

**12 NOVEMBER 2018**

Minutes of a meeting of the **PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer at 9.30 am when there were present:

Councillors

Mrs S Arnold (Chairman)  
R Reynolds (Vice-Chairman)

Ms V Gay  
Mrs A Green  
Mrs P Grove-Jones  
N Pearce

Ms M Prior  
S Shaw  
R Shepherd  
D Young

Observers:

Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds  
N Dixon  
J Rest  
B Smith

Officers

Mr M Ashwell – Planning Policy Manager  
Mr S Harrison – Senior Planning Officer

**48. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Mrs A Fitch-Tillett.

**49. PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Kerry Walker, a resident of Hoveton, referred to an apparent increase in the number of dwellings proposed to be allocated in Hoveton from 150 to 160 according to papers published for this meeting. She referred to the Greater Norwich Development Plan (GNDP) which was currently out to Section 18 consultation, which included the possibility of up to 470 homes in Wroxham. She considered that the allocations for Hoveton should be seen against this backdrop, plus a potential challenge in favour of a further 300 dwellings. She requested clarification in respect of the increase.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that 160 was an error and the correct figure was 150. No formal decision had been made in respect of Hoveton as further discussions were ongoing with the Education Authority with regard to the possibility of reserving land for educational use. The GNDP consultation included every site which had been put forward during the call for sites process and a decision was yet to be made on allocations in Wroxham. Any growth in Wroxham would need to be taken into account provided a decision was made before the proposed allocations in Hoveton were considered at a future meeting.

**50. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2018 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**51. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

**52. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor B Smith (local Member for Mundesley) declared an interest in site MUN03 as he lived on Church Lane, Mundesley.

**53. UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Corpusty & Saxthorpe Neighbourhood Plan

The Inspector's final report had now been received. The Inspector had found the Corpusty & Saxthorpe Neighbourhood Plan basically sound but had made extensive modifications, many of which endorsed the modifications recommended by Officers. The next stage was to consider whether or not to accept the plan and if so, it would then go forward to local referendum. If agreed locally, the plan would be adopted as part of the Development Plan.

In response to a question by Councillor Ms V Gay, the Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the referendum would be decided by simple majority of turnout.

The Chairman gave credit to the Officers who had been involved in assisting the Neighbourhood Plan Group. If approved, the plan could be used as a template for future neighbourhood plans.

Draft Local Plan consultation

The Planning Policy Manager stated that it was anticipated that consultation on the draft Local Plan would commence in early February to allow completion of the consultation before the election purdah period. It was likely that an additional meeting would be necessary to complete work on the strategic policies. He suggested 30 January 2019 as a possible date.

**RESOLVED**

**That an additional meeting of the Working Party be held on Wednesday 30 January 2019.**

**54. Local Plan – Identification of provisional housing sites across the District for inclusion within the emerging First Draft Local Plan (consultation version)**

The Planning Policy Manager presented a report outlining the sites that were proposed to be included as preferred options for housing site allocations within the First Draft Plan (Reg.18) which will be subject to public consultation next year. The report presented further information on issues that had been deferred at previous meetings and detailed additional sites in Cromer, Sheringham, Holt and North Walsham (agreed in principle at the Working Party in August). The report also updated the latest position on housing targets.

Councillor R Reynolds referred to the revised methodology and asked if an additional 150 dwellings per year would be deliverable.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that large allocations were necessary to deliver a large number of dwellings. It was hoped that the larger allocations would deliver towards the end of the plan period.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones considered that the Government must be aware that most District Councils would struggle to deliver the annual housing requirement, particularly in areas with difficult terrain.

The Chairman asked if the creation of a new town close to the Council's border would affect the District.

The Planning Policy Manager stated that there had been discussions under the Duty to Co-operate regarding distribution of growth and possible garden villages in the County. Such proposals were currently seen as additional growth over and above local plan allocations. He referred to a recent proposal for a new town near North Elmham. He considered that if such a proposal had a prospect of being delivered it might be appropriate to make representations that it would help to address housing need in the District given its proximity to the border.

The Chairman stated that she had been asked at a recent Parish Council meeting how the Council knew what its forecasts were.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that the number of households which were likely to form was decided at national level. The Government took the household forecasts as a starting point and added an affordability uplift, which gave this Authority an annual requirement of 550 dwellings. This figure was a starting point which would be tested as to how much could be delivered and the consequences of delivering it, and the resulting number would be included in the Local Plan for consideration by the Inspector.

Councillor N Dixon stated that the purpose of planning policy was to ensure that development took place in the right proportions and in the right locations and he discouraged looking solely at the metrics. Development was relied upon to deliver infrastructure and employment sites and it was crucially important to get the balance right.

The Chairman stated the public assumed that land banking happened and it was important to ensure it did not occur in North Norfolk.

#### North Walsham

Councillor D Young referred to site NW01/B and asked if it was intended to retain the existing garden centre.

The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the garden centre would remain for the time being. The policy context would ensure that any loss of employment was minimised by retention of facilities on the existing site or relocation of the business prior to development.

Councillor Ms V Gay considered that it would be preferable for development briefs to be prepared and funded by the local authority in order to represent the interests of the whole community and not just the developers.

**RESOLVED**

**That the enlarged NW01/B site is identified as a provisional preferred site and that the site NW62 has the upper limit of dwellings increased from 1500 to 1800.**

Cromer

**RESOLVED**

**That site C16 is identified as an additional provisional preferred site.**

Holt

**RESOLVED**

**That the enlarged site H20 is identified as a provisional preferred site.**

Sheringham

**RESOLVED**

**That site SH97 is identified as an additional provisional preferred site.**

Stalham

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones considered that there may be a need to increase the number of employment units in the event of an increased housing allocation.

Councillor N Dixon considered that a change of approach would be needed to deliver mixed sites. The existing mixed allocation in Stalham had not been properly marketed or market tested and no units had been built.

The Planning Policy Manager considered that it would be possible to make the requirements for employment provision more substantial than in the current allocation. There may need to be flexibility in terms of employment uses, including community use, care and nursing homes etc. which created employment.

Councillor Mrs P Grove-Jones stated that a care facility was desperately needed and proposed acceptance of the recommendation with the caveat that the provision of a care facility was included as a requirement.

**RESOLVED**

**That ST23/01 is identified as a provisional preferred site, subject to a requirement for the provision of a care facility.**

Briston

The Working Party noted that BRI18 was considered unsuitable for development.

## Mundesley

Councillor B Smith stated that the Working Party had only viewed MUN04 on the site visit. He considered that other sites should be revisited before making a decision. He considered that MUN03 was too prominent as it was on elevated land and would overlook the whole village, and that access to Cromer Road was difficult. He considered that MUN10 and MUN05 would offer better access and that MUN09 would complete the development of bungalows on Trunch Road.

He declared an interest in MUN03 as he lived on Church Lane but stated that he was speaking on behalf of the village and not for himself.

The Planning Policy Manager explained that Officers had appraised all sites. MUN10 and MUN05 had been discounted on grounds related to access and proximity to services. If Members wished to visit additional sites they could do so, however the Officers' recommendation remained MUN03/A.

Councillor Smith considered that the sites he had suggested were well related to facilities and that people should be encouraged to walk into the village.

Members spoke in support of a site visit and it was suggested that it be tagged onto a Development Committee site inspection if it was practical to do so.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the Highway Authority had objected to MUN10 and MUN05. There were challenging highway issues related to MUN09 with regard to school parking outside the site and no scheme had come forward to mitigate the problem. There was also no public pedestrian access from Link Road to Gimingham Road.

## **RESOLVED**

**That the Working Party visit sites MUN03/A, MUN05, MUN09 and MUN10 before making a decision on the provisional preferred site.**

At the close of the meeting, the Working Party had an informal discussion with regard to consultation process and feedback on Parish Council briefings. The Chairman thanked the Planning Policy Manager and his team for their handling of the Parish Council briefings.

The meeting closed at 10.55 am.

---

CHAIRMAN