

PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party held on Monday, 14 December 2020 remotely via Zoom at 10.00 am

Committee	Mr A Brown (Chairman) Mr N Dixon Ms V Gay Mr N Pearce Mr J Toye	Mrs P Grove-Jones (Vice-Chairman) Mr P Fisher Mr P Heinrich Mr J Punchard
------------------	---	--

Members also attending: Mrs A Fitch-Tillett (substitute for Dr C Stockton)
Mrs W Fredericks (substitute for Mr T Adams)

Observers:

Mr H Blathwayt
Mr V FitzPatrick
Mr R Kershaw
Mr N Lloyd
Mr J Rest
Mr E Seward
Miss L Shires

Officers in Attendance: Head of Planning, Planning Policy Manager, Planning Policy Team Leader, Senior Planning Officer, Landscape Officer, Landscape Officer (Design) Democratic Services Manager, Democratic Services & Governance Officer.

52 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mr T Adams and Dr C Stockton. Two substitute Members attended the meeting as shown above.

53 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

The Chairman welcomed the members of the public who were present and stated that he would allow them to speak under the relevant agenda items, and that he would take agenda item 10 first.

54 MINUTES

The Minutes of a meeting of the Working Party held on 9 November 2020 were approved as a correct record.

55 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

56 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

All Members had received information from Mr Mack, landowner of BLA01, and numerous emails in respect of items on the agenda.

Councillor Mrs W Fredericks declared that she knew the landowner of Mundesley MUN03/A.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett declared that she knew the land owner of Mundesley MUN03/A. She was Vice-Chairman of the Norfolk Coast Partnership and the Council's representative on the Wash and North Norfolk Marine Partnership, both of which had had lengthy inputs into the Landscape Character Assessment.

Councillor P Heinrich declared that he was a member of North Walsham Town Council.

57 UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (IF ANY)

None.

58 LOCAL PLAN - PROGRESS UPDATE ON SITE SELECTION OPTIONS - DEFERRED SITES

The Planning Policy Manager presented an update report on the deferred sites at Blakeney and Mundesley.

Blakeney

Rosemary Thew, Chairman of Blakeney Parish Council, made a statement to the Working Party (summarised). The Kingsway site (BLA04/A) was preferred but further information had recently been tabled, which the Parish Council had not had the opportunity to discuss. There had been no public consultation on the Oddfellows site (BLA01/B). The Oddfellows site would block views, require an extensive roadway which would cause disruption to residents and lighting would run counter to the dark skies policy. Direct access via Morston Road would be dangerous for pedestrians and proposed pedestrian access would compound problems on Queensway, which was already dangerous. The Kingsway site would be closer to existing development, would not block views and a footpath ran along the length of the site which would allow easy access to village facilities and for children to walk directly to school. Affordable housing was the main issue for the village and more large houses and second homes were not needed. She requested deferral for one month to allow both proposals to be tabled at a Parish Council meeting on 12 January 2021.

The Chairman responded that it would not be appropriate to delay consideration of this matter. Full consideration had been given in July 2020 and the Local Plan was subject to a rigid timetable to enable it to be submitted for examination by the Inspector in mid-2021.

Four members of the public spoke in support of BLA01/B (summarised):

Clive Albany: Referred to the previous decision and discussions at the July meeting. The areas of concern had been resolved. BLA04/A would be more prominent and would not provide the opportunity for green space. The 1.5 ha of green space, housing design, safe village pathways and off-road siting easily outweighed any minor negatives of BLA01/B when compared to BLA04/A's prominent, crowded basic design and total lack of any public green space.

John Fairlie: Both sites have been tested against the adopted and draft Landscape Character Assessment and adopted Conservation Area and Management Plan

criteria. BLA01/B would meet allocation and affordable housing requirements, with landscaped views from Langham Road. The topography of the site would allow for a scheme with open space and landscaping features that would reflect the density of development across the village and blend into the existing settlement pattern. It would provide footpath connectivity with Morston Road and maintain important views. BLA04/A would conflict with the Local Plan evidence base as it would create a hard edge to the village, interrupt the setting of the Church, provide no connectivity to residential streets and change the character of the approach to the village.

John Bryant: Site 01 would best meet the needs of the village, is already more connected to the village than site 04, and would be further connected by footpaths and a cycleway. It would provide for landscaping and open space, and have the minimum environmental and visual impact on the landscape. Plans for site 04 could not match the exciting plans for site 01. The development of site 04 would spoil views to the east as you enter Blakeney and block views of the church, contrary to the adopted Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

David Foreman: Accept the need for homes for local people but regret the necessity for expensive homes to finance them. The environmental and visual impact should be mitigated by placing the houses in the least obtrusive position. Referred to the decision at the July meeting; the facts have not changed and neither should the decision.

Three members of the public spoke in favour of BLA04/A (summarised):

Tony Hadley: BLA01/B would require a 250m long access road, which would cause disturbance to wildlife, pollution, compromise the dark skies policy and scar the landscape, there were concerns over viability and connectivity to the village. Blakeney Parish Council unanimously supported BLA04/A. Coast/sea/marsh views were unique to the coastline and especially Blakeney and views of the church would not be lost. BLA04/A would provide the right accommodation in the right location and within budget.

John Myers: The site would provide much more convenient and pleasant access to services for its residents. The development would require less greenfield land and would not incur the expense of providing the roadway nor its incursion into agricultural land. Being on higher ground, the site would be more resilient to flood risk. The development would not obscure important views. The quality of the market houses would be higher than those on BLA01/B.

Tim Schofield: There is questionable viability in respect of the Oddfellows site. Both sites are located in an exceptionally sensitive area and BLA04 was preferred by the Council after careful consideration by professional analysts and extensive public consultation, and there was a strong evidence base for the choice. Density is appropriate for this context, whereas BLA01 would be twice the size with half the density and require a huge amount of land to make it acceptable, including a large tranche of BLA09 which was widely discredited during the call for sites and consultation phases. BLA04/A would not require large tracts of land.

The Planning Policy Manager displayed a map showing the location of the sites, and photographs taken from viewpoints on both proposals.

At the request of the Chairman, the Planning Policy Manager outlined the procedure for the Local Plan to proceed to the next stage. He explained that all discounted options had been published at Regulation 18 stage, so there had been consultation

on the Oddfellows site at that stage. Members were now selecting the final choice of sites to submit for examination, prior to which they would be subject to Regulation 19 public consultation, with all other options excluded. The public could comment on the selected sites and those comments would be considered by the Inspector. The Council would defend and justify its proposals to the Inspector, who would decide if those proposals were acceptable. People who made representations at Regulation 19 stage would have the opportunity to be heard at the examination by the Inspector.

The Planning Policy Manager read to the Working Party, the comments of Councillor Ms K Ward, the local Member. Councillor Ms Ward had been extensively lobbied over both sites and had no financial interest in either site. The overriding consideration for the majority of residents who had contacted her was the provision of local homes for local people, and in particular, homes for social rent. Residents would support the site that guaranteed the most social housing, particularly if it could be secured for local letting rather than general letting. She understood that BLA04 was preferred by the Parish Council as the landowner was offering significant social housing provision, and local housing providers were already working with the Parish Council to secure local letting options. She had not been provided with information on the social housing provision for BLA01. She requested that the Working Party select the site that had demonstrated commitment to social housing provision. Both sites were problematic from a landscape perspective but she did not consider that landscape was a critical issue at this stage.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the preparation of the Local Plan was concerned with the principle of allocating land, the number of dwellings, controlling layout etc and provision of affordable housing. Affordable housing on allocated sites should be delivered for general letting. Both sites were offering 35% affordable housing which should be delivered in the tenure mix set by policy, but priority would be determined by the Housing Enabling Team under the general lettings policy and not the local lettings policy. He advised the Working Party to treat both sites equally as they were offering broadly similar quantities and mixes of affordable homes.

Councillor N Dixon stated that a decision had to be made and he was satisfied that the Officer's recommendation should be supported.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett stated that she was always concerned about incursions into the AONB and would take some comfort if the design were to be of a local vernacular. She was also concerned about light pollution. She asked if it was possible to address these issues at this stage.

The Planning Policy Manager advised that design was a matter for consideration at planning application stage when the impact could be judged.

Councillor J Toye considered that the paths should be well maintained to discourage people from using cars or an unsuitable route. He asked what the proposals were for both sites.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that it would be possible to walk to the key village facilities from either site. It would be difficult to separate the sites in terms of their proximity to day to day services or on the basis of a better link. It might be possible to improve the existing footpath within site BLA04/A, but only for the section that ran parallel to the site itself.

Councillor Ms V Gay stated that she had formed the impression at the July meeting

that Blakeney Parish Council had no preference, but it was now clear that the Parish Council had a view in this matter which would weigh with her when casting her vote.

Councillor P Heinrich considered that there was a fine balance between the sites but he had to take note of the Parish Council view. He also took note of the Officer's arguments in favour of BLA04/A. He was still considering his position but tended towards the recommendation.

Councillor N Pearce considered that either choice would have a detrimental effect on the environment and surrounding area. He applauded the inclusion of affordable housing in both schemes. He asked if the percentage of affordable housing was definite.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that it was unusual for viability assessments to be submitted at this stage. In both cases they were based on assumptions rather than specific proposals, but both claimed to be able to deliver 35% affordable housing. Both assessments had taken a reasonable view in relation to the costs associated with development, and the Oddfellows promoters had included the costs of providing the road. Neither viability assessment had been subject to professional scrutiny and had been taken at face value, but there was nothing that indicated to him that they would struggle to reach 35% as the housing market in Blakeney was very buoyant with high property values.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones considered that reasoned arguments had been put forward for both sites and it was a finely balanced decision. She was minded to support the Officer's recommendation.

The Head of Planning stated that what had been put forward by both parties was an expression of intent on the balance of probabilities. These were not planning applications, there was no Section 106 Agreement tied to them and the matter would have to be resolved through the development management process.

It was proposed by Councillor N Dixon, seconded by Councillor P Grove-Jones and

RECOMMENDED unanimously

That site BLA04/A (land east of Langham Road) is retained as an allocation in the proposed submission Local Plan and the final policy wording is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager.

Mundesley

Mrs W Fredericks, the local Member, stated that she was very pleased that the number of dwellings had been reduced from 50 to 30 and expressed her appreciation for the consultation with Mundesley Parish Council. She requested that the dwellings were sited away from the Victorian terraced properties as there were concerns regarding drainage, overlooking and overshadowing.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the site was large enough to accommodate a variety of layouts. The impact on the terrace would be a matter for consideration by the Development Committee when a planning application was submitted. He suggested that wording be added to the policy to flag up the need to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Councillor Mrs Fredericks welcomed the suggested additional wording and proposed

the recommendation subject to that amendment. This was seconded by Councillor A Brown.

RECOMMENDED unanimously

That MUN03/A – land off Cromer Road and Church Lane (reduced to approximately 30 dwellings) is retained as an allocation in the proposed Submission Local Plan, and the final policy wording is delegated to the Planning Policy Manager, to include the need to protect the amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Holt and Cromer

The Planning Policy Manager reported that a report would be submitted regarding Beresford Road, Holt in the New Year.

The sites at Cromer would be reconsidered when a decision had been made on a planning application in respect of Norwich Road, Cromer.

59 LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT AND LANDSCAPE SENSITIVITY ASSESSMENT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

The Planning Policy Team Leader presented a report relating to the Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) and Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (LCS) Supplementary Planning Guidance, which considered the representations made at Regulation 12 and 13 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance preparation. He recommended that the Working Party recommend to Cabinet the adoption of the documents as guidance to inform the preparation of the Local Plan and for use as material considerations in the preparation and determination of planning proposals in North Norfolk, and to give the Head of Planning the authority to follow the remaining statutory processes which included the withdrawal of the 2009 LCA and the issuing of notices to replace the statutory documents on the Council's website and publish them in a timely manner.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett paid tribute to the Landscape Officer (Design) for her work on this matter. She proposed the recommendation.

The Chairman supported Councillor Mrs Fitch-Tillett's comments and seconded the proposal.

RECOMMENDED unanimously

That Cabinet:

- 1. Adopts and publishes the revised 2021 Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Assessment as Supplementary Planning Guidance.**
- 2. Revokes the existing 2009 North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment in line with the legislative requirements.**

Gives delegated authority to the Head of Planning in relation to the required statutory process.

60 RECREATION AVOIDANCE MITIGATION STRATEGY

The Planning Policy Team Leader presented a report which summarised the feedback received in response to the Regulation 18 stage of plan preparation and sought to agree the final in principle policy approach to address the impacts of growth through the adoption of a Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.

Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett was pleased that this strategy had come forward. There had been an enormous amount of visitor disturbance during 2020. She paid tribute to the work that had been carried out by the Council's Officers and across the County through the Duty to Cooperate, and proposed the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor A Brown seconded the proposal.

Councillor Ms V Gay asked how the scheme would work and what would happen once the tariffs were collected.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that the tariffs would be collected at a fixed rate per dwelling, which would be paid into a collective fund to be controlled by a County-wide steering group. The funding would be used for a range of measures including the appointment of rangers and provision of signage. The group had not yet been set up but it would be necessary to demonstrate that it was in place when the Plan reached the examination stage. Kings Lynn and Great Yarmouth Councils were already operating their own schemes and would pay the funds into the County-wide fund once it was set up.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the Working Party was being asked to agree the principle of the tariff payments. The administration of the scheme was an issue for the future.

The Landscape Officer explained that it was likely that roving wardens would be appointed who would be allocated to specific sites once the impact had been identified and the money collected. The wardens would combat visitor issues through signage and direct communication to encourage appropriate behaviour by the public at these sites. This was seen as best practice and schemes were in place elsewhere in the country. The partnership would be Norfolk based and would be able to allocate money when the development and impact was envisaged.

Councillor P Heinrich welcomed the proposals. He was pleased to see that Bacton Wood and Ansons Wood would form a country park and stated that it was important to be able to manage those areas better than was currently the case when the North Walsham Western Extension was developed.

RECOMMENDED unanimously

- 1. That Cabinet endorses the approach and delegates responsibility for drafting such an approach, including that of finalising the associated tariff and Policy to be included in the Local Plan to the Planning Manager.**
- 2. That Cabinet endorse Option 1 set out in the report to the Working Party in respect of the collection of the tariff.**

61 LOCAL PLAN DRAFT POLICY APPROACHES TO THE ENVIRONMENT

The Planning Policy Team Leader presented a report relating to draft Environment

policies, which summarised the feedback received in response to the Regulation 18 public consultation and the Officer responses, and recommended that Cabinet endorse the policy approaches as set out in the report.

The Chairman commended the Officers on their work on the policies. The Planning Policy Team Leader thanked him for his comments.

Councillor Ms V Gay welcomed the policies and the strengthening of the wording compared to the current Core Strategy, and in particular the requirement to comply with the Design Guide. She welcomed the attention given to geology, which had been highlighted in the consultation, and the particular strength given to the historic environment.

Councillor P Heinrich supported Councillor Ms Gay's comments and thanked the Officers for their work. He considered that ENV9: High Quality Design would be critical to the Development Brief for the North Walsham Western Extension and should be seen by the public as setting the expected standards.

The Planning Policy Team Leader explained that Officers had worked very collaboratively across the disciplines to ensure that the policies flowed on from each other and connected back to the Council's objectives.

It was proposed by Councillor Ms V Gay, seconded by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones and

RECOMMENDED

That Cabinet endorses the revised Policies below and delegates responsibility for drafting such an approach, including that of finalising the associated policies to the Planning Manager:

ENV 1: Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty & The Broads;
ENV 2: Protection & Enhancement of Landscape & Settlement Character;
ENV4: Biodiversity & Geology;
ENV 5: Green Infrastructure & Public Rights of Way;
ENV 6: Trees, Hedgerows & Development;
ENV 9: High Quality Design;
ENV 10: Protection of Amenity;
ENV 11: Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment

62 LOCAL PLAN SITE ALLOCATIONS: NORTH WALSHAM

Barry Hester made a statement to the Working Party (summarised):

The Town Council and Regenerate North Walsham CIC had tried to set up discussions with NNDC without success and the policy wording now presented is a fait accompli that did not reflect an adequate policy basis to meet the aspirations of North Walsham as the next major growth point within the District. It did not:

- acknowledge the work done to bring national expertise and potential funding.
- answer questions around how the required infrastructure and the town's economic ambitions would be delivered.
- convey the desire for the extension to be a modern garden suburb that would become a mixed-use, walkable neighbourhood instead of a vast estate generating more commuting to Norwich and seizing up the local road network.

- address key issues of viability and deliverability.

Mr Hester requested the withdrawal of the item to allow for dialogue between the District and Town Council and for the technical matters to be resolved.

The Senior Planning Officer presented the final suite of preferred allocations for North Walsham for inclusion in the Regulation 19 consultation. He reported that work on the Development Brief was ongoing and it was hoped to continue constructive dialogue with the Town Council and key stakeholders in the New Year. Local Members were being kept informed and it was hoped to undertake public consultation in the Spring. Local Members and the Working Party would have the opportunity to consider the draft Brief prior to the public consultation. He presented an amended policy recommendation for site NW62/A to include reference to the requirement for the Western Link Road to provide a connection from Cromer Road to the industrial estate (Cornish Way) and the requirement for the production of a Consultation and Engagement Statement.

Councillor E Seward stated that he was speaking as both as a District Councillor and County Councillor for North Walsham. He agreed with the Officer assessments of the site allocations and considered that there was little option than to have a large development in the town if the Government's housing targets were to be met. He referred to the sites at Nursery Drive and Norwich Road, which had been allocated in the current plan but remained undeveloped, as a reminder that allocations did not necessarily lead to more housing.

With regard to the Western Extension, Councillor Seward stated that this was a major development for the town and it was important to get the supporting infrastructure correct. He referred to highways study that had considered the viability of extending the link road into the industrial estate. He considered that a new railway bridge was unnecessary as the existing bridge was adequate and all that was needed were traffic lights and a form of crossing for pedestrians, and more work was needed in that regard. An element of public funding would be necessary in order to get the infrastructure right, but it had not been recognised in correspondence he had had with the Head of Service at Norfolk County Council. He agreed with the revised definitions in the draft policy in terms of the link road, although he considered that there was a need to strengthen the policy to get the link road built at the beginning of the development and not piecemeal as the development was built. He welcomed the consultation and engagement strategy. He stated that the Town Council was a pivotal body and, as a Cabinet Member, he would be seeking firm assurances that it would be treated on a par with the District Council, Norfolk County Council and Council planning officers. He stated that it was crucial that sustainable development was embraced in the policy statement and Development Brief to ensure that developers could not get round it.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that discussions would be held with the County Council and landowners regarding infrastructure, which would include funding issues.

Councillor P Heinrich supported the comments made by Councillor Seward. He thanked the officers for their hard work in bringing together the site allocations and their very careful assessment, not only of the sites but the difficulties inherent in expanding the town within the constraints of the historic core and the complex highway difficulties. He was grateful that the Town Council and associated bodies would be fully included in discussions regarding the Development Brief. It was necessary to meet the aspirations the North Walsham residents and get the design,

layout, landscape, environmental issues and infrastructure considerations right for everyone and not just the developers. He considered that the new ENV9 policy would meet many of the concerns and set a good basis on which to move forward.

Councillor Heinrich referred to the specific sites. He considered that the Norwich Road site had the potential to provide additional employment land for low impact activities that were likely to evolve in the future, and that a good quality development brief would resolve any outstanding issues. The current traffic situation on Norwich Road emphasised the need for the western link road to get the bulk of the traffic away from it, and he requested the inclusion of traffic restrictions. It was necessary to attract 21st Century businesses in suitable premises on NW02 and on part of the mixed use land to avoid the western extension becoming a dormitory suburb of Norwich. The western extension was clearly the only viable location for expanding North Walsham and meeting the Council's land requirements. He regretted the loss of high grade agricultural land and the impact on the landscape, but considered there were positive factors in that a holistic development brief could be achieved that would govern the form and quality of the development and reduce problems elsewhere in the town. North Walsham could be enhanced by the proposals. He stated that the Town Council's Vision Statement was not significantly different from the Officers' proposed vision and it was important to continue working together. The extension of the western link road into the industrial estate was key to the development and it was important to ensure that funding was in place. It was the only way to improve access for businesses and to get HGV traffic off unsuitable roads, and it was necessary to get a very high quality Development Brief before anything took place.

Councillor Ms V Gay expressed appreciation for the amended wording and supported Councillor Heinrich's comments regarding the link road. The road was not only vital to the proposal for the western extension, but to the whole of the Local Plan. She considered that nobody wanted to see a vast, undistinguished housing estate and work had been done to eliminate that possibility. She also supported Councillor Heinrich's comments regarding employment land, which was needed in the right place to discourage people from working elsewhere. She welcomed the mention of the Battlefield, which was of national significance and would form part of the future of the town. She referred to suggestions by Historic England, which she hoped would be taken into account in the final wording.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones supported the comments made by the North Walsham Members. She considered that the scheme would eventually stimulate and enhance North Walsham provided the Design Guide was used effectively to achieve housing that was not the same as everywhere else.

Councillor N Pearce considered that the most important element in the scheme was the road, and that it should be built before the housing and employment land was developed. He considered that the road would be the catalyst to encourage people to live and work locally, and housing types should reflect local need. He considered that the overriding issue was the engagement with the Town Council and stakeholders to move the process forward.

Councillor N Dixon stated that he was comfortable with what had been presented, but was concerned about the process and the Town Council's comments. It was essential to involve the Town Council in the evolution of the plans and give them every opportunity to contribute.

Councillor Mrs W Fredericks asked if the primary care services had put their views

forward, as people had to wait increasingly longer to see GPs etc and the welfare of residents was of concern.

The Chairman expressed his gratitude to Officers for amending the policy to provide for early delivery, and he hoped that the Development Brief would be seen as a blueprint which would carry significant planning weight. He agreed that stakeholders should be brought together and that it was important that the Town Council was treated equally as requested by Councillor Seward. The scheme was pivotal to the delivery of the Local Plan in terms of housing delivery so it was necessary to make every effort to ensure that it was satisfactory for everyone involved, particularly the residents of North Walsham.

The Officers responded to Members' comments.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that Historic England's comments were standard in relation to all sites. It had been agreed early on in the process that the comments of statutory consultees would be included verbatim and the default was to accept their modifications. He was gratified to hear the positive comments towards the concept, and Members were being asked to agree to the principle of the allocations and rule out other sites, and to agree to the preparation of a Development Brief, which would be consulted upon prior to the Regulation 19 consultation. He acknowledged that engagement had not been as good as it could have been, although there had been little to engage upon, and it was essential that the Town Council and other stakeholders were on board and supportive.

The Senior Planning Officer stated that a District-wide infrastructure delivery plan was being prepared which would involve detailed discussions with all providers, including the health sector, and a specific and bespoke infrastructure delivery plan would be prepared for North Walsham. A health impact statement would be sought to highlight the health impacts of the proposals.

There was a need to strengthen some of the policy wording. It was hoped to have engagement with the Town Council early in the new year to provide an update and map out how to move forward. The strengthened policies would be built on in the Development Brief, which would be a Supplementary Planning Document with its own adoption process to give it a high degree of planning strength alongside the Local Plan.

A Heritage Impact Statement had been prepared, which picked up on the heritage assets in the town, historic buildings and the battlefield site. Discussions had been held with the Battlefields Trust and Officers were in contact with other projects in the town.

The Planning Policy Team Leader stated that as part of the developer contributions and viability, there was a requirement for a health impact assessment for developments over 50 dwellings and the Council was signed up to the Health Protocol, which meant that the Primary Care Commission and NHS England were consulted so that they could comment and request contributions as development proposals came forward. Those health bodies had already been consulted as part of the Local Plan production process and he wanted to give assurance that the health issues had been addressed, and if a specific need was identified it would be included as a policy requirement.

It was proposed by Councillor J Toye, seconded by Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones and

RECOMMENDED unanimously

That Cabinet:

1. **Endorses the identified sites for inclusion in the Local Plan.**
2. **Delegates the final policy wording to the Planning Policy Manager.**
3. **Discounts all other sites at this stage.**
4. **Agrees the green open space designations shown on the site assessment maps.**

63 BROWNFIELD LAND REGISTER UPDATE

The Planning Policy Manager presented a report updating the Brownfield Land Register and recommended that the register is published as required by the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017 and that Part 2 of the Register is not undertaken.

It was proposed by Councillor A Brown, seconded by Councillor P Heinrich and

RECOMMENDED unanimously

That the register is published as required by the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017 and that Part 2 of the Register is not undertaken.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm.

Chairman