

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

LDF TASK & FINISH GROUP

**Held on Wednesday, 15 December 2010 at 3.30 pm in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham, NR19 1EE**

PRESENT

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

Mr D.S. Myers (Chairman)
Mr F.J. Sharpe (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs A.L. Steward
Mrs L.S. Turner

Also Present

Mr S.G. Bambridge
Mr J.P. Cowen
Lady Fisher

Mr P.J. Hewett
Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris

In Attendance

Phil Daines

- Development Services Manager (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)

Helen McAleer

- Senior Committee Officer

Sarah Robertson

- Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)

Jamie Smith

- Environmental Planning Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)

David Spencer

- Principal Planning Policy Officer (Capita Symonds for Breckland)

Mark Stokes

- Deputy Chief Executive

22/10 INTRODUCTION

The Chairman explained the procedure for the meeting which had been called at the request of Cabinet, to consider amendments to the proposed Site Specifics Submission Document. Elected Members would be free to speak.

23/10 APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Mr B Rose.

Mr P Cowen had also sent apologies as he would be arriving late. (He joined the meeting during Agenda Item 4).

24/10 URGENT BUSINESS

There was none.

25/10 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The Chairman clarified that Members would only need to declare a prejudicial interest if they owned, or had relatives or close friends who owned, any of the specific sites under consideration.

Action By

Action By

Mr P Duigan and Mrs L Turner declared a personal interest in the site near Windmill Avenue in Dereham as the Town Council (of which they were both Councillors) owned land in the vicinity.

Mr F Sharpe declared a personal interest in paragraph 3.4.16 on page 6 of the Agenda (re Swaffham).

Lady K Fisher declared a personal interest in paragraph 3.6 on page 7 of the Agenda (re Habitats Regulation Assessment).

Mr P Cowen declared a personal interest as an architect in practice in the district.

26/10 SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES & PROPOSALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT 2001-2026

The Principal Planning Policy Officer gave a brief update on the history of the document. The Preferred Options for the Site Specifics Policies and Proposals had been published in June 2010 for six weeks public consultation.

The majority of the comments received had referred to site D2 in Dereham and site SH2 in Shipdham. Relatively few comments had been received regarding proposed changes to Settlement Boundaries.

Following consideration of all representations received and approval by Cabinet and Council the proposed Submission Document would be published at the end of January 2011 before submission for Independent Examination.

At Cabinet on 30 November 2010 the document had been referred back to the LDF Task & Finish Group (the Group) for further clarification. Ward Representatives had been asked to provide comments.

The areas highlighted for clarification were included, in alphabetical order, on the agenda.

27/10 SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES (APPENDIX A) AND SITE ALLOCATIONS (APPENDIX B)

For ease of reference, Settlement Boundaries and site allocations would be dealt with together. See each Parish below.

(a) **Beetley**

The original Officer recommendation had been to retain the Settlement Boundary.

Following a representation received, it was proposed to amend the Settlement Boundary to omit the school playing field.

RESOLVED to support the Officer recommendation.

Action By

(b) **Cockley Cley**

The original Officer recommendation had been to delete the Settlement Boundary. The Group had recommended its retention. Officers reiterated their reasoning for deleting the boundary; the village was wholly within the Stone Curlew buffer zone; there was no room for expansion; and there was only one key service in the village.

Members noted that the Parish Council had made vigorous representation to retain the boundary. They also felt that the Stone Curlew buffer would limit development and saw no reason to remove the boundary.

Mr Cowen pointed out that the reason no representations had been received during the public consultation was because the Parish Council and residents believed that their views had already been taken into consideration following the Group meeting and its recommendation to retain the boundary. He also suggested that the Stone Curlew buffer zone might be reviewed.

The Ward Representative proposed that the Settlement Boundary should be retained as previously agreed.

RESOLVED to retain the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

(c) **Croxton**

Officers had originally recommended three changes to the Settlement Boundary, however, following consultation with the Parish Council seven changes had been agreed by Cabinet.

The Change at CRO.6, which had been to tighten the Settlement Boundary, was no longer appropriate as planning permission had been granted.

It was therefore recommended that the six remaining changes should be carried forward.

RESOLVED to support the Officer recommendation.

(d) **Dereham**

A significant number of representations had been received in relation to the Preferred Options consultation.

In response to the concerns raised, Officers were recommending a reduction in the number of homes to be developed at D2 (from 240 to 220) and the inclusion of a small additional allocation at D4 (previously known as D6) the nursery site at Shipdham Road.

Dereham Members queried the inclusion of D4 which was remote from the town centre, with minimal facilities especially for children, and on a busy road. It was also suggested that D4 could be left in abeyance to see if the allocation could be taken up by some of the local villages not

Action By

currently allocated for development, which might, under the new Localism Bill, be able to expand if they so wished.

A Member queried the designation of glasshouses and it was confirmed that they did not qualify as brownfield sites currently. However, the site had other structures on it and its edge of town position meant that it was likely to come through the planning system. This was considered to be a good opportunity to settle its future with a positive allocation.

RESOLVED that site D4 (Shipdham Road) was not supported, contrary to Officer recommendation.

(e) **East Tuddenham**

Officers had originally recommended the deletion of the Settlement Boundary, but following representations made by the Parish Council the Group had supported their wish to retain the boundary. It had been pointed out that there were good employment opportunities in the village. Officers had investigated and confirmed that there were employment and social opportunities in the village and they had therefore recommended three amendments to the Settlement Boundary.

The Parish Council supported the amendments but had requested the inclusion of an area of land north of Mattishall Road at 'The Baynings' to provide an opportunity for the development of about seven family homes, to balance the large amount of smaller, affordable housing already available in the village.

Officers explained their reasons for wishing to exclude land to the north of Mattishall Road and pointed out that under the current planning system, although the Development Control Committee might refuse an application for a larger number of houses on that site, due to its size there was the possibility that such an application might be approved on appeal by an independent Inspector.

The Ward Representative acknowledged the danger of including the site as it could potentially lead to larger development than the Parish Council wanted. He suggested that it could be included at a later date, when numbers could be controlled.

RESOLVED to support the changes to the Settlement Boundary with the inclusion of land at ET.2 and incorporate land north of Mattishall Road ('The Baynings') contrary to Officer recommendation.

(f) **Foxley**

The Group had recommended the retention of the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation. The Ward Representative explained that there was a diversity of opinion; the Parish Council did not want development but large numbers of the residents did. Everyone, however, wished to retain the Settlement Boundary.

RESOLVED to retain the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

Action By

(g) **Gressenhall**

Following representations received it was recommended that an additional amendment should be made to the Settlement Boundary at GR.3 to tighten the boundary at the rear of 18 Bittering Street, to match the boundary at 14 and 16 Bittering Street.

RESOLVED to support the additional amendment as recommended.

(h) **Guist**

The Group had supported the retention of the four areas of Settlement Boundary against Officer recommendation. Officers still felt that the boundary should be deleted.

A Member recalled that the Group had wanted to retain the boundary to support the Post Office and store in the village. However, as they were unlikely to survive, he now agreed with the Officer's recommendation.

Another Member noted that as other Post Offices in nearby villages had already closed, more people were likely to be using the Guist facility.

RESOLVED to support the retention of the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

(i) **Ickburgh**

This village was similar to Cockley Cley in that it was wholly within the Stone Curlew buffer zone. Due to that fact and the limited facilities in the village Officers were again recommending the removal of the Settlement Boundary.

The Ward Representative was concerned that there was only one Parish meeting a year. She asked if they had been given an opportunity to comment and this was confirmed.

RESOLVED to support the retention of the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

(j) **Little Cressingham**

Officers reiterated their reasons for recommending the deletion of the Settlement Boundary. However, the Ward Member said that five people had made representations to keep the boundary and they should be supported. He also pointed out that the village was only two miles from Watton and all the facilities there.

RESOLVED to support retention of the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

Action By

(k) **Shipdham**

Lots of representations had been received on the Shipdham allocation and in response to those the Officers had amended their recommendations.

The Thomas Bullock Playing Field site was no longer proposed as a Preferred Option. The site at SH.1 (the Coal Yard) was proposed for 80 dwellings (an increase from 50) in addition to the site at SH.2 (Parklands Avenue).

The Ward Representative said that he and the Parish Council welcomed the change. He pointed out some inconsistencies in the report and asked for clarification.

Other Members also noted that the report needed to be absolutely clear when it was published for consultation purposes. The Principal Planning Policy Officer agreed and said that there would be just one set of maps published with a clear legend to avoid confusion.

With regard to the four Settlement Boundary changes previously recommended, it was proposed to add a fifth amendment at SHP5 between 27 and 29 Market Street to reflect development already built.

The Ward Representative said that the changes made perfect sense.

RESOLVED to support the recommendations.

(l) **Shropham**

A favourable response had been received to the proposed changes to the Settlement Boundary. Following consultation a further amendment was proposed at SHR.3.

The Ward Representative applauded the proposal which he said were well thought out and well considered. He thanked the team, on behalf of the community, for considering their wishes.

A Member asked how the sites would be accessed and it was explained that they the right size to be accessed from a private drive.

RESOLVED to support the recommendations.

(m) **Sparham**

Officers were recommending the removal of the Settlement Boundary.

The Ward Representative supported its retention and pointed out that the village was within three miles of many facilities and employment opportunities. He said that the community wanted to retain ownership of their village and the Parish Council were hoping for modest expansion in the future.

RESOLVED to retain the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

Action By

(n) **Stanfield**

Officers were recommending the removal of the Settlement Boundary, but Members had supported its retention previously and did so again.

RESOLVED to retain the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

(o) **Stow Bedon**

Officers were recommending the removal of the Settlement Boundary, but Members had supported its retention previously and did so again.

RESOLVED to retain the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

(p) **Tittleshall**

Officers were recommending the removal of the Settlement Boundary, but Members had supported its retention previously and did so again.

RESOLVED to retain the Settlement Boundary, contrary to Officer recommendation.

(q) **Watton**

15 amendments to the Settlement Boundary had been consulted on and one additional amendment was proposed at WAT.16 to include land with planning permission.

Watton Town Council had requested the inclusion of an additional piece of land adjacent the cemetery to allow its extension. However, it was pointed out that such an extension would be supported by Officers, outside the Settlement Boundary.

A Member noted that if the land was included within the Settlement Boundary it could lead to development on the land, precluding its potential use as an extension to the cemetery.

RESOLVED to support the recommendations.

28/10 ADDITIONAL ITEMS CONSIDERED

(a) **Garvestone**

This village was included in the report due to a recent planning permission.

Seven amendments had been recommended to tighten the Settlement Boundary around the village, restricting development. However, in light of the recent planning approval, Officers were recommending that GV.3 should be retained within the boundary.

RESOLVED to support the amendment as recommended.

Action By

(b) **Garboldisham**

It was clarified that the Fox Public House had been removed from the Settlement Boundary.

(c) **Harling**

Issues had been raised by the Ward Representative and the Parish Council. Boundary changes had been agreed by the Group at HAR.2 on the West Harling Road. The boundary had been extended to include a site with planning permission for ten houses, but not extended around the adjacent site with permission for 15 houses, as that development had not been commenced.

The Ward Representative sought clarification on the number of sites allocated. 50 houses had been agreed and she asked if that number would be exceeded.

It was confirmed that no further allocations would be made through the LDF process. Excluding the site with planning permission for 15 houses gave Members the opportunity to keep to the 50 limit if that site did not go forward.

(d) **East Guiltcross**

The Ward Representative for East Guiltcross had asked if Banham, Snetterton and Quidenham were excluded from the document because they were in the Attleborough Area Action Plan (AAAP).

It was confirmed that Banham was covered by the Site Specifics document but that Eccles Road Quidenham and Snetterton were in the AAAP which was now out for consultation.

(e) **Dereham Allocation at Greenfields Road**

A Dereham Ward Representative passed on the concerns of his constituents with regards to potential 'rat-running' associated with this development.

The Development Services Manager suggested that such issues could be addressed by the Development Control process.

(f) **Swaffham Allocation**

Mr F Sharpe declared a personal interest in this item.

He had been asked to express the Town Council's disappointment with the recommendation of the Brandon Road site for 250 houses. It was adjacent to a site with planning permission for 400 houses and the additional traffic from those sites would cause highway problems.

Although the Town Council had a vested interest in another site, they would rather have no site than the one proposed because of the problems it would cause.

A Member suggested that the S106 contributions might allow a by-pass to be built.

Action By

29/10 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The following appendices are attached to the Minutes for information:

Appendix A	Settlement Boundary changes; and
Appendix B	a list of additional representations received.

The meeting closed at 6.05 pm

CHAIRMAN