discussed.	
	The Senior Planning Policy Officer explained that a number of the villages in this ward were within areas of internationally important habitats with species which were protected by European Directives. To protect those areas from harm the Core Strategy had introduced a 1500 metre buffer zone. The Senior Planning Policy Officer was mindful of the fact that Cabinet had requested further evidence of the effects on the protected species, but said that in their proposals, officers had taken into account the fact that the evidence in the Core Strategy had been judged to be sound by the Inspector at the Examination in Public.	
	<u>Beachamwell</u>	
	Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.	
	Mr Monson, Ward Representative, said that he had spoken to the Parish Council and they were not concerned about the removal of the Settlement Boundary.	
	No further representations were received.	
	<u>Cockley Cley</u>	
	Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.	
	The Parish Council representative said that the boundary had been	

Action By

drawn to restrict development and they would like to retain and amend it. He explained that almost the whole village belonged to one landowner. The original village had actually occupied the four green areas in the centre of the village and he asked that at least two of those areas should be included within the boundary to allow for slow development over the next 50 years. He believed the original core of the village should be available for development and said that a few extra people would help to maintain the viability of the village which currently included about 30 children.

Mr Monson, the Ward Representative, said that this was a reasonable suggestion, although the areas were currently registered as Open Space. One comprised the village green, which would not be developed, but he asked officers if the other green areas could be considered for development.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer explained that because of the village's position within the 1500 metre buffer zone, they would not be able to support such proposals at the current time however they could be revisited at a later date following further work on the evidence.

A Member asked what detriment the buffer zone had on development. The Chairman said that in effect it meant they could not even keep the Settlement Boundary. This was one of the reasons why more information was being sought. He asked Officers what effect proposing the retention of the boundary would have.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer responded saying that it could mean that development could be proposed which would normally be acceptable, but which might not be supported. He suggested that there was an option to keep the Settlement Boundary but to make it even tighter.

A Member mentioned that there was provision for development within the buffer zone, providing it did not affect the protected species. The Senior Planning Policy Officer agreed that development could take place if it was masked by other development, but he did not think this was possible in Cockley Cley.

Mr Monson, Ward Representative, did not altogether agree saying that the two green areas on the left were surrounded by development. He was personally in favour of retaining the Settlement Boundary slightly tightened.

No further representations were received.

Foulden

Six amendments proposed.

Mr Monson, Ward Representative, had received no representations and considered that the amendments would be acceptable.

No further representations were received.

Great Cressingham

Action By

Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.

Mr Monson, Ward Representative, knew of one or two areas where development had been requested and asked what the current position of those planning applications was.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer was not aware of the current status of the applications but said that they would be judged against the Habitat Regulations.

No further representations were received.

Gooderstone

Nine proposed amendments.

The Chairman of Gooderstone Parish Council said that they did not want to restrict development and they wanted to extend the Settlement Boundary. They had sent in their suggestions but had heard nothing. The village had a school and needed to encourage young people otherwise it would become a retirement village and the school would close.

Over 100 residents had attended a public meeting that had been held two years previously to discuss the proposed development of a local vegetable processing plant that had closed. Only two of those present were against the development. The site was about 50 acres and could support an additional 50 to 60 houses.

Mr Monson thought that as a brownfield site it would be ideal for development. He questioned some of the proposed amendments and said that the village had potential for development and the boundary should not be drawn so tightly. He was in favour of keeping the boundary as it was.

The site of the factory was pointed out on the map. It was outside the Settlement Boundary and close to the European Habitat area. The Principal Planning Policy Officer said that he would be happy to meet with the Parish Council to explain the changes caused by the current restrictions.

Members were keen to support the Parish Council and residents. The Chairman of the Parish Council was asked if they would meet with officers to discuss the proposals and he agreed saying that more discussion would be good, they did not want the village to die.

No further representations were received.

Little Cressingham

Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.

The Chairman of Little Cressingham and Threxton Parish Council said that the two villages abutted one another and also abutted Watton. The creation of the Threxton Industrial Estate had created jobs and

Action By

there were other jobs in Little Cressingham. Following consultation with the residents the Parish Council were requesting retention and enhancement of the Settlement Boundary to allow for further development. They did not accept the arguments about the effects on the protected species.

Mr Monson, Ward Representative, agreed that Little Cressingham was a 'go ahead' village only one and a half miles from Watton and the Threxton Industrial Estate. All the development in Watton was occurring on the other side of the town and some development here would balance that. The boundary should be retained. There was space on the south side of the church for three or four houses which would enhance the village and link it to the church. He said there was scope for small development and he would like to see the boundary extended.

A Member agreed and said that the Parish Council should be supported.

The Principal Planning Policy Officer repeated earlier advice saying that Little Cressingham was within the 1500 metre buffer zone and any development would have to meet the habitat regulations. If such villages were allowed room to develop it could have the effect of making the Site Specifics document unsound.

A Member asked if the directives could be challenged and the Development Services Manager advised that a report was being prepared for Cabinet as requested. More research was needed to support any argument against the Inspector's finding as the buffer zone was supported by all the experts in the field. The directives could not be challenged at the moment.

The Chairman asked why they had been able to support the retention of the Settlement Boundary at Gooderstone and Foulden but were being advised they could not support it here and was told that those villages had some key services. The Principal Planning Policy Officer was concerned at the need to be consistent, but the Chairman said that the consistency was in the Group listening to the Parish Councils.

No further representations were received.

Oxborough

Mr Monson left the room whilst this parish was discussed.

Proposed to delete the Settlement Boundary.

There was no information available on the views of the Parish Council.

A Member asked if the removal of the boundary would curtail any potential development associated with Oxborough Hall and the tourism and employment that it created. He was advised that there were policies that supported such facilities.

No further representations were received.

Action By

South Pickenham

Mr Monson returned to the room.

No change proposed.

No further representations were received.

CONCLUSIONS – MID FOREST WARD

Cockley Cley -

Proposed to retain a slightly tightened Settlement Boundary as a reasonable alternative, contrary to the recommendation.

Foul登 -

Support the six amendments (FOU.1 – FOU.6) as recommended.

Great Cressingham -

Support the deletion of the existing Settlement Boundary as recommended.

Gooderstone -

Proposed to defer the decision and to arrange a meeting between Capita Symonds Officers and the Parish Council. Conclusions from that meeting to be reported direct to Cabinet.

Little Cressingham -

Proposed to retain the Settlement Boundary as a reasonable alternative, contrary to the recommendation.

Oxborough -

Support the deletion of the existing Settlement Boundary as recommended.

South Pickenham -

Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary).

(f) **Nar Valley Ward**

Narborough

One amendment proposed.

Mr Williams, Ward Representative, asked if retaining the Settlement Boundary would restrict the proposed areas put forward for allocated development.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that when the final allocation options were identified the Settlement Boundary would be drawn around those areas.

The Parish Council Representative said that there were about 20 old houses in the middle of the village built after the war. He asked if they could be knocked down and replaced by three times as many.

Action By

The Senior Planning Policy Officer said that they were within the Settlement Boundary and that discussions were being held about their future. Policies dealing with density, design, form and character would protect the area from significant intensification.

The Parish Council Representative asked if there was to be an increase in the middle of the village, why change the boundary?

No further representations were received.

Narford

No change proposed.

Mr Williams, Ward Representative said he had received no representations and he agreed with the proposal.

No further representations were received.

Newton by Castle Acre

No change proposed.

No representations were received.

Sporle

Two proposed amendments.

Mr Williams, Ward Representative, agreed with the suggested amendment at SPO.1. With regard to SPO.2 he explained that the Parish Council had not wanted to take this on as amenity land, but he agreed that it should be Public Open Space. He concluded by asking about the areas with planning permission that had not been included within the Settlement Boundary.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer explained that the two areas to the south had Outline planning permission only and so it was not certain what would be developed there. They could be included in a future review.

SPO.2 would be designated as Open Space, but the land was not easily accessible to the public.

Mr Williams had been advised by a resident of Sporle that the map was incorrect as it did not show the correct extent of land with planning permission on the site opposite SPO.2. The Officers agreed to check this.

No further representations were received.

South Acre

No change proposed.

No representations were received.

Action By

CONCLUSIONS – NAR VALLEY

<u>Narborough</u> -	Support the proposed amendment (NAR.1) as recommended.
<u>Narford</u> -	Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary).
<u>Newton by Castle Acre</u> -	Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary).
<u>Sporle</u> -	Support the proposed amendments (SPO.1 and SPO.2) as recommended.
<u>South Acre</u> -	Support no change as recommended (ie no Settlement Boundary).

(g) **Necton Ward**

Necton

Three amendments proposed.

Mr Wilkin, Ward Representative, said that he had received very few representations and he was happy with the proposals. He drew attention to the flooding problems in Necton and also commented that the junction with the A47 needed improvement.

A Member was pleased to see that the area adjacent the A47 was retained within the Settlement Boundary as he wished to see that area redeveloped.

Mr Wilkin agreed but said that if housing was proposed, there would need to be a buffer zone. He thought that an industrial use would be preferable.

No further representations were received.

CONCLUSIONS – NECTON WARD

<u>Necton</u> -	Support the proposed amendments (NEC.1 – NEC.3) as recommended.
-----------------	---

(h) **Wissey Ward**

Ashill

In the agenda this parish was recommended for one amendment. However, following representations received, the proposal had been amended.

No change proposed.

Action By

Mrs Ball, Ward Representative, was not happy with the map. She made the following points:

- The land between ASH.1 and the site outside the Settlement Boundary with planning permission was allotment land and should be shown as green.
- Planning permission for four large houses at The Firs was not shown – she wished for the Settlement Boundary to be tightened there to prevent further development.
- The site over the road from that at ‘Woodlands’ had been developed for 20 years and should be included within the Settlement Boundary.
- A Peddars Way Housing Association application at Goose Green was not shown.

The Development Services Manager agreed to check the points raised but did not think that they affected the proposal.

A Member noted that there was a large section of the village to the south of the map shown and it was confirmed that that area had never been within the Settlement Boundary.

No further representations were received.

Holme Hale

Proposed to delete both areas of Settlement Boundary.

Mrs Ball, Ward Representative, asked if the proposal would affect exception sites in the future and was advised that they would be considered in the same way and would have to be well related to the village.

No further representations were received.

North Pickenham

Four proposed amendments.

Mrs Ball, Ward Representative, declared an interest in land to the rear of the Public House and then made the following points:

- The area known as Breckland Green should be included in the Settlement Boundary as it was already partially developed and was a brownfield site.
- Land to the rear of the Public House should be designated as Open Space and retained within the Settlement Boundary to protect the church.
- There was a need for allotments in the village and no room within the Settlement Boundary.

With regard to the first point made, the Development Services Manager, assured Mrs Ball that the site was not brownfield; and with regard to the third point it was confirmed that allotments could be provided outside the Settlement Boundary.

Action By

Mr Sharpe, declared a personal interest as he lived in North Pickenham. He believed that the village needed more houses to support the Public House and school. He thought that the most obvious place for development was Breckland Green but accepted that it was outside the scope of the meeting. He was a member of the Development Control Committee which had recently refused an application to complete a horseshoe of development around the Open Space. He suggested that the Parish Council should approach the Council to request its inclusion.

The Chairman asked Members for their views on development on Breckland Green and the Development Services Manager explained that the recent planning application on that site had proposed development **on** the Open Space and he suggested that there might be other more appropriate ways to allow the village to grow.

Following a question from the Principal Planning Policy Officer it was confirmed that the Group supported further discussion with the Parish Council concerning Breckland Green and also the provision of alternative Open Space.

No further representations were received.

CONCLUSIONS – WISSEY WARD

<u>Ashill</u> -	Support recommendation of no change to the existing Settlement Boundary.
<u>Holme Hale</u> -	Support deletion of existing Settlement Boundaries as recommended.
<u>North Pickenham</u> -	Support the proposed amendments (NPI.1 – NPI.4) as recommended.

7/10 NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on Thursday 28 January 2010 at 2.00pm in the Old School Hall, School Lane, Harling, NR16 2LU.

The meeting closed at 1.35 pm

CHAIRMAN