

Minutes of a meeting of the **Council** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Tuesday 22 March 2011** at **7.00pm** when there were present:

Mr T H Gasson – Chairman

Mr A D Adams	Mr D M Dewgarde	Mr A S Mallett
Mr P Balcombe	Mr J F Fisher	Mr B A McGilvray
Mrs C H Bannock	Mr R R Foulger	Mr R R Nash
Mr S C Beadle	Mr I G Graham	Mr A J Proctor
Mrs V M Beadle	Mr C A Green	Mr N C Shaw
Mr J W Bracey	Mr D G Harrison	Mr M D Snowling
Mr P H Carrick	Mr J M Joyce	Mr J P Starling
Mr S M Clancy	Mr K S Kelly	Mr N E J Starling
Mrs J C Cottingham	Mr R J Knowles	Mr C D Thompson
Mrs K Davis-Claydon	Mr K G Leggett	Mr S D Woodbridge
Mr G E Debbage	Mr I J Mackie	Mr J M Ward

Mr J Sadler, Member of the Standards Committee, attended the meeting for its duration.

Also in attendance were the Chief Executive, the Strategic Director and Chief Planner, the Strategic Director (Organisational Development), the Head of Corporate Services and Monitoring Officer, the Head of Information and Human Resources and the Committee Officer (DM).

The press and 33 members of the public were in attendance.

### **137 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Minute No &amp; Heading</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Mr Bland	139 – Council	Personal and Prejudicial Interest – reaffirmation of previous declaration (item not discussed)
Mrs Bannock Mr Carrick Mr Foulger Mr Green	147 – Planning Committee	Personal Interest – reaffirmation of previous declaration(s).

---

Mr Adams Mr Clancy Mr Joyce Mr Harrison Mr Mackie Mr Proctor Mr Shaw Mr Ward	Any matter relating to Norfolk County Council	Personal Interest – Norfolk County Councillor.
---	--	---

**138 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr J Carswell, Miss C Casimir, Mr S Dunn, Mr D R French, Mrs S C Gurney, Mrs S L Hayes, Mr B J M Iles, Mr B S Kular, Mrs S Peters, Mrs B H Rix, Mr D W Thompson, Mr S A Vincent, and Mr G B Walker.

**139 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 February 2011 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

**140 MATTERS ARISING**

With reference to Minute 126 – Minutes, Mr Foulger updated Members on the current situation regarding investigations into the explosion at Rackheath Industrial Estate. It was anticipated that the outcome of investigations would be known by the end of March and that this would identify any action needing to be taken. He had looked into the planning history of the issue of access to the site and confirmed that no provision had been made for more than one access/exit to the site.

**141 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman advised Members that on 28 February 2011 he had attended the Norwich Welsh Societies annual St David's Day dinner. On 4 March he had attended, with the Vice-Chairman, the laying of the foundation stone for the Aylsham Care Trust's new Community Centre. The Vice-Chairman outlined the facilities to be provided at the Centre which was being built on land donated by Mr Rees Coglan and was part of the St Michaels Care Complex. After the Ceremony, the Vice-Chairman had been shown round the 86 bed nursing and residential home at the Care Complex.

On 11 March the Chairman had attend the Lord Mayor of Norwich Charity Ball raising funds for "housing for the deaf" and on 14 March he had presented a bouquet of flowers to Mrs Muriel Oaks on the occasion of her 100<sup>th</sup> birthday.

The Chairman announced that Mr and Mrs Beadle were taking part in sponsored walk to raise funds for Macmillan Cancer Support, in memory of their son, and he invited Members to sponsor them.

The Leader of the Council informed Members that he had received a request that afternoon for permission to video the Council meeting. He suggested that, if the Council was minded to allow recording of its proceedings, such recordings should be done independently to ensure a proper and accurate account of proceedings was taken and maintained. This was an issue the new administration might like to consider but, as yet, the Council had not taken the opportunity to consider the principle of recording meetings and he felt that the current request should be refused, bearing in mind the late notice of the request. He then proposed, seconded by Mrs Davis-Claydon, that the request to record the meeting be refused. Mr Joyce asked for further information about the request as, in principle, he did not feel that it would be a problem. He felt it would be beneficial for Council meetings to be more widely publicised. The Leader of the Council stated that the request had been received from Mr Heard on behalf of Stop Norwich Urbanisation (SNUB) and, whilst he was not opposed in principle to recordings being made, he reiterated it was important to ensure any recording was carried out independently.

The proposal to refuse permission for SNUB to video the meeting was then put to the vote and, with 23 Members voting for the proposal, 9 against, it was

**RESOLVED** that permission to video the meeting by SNUB be refused.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation informed Members that a new fund had been created - the Broadland Investing in Young People Fund to which £50,000 had been allocated from the Recession Mitigation Programme specifically to support young people in the District. Parish/Town Councils and voluntary organisations could apply for grants from £500 to £5,000 for suitable projects.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Environmental Services informed Members that he had attended the Clean Britain Awards in Birmingham on 2 March 2011 and that Broadland District Council had won the Gold award in the cleanest district category and had gone on to win the National award for the cleanest place overall. Members thanked all the staff, the Council's Contractors and partners involved in achieving the award.

Mrs Cottingham informed Members that fund raising efforts by the "Pink Party" (a group of Broadland's lady Councillors) had succeeded in raising £549 mainly from book sales held at Thorpe Lodge and that the money was being shared between "Break" and Aylsham Old Peoples Welfare Association. She thanked staff at Broadland for donating and purchasing books and Mrs Rix for her help in running the book stall.

**142 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

It was noted that there had been no questions submitted from the public to speak at the meeting.

**143 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

The following representations were made by the public:

**Mr Williams**

"I hope you have had time to assimilate the outcome of the JCS process. If you have you will see how many aspects you never subjected to any form of scrutiny. Many have now been changed as a result of the Examination. So, far from congratulating yourselves on the fact that it has been found to be "sound" you need to look at the Inspectors caveats. Despite what your briefings have told you, these shortcomings are massive. You will see that the original skepticism of the Inspectors has been tempered by careful language and doubt. The lack of interest by Councillors in the Hearings was disappointing. It is the most important issue facing our community but how many of you took the trouble to attend. Are you surprised at the anger it has generated in the local community.

I would like to highlight just some of the issues:

Lack of Democracy - This Council has a large conservative majority but only six or seven people make all the decisions. The same few who are twin hatters, members of the Cabinet and on the GNDP Board. Decisions are supposedly taken by the Council but in effect they are only ratified.

The JCS was created behind closed doors mostly by Officers and subject to little scrutiny. We hear much of the amount of consultation which took place but by not addressing all the comments it does not constitute consultation.

Affordable Housing - 11,200 Affordable houses in these papers is somewhat different from the 16000 extensively quoted by your leader at public meetings. Even so the viability of development is in doubt. The initial 40% assumption was found to be wrong, as most developments were unviable at that level. Even at 33% only 45% of schemes are viable on consensual values and that is described as significant - to me that is still less than half. What will happen in the other half.

Jobs - 27,000 jobs reads the headline but 37000 houses probably need

50,000 jobs and we already have a high unemployment level in Norwich at 4.7%. So this plan merely adds to the unemployment burden and increases the deprivation.

Funding - JCS Infrastructure Cost c 1.2 Billion of which £400 million is in Broadland circa £40,000 per house. CIL value max £15,000 where is the rest coming from.

You are already changing the JCS before you have not even approved it. The abandonment of the highest quality development promised in the JCS has also gone. Government policy and funding for eco-towns are unclear, yet the JCS states that 'the Rackheath eco-community will remain part of this strategy even if the Government's programme falters.' Why it was the government's big idea and in the wrong place.

The deliverability of the NDR, and therefore the full effectiveness of the strategy in respect of its largest growth location, could be in doubt for an unknown length of time.

3200 houses without the NDR despite your promise No NDR no development. Starting with 1250 in the Planning papers tomorrow. You have allowed the development of an entirely undemocratic process which is epitomised in tonight's recommendation. It was prepared by the GNDP Policy Group and presented by the Strategic Director. You are asked once again to delegate powers to Strategic Director and the Portfolio Holder. How much do you know about what is implied in these plans? Judging by previous discussion not much. You really need to wake up before it is too late.

Norfolk Ambition - this latest incarnation of public service control is set to approve another scheme to increase the population by a third. Norfolk's total population change over the 25 years to 2033 would include approximately a quarter of a million from net in-migration."

### **Mr Hastings**

"Mr Chairman, Thank you for allowing me as a Past Chairman of this Council to say a few words this evening, as the residents of the Ward that I was privileged to serve for Seventeen Years have asked me to clarify two items, what has happened to our democracy and why are you not listening? South Norfolk, Breckland and West Norfolk have all listened and supported their residents who elected them, but Broadland has not.

We have now had three public meetings at Rackheath and at each one strong

opposition has been voiced against the Ecotown and the massive over development of the NE Triangle. At the first meeting the leader of the council seemed to sense the anger and he made two promises: 1. If there is strong local opposition then we will not proceed with the Scheme and 2. no NDR – no eco town. I will be interested this evening to see what those promises are worth. At the last meeting we had an event that I had never seen before when the village moved a vote of no confidence in the Broadland Council. That in my day as a Councillor would have caused very deep concern but it was shrugged off.

Then we had a deputation from five parish councils early in the morning prior to a Council Meeting to lodge a formal protest, but amazingly at the evening meeting there was no mention of that visit – can we really treat our Parish Councils in this undemocratic way.

Next was a petition by over 3,000 local residents against the Eco town and the over development, but again this has been ignored.

Finally, your own Questionnaire of the Exemplar first stage of the Eco town produced another resounding no, but again this appears to have been quietly forgotten. Mind you how we can call this exemplar a good example of a green development when it is being built on grade two farmland is beyond me.

We also have our MP and the CPRE totally against the proposal, so how much more opposition do you want before you start to listen. So can I make a plea this evening for you to consider what I believe is the most important thing in life and that is people. Put aside the New Labour initiative to build their new eco towns and their culture change for in the village of Rackheath. I realise that the bribes by Gordon Brown to get his schemes built are tempting, but as we all now know, he did not have that money to give away and all of us are now paying a terrible price, especially the young and the elderly. Put aside the greed of the developers in their rush to make a fast buck and listen to the local people.

People in Rackheath who bought their homes as they wanted to live in a Broadland village and not in the high density of the Norwich Urban Sprawl, which if this scheme went ahead would stretch almost to the gateway of the Broads at Wroxham. Of course we need development but not at any price.

Please I beg you to think carefully before you destroy a Broadland village and their way of life. In the vote this evening it will be interesting to see if our local Councillors do support the residents and democracy is still alive in Broadland or whether we now live in a dictatorship. Thank you.”

**Mr Heard**

“Policymakers at national level are increasingly recognising that many of the solutions to major social challenges – from improving public health to providing affordable housing need to be much more local. Local solutions are frequently very effective, as they reflect the needs of specific communities and engage citizens in taking action. They are often cost-effective, since they provide a conduit for the resources of citizens to complement those of the state. Given the growing pressure on government finances, these are important benefits.

The test of a Big Society is a society in which individual citizens feel big: big in terms of being supported and enabled; having real and regular influence; being capable of creating change in their neighbourhood. It certainly does not pass the test here in Broadland. It is no surprise then that only 4 out of 10 of us believe that we can influence local decisions. Only 1 in 33 of us attend public meetings. We feel anger and frustration at the recent behaviour of this District Council and are relatively powerless to change them. We are often anonymous taxpayers without a real sense of how our money gets spent. Most of us try to be reasonably good citizens but our influence seems very small. The Planning Inspector advises that there is “a public sentiment of exclusion, confusion, frustration and dissatisfaction” here in Broadland.

The decisions made by this council about the development of the North East Growth Triangle have bankrupted the brand of the council and no one trusts it anymore. Broadland District Council has a bad name out on the streets, as does any initiative associated with it. You should not underestimate the damage that this council has inflicted on the democratic process in this district.

There are an estimated 900,000+ community groups in the UK with award winning groups here locally. Why is this council intent on ignoring them? Other organisations such as CPRE agree with our strategy to disperse new houses rather than this current development plan. Indeed CPRE have taken the unprecedented step of writing to all local MPs about the lack of democracy here in Broadland and in the county generally.

The fight is not over. We are approaching the local elections in May and there will be a real need for all of you to justify your actions so that the electorate can decide at the ballot box. It will be interesting to see how many of you justify your positions by telling the citizens that voted for you in your ward that you have protected their immediate location as all of the additional housing will be elsewhere! That is real Nimbyism at work.

There is also the very real prospect that SNUB with other national and local

groups mount a legal challenge through a judicial enquiry. This council will have to think really hard about the unintended consequences of this JCS before voting for it. The main risk, as highlighted in the Inspectors final report, is around the legacy debt that would remain if the development were not to happen as quickly as anticipated, meaning that the funds secured are insufficient to repay the loan (or the interest payments), or that borrowing costs rise. A very real threat when considering the current economic climate. We urge you to reject this JCS and revisit the whole need for this level of housing on productive agricultural land that will be needed for future generations.”

### **Mr Townley**

“I am here this evening to represent Gt & Lt Plumstead Parish Council. The Purpose, to request the assembled Councillors to reject the JCS with regard to the North East triangle.

Councillors you need to comprehend the anger across our Parish concerning the North East Triangle and the way this has been conducted by Broadland District Council.

Why are so many die hard Conservatives up in arms? The reason is they feel cheated having taken part in a consultation only to see it binned and top down. Growth numbers pushed through by this council by way of extraordinary meetings.

On the first day of the EIP (Examination In Public), I asked Phil Kirby what had happened to the 1200 replies/submissions from parishioners. I received no reply!

When one looks at the inspectors report (he clearly states) page 4 Para 8 in his Conclusion. The growth targets were not Top Down by the EEP but were requested /inserted by the GNDP themselves.

Lets have some Candour, in a discussion I had with Councillor Proctor, I put the view of our Parish that the major Growth should be situated on the South side of Norwich (and market Towns and Villages throughout the North East Triangle should be allowed to expand proportionally maintaining natural growth and safeguarding facilities) because it makes economic sense and rail and road infrastructure could be upgraded at much more cost effective way along the A11 corridor. He agreed, but said South Norfolk would not have it. Councillors why should we?

At the extraordinary meeting held at BDC prior to the spending review our District Councillor stated, whilst these JCS proposals will devastate our Parish there is nothing else on the table, so I am voting for it. There was nothing else on the table for Councillors to vote for!



The proposed NNDR will not decrease traffic; on the contrary, it will significantly increase it for Norwich and Norfolk. As an integral part of the NNDR plans are the the proposed closure of Smee lane, Low road and Middle road ,again the closure of these feed roads will result in the funnelling of traffic onto the Plumstead, Salhouse, Thorpe roads.”

*[note: All public speakers were asked to supply copies of their presentations to Council and these have been reproduced above.]*

## 144 JOINT CORE STRATEGY

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation introduced the report which invited the Council to consider adopting the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) following receipt of the Independent Inspectors' report into the soundness and legal compliance of the Strategy. Members received a copy of the recommendations of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership policy group as set out in the Minutes of its meeting held on 17 March 2011 (a copy of the Minutes was circulated to Members present and is attached as appendix 1 to the signed copy of these Minutes).

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation thanked all officers at the four authorities involved in the GNDP for the work they had done over the last four years on the JCS. The production of a JCS, through informal partnership working had been unique and the Inspectors had commended that. Many lessons had been learnt by the GNDP. The GNDP had not been a decision making body but a forum for discussing the various issues and making recommendations, with the individual planning authorities making the ultimate decisions. The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation added that three partner councils were each meeting this evening to consider the GNDP's recommendation.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation went on to state that the strap line to the GNDP and the JCS had been: “Jobs, homes and prosperity for local people” and that the Strategy was a 15 year plan designed to create these. There was a proven need for new housing and jobs and a need to ensure that the development proposed for the 15 year period of the JCS was properly managed and, most importantly, underpinned by infrastructure.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation went on to highlight the importance of infrastructure to the delivery of the JCS and how some of this could be funded. Infrastructure did not just include the roads and the Northern Distributor Road (NDR), but also schools, medical and dental facilities and more community facilities. The NDR, although a significant element of infrastructure for the Norwich area and for Norfolk was part of the

Norwich Area Transport Strategy and without the NDR, improvements to public transport could not be leveraged. He went on to state that a key objective of the JCS was to ensure that the planned growth in homes and employment was supported by infrastructure. Funding over the lifetime of the plan was estimated at £600m and, despite the pressure on public finances, the Government was committed to introducing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the mechanism for this funding. However, in order for the CIL tariff to operate, there had to be an adopted core strategy. The GNDP had agreed to support in principle the use of a significant proportion of CIL revenues to establish a shared fund to support delivery of priority one infrastructure (including up to £40m of local investment for the delivery of the NDR and related measures) and the Inspectors had supported this approach.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation drew attention to the legal processes that the JCS had been through before it could be adopted which were summarised in the report. In particular, he drew attention to the Inspectors' acceptance of local evidence for the scale of housing required and agreement that the housing trajectory as proposed was reasonable; the authorities had seized the initiative, risen to the challenges presented by the demographic forecasts for the area, and made a proactive response which recognised the scale of the issues. The JCS set out a sound long-term Strategy for growth and the GNDP position on this issue was worthy of support.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation stated that, with regard to the reduction of affordable housing on sites of more than 16 dwellings from 40% to 33%, the Inspectors appeared to have broadly accepted the overall level of need, but not the case for front loading provision to deal with the existing backlog of housing need. The effect of changing the headline target would be mitigated by the fact that only a proportion of sites would have been able to deliver up to 40% taking into account viability. This reflected the current economic climate and about 94% of the currently estimated affordable housing need to 2026 could still be met. The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation then made reference to the Inspectors' support for the economic and employment aspects of the JCS and stated that the approach to water efficiency and the aspiration to move away from dependency on fossil fuels and support decentralised low-carbon or renewable energy provision was praised.

A key point of contention had been the distribution of planned growth and support had been received for each location for major growth with the Inspectors agreeing that different approaches were required in Broadland and South Norfolk. The Inspectors had also accepted that it was not necessary or appropriate for the JCS to incorporate a complete "plan B".

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation went on to state

that there were two options open to each Council - adopt the Joint Core Strategy in the form recommended by the Inspectors or not adopt it; there was no facility to make amendments to the Strategy.

With regard to the main considerations needing to be taken into account in deciding whether or not to adopt the JCS as set out in the report, the Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation drew attention to three main considerations:

- it was essential that the necessary future development was properly planned and guided which was exactly the purpose of the Joint Core Strategy;
- an adopted JCS would help in resisting speculative and inappropriate development proposals;
- adoption of the JCS would give status in a statutory document to NATS and its components, including the NDR.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation stated that development was not just about lots of new buildings, homes, offices etc but was also about protecting environmental assets and the green infrastructure of the area and that there were valid concerns, particularly with regard to the Growth Triangle, that these could be cast aside and be taken over by development but he felt that it was not the case. All sites in the Growth Area Triangle (GAT) that had externally derived environmental designations, such as County Wildlife Sites and Ancient Woodland, were currently protected by the existing Broadland District Council local plan policy ENV7. This specifically stated that “development which would significantly adversely affect the wildlife interest of areas of local conservation importance including county wildlife sites and ancient woodlands identified by English Nature or the value of regionally important geological sites would not be permitted”. The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation stated that this would be reinforced through particular policies of the Joint Core Strategy and he made reference to the policies concerned:

- Policy 1 - ‘the environmental assets of the area will be protected, maintained, restored and enhanced and the benefits for residents and visitors improved’.
- Policy 2 - ‘development proposals will respect local distinctiveness including the landscape setting of settlements, the urban/rural transition and the treatment of gateways’.
- Policy 7 - ‘healthier lifestyles will be promoted by maximising access by walking and cycling and providing opportunities for social interaction and greater access to green space and the countryside’.
- Policy 8 - ‘development will be expected to provide for access to green space, including formal recreation, country parks and the wider countryside’.
- Policy 9 - ‘opportunities will be sought to enhance green infrastructure throughout the area, with particular emphasis on priority areas’.

- Policy 10 - relating to the GAT specifically - 'retention of existing important green spaces and significant levels of heath land re-creation to provide stepping stones to link Mousehold Heath to the surrounding countryside restoring and conserving historic parkland and important woodland'.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation stated that part of the requirement of the JCS was for the development of an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the whole of the GAT, in consultation with local communities, to ensure that all forms of development were properly planned for. The AAP would not only continue to protect these environmental assets through the existing local plan policy ENV7 but also enhance that protection through the policies in the JCS and subsequent DPD's (site allocations/development management). The AAP would also allocate specific sites which would be retained as strategic green infrastructure, specifically where there was rich biodiversity, such as areas of woodland, and would also make provision for informal recreation.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation stated that a plan such as this, which was for a 15 year period, was not one that would be left to wither on the vine. It would be closely, regularly and rigorously reviewed to ensure it remained fit for purpose. Equally, its delivery had to be closely, regularly and rigorously monitored. This did not mean however that there would be no development, as a level of development could be managed but it would have to meet normal planning considerations and be development that existing infrastructure could support. If applications came forward which did not accord with current planning considerations and were not underpinned by the required infrastructure, they could be turned down.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation then proposed, seconded by Mr Graham, that Members support the adoption of the Joint Core Strategy and the recommendations tabled at the meeting.

Some members raised concerns about the implications of adopting the JCS. They were concerned about the inclusion of the eco-town in the JCS and the fact that this had already been watered down with a drop in the level of affordable housing from 40% to 33%. There were concerns about the lack of infrastructure and the difficulties of providing and funding sufficient infrastructure to support the proposals. There was a lack of support for the NDR, and they felt that, despite the Inspectors' finding that the JCS was sound, the proposals were not in the interests of Broadland. There were concerns about the loss of the natural break in development between the City and the Broadland District and there was a need to protect and enhance existing village communities. The development proposed would not be sustainable and it was suggested that focusing development in one area would result in a greater dependency on cars. Reference was made to the fact that GNDP meetings had not been open to the public and it was suggested that consultation had been poor and the public had been ignored. Some

Members stated there were elements of the Strategy which were sound and worthy of support but other aspects were not acceptable but unfortunately there was no scope for amendment to the Strategy and the only option open to the Council was to accept or reject it. The inclusion of the eco-town and the principal of building on a greenfield site remained the main focus of concern.

Other Members spoke in favour of adopting the JCS and felt the Strategy would allow for the protection of environmental assets including county wildlife sites. The Strategy referred to the importance of protecting green infrastructure and utilities and securing the long term viability of existing woodlands. There was an overwhelming need for housing and jobs for future generations and it was important to recognise that this was a long term Strategy with support of the partner authorities. There were good reasons for siting development growth in the north-eastern triangle and regard had to be given to the needs of the majority and not just the concerns of a minority of people. The Strategy would help protect against piecemeal development and the impact of this on infrastructure. Reference was also made to the release of brownfield sites in the City centre as part of the Strategy and failure to adopt the Strategy would have an impact on investment in the area. The Strategy would also help to ensure future investment in the Broadland area. Reference was made to proposals in the JCS for cooperation with other organizations including Natural England, the Environment Agency and Anglian Water with regard to climate change, environmental, energy, and water efficiency issues and the ability to progress the policies contained in the Strategy. It was suggested that there had been ample opportunity for interested parties to comment on and raise concerns about the proposals during the preparation of the JCS and there had been many cross party working groups involved at all stages during the four year preparation of the Strategy, all feeding into the GNDP. With regard to the reduction in the levels of affordable housing sought from 40% to 33%, in the current climate this was probably a more realistic target of what could actually be delivered.

Mr Mackie asked the following question. Question: Could the portfolio holder assure me that the existing Racecourse, Browns and Belmore Plantations will be included in the new Area Action Plan and retained as that strategic infrastructure? Reply by Cllr Proctor: An Area Action Plan will be considered by the new administration; however, if I form part of that administration I would need some convincing why they should not be included as such in the new Area Action Plan. In response to further questions, the Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation also explained how Hoveton and Wroxham were being considered together as a key service centre, and confirmed that the targets identified within the Strategy were evidence based reflecting a proven need for the provisions within the Strategy.

Members then voted on the proposal and it was, with 23 members voting for, 8 against,

**RESOLVED:**

to

- (1) note the Inspectors' report including the required changes in appendices;
- (2) formally adopt the Joint Core Strategy as part of the development plan for Broadland, providing new strategic policies, superceding a limited number of policies in the current Broadland Local Plan and making minor consequential amendments to the Proposals Map for Broadland;
- (3) delegate authority to the Strategic Director and Chief Planner to proceed with necessary legal and administrative processes to secure adoption of the JCS and
- (4) delegate authority to the Strategic Director and Chief Planner, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to make any consequential changes to the previously agreed "Broadland District Council Statement on planning matters arising from recent Government announcements".

[Mr McGilvray asked for his vote against the proposal to be recorded.]

**145 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The Minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 15 February 2011 and 1 March 2011 were received.

**146 CABINET REPORTS**

The Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 8 March 2011 were received.

*Minute 134 – Review of Capital Strategy 2011-14*

**RESOLVED:**

to

- (1) agree the Broadland District Council Capital Strategy including prioritising the appropriate level of capital spend (attached as appendix 2 to the signed copy of these Minutes);

- (2) agree the level of capital investment for each of the identified priority areas, noting the revenue implications and
- (3) note that the next administration may choose to set alternative priorities, which would necessitate a review of the Strategy for 2012/13.

*Minute 135 – Corporate Risk Register Review*

**RESOLVED:**

to note the updated Corporate Risk Register (attached as appendix 3 to the signed copy of these Minutes).

*Minute 137 – Procurement Strategy 2011-2015*

**RESOLVED:**

to

- (1) endorse the proposal that future reviews of the Strategy be every three years;
- (2) adopt the Strategy as amended (attached as appendix 4 to the signed copy of these minutes) and
- (3) amend the Action Plan to include reference to the need to include Environmental Procurement arrangements within the Strategy.

*Minute 139 – Rackheath Exemplar Brief*

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation introduced this item and emphasised the need for the project to be viable to ensure it was implemented. In response to concerns about the need to ensure that there was no development without the corresponding infrastructure, as well as ensuring the local school was not expanded by using mobile classrooms, and that the project needed to continue to be “exemplar”, the Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation stated that efforts had continued throughout the project to achieve this.

**RESOLVED:**

to adopt the Exemplar Brief as amended (attached as appendix 5 to the signed copy of these Minutes).

*Minute 142 - Rackheath Joint Venture Agreement*

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Policy and Conservation introduced this item and stressed the importance of the Agreement in committing all partners to adhere to the Brief in considering planning applications in the future.

**RESOLVED:**

to

- (1) enter into a Joint Venture Agreement on the terms as set out in the report and detailed in the draft agreement and
- (2) nominate the Strategic Director and Chief Planner as the Council's representative on the Executive Board;

**147 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 9 February 2011 were received.

**148 REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

The Minutes of the Regulatory Committee meetings held on 10 February 2011 and 3 March 2011 were received.

**149 STANDARDS COMMITTEE**

The Minutes of the Standards Committee meeting held on 4 March 2011 were received.

**150 BROADLAND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP (BOARD)**

The Minutes of the Broadland Community Partnership (Board) meeting held on 2 February 2011 were received.



**151 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

It was noted that no questions had been received from Members in accordance with procedural rule 12.4.

**152 MOTIONS**

It was noted that no Motions had been received under procedural Rule 13.

**153 UPDATE FROM MEMBER CHAMPIONS**

Members received and noted the report from Mrs Bannock, Member Champion for Sports.

**154 FUNDING REQUEST – NORWICH DOOR TO DOOR COMMUNITY TRANSPORT SCHEME**

The Head of Information and Human Resources introduced his report and informed Members that the County Council was intending to review its network of supported bus services and that the Door to Door service would be included in this review. It was unlikely however that the review would be complete before September 2011 which would leave the Door to Door service without funding until then.

Members expressed their support for the vital service provided by Door to Door, particularly for vulnerable people, and felt the Council should endeavour to fund the service in the short term pending the outcome of the review of supported bus services by the County Council. In the meantime efforts should be made to urge the County Council to provide financial support to the service.

**RESOLVED**

that the Council continues to fund the Norwich Door to Door Service at current levels on a monthly basis for up to a year pending the review of supported bus services by the County Council and in the mean time the County Council be urged to support the service.

*The meeting closed at 9.25 pm.*