

---

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**LOCAL PLAN WORKING GROUP**

**Held on Friday, 15 July 2016 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mr C G Carter (Chairman)                      Mr S H Chapman-Allen  
Mr S.G. Bambridge                                Mr M. S. Robinson

**Also Present**

Mr P.J. Duigan                                      Mrs L.H. Monument  
Mr P.D. Claussen                                 Mr R. R. Richmond  
Mr R.W. Duffield                                 Mr P S Wilkinson  
Mrs K. Millbank

**In Attendance**

Julie Britton                                        - Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Phil Mileham                                       - Strategic Planning Manager  
Martin Pendlebury                               - Principal Policy Planner (Capita)  
Simon Wood                                        - Interim Business Manager (Capita)

**Action By**

**27/16 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

None.

**28/16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Councillor Richmond and Councillor Duffield declared an interest in relation to sites that they had registered in the Local Plan in Beetley and Gressenhall.

**29/16 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

None.

**30/16 NON MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

Councillors Kate Millbank, Linda Monument, Paul Claussen, Richard Duffield, Phillip Duigan and Robert Richmond.

**31/16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Simon Wood (SW), Interim Business Manager, Capita informed the meeting that this was the third Working Group to consider the proposed site allocations and settlement boundaries within the District. The Planning Policy Team had assessed each area according to the criteria

as listed at paragraph 1.6 of the Locational Strategy, Level and Location of Growth and Rural Areas report published on 4 July 2016. Further work had been completed on the housing trajectory, this had demonstrated that the SUEs within Thetford and Attleborough were not expected to be delivered in their entirety within the Plan period. As a consequence, and to meet the housing requirement, a higher level of provision in the largest settlements would now be required which was different to what had been discussed previously at the meetings earlier in the year. The revised distribution of proposed housing growth had been endorsed at the first LPWG meeting held in Thetford on 11 July 2016 as follows:

- Key settlements – 50%
- Market Towns – 30%
- Local Service Centres – 15%
- Rural areas – 5%.

This distribution was still consistent with the broad Spatial Strategy.

The second report that was discussed at the Thetford meeting was in relation to Policy PD05 which had been split into two parts. PD05a applied to settlements that met three out of five of the service facilities audit identified in paragraph 1.6 of the settlement boundary report (published on 4 July). PD05b would apply to the smaller villages that had two or fewer of the service facilities required. These villages would have no settlement boundary but small amounts of development could be permitted if they had local support in accordance with Policy PD05b.

This would all be subject to further consultation following this round of LPWG meetings.

The Chairman advised that this round of meetings was for the Group to hear views from the public to help shape the document. Further consultation would be had followed by the document being submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

Councillor Duigan, a Ward Member for Toftwood and a Town Councillor for Dereham, felt that the change to the number of proposed housing growth for the market towns contained very little information as to how the figures had been reached. He had no idea, until now, that Swaffham and Dereham was going to be allocated 600/700 houses. The Neighbourhood Plan had been put together on the former figures and he asked if this would mean that the background documents would have to be changed. Further explanation was required.

Roger Atterwill, the Chairman of Swanton Morley Parish Council, informed Members that the Parish had been completely thrown out by these new figures and had grave reservations for the five year land supply if the 5000 houses were not delivered in Thetford. He asked if this would have a knock on effect to all the other areas and also asked why the change of heart so late in the day.

Tony Needham, Dereham Town Council, pointed out that the monitoring report in October 2015 stated 1200 completions a year and now this had been changed to 575. He also wanted to know what had

categorically changed in a matter of months.

Councillor Robert Richmond could not support the proposals and mentioned the 1000s of houses granted for Thetford in April 2014 none of which had been built. This increase for Dereham, in his opinion was not do-able and also not fair.

SW advised that in terms of Thetford, the site was currently being marketed. Infrastructure, power and other issues of that nature, were also being addressed. The reason the numbers had changed was due to the changes to a reappraisal of the trajectory for housing delivery to meet the five year housing land supply requirement. Everything that had been agreed was in accordance with the Spatial Strategy. The Preferred Directions consultation was just that, a consultation and in terms of infrastructure and drainage etc that would all form part of the Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan going forward.

Phil Mileham, the Strategic Planning Manager for Breckland Council stated that the Planning Committee agreed the Thetford SUE in 2014 and the planning permission had been issued at the back end of last year and was granted with outline planning for seven years recognising the likely lengthy lead in time to deliver such a large development.

### **32/16 PREFERRED SITES (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

#### **(a) Bawdeswell**

Bawdeswell had been designated a Local Service Centre due to meeting the five criteria. The preferred site which was subject to a pending planning application was allocated to the southern edge of the village centre for 33 units – the requirement would be met if permission was granted. The two alternative sites were located to the north of the village - one having site capacity of 45 dwellings and the other 36. The site to the west (005) was considered more isolated although Norfolk County Council Highways had raised no objections.

Mr William Mason, Vice-Chairman of Bawdeswell Parish Council agreed that although the village was quite small some growth must be accommodated but he felt that Local Service Centre status should be removed and the settlement boundary be retained as it was. Bawdeswell did not have as many businesses as suggested on the audit and there were significant concerns in relation to drainage/sewage. Members were informed that a planning application was being considered at Breckland's Planning Committee soon; therefore, more time should be provided to consider this document.

The Ward Member for Bawdeswell, Councillor Gordon Bambridge reminded everyone in attendance that these meetings had been arranged to listen to all concerns. He agreed with the drainage concerns on the planning application site which he felt should be addressed sooner rather than later.

In response to a technical question, the Strategic Planning Manager explained that soundness concerns to the Local Plan would be likely if

a village had its Local Service Centre status removed when all the necessary criteria had been met; there would be a danger of inconsistency within the document.

Mr Atterwill hoped that the document that Breckland Council put forward was going to be consistent as the requirement of the five criteria was, in his opinion, a very good formula and was sound and he felt that villages that remained as Local Service Centres would be able to cope.

Mr Mason disagreed as there was no consideration for medical facilities and he questioned the criteria. SW felt that the criteria were fairly explicit and Bawdeswell met every one. As far as drainage was concerned, Anglia Water had raised no objections to this allocation or the planning application as it was felt to be the most sustainable site. Councillor Bambridge was shocked to hear that Anglia Water thought that the drainage on this site was adequate; and it was, therefore,

**AGREED** that the preferred site be endorsed; subject to the outcome of the planning application and flooding/drainage issues.

**(b) Dereham**

A detailed presentation would be provided once the transport study had been completed. The background context to that study, the key emerging findings and conclusions were highlighted. MP stressed that the Study findings did not provide any indication of a locational advantage in transport terms as all traffic intersected at the Tavern Land junction. He concluded that it was possible for Members to consider the sites to be put forward for consultation. He acknowledged that this would be very important evidence base for the Local Plan.

Councillor Kate Millbank, Ward Member for Dereham and a Member of Dereham Town Council asked what the potential mitigation measures were for the Yaxham Road/Tavern Lane junction as this she felt was a major part of the problem in Dereham. Members were informed that there was a quick win solution in terms of improvement works to the existing highways junction but that a wider solution had also been identified. SW assured the meeting that there was a scheme being proposed but he was unable to provide additional detail as the scheme was currently being costed. MP pointed out that the study had been very helpful as County Highways had now acknowledged that the Tavern Lane junction was a problem which had been supported by evidence.

The Chairman of Whinburgh & Westfield Parish Council pointed out that there had been further development in that area since November when the study was first carried out SW had those businesses been encompassed. The roads and roundabouts were always backed up and there was a capacity problem and he asked how this would impact on any of the planning applications proposed in Dereham. MP advised that the Transport Consultants had taken these businesses into account. SW then explained that the Study would seek to highlight the solution in terms of development; the planning

**Action By**

applications would not be determined until the outcome of the Transport Study was published. The Chairman of Whinburgh & Westfield Parish Council asked if any applications would be declined on the outcome of the Study. It was noted that there was a test that planning applications had to meet. Councillor Duigan presumed that Highways would have to finance any improvements to mitigate these problems. He asked if this Study concentrated on just the proposed Yaxham Road development. MP advised that the Transport Consultants had been fed the information on all the potential allocated sites. Councillor Duigan asked if the proposed development on Swanton Road had been taken into account. SW assured the meeting that all growth scenarios had been factored into the modelling. Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen wanted to know if the four sites that were coming forward had outline planning permission. SW stated that there were not any consents on any; all were pending. Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen suggested that a meeting should be had with Dereham Town Council and the Planning Officers to discuss all these problems that the town faced.

A Dereham resident was concerned that Officers had come to this meeting without all the necessary information on the Transport Study and felt that there was not any planning logic behind all this. Councillor Bambridge asked when the Study was likely to be completed. He felt that there was too much uncertainty to make an informed decision. SW advised that the report was being finalised and reminded Members that they were not deciding today if the sites were suitable for development; the plans going forward would be looking at mitigation schemes and as such preferred locations could be identified. Councillor Robert Richmond said that he had lived in this area since the 1960s and regularly attended the Town Council meetings and was told that this Transport Study would be ready to view; how could anything be agreed on these preferred sites without the necessary information. Mr Atterwill proposed that the decision on all the preferred sites be deferred until the Transport Study had been completed. He felt that the Council was working against a government dictated ruling and he urged Breckland to be bold and take a step a back and delay the Local Plan. He considered the deadline should be extended as there was not enough information on which to make a decision and not just for Dereham. Breckland needed a plan that was robust that allowed everyone the opportunity to put their concerns forward.

Mr Needham agreed with Mr Atterwill's comments and he was pleased with the Highways acknowledgement that they had got it wrong. He asked if the Transport Study looked at the 'knock on' affect if the remedial action made the traffic flow quicker, the 'knock on' effect this might have on somewhere else in the town. PM said that it looked at all key junctions and therefore any 'knock on' effects. Mr Needham felt that the approach to these concerns should be that Transport Study be available to Members prior to the document being signed off in August. An additional meeting could be held.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen asked the Dereham Town Council representatives if there were any other sites that they would like the Working Group to consider; that they would prefer to come forward for

**Action By**

the 750 dwellings.

Councillor Bambridge disagreed with Mr Atterwill, the deadline should not be extended as in his opinion, it was manageable and should not be extended just for Dereham. Councillor Duigan had not any problems with the former document but did now with the extra 750 dwellings and felt that a sensible decision could not be made.

The Chairman emphasised that these meetings had been set up as a steer to inform a document that would be subject to public consultation. He advised that there was a further round of consultation to be had on the whole Plan prior to submitting for inspection and if the same issues and concerns still existed after that then Breckland had a problem.

Councillor Claussen felt that the Transport Study was essential and should be available sooner rather than later. Councillor Millbank asked if immigration/migration had been taken into account.

SW also reminded everyone in attendance that this meeting was just to get a steer to shape a document and there was more work to be done once the sites had been identified.

The preferred sites and the alternative sites were then considered.

Councillor Linda Monument, a Ward Member for Dereham wanted to discuss sites 023 and 029 which were in her Ward. She reminded Members that on the plan issued in the winter of 2015, site 023 which had potential for 200+ dwellings had been classed as unreasonable for development and she wanted to know what had changed since then and why this land had been promoted since 2015. This whole site would have to be accessed over a level crossing and both sites filtered down to some dangerous crossroads taking into account two schools and the Kings Road access to the centre of town. If this site was to be developed there would be a greater number of people including children and probably fatalities. There had not been any consultation with Mid Norfolk Railway, the crossing itself was not very wide and was dangerous for pedestrians to cross and for cyclists; she was very worried and felt that there must be some jolly good provision in relation to safety issues.

Mr Needham concurred with the aforementioned views, this was a very narrow carriageway for people to use and the Highways Department should come out and look. He mentioned the soil types which were all of a higher grade than what had been suggested.

The Chairman asked if more sites could be consulted on. PM said that there was another map as part of the agenda pack showing all of the sites put forward. Mr Needham reminded Members that the Town Council had been identifying land for 150 properties not 750 and Officers had not provided any explanation for this increase.

A question was asked about the area coloured blue on the map. SW confirmed that this blue area was the former Maltings which was an existing allocation and there had been recent interest in the site.

**Action By**

Mr Atterwill suggested a link road being installed to take the traffic away from the town. Councillor Millbank agreed as this had also been suggested at the Dereham Town Council meetings. Councillor Duigan remembered that the last Local Plan included the reasons for the unreasonable sites and felt it would be quite useful to have the same context in this one.

Mrs Baker, a Toftwood resident representing the Resident's Group was very worried about all the sites and asked what bright person had decided that the infrastructure should catch up with development. She indicated that this was like a number crunching game for the Government and Councils should not have to meet deadlines set by them. She was very surprised by the photographs as there were no cars in sight and wondered what time of day these had been taken, flooding was another big problem that should be taken into account. She wanted Dereham to be classed as a nice place to live for all our children and our children's children.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen sympathised with all concerns but noted there was nationally a massive housing shortage that needed to be addressed. The infrastructure needed to be put in place for future generations and he wanted all views to go forward as every local authority had a figure that had to be met. He felt that if Breckland went back to the consultants again it would be like an ever evolving circle and no-one would get any further forward. None of the Local Plan Working Group Members sat on the Planning Committee; the Group was seeking a steer on which of the sites the public should consult on. Breckland Council had to work with the sites it had now and he asked everyone if the four preferred sites should be consulted on or to consult on them all.

In response to a question as to what happens if after consultation none of the preferred sites came back as suitable, PM advised that all sites had been consulted on in Jan/February 2016 following which some new sites were added. The preferred sites would go out for further consultation, it was suggested that all sites should go forward for consultation. Pm reminded the meeting that the next consultation needed to clearly show the Council's preferences for the site allocations. If not, the consultation would simply repeat the exercise that took place in Jan/Feb 2016.

The Chairman of Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan Group emphasised the infrastructure issues which would have a knock on effect to neighbouring villages.

Councillor Duffield mentioned the sites that had pending planning permissions and felt that Members should be bold enough to say no.

Following all the comments and concerns mentioned above, the Chairman felt that further, wider consultation was required based on the Transport Study and based on what he had heard and he asked Officers what they would recommend in order to keep this Local Plan on target. PM advised that he would not recommend wider consultation but instead to convene another Local Plan Working

**Action By**

Group meeting before Cabinet and by then the Transport Study would be finalised.

SW explained that in terms of planning applications all would have to be considered on their own merits.

Councillor Mark Robinson shared everyone's concerns and favoured an additional meeting to deal with the issues surrounding Dereham.

Councillor Bambridge reminded the meeting that all sites would have to go through the proper planning process. As far as the site specifics for the Local Plan were concerned, he was content for sites 001, 007, 017, 018, 023 and 029 to be considered bearing in mind that the hospital site and the maltings site should be put into the mix too – all sites were feasible but he felt that 003, 005 and 024 should be removed altogether. Councillor Millbank said that she would like site 010 to be added as a proposed preferred site for consideration.

PM said that these sites appeared to meet the draft housing requirement.

**AGREED** that the sites listed above be endorsed for further consultation.

**(c) Hockering**

Councillor Bambridge who lived in the village stated that Hockering had been designated as a Local Service Centre and had a revised allocation of 25 dwellings - the preferred site was capable of holding 16 units and there was no suitable access onto The Street.

Mr Hawker from Hockering Parish Council had lived in the village for 30 years but was employed in Dereham, since then he had seen a huge increase in housing and traffic and wondered when it would all come to an end. He felt that it was not just the housing in Dereham that exacerbated the traffic and asked if public transport had been considered taking account of the daily queues on the A47. Referring to the Local Service Centre designation that Hockering had been given, he was not aware of any major employment in the village, there were no medical facilities, no consideration had been given to drainage/sewage and he profoundly believed that Hockering was not suitable as a Service Centre and was certainly not suitable for any more growth.

The Chairman disagreed and believed that Hockering met the criteria for Service Centre status. SW highlighted the audit that had been carried out for the village. Again Mr Hawker queried the employment and asked where the 22 businesses were. MP said that this information would be shared with him.

Councillor Bambridge drew attention to the sites that the Officers believed should go forward. Mr Hawker felt that none of the sites were suitable and stated that this was an opportunity for local authorities to take a step forward to Government stating that Breckland Council was not happy with all this uncontrolled growth.

SW pointed out that the existing consents for 41 dwellings had been taken into account.

**AGREED** that the preferred site 004 be endorsed for consultation.

**(d) Mattishall**

As a Local Service Centre, Mattishall had been given a revised allocation of 105 dwellings.

A Mattishall representative stated that the Neighbourhood Plan had been published and Mattishall had no problem being designated as a Local Service Centre. The village had a strong relationship with Dereham and Norwich and the village was happy to have some development but they were not content with the preferred site in question. The preferred site was capable of 77 units and he felt that all sites should not be greater than 24 dwellings and should be phased over the life time of the Local Plan. One planning application had already been rejected due to the flooding report therefore 77 houses being placed on that site was in his opinion ridiculous. He felt that any development in the village should happen in the east and he mentioned some sites situated at South Green which had for some unknown reason been ruled out. He and the parishioners would prefer to see the smaller sites on the first map on page 10 of the agenda to be given further consideration.

A Neighbourhood Plan representative said that she would not want to see any of the sites under site no. 015 downwards ruled out. Any development to the west would not be good for the village with significant consequences.

PM mentioned the comments received from the Neighbourhood Plan Group and informed residents that there was further investigation to be carried out on those other sites.

**AGREED** that the preferred site be endorsed, not the alternatives. Officers were to re-examine other alternative sites to see if these were capable of being reasonable alternatives.

**(e) North Elmham**

North Elmham had been designated as a Local Service Centre and had a revised allocation requirement of 55 dwellings. There were two preferred sites and three alternative sites to consider.

Mr John Labouchere a representative from the village stated that North Elmham and the surrounding villages hinged on the town of Dereham a great deal. He was happy with the Local Service Centre designation but the village had everything it needed and as far as he was concerned was full. He felt that the alternative site, 006 should be considered with great care as the land was very wet as it adjoined the river. The yellow hatched site should have the railway gates and the post re-aligned with the road and site 009 was being presented to the Planning Committee on 25<sup>th</sup> July. He also felt that the settlement boundary should not be breached without consultation. MP informed

**Action By**

Members that the resolution to grant planning permission on the yellow hatched site was subject to planning conditions addressing the safety issues at the Railway crossing.

Another North Elmham representative felt that site 001 to the north of the village would bring particular benefit to the community as a footpath had been installed.

**AGREED** that site 006 be withdrawn due to flood risk concerns and the remaining sites be endorsed.

**(f) Swanton Morley**

Swanton Morley had been designated as a Local Service Centre and had a revised allocation of 85 units. There was one preferred site and three alternatives.

Mr Roger Atterwill, the Chairman of Swanton Morley Parish Council mentioned the email that the Clerk of the Parish Council sent to the Planning Policy Officers asking for evidence of how these sites had been arrived at, as yet, no response had been received. He highlighted the sites that the residents and the Parish Council were in support of. He felt that there would be a serious social sustainability issue if the sites near the Village Hall, namely 0002 and 0003 were developed and he asked that these be removed. The facility was used a great deal for big events and any building near it would affect the Hall's licence.

The Strategic Planning Manager advised that adverse comments in relation to these two sites had been received. He was averse to removing these sites from the consultation but he asked if the Parish Council had any alternatives that they felt should come forward. In response, Mr Atterwill informed the meeting that he was here to offer the evidence required and this evidence had proved that there had been an overwhelming desire from residents/parish council to build on 014 and 016 as the Wensum Way had been completely resurfaced. The road would have to be widened and cycle ways and footpaths would need to be installed and additional parking facilities could be installed adjacent to the school. He reminded Members that the evidence he had requested from the Officers had not been forthcoming.

The Chairman asked if site 001 could be removed and Mr Atterwill asked if sites 014 and 016 could be added as more development could be had. The Strategic Planning Manager explained that all of these sites had already been put forward in the last round of consultation earlier in the year and that whilst he noted public opinion from the Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan survey, in pure planning terms they should still be consulted on as alternatives albeit not preferred for the reasons outlined.

It was agreed that sites 0014 and 0016 would be added as further alternative options and site 001 would be removed.

Councillor Bambridge felt that Swanton Morley had been very pro-

**Action By**

active in getting these sites into the mix.

Mr Atterwill asked if sites 0014 and 0016 could be changed to preferred sites and all the alternative sites be removed. In response, the Strategic Planning Manager said the answer to this request was no as they all have to be considered in the consultation process and the number of sites aligned to the updated draft housing numbers.

It was agreed that 0014 and 0016 could be added as alternative sites. Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen supported this proposal and he noted, without prejudice, the other 3 sites may not be taken forward following further consultation.

It was noted that over-allocation would be welcomed in some areas.

**AGREED** that the preferred site 013 be endorsed, site 001 be deleted and sites 014 and 016 be added as alternatives.

**(g) Yaxham**

The Chairman asked if there had been an update as to whether Yaxham should be classed as a Local Service Centre based on some information from the Parish Council prior to the meeting. MP advised that it was considered that Yaxham fulfilled all five criteria. There was a shop and the public house was closed at the moment but could possibly re-open. The employment in the village was highlighted.

Mr Tibbetts, a Yaxham resident said that the main employment originated from the village shop. The pub, he was certain would never re-open and the remaining employment consisted of one and two man bands – mostly self-employed people. Further to this there was no infrastructure and no medical facilities.

The Chairman felt that the employment in Yaxham should be classed as border-line thus reducing the criteria from 5 to 4 meaning Yaxham could be dropped as a Service Centre. It was agreed that the status of the school was up to capacity and the village could not support any further expansion. However, others felt that more housing could support the shop and create more community vibrancy.

Discussions were had in relation to no room to expand the school due to lack of land.

Yaxham did want growth but not Local Service Centre status. The Chairman said that there must be good reason for such status being removed.

It was pointed out that development in Yaxham could have a detrimental effect to the traffic in Dereham and Mattishall but 25 dwellings over a 20 year period was considered to be acceptable.

Councillor Sam Chapman-Allen stated that Croxton had similarly been invited to challenge the audit document.

**AGREED** that the preferred site be endorsed, subject to further

evidence being provided prior to the Cabinet meeting on 30 August 2016 in relation to the service audit.

**33/16 SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES - PLEASE REFER TO THE SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES AND PREFERRED SITES REPORT AS MENTIONED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

It was noted that Local Service Centres would retain their Settlement Boundaries. The meaning of a settlement boundary was explained.

Mr Atterwill read aloud a response from the Planning Policy Team in relation to the information that he had requested earlier in the week which he had just received.

Longham

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B**

Gressenhall

**Agreed to amend the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05A**

Beetley

There was some disappointment that Beetley had lost its Local Service Centre designation. It was confirmed that there was no Settlement Boundary for Old Beetley and East Bilney.

**Agreed to endorse the proposed retention of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05A.**

Garvestone

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B**

East Tuddenham

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B**

Lyng

It was noted that the Parish Council had requested that the Settlement Boundary be retained as it was.

**Agreed, that the proposed amendment to the Settlement Boundary be endorsed.**

Sparham

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B**

Bintree

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B**

Foxley

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B**

**Action By**

Brisley

A Brisley representative pointed out that there was divided opinion on Brisley; however, the majority favoured retention without any further development as it was felt that the provision of PD05B was not robust enough. Local support should be seen as a majority vote. There had been no time for a Parish meeting as the information at this meeting was only provided recently. It was unknown whether any further land representations had been put forward since January/February 2016. It was agreed that this would be investigated.

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B.**

Guist

**Agreed, to endorse the proposed deletion of the Settlement Boundary in line with Policy PD05B**

**34/16 NEXT MEETING**

The arrangements for the next meeting on Tuesday, 19 July at 9.30am in Watton were noted.

The meeting closed at 2.05 pm

CHAIRMAN