CABINET

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on Monday 11 June 2012 at 9.00 a.m.

Members Present:

Cabinet: Councillors J Fuller (Chairman) Y Bendle, D Bills, K Kiddie, G Wheatley, M Wilby

Non-Appointed: Councillors V Bell, T Blowfield, L Dale, M Edney, F Ellis, C Foulger, J Herbert, N Legg, B McClennig, J Mooney, B Riches, R Savage, N Ward

Officers in Attendance: The Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executive, the Director of Development and Environment, the Planning Policy Manager, the Local Plan Policy Manager, the Senior Planning Officer (SM), the Planning Consultant and the Planning Officers

Also in Attendance: 8 members of the public

2082 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following members declared interests in the matter listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr J Fuller</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr J Herbert*</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>Prejudicial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr M Wilby</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Cllr J Herbert, after having made representations to the Cabinet, left the meeting whilst the item was discussed. He was not present during any other of the discussions.

In addition to the above the declarations, all members of the Cabinet declared that they had been lobbied by developers and land owners with regard to a number of sites, in relation to minute 2068.

2083 URGENT ITEM - JOCELYN RAWLENCE
RAY GOREHAM

Cabinet was very sorry to note the deaths of Jocelyn Rawlence, former Councillor of South Norfolk Council, and Ray Goreham, the first Chief Executive of South Norfolk Council.

2084 MINUTES

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on Monday 30 April 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2085 SOUTH NORFOLK COUNCIL’S SITE SPECIFIC POLICIES AND ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT: PREFERRED OPTIONS (PART 3)

The subject of the decision

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager which sought Cabinet approval with regard to the publishing of sites within the Norwich Policy Area (excluding Cringleford, Long Stratton and Wymondham), which would form part of the next consultation stage of the Council’s Site Specific Policies and Allocations Development Plan Document.

The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that this was the last phase of sites for consideration by Cabinet, before the consultation phase. This was a particularly important phase as it included the major growth locations in the Norwich Policy Area, which would also accommodate the 1800 homes not previously attributed to a location. Members noted that 1810 homes had been allocated to fulfil this requirement and the distribution of these was outlined at Appendix 2 of the report.

In response to a query regarding the recently published National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the Planning Policy Manager confirmed that all 3 phases of the preferred options, conformed with and reflected the aims of the NPPF.

Members considered each allocation village by village.

Other Villages

Bawburgh
Members noted the small allocation of 5 dwellings; a low density to ensure no impact on the conservation area
Flordon
A decision had been made not to allocate any of the sites put forward.

Keswick
There was a proposal for a small allocation of 10 dwellings, and a new area of employment, to include a new link road from the B1113 to the A140, which was welcomed by members.

Ketteringham
Members were informed that the development boundary remained. Due to the lack of local facilities and objections from Highways, no allocation was proposed.

Swainsthorpe
Members noted the various changes proposed to the development boundary. Sites had been assessed but failed to meet the criteria on access grounds.

Service Villages

Bramerton
Officers explained that two sites had been allocated to accommodate 20 dwellings.

Little Melton
The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) had recommended an allocation of 10-20 dwellings, but, due to the suitability of sites and excellent access to services, an allocation of 50 dwellings was proposed through a combination of 3 sites. Members noted that a number of sites had been put forward for consideration but had been dismissed due to issues of access. The Chairman reminded members that not all sites could be successful and that the number of sites put forward had exceeded those allocated by fifteen to one. In response to a query regarding site 1072, officers explained that this area contained a listed building, and all things considered was not felt to be a suitable site.

Mulbarton / Bracon Ash
Cllr J Herbert, District Member for the Mulbarton ward, requested that site 273 be included in the preferred options as a strong alternative to the sites already put forward for allocation in Mulbarton. This site was much preferred by both the Parish Council and other residents of the village. The current proposal was not believed to be deliverable by local residents due to issues around access. Cllr Herbert also sought assurances that the Council was not currently negotiating the sale of open space in Mulbarton to a developer which would ensure the current allocation was more deliverable.

(having made his representations, Cllr Herbert left the room)

The Chairman stressed that every site was assessed against the same criteria and the whilst considering suitability, members needed to be blind to the ownership of land. He reminded members that the consultation period would give residents an opportunity to raise objections.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that in the rural areas, reasonable alternative sites had been identified, but all reasonable sites had already been proposed within the service villages, in order to accommodate the “floating 1800”.

(having made his representations, Cllr Herbert left the room)
The alternative site suggested by Cllr J Herbert was not deemed suitable due to its location on an acute bend, its affect on the setting of the village and objections from Highways. The site was indeed near to the local nursery and Public House, but further away from other services in the village.

Cllr N Legg, also local member for Mulbarton, understood that there were issues regarding access for the proposed allocation. He believed that the Planning Policy Manager had been working with Highways to overcome these access issues and he hoped that similar negotiations had been made with regard to site 273.

In response, officers confirmed that both sites had been considered in terms of access issues. The allocated site was supported in principle by Highways. Highways could only support a maximum of 10-20 dwellings at site 273, due to a lack of secondary access.

Mr P Leigh, Chairman of Mulbarton Parish Council was concerned that the allocation was a “done deal”. Plot 273 already had access to the main road and he suggested an alternative access point at St Omer Close. He felt that the Parish Council had not been kept informed and that the views of the Parish Council and other residents had been ignored.

The Chief Executive was concerned that the Parish Council had not felt involved in the process, explaining that all district members had been briefed on each stage of the process and been encouraged to feedback to villages in their wards.

Members acknowledged the views expressed by local members and Mulbarton Parish Council, but stressed that it was an evidence based process and that Mulbarton needed to take its share of housing allocations.

With regards to Bracon Ash, officers explained that the proposed allocation was for part of a site put forward, to accommodate 20 dwellings.

**Newton Flotman**
Members noted that the development boundary had been amended to take account of flooding issues. A small part of site 607 had been allocated to accommodate 30 dwellings.

**Spooners Row**
Cabinet noted some changes to the development boundary which had been amended to take account of flooding issues. Two sites had been allocated to accommodate a total of 15 dwellings. Cllr B McClennig suggested that the Council encouraged train operators to increase the number of trains stopping through the village and this was supported by the Chairman.

**Stoke Holy Cross**
The Planning Officer explained that part of a number of sites put forward had been amended to make one site which would accommodate 75 dwellings.

**Surlingham**
Members noted minor alterations to the development boundary. A total of 10 dwellings had been proposed over two allocated sites.

**Swardeston**
Members noted that part of site 978d had been allocated to accommodate 30 dwellings

**Tasburgh**
Cabinet noted that site 511 had been allocated to accommodate 20 dwellings.

**Norwich Fringe**

**Colney**
Members noted one small extension to the development boundary. The Senior Planning Officer explained Colney to be one of the strategic employment locations in the Norwich area. The total area of development had not changed, just a slight configuration of allocation was proposed.

**Trowse**
Members noted that two sites had been allocated to accommodate 250 dwellings. It was also proposed to retain the allocation for a park and ride site on the opposite side of the A47.

**Key Service Centres**

**Poringland / Framingham Earl**
Cabinet was advised that a flood risk study had indicated that those areas with only a low risk of flooding were those areas furthest away from services. Four sites had been allocated, accommodating approximately 320 additional dwellings. Three further sites had been allocated to allow for a care home, employment and amenity open space.

**Costessey**
Members noted that although Costessey provided a good range of services, due to the way in which they were distributed, allocating sites to be close to services was difficult. There were also significant landscape issues and Highways had indicated that it would not wish to see additional traffic on roads through Old Costessey, such as West End, The Street, and Folgate Lane.

Officers explained the main allocation to be at site 270a, west of Lodge Farm, to accommodate 500 new homes. Site 270b was to be retained as an open space for associated green infrastructure.

Sites A0001 a b and c and site 782 were proposed as allocations for employment uses, as the JCS had identified Longwater as a strategic employment area.

Site 522 had been included as an employment allocation in the longer term, subject to capacity at the A47 Longwater junction.

Cllr V Bell, local member for Costessey, explained that the Parish Council was happy with the proposals. She explained that the Parish Council had felt engaged throughout the whole process and she commended all officers involved.

**Easton**
Members noted that a site had been proposed to the west of Easton (part of which fell within the jurisdiction of Broadland District Council) for approximately 40 ha of development. Due to the size of the proposals and its location across two local
authorities, it was not possible to include the site as a preferred allocation. Members noted that instead, a possible site for 5-10 ha was included in the consultation document, and that views would be sought on alternative locations.

The Chairman expressed concerns that this application was too large and diverse. Members also noted that the site had not been put forward as part of the Broadland’s Site Specific Policies and Allocations.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that a substantial allocation to accommodate 900 homes was proposed along with associated infrastructure, to include an enhanced village centre and improvements to the primary school.

**Hethersett**

Members noted that significant allocation of 1226 houses was proposed. Officers explained that due to the village’s proximity to Little Melton and Wymondham, considerable strategic landscaping would be required to ensure the separation of sites.

Cllr G Wheatley commented on the surrounding allocations in neighbouring villages, stressing the need for a co-ordinated approach. Cllr D Bills, local member for Hethersett was satisfied with the proposals but stressed that the numbers proposed were an absolute maximum. Cllr L Dale, also local member for the village, was concerned at the proposed number of houses, referring to an accident black spot at Henstead Road.

**Hethel**

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the Joint Core Strategy had identified Hethel as a strategic employment location, suggesting a development of around 20 ha to focus on advanced engineering and growth of technology capabilities. Large scale general employment was not deemed to be appropriate.

Cllr N Legg queried the proposed new development boundary, asking why it did not encompass the TML Engineering site. Officers agreed to review further the proposed development boundary for employment use.

Summing up, the Chairman referred to the extensive assessment process that had taken place. The process had been very thorough and complicated at times but all allocations were evidence based. He stressed that the Council would listen to any objections made as part of the consultation process, but any representations needed to be policy based.

The Planning Policy Manager explained the next stage of the process was to produce a sustainability report to accompany the consultation. It was likely that the consultation would commence the beginning of September.

**The Decision**

RESOLVED:

1. To
(a) To agree the sites shown as preferred options in the appendices to the report as the Council’s preferred options for:

**OTHER VILLAGES:** Bawburgh, Colton, Flordon, Keswick, Ketteringham, Marlingford, Swainsthorpe

**SERVICE VILLAGES:** Bramerton, Little Melton, Mulbarton & Bracon Ash, Newton Flotman, Spooner Row, Stoke Holy Cross, Surlingham, Swardeston, Tasburgh

**NORWICH FRINGE:** Colney, Trowse

**KEY SERVICE CENTRES:**
Poringland/Framingham Earl

**GROWTH LOCATIONS:** Costessey/Easton and Hethersett

**STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT LOCATIONS:**
Hethel, Colney (NRP)

(b) That officers review further the development boundary proposed at Hethel, for employment use.

2. To note that these sites will be included in the preferred options consultation document, to be published in September 2012.

3. To delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, the ability to agree to corrections and minor text changes to the consultation document, providing they are not material to the preferred sites agreed.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure planned and co-ordinated future development, allowing residents to be involved in shaping communities.

**2086 DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES DOCUMENT**

The subject of the decision

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which proposed the topics and policies to be included in the draft Development Management Policies Document.

The Planning Consultant outlined his report, drawing members’ attention to the findings of the Regulation 25 public consultation outlined at Appendix B, and the
proposed topics and policies to be covered in the new draft Development Management Policies Document, at Appendix A of the report. He explained that the impact of the National Planning Policy Framework had been considered when preparing the table of proposed topics and policies.

The Decision

RESOLVED: To:

(a) Note the findings of the public consultation outlined at Appendix B

(b) Agree the Table (Appendix A) as the basis for preparing Development Management Policies and supporting documentation.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure fair decision making process that complies with national planning policies and the Joint Core Strategy.

2087 WYMONDHAM 2026 – SHAPING THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF YOUR TOWN VISION AND OBJECTIVES

The subject of the decision

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which sought approval for the vision and objectives of the Wymondham Area Action Plan, allowing officers to proceed with the production of a more detailed preferred options document for public consultation in autumn 2012.

The Planning Officer explained that the first stage of the consultation was to gather people’s views about future development in Wymondham. In addition to Wymondham residents, those from Spooner Row, Suton and other neighbouring parishes were asked to complete the questionnaire. Some very clear messages had arisen from the consultation and these included the need to protect the unique historical character of the town and to maintain the gap between the town and Hethersett. The results of the consultation together with requirements in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) had been used to create a vision and set objectives for the Area Action Plan.

Cllr R Savage, local member for Wymondham, thanked the Council and officers for allowing Wymondham to be involved in shaping its own future through the Area Action Plan. He was satisfied with the allocation to allow for 2,200 new homes and was pleased to note that the town would not need to share the burden of the “floating 1800” additional homes required by the JCS.

Cllr J Mooney, also a local member for the town, drew members’ attention to the questionnaire results which indicated residents’ wishes to protect open spaces and the Tiffey Valley from development. He added that the residents of Wymondham
were not against a new supermarket; they just wanted to ensure that it was
developed in the right location.

The Chairman commended the report and was pleased to note that local residents
had been so positively involved in the process. Members noted that the preferred
options for the site specific policies and Allocations DPD for Wymondham would be
reported to Cabinet on 16 July 2012.

The Decision

RESOLVED:

1. To approve the Vision and Objectives, outlined at
Appendix 2 of the report and to instruct officers to
proceed with production of a Preferred Options document
for public consultation in autumn 2012.

2. To note that the Preferred Options document will be
considered at 16 July 2012 meeting of the Cabinet

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure a coordinated approach can be taken with regard to the future growth of
Wymondham, allowing residents to be involved in shaping the future of the town.

2088 RESPONSE TO THE PUBLICATION OF THE NORFOLK MINERALS AND
WASTE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: MINERALS SITE SPECIFIC
ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT PRE-SUBMISSION
VERSION AND WASTE SITE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN
DOCUMENT PRE-SUBMISSION VERSION

The subject of the decision

Members considered the report of the Local Plan Policy Manager, which
recommended a suggested response to Norfolk County Council’s publication of its
pre-submission versions of its Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations
Development Plan Documents.

Members noted the contents of the suggested response and concurred with the
view that an objection should be raised to the non allocation of the waste
management provision in Bergh Apton. The Chairman wished to emphasise that
this was the only waste recycling centre serving the eastern half of the South
Norfolk District.

With regard to the proposed mineral site provision in Wymondham, both Cllrs N
Ward and R Savage indicated the need for adequate landscaping to ensure the
impact on surrounding area was minimised.

The Decision
RESOLVED: To agree the response outlined at Appendix 4 of the report and its submission to Norfolk County Council, subject to minor amendment to emphasise that the Bergh Apton household waste recycling centre is the only such facility serving the eastern half of South Norfolk district.

The Reasons for the Decision
To ensure that appropriate considerations are applied to the allocation of sites

2089 CABINET POLICY COMMITTEES – FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

The subject of the decision
Members considered the report of the Compliance and Risk Manager, which set out an initial work programme for the Policy Committees over the forthcoming year, for Cabinet to review and approve.

Referring to paragraph 3.3 of the report, Cllr D Bills stressed the need for Cabinet to agree to the formation of a cross-cutting task and finish group to review the future of the Council’s leisure service.

The Decision
RESOLVED:
1. To note the work programmes attached at Appendix 1 of the report;

2. To approve the working style for Cabinet Policy Committees, outlined at Appendix 2 of the report.

3. To agree the formation of a Cabinet Task and Finish Group to review the future of the Council’s leisure centres.

The Reasons for the Decision
To support a co-ordinated approach to the development of policy.

2090 VARIATIONS TO SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS – DISCOUNTED MARKET SALE

Members noted the reasons for the report being withdrawn.

2091 CABINET CORE AGENDA

Members noted the latest version of the Cabinet Core Agenda
(The meeting concluded at 12.08 pm)

___________________________
Chairman