

PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party held on Monday, 16 January 2023 at the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 10.00 am

Committee Mr A Brown (Chairman)
Members Present: Mrs P Grove-Jones (Vice-Chairman)
Mr N Dixon Mr P Fisher
Ms V Gay Mr P Heinrich
Mr R Kershaw Mr G Mancini-Boyle
Mr N Pearce Mr J Toye

Substitute Cllr V Holliday
Members Present: Cllr A Fitch-Tillett

Officers in Attendance: Planning Policy Manager (PPM)
Senior Planning Officer
Democratic Services Officer (DSO)

62 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr J Punchard, with Cllr A Fitch Tillett present as a substitute, and Cllr C Stockton, with Cllr V Holliday present as a substitute.

63 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no public questions.

64 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party meeting held 12th December were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

65 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

- i. The PPM advised that feedback had been received regarding the adequacy of the Glaven Valley Rural Conservation Area Appraisal Consultation, due to close on 20th January. The PPM accepted the concerns raised and advised that the consultation would be extended to enable additional drop in sessions. The exact extension was to be determined based on availability of venues, but was approximated to be between 4 and 6 weeks.
- ii. The Chairman supported the approach set out by the PPM, and the need for the public to be satisfied that they were able to properly engage with the consultation process.

66 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

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

None.

68 ANY OTHER BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE

- i. The PPM advised that in December 2022 the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities published their proposed revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework through a consultation period that will end on 2 March 2023. He advised the Working Party that the revised NPPF would impact on Local Plan submission and advised that this consultation would be brought for consideration to the scheduled Working Party meeting in February. It was noted that the revised NPPF would likely be published for summer 2023. As part of transitional arrangements, any Local Plans submitted over the next 16 months or so, would be examined in the same existing process. Once published, the revised NPPF would have an important impact on examination, as one of the legal tests pertained to compliance with national guidance. Should the Local Plan Inspector consider that the submitted Local Plan failed to accord with the revised NPPF, there would be scope to table further modifications. The PPM advised, based on the published consultation, that he did not consider the revised NPPF would have a significant impact on the emerging Local Plan.
- ii. Cllr G Mancini Boyle considered the core principles of the NPPF would remain the same, but asked if there were substantial improvements, how these would be reflected.
- iii. The PPM stated that he did not consider that there would be any radical changes to the NPPF, and none of which would have an adverse impact. The PPM highlighted the likely revisions to the NPPF including increased delivery of elderly person accommodation, which he considered the emerging Local Plan would accord with. Further, NNDC had introduced through its emerging Local Plan additional policy areas including first homes, based on evidenced need for social housing. The revised NPPF was expected to focus on Social Housing also and would review mechanisms for delivering this change.
- iv. The Chairman asked whether the revised NPPF would make reference to Councils which had declared a Climate Emergency. The PPM advised he was not aware of such specifics, though commented the revised NPPF would likely include a policy shift towards being more permissive of land based wind, subject to an expression of public support (the process of which was to be agreed).
- v. The PPM advised that a series of consultations were anticipated in the coming year including standard development management policies, the content of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill, the test of public support of wind turbines and others.

69 LOCAL PLAN SUBMISSION: PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS (SITE ALLOCATIONS)

- i. The Chairman reminded Members that the opportunity to make substantial modifications to the Local Plan had passed, and that this item was not an opportunity to dissect the Local Plan and to start again.

Employment Land Designation:

- ii. The PPM introduced the Officers report noting the deferred matter from the previous meeting, employment land provision, and summarised prior discussions including concerns raised about the Plans approach towards the designation of employment land and specifically if the outlined approach would be sufficiently flexible to meet future needs.

The PPM stressed that most employment development in North Norfolk came from existing businesses, with little inward investment, often these business were very site specific wishing to remain in their existing location. The Plan, as drafted recognises that there are sometimes difficulties with matching the specific requirements of developers with the available supply of land. To address this concern policies SS2 and E3 of the Plan both allow for employment growth on unallocated sites, including those in the designated Countryside Policy Area, provided it is first demonstrated that the designated sites are not suitable. This change in policy from the existing Local Plan was considered positively by Officers to better enable development.

Further, at the last meeting concerns about site viability were raised particularly in instances in which land owners are reluctant to release land, lacking sufficient incentive to do so. The case was made that any policy should also support mixed use developments as a mechanism to encourage land owners to release land. An example at Hoveton was referenced where permission had been granted for both a small housing scheme and an associated job creating development, where it was suggested that it was unlikely that the employment aspects of the proposal would have preceded without the 'enabling' housing development. The PPM advised that Officers, not disagreeing that such enabling approaches may be necessary in some circumstances, did not support the inclusion of enabling development provisions within the policy itself, considering it set an unintended precedent in which landowners may argue that they cannot release land for employment development unless housing was included. The PPM argued that this would likely undermine the delivery of allocated sites as these would risk being viewed as less desirable.

He noted that there was a small modification to the policy, as included in Appendix 4.

- iii. Cllr N Dixon thanked the PPM for his explanation, however expressed his concern about the willingness of land owners to release land for employment use, noting that many desire residential development value. As such, he considered that mixed use proposals offered a significant attraction, bringing forward employment opportunities alongside significant residential developments, whilst addressing issues of sustainable communities, and infrastructure. Whilst not suggesting that every major residential development should have employment allocation beside it, he considered that there had been missed opportunities. Cllr N Dixon reflected that employment land was

increasingly being lost to residential developments, and employment land was challenging to liberate from landowners.

- iv. The PPM reflected that although the authority received enquiries from businesses wishing to expand, it was difficult to find suitable sites. He considered that the locality of sites was an issue to accommodate the needs of business, and was unpersuaded that allocating additional plots of land for mixed use would resolve the problem, noting that there was no indication that additional allocation would be preferable. Further, at this stage of the Local Plan process, the opportunity to consider new sites had passed. The PPM considered that the proposed approach provided a high degree of flexibility in permitting employment land development outside of the prescribed setting, subject to other planning constraints including access, AONB designation and others. He noted that mixed use allocation sites had been a feature of the previous Plan, but that these schemes were not without their problems. Many of these sites were now being recycled for elderly person developments rather than employment developments.
- v. Cllr P Heinrich expressed his support for the flexibility described by the PPM, and contended it was important to consider the needs of modern small scale industry, including tech based businesses, as these had different needs and may not wish to be based from traditional industrial estates.
- vi. The PPM affirmed that employment land policy focused on new build employment generating proposals which formed part of a series of policy's towards an overarching strategy. He stated that the absence of opportunity and absence of sites should not become a constraint, and the policy as drafted, offering a high level of flexibility, would be able to accommodate needs as it arises in a sensible way.
- vii. Cllr N Dixon advised he did not wish to see employment land designated for the sake of designation, and expressed the need for targeted, evidence-based allocations where there is a good likelihood of delivery. He reflected on the situation in Stalham, and challenged the supposed lack of demand for development given the town was located equidistant between Scottow Enterprise Park and Martham, both of which were expanding. He expressed his concern for the lack of employment development in North Norfolk, when compared to its neighbours.

The meeting was adjourned at 10.21am to 10.00am 30th January due to an IT outage.

Cllr A Fitch- Tillett and Cllr G Mancini-Boyle gave apologies for the reconvened meeting.

30th January 2023

- viii. The PPM offered as a reminder following the reconvening of the meeting that Members had been discussing the adequacy of employment land provision, if the policy as drafted was sufficiently flexible or whether a permissive policy approach should be adopted for mixed use-development. He summarised his and Members earlier comments, and affirmed Officers support for the recommendation.
- ix. Cllr N Dixon advised he would be content with the Officers recommendation

provided that the flexibility for employment land development outside of the prescribed settings was made explicit within the policy document, ensuring it was obvious to the reader the way in which businesses may expand or move into the area. Cllr N Dixon reflected on the example at Hoveton, in which the lack of sites resulted in the associated business being dependent on co-operation from the land owner. Unfortunately the business and land owner were unable to reach an agreement, therefore making enabling development crucial. He noted feedback from businesses received when he was portfolio holder for economic development, which considered that their prime barrier to growth was planning; gain sites and permissions in a timely fashion. Cllr Dixon contended that where interest was known for an area, there should be a choice of site available, noting that there remained only one site available in Hoveton.

- x. The PPM noted the lack of designated employment areas across the district, but advised the policy was drafted to ensure flexibility in permitting development outside the designated setting. He advised that the Hoveton example was not representative of all cases, and noted that in Fakenham enabling development had not been required. The PPM reflected that Members were broadly supportive of the policy and suggested wording be included, possibly in the pre amble of the policy, to better establish the principle of enabling development in a positive way. He advised that through the second Officers recommendation, if agreed, he would draft a paragraph to proceed the policy stating in effect, that exceptionally it may be necessary to include enabling development, with a definition of enabling development in the glossary to the plan.
- xi. Cllr N Dixon asked if the choice and plurality of sites could be considered, noting the position of NNDC competing with other sites including Scottow Enterprise Park which were considered to be more attractive to businesses.
- xii. The Chairman reflected that there were inhibitors beyond the Councils control including access to A47 and funding from central government which affected the attraction of businesses to North Norfolk.
- xiii. The PPM reiterated that the opportunity to find and consult on additional employment land allocations had passed, as this process would have proceeded the Regulation-18 stage some two years prior. The PPM was sceptical that any additional call for employment land via consultation would result in an increase of sites.
- xiv. Cllr J Toyé supported the policy as outlined by the PPM, and stated it was important that residents knew where employment land would be allocated, in particular where to expect industrial employment land. He considered, as a separate matter, that it would be beneficial to make more attractive to businesses those designated sites, encouraging these options be taken up in the first instance.
- xv. The PPM noted that there were a series of measures which could be introduced including investment strategies, advertisement and compulsory purchasing, which could serve to make land more attractive. However, such leavers were not a feature of planning policy documents, which focused on land use.
- xvi. Cllr N Pearce expressed his support for the comments made by Cllr N Dixon

and Cllr J Toye. He argued that the Council were charged to protect heritage, though supported the need to be flexible. Cllr N Pearce argued it was an unenviable problem to balance the needs and wants of businesses with protecting the districts heritage.

- xvii. Cllr P Heinrich affirmed that the bridges over the rivers at Wroxham and Coltishall were inhibitors of growth, and reflected that North Norfolk lacked sufficient transport links to support the easy movement of heavy goods. He considered that future businesses in the district would be small, modern tech-based industries, and it was important to work towards where such businesses could be accommodated.
- xviii. Cllr R Kershaw advised that over the last three years he had been part of the Norfolk and Suffolk economic strategy and referenced situations in which digital businesses, who had publically expressed an interest in coming to North Norfolk, were courted by Norfolk County Council inviting them to alternate sites and offering business rates reductions which NNDC couldn't match. Further, he considered that North Norfolk lacked the capability to host large delivery centres, nor had the capacity to supply enough electricity in the network to support all car charging requirements. Cllr R Kershaw further argued 5G and other improvements were needed to attract tech business, but that when applications were received for new Masts, these were highly contested by local residents. He supported the employment land provision policy, and in businesses looking first to the land register, before considering options elsewhere. Cllr R Kershaw noted that businesses North Norfolk would be and had successfully attracting tended to be digital, in the catering and hospitality sector, as well as eco-tourism. Importantly, given the districts demographic would lead to an increase in care homes and care facilities, which whilst not classed as a business, required land also. Cllr R Kershaw reflected that due to the cost of living crisis and fuel costs, business were having to reconsider their investment and business needs, he concluded that due to the reasons outlined, North Norfolk would be in the shadow of South Norfolk and Norwich for many years to come.
- xix. Cllr P Grove-Jones supported for the views outlines by Cllr R Kershaw, and asked if there was a minimum size for employment land designation.
- xx. The PPM advised there was no size limit, but employment land would be designated for specific uses classes of development. Some use classes would be directed to industrial land, as the nature of these businesses required specific settings. The PPM advised that the new policy would better enable development and would shift the presumption from negative to positive.
- xxi. Cllr V Holliday stated that whilst wanting to diversify employment it was difficult to craft a policy that applies across the whole district. She further commented of her disappointment to lose the employment land designation in Holt which had been useful for residents in her ward.
- xxii. Cllr V Gay expressed her support for policy and position outlined by the PPM, in allowing discretion to the Development Committee to weigh considerations. Further, such a position would aid the Council in defending its decision making through a plan led system.
- xxiii. The Chairman summarised Members debate and advised, pending

acceptance of the Officers second recommendation, that the PPM would draft a paragraph to be included in the final document around enabling development, categorising this as a minor amendment encompassed within the recommendation.

Local Plan – Schedules 3 , 4 & 5

- xxiv. The PPM advised that public consultation had been completed, with representations made requesting specific modifications (Schedule 3). All representations would be submitted to the Inspector as part of the submission process regardless of whether the Council chose to approve, decline or vary the modifications. Included in the documentation supplied to the Inspector would be all representations, a schedule of modifications, and the version of the Plan incorporating those modifications. It is ultimately at the discretion of the Inspector whether to accept modifications or not, regardless of the Councils recommendation for adoption. Having reviewed the modifications, Officers recommended through schedules 4 & 5 a series of proposed modifications.

Schedule 4 comprised of minor modifications which do not materially affect policies, and could be considered clarifications and corrections and those which address inconsistencies such as presentational, typographical and grammatical errors.

Schedule 5 consisted of a main modification for policy HV01/B, the land at Hoveton.

The PPM noted Appendix 5 of the Agenda Park, 'Recommended Policies Map Modifications' and advised that the only substantial change was for the site at Hoveton (Schedule 5), which added a significant parcel of land into the modification. It was noted that this would importantly not adversely affect residents, with the land adjoining agricultural land. The PPM advised the larger site would accommodate approximately 150 dwelling as compared to 120 under the prior scheme, and though the scheme could be made larger, it was considered that the 150 dwelling figure would allow for the development of a nicer scheme with more open spaces, larger plots, and strategic landscaping. Critically, more of the enhanced value could be spent on infrastructure, particularly drainage works. Presently, both this and the adjacent site were dependent on the drainage system at Hoveton which was not considered adequate. If permitted this scheme and the neighbouring site would drain through alternate sewage treatment works which the PPM considered would be largely supported by the local community. As this was a proposed main modification, it was anticipated that the Inspector would go out to public consultation before reaching a decision.

- xxv. Cllr N Dixon added, in the case of Hoveton, that the proposed site formed part of a strategic infrastructure addition and through Anglian Water improvements, would be a significant investment in the future.
- xxvi. Cllr P Fisher enquired about the Wells-next-the-sea site, and what the ground either side of the new access road would be used for. The PPM advised the background for the modification, with Wells Town Council producing their own neighbourhood plan in parallel to NNDC. Wells Town Council had indicated that they would like to see the area either side of the access road designated as green open space. Officers therefore considered

it prudent to show the access works to the allocation, and to leave the remaining land outside of the allocation unmarked in anticipation of the successful acceptance of the emerging neighbourhood plan.

- xxvii. The PPM advised, unless the Working Party had any questions regarding Schedule 3, he would elaborate and take Members through Schedule 4.

Starting from p.67, the PPM highlighted modification PMIN/22.1/02, proposed to correct a duplication of policies. This correction would ensure a distinction between the matters.

P.68 - PMIN/E7/0, pertained to minerals on a site and the need to address Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16. The PPM described this as a standard clause to state where there is evidence of silica sand or some other mineral which may be worked, should be worked (if it is practical to do so) before the subject site is developed.

P.69 – The PPM noted the change of wording suggested in PMIN/11.1/02, PMIN/11.1/03 and elsewhere in the document, from ‘prior approval’ to ‘submission approval and implementation of’. The PPM considered this a useful change, as previously submission and implementation had been neglected in the wording of clauses.

P.70 – P.71 – 12.2 Land at Heath Farm, Holt – The PPM commented shortly before the Regulation-19 consultation the Landowner advised, in writing, that they didn’t want their land to be included within the plan. For a Local Plan to be considered sound it must be effective and deliverable, and including sites in which the landowner objected to development failed to meet the soundness test. As such, it was proposed that the site be removed from the Local Plans proposed allocations. However, the older designations remained in the Plan including Hempstead Road and elsewhere in the town. The PPM advised that the removal of this site posed a risk to the Plan, as the Inspector may determine provision of employment land in the specific catchment area (Holt, Cromer & Sheringham), inadequate. Should the Inspector consider the Plan short on employment land, they may determine the plan unsound. However, the PPM advised that it was highly improbable that a Local Plan be determined unsound based on a single issue. The Inspector may alternatively defer examination of the Plan and invite the Authority to find additional sites for employment land, or consider the provision of employment land adequate for the next 5 years but subject to a single issue review for the specific catchment area. It was noted that this was a significant change to the Plan and would be subject of discussion through the examination process.

P. 72 – North Walsham – In addition to the modifications included in Schedule 4, the PPM proposed a further modification, grounded in concerns regarding transport and access through to the industrial estate. The PPM considered the link between Cromer Road to the back of the industrial estate to be problematic as it would involve looking at Bradfield Road linkage, railway bridge improvements, and third-party land not controlled by the major consortium to get into the back of the industrial estate. Nevertheless, current evidence indicated the desirability for this to be undertaken, with a Public and Member expectation that this be delivered. The PPM proposed additional wording where the policy references delivery of the Bradfield Road/Railway Line/ Back of the Industrial Estate Link, ‘unless otherwise agreed’. It was

noted that there was not currently a full traffic impact assessment or model for traffic circulation, which would happen as a consequence of the development, and that although alternate access routes were considered unlikely, they should not be entirely ruled out at this stage. By including this wording, and proposed modification, it would allow opportunity for other options to continue to be explored without removing the backstop that the link must be provided, pending and informed by evidence.

P.76 - 16.2 Land North of Yarmouth Road, East of Broadbeach Gardens, Stalham – The PPM advised by including the site as part of the allocation, the opportunity would be created for the whole site to be looked at in a comprehensive manor, delivering a better scheme overall.

With reference to the Cromer Allocation – Land at Pine Tree Farm (p. 68), the PPM advised that there had been concern about unacceptable impacts of development on the highways network. Policy would require the submission of a traffic impact assessment, however the PPM considered that wording could introduced to tighten up the policy and its intention. The PPM proposed that early development of the roundabout adjoining the site be undertaken, before the inhabitation of the dwellings. Secondly, wording be added to the policy to ensure that the traffic impact assessment, when submitted, be subject to public consultation. Finally, as it was considered that construction traffic to large sites could have significant impacts on the highway network, the PPM proposed that the assessment include delivery routing agreements to cover off the impacts of construction traffic.

- cxviii. Cllr N Pearce stated, with reference to Land at Pine Tree Farm, that local residents understood the need for additional housing, and noted the current waiting list length for affordable/social housing, with more than 2500 families requesting accommodation. Cllr N Pearce considered the provision of social housing in such large schemes integral, and reflected that such housing often was lost or reduced when developers were made to pay for infrastructure improvements. Due to the nature of the site, infrastructure requirements were fairly substantive. Cllr N Pearce supported the proposed modifications put forward by the PPM, but stressed that more should be done to ensure that the allocation of affordable/social housing be secured. He advised that he could not agree with any undertaking on the site in which the affordable/social housing percentage was diminished. Cllr N Pearce asked that something be put in the policy to protect the 35% affordable housing figure.
- xxix. The PPM advised, with regret, that there was no mechanism to guarantee with absolute certainty the building of the described percentage of social housing, as it could not be predicted what position a developer may be in when they submit their planning application, and what the market conditions may be. However, Officers had been mindful throughout in the use of language to narrow down the scope for such variations to be negotiated and agreed at the planning application stage.
- xxx. Cllr N Pearce in response to the PPM's advice, asked if his proposed modifications would carry any weight.
- xxxi. The PPM advised the Local Plan sets out the policies which inform decision making. Section of 38 of the Planning Act stipulates the legal requirement is to determine applications in accordance with the development plan unless

material considerations suggest otherwise. It is therefore for the Development Committee to consider each application on its merits, determine what constitutes as a material consideration, how much weight should be attached to it and how to balance the various competing factors, whilst having due regard for the starting position which is the presumption in favour of the Local Plan and its policies. In the case of viability, it may be that the Development Committee when presented with an application may accept a proposal for 30% affordable homes rather than 35%, as they make a planning judgement that it is better to achieve 30% than wait and get a lower offering or have the site sit undeveloped. The PPM further advised that Development Committee could depart from policy if justified.

- xxxii. Cllr N Pearce thanked the PPM for his explanation but expressed his disappointment that not more could be done. He concluded that he would support the Officers recommendation subject to the proposed modifications outlined by the PPM, which he saw as an improvement.
- xxxiii. The Chairman reflected on the situation in Fakenham. The PPM agreed that Fakenham was a good example, as it too required significant infrastructure improvement including a new roundabout to service around 1000 houses, the cost of which kept increasing. The Council in this circumstance had indicated a willingness to assist in the funding of the roundabout subject to an enhanced deal for additional affordable housing on the site. However, this would not adequately address the risk the developer feels in bringing the infrastructure forward. Nutrient Neutrality guidance had resulted in additional costs to the Fakenham proposal that was not perceived when the site was allocated.
- xxxiv. Cllr P Fisher noted an error at the top of P.70 – Wells and asked for a correction in wording from displays to splays.
- xxxv. Cllr P Heinrich with reference to the proposed site in North Walsham, affirmed the importance of improvement to the highways network to support development of the site, and noted the technical and financial issues with alternate access schemes, though accepted the PPM's recommendation which would permit flexibility pending further traffic management studies. He considered the Bradfield Road/Railway Line/ Back of the Industrial Estate Link essential to free up residential streets from unnecessary HGV traffic, and reflected on the support for this scheme by residents.
- xxxvi. The PPM clarified that the current policy weds itself to one specific solution, which whilst considered at present to be the best solution, would not allow for any other potential avenues to be explored. By adding the words 'unless otherwise agreed' the opportunity would be given for the site developer to consider alternatives, though noted that such options were unlikely given the associated costs. The PPM considered the proposed modification beneficial in the absence of a detailed model which would be required as part of any planning application, which would have informed Members decision making. The Norwich to Cromer Link was expected to be deliverable.
- xxxvii. Cllr V Gay commented that she was satisfied with the proposed amendments put forward by the PPM, and advised with regards to the Bradfield Road/Railway Line/ Back of the Industrial Estate Link her concern that this may not be delivered given that support in the town for the entire policy had been based on the provision of the road link to the industrial site. She

enquired 'unless otherwise agreed' by whom.

- cxviii. The PPM advised this would be 'unless otherwise agreed' by the local planning authority. He understood and expressed sympathy with the position of residents, that they had been consulted upon and agreed a position, which they wished for the Inspector to make a determination on. However, having heard representations from land owners, the consortium, and considered the practicalities of implementing the site, he was persuaded that greater flexibility was required should a different or better solution be offered following investigation. The current policy would not allow for this exploration, and would result in a departure. He considered that the additional wording would allow for the authority to retain control, whilst permitting some flexibility pending future evidence.
- cxix. Cllr V Gay enquired the answer to her question, raised at the last meeting between 'non-designated' and 'undesigned' (Minute 58 xxiv). The PPM advised that he was unable to offer the proper definition, but that the proper protective terminology would be used.
- xi. Cllr V Gay, with reference to P.72 asked about the use of wording between 'should' and 'must', as she considered there to be a distinct difference between the implications of each. Cllr V Gay explained her understanding that 'must' indicates a requirement, whereas 'should' indicated a preference. The PPM commented that there was not a deliberate difference in the choice of terminology used, and argued this reflected that the policies were drafted by multiple authors.
- xli. With regards to 'offset' and 'landscape buffer' (P.72) Cllr V Gay stated she was unclear of the meaning of the two, and what the implications may be. The PPM advised that 'offset' was default terminology for the distance between the interfaces of buildings or boundaries. That distance could encompass flat grass or anything else in the absence of a landscaping requirement. Officers did not consider that there need be intervening planting on the subject area to make the space effective.
- xlii. Cllr V Gay concluded, as an observation, that she appreciated the detailed wording around the protection of hedgerows along Weavers Way and elsewhere.
- xlili. Cllr J Toye commented that whilst it was disappointing that the landowner at Holt had changed their mind in allowing for development, he reflected that Members had fully considered Policy EC3 and the sequential test within the policy which would enable for other sites to be identified. On North Walsham and the outlined transport issue, Cllr J Toye agreed that there should be flexibility to accommodate solutions which had yet to present themselves, but considered it important that these delivered an improvement. He and the residents of North Walsham would not be satisfied, whatever scheme comes forward for there to be no traffic improvement, irrespective of whether a traffic survey determined there to be no additional or adverse impact. Whilst he accepted the proposed changes he believed that the authority should, in as strong words as it can, ensure the delivery of an improvement to the transport network.
- xliv. Cllr V Gay reflected on a change in sentiment, with people being much more persuaded for the need of housing and particularly affordable housing, but

the barrier to development related to concerns of traffic. She affirmed that such concerns must be taken.

- xliv. Cllr J Toye asked whether the Highways Authority, Anglian Water, and other relevant authorities considered the NNDC Local Plan in their planning. The PPM advised this should occur, and all relevant authorities had been presented with a draft version of the emerging Local Plan. At this stage of the Plan, junction detail, visibility splays or the precise nature of the highways works necessary were not considered. Had the Highway authority considered there to be a fundamental issue with the deliverability of the sites, they would have objected to the allocation at the various consultation stages. It was possible, though highly unlikely, that a site contained within the Local Plan be undeliverable because of a yet unknown constraint. It was considered that all sites, with the right mitigation packages in place would be deliverable.
- xlvi. In response to questions of funding, the PPM advised that sometimes a hybrid approach was undertaken between the Highways Authority and the developer, with the County Council wanting to deliver some form of betterment. However, the starting premise is that it is for the developer to fund the mitigation works which are necessary to make their proposal acceptable in land use terms. It was noted that development which depends upon expensive infrastructure delivery raises questions about viability, such matters were compounded in places like North Walsham where the average new build property price was lower than other towns in the district.
- xlvii. The PPM concluded Members questions and debate by summing up discussion and reiterating the Officers recommendation. He advised that subject to acceptance of the second recommendation, he would ensure the addition of some wording in the preamble to policy E3 on employment land to cover off positive approach to enabling development. As well as the addition of wording as discussed 'unless otherwise agreed' and inclusion of wording to ensure betterment be achieved through the proposal at North Walsham. With regards to Cromer, ensuring early access to the site prior to occupation, the need for traffic impact assessment and public consultation covering delivery traffic impacts.
- xlviii. Cllr R Kershaw proposed acceptance of the Officers recommendations, Cllr J Toye seconded.

IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY AGREED by 10 votes for.

Members of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party recommend to Cabinet that the appended Schedules of proposed modifications along with the Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan be submitted for independent examination.

Members of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party recommend to Cabinet to delegate minor amendments in the finalisation of the submission version & Schedules and associated documents to the Planning Policy Manager in conjunction with the Policy Team Leader and Portfolio Holder.

70 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Not applicable.

71 TO CONSIDER ANY EXEMPT MATTERS ARISING FROM CONSIDERATION OF THE PUBLIC BUSINESS OF THE AGENDA

None.

72 ANY OTHER URGENT EXEMPT BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE

None.

The meeting ended at 12.01 pm.

Chairman