Minutes of an **Extraordinary** meeting of the **Council** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Thursday 2 August 2012** at 7.00pm when there were present:

Mrs S C Gurney – Chairman

Mr A D Adams	Mr A P Findlay	Mr B A McGilvray
Mr P Balcombe	Mr J F Fisher	Mr R R Nash
Mrs C H Bannock	Mr R R Foulger	Mr J N Pettman
Mr J W Bracey	Mr D G Harrison	Mr A J Proctor
Mr P H Carrick	Mrs L H Hempsall	Mrs B H Rix
Mr J A Carswell	Mr J M Joyce	Mr D Roper
Mr S M Clancy	Miss J R Keeler	Mr N C Shaw
Mrs J C Cottingham	Mr R J Knowles	Mr M D Snowling MBE
Mr W F Couzens	Mr B S Kular	Mr J P Starling
Mrs K Davis-Claydon	Mr K G Leggett MBE	Mr D W Thompson
Mr S Dunn	Mr I J Mackie	Mr S A Vincent
Mr J J Emsell	Mr A S Mallett	Mr S D Woodbridge

In attendance were the Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executive, the Head of Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer and the Committee Officer (DM).

Also present was Mr J Sadler – co-opted member of the Standards Committee.

At the beginning of the meeting the Chairman reminded all present that, in accordance with the constitution, no part of the meeting should be recorded in any way by tape, film, video equipment or any other means, without the consent of the Members present at the meeting.

64 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

The Head of Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer advised Members that further guidance on registering Members interests had very recently been received from the Department for Communities and Local Government but on an initial reading, it did not appear to address the queries raised by many councils and he suggested the Council await the outcome of the request for Counsel's Opinion by Coventry City Council. Insofar as the business being transacted this evening, he suggested Members representing parishes listed in the reports specified on the Agenda, declare non-pecuniary interests in such matters.

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Mr Adams, Mr Carswell, Mr Clancy, Mrs Gurney, Mr Harrison, Mr Joyce, Mr Mackie, Mr Proctor, Mr Shaw	Any matter relating to Norfolk County Council	Non-Pecuniary Interest – Norfolk County Councillor

Mr Adams, Mr Balcombe, Mrs Bannock, Mr Bracey, Mr Carswell, Mr Clancy, Mr Couzens, Mrs Davis-Claydon, Mr Dunn, Mr Emsell, Mr Findlay Mr Fisher, Mr Foulger, Mrs Gurney, Mr Harrison, Mr Joyce, Miss Keeler, Mr Knowles, Mr Leggett, Mr Mackie, Mr McGilvray, Mr Nash, Mr Proctor, Mr Roper, Mr Shaw, Mr Snowling, Mr J Starling, Mr Thompson, Mr Vincent	Minute no 70 - Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk – Sustainability Appraisal and Next Steps	Non – Pecuniary Interest – Member of either a Parish/ Town and/or County Council

65 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs M Bradley, Mr D Buck, Mr S R Buckle, Mr I G Graham, Mrs T M Mancini-Boyle, Mr N E Starling, Mrs C Ward, Mr D C Ward and Mr C J Wheeler.

66 ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reported on the recent Broadland Sports Day event held on Friday 27 July to coincide with the start of the 2012 Olympics, where staff and Members had been encouraged to come to work in their favourite sports wear and had taken part in a range of sporting activities to raise awareness of participation in sport. A sum over £80 had been raised for the Norwich Swan Swimming Club. The Chairman also reported on a recent visit to Broadland by a delegation from China.

The Vice-Chairman reported that he had attended the unveiling of a plaque and planting of a tree at Salhouse to celebrate the diamond jubilee.

67 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

It was noted that there had been no questions received from the public.

68 PUBLIC SPEAKING

The following representations were made by the public:

Mr Heard

"I wonder as I listen to the debate around the JCS whether this ruling group actually get it. After all it must be difficult to comprehend large 200 page documents placed in front of you just before a meeting or as Judge Ouseley

put it "wading through treacle". The Judge was very clear in declaring that what you did was UNLAWFUL and the work has to be redone. You haven't done this but merely window dressed and regurgitated the previous results without a full and transparent process whilst using the offices of POS Enterprises that has Mr Kirby listed as a Director. Hardly transparent although I'm sure he expressed an interest as they are described as a "critical friend"! This is treating the judgement with contempt and taking us for fools particularly as your own so-called independent inquiry has not yet been completed. We continue to receive legal advice on this contemptuous point with national backers who see the significance of this judgement as the case illustrates the potential future pitfalls as local planning authorities tackle their duty to co-operate as defined in the new Localism Act, and National Planning Policy Framework. You are attempting, by rushing through with a consultation in the holiday month of August and refusing legitimate requests to extend the time period, to minimise the impact of the judgment. Lets face it; can Broadland's housing strategy be reconsidered without affecting the rest of the JCS? The answer surely must be no.

It is hard to see how proper consideration of the alternatives to growth can exclude the possibility of some or all of that growth being reallocated to where the jobs are. Perhaps the reason for the rush is the abolishment of the East of England regional strategy opening the way for all Norfolk community groups to collaborate, with the help of CPRE, and successfully argue that a lower level of growth overall is more appropriate, potentially affecting the whole JCS area. Or is it because you need these houses as income generators and not to satisfy housing need at all. After all Broadland is facing bankruptcy if its financial reserves are not replenished. Even now we could still see the dual prospect of huge council tax increases and large estates of empty and unsold new homes. A future that none of us would like to see. Or are you rushing to get this through before county council elections next year fearing the backlash from the clear lack of democracy in the county and the loss of twin hatter seats?

Our campaign continues and we will take whatever actions, direct and indirect, to ensure that you understand that local people do not want or see a real need for this level of development. There is plenty of evidence that confirms this view but for some reason you do not seem to get it. The smoke and mirrors that are being deployed including the Postwick Hub deliberations trying to divorce it from the NDR, the investment of over one million pounds in the small village of Rackheath in union with a leading national house builder and the secret agreement with Salhouse to restrict new house to no more than 70 do not fool anyone. You decide whether these are bribes or incentives. Please do not treat as idiots or underestimate us. Let's see some reality and candour rather than arrogance and untruths."

Mr Lindsay

Here we stand once again at an Extraordinary Full Council Meeting when, once again, under self-imposed time constraints you will be asked to "hurry through" yet another possible flawed and unlawful document called the Community Infrastructure Levy. This Council knowingly took risks on the Joint Core Strategy and once again you stand on the edge to risk more possible legal challenges which not only incur huge costs on the public purse but cause serious delays to future real developments for our area!

I am not here to argue regarding what possible schemes await CIL monies or dwell on the already adequate Section 106 Agreement which is in place but I will draw your attention of your own officers' observations.

On Wednesday 25 July 2012, the Place Shaping Committee – page 26 section 3.2, I quote "In order to adopt a CIL, a charging authority must have an adopted local plan, which in the case of Broadland, Norwich City and South Norfolk Councils, is the Joint Core Strategy.

The Joint Core Strategy is adopted with the exception of policies relating to the distribution of housing growth in the Norwich policy area of Broadland".

In other words, you do not have an adopted local plan. And an Officer further states, same meeting – section 3.3 "The current timetable has submission of CIL and pre-submission publication of the remitted parts of the Joint Core Strategy occurring simultaneously?" Bear in mind a charging authority must have an adopted plan. A scenario, very possibly, Justice Ouseley, is not happy with the works to the remitted parts of the Joint Core Strategy. Once again, this Council will have pushed through another proposal and, if unadopted, will have further legal ramifications.

After all, Section 7.7.1 of the same document states "The outcome of the legal challenge to the Joint Core Strategy is clearly a factor which needs to be considered, legal advice obtained leads to the conclusion that the Judgement is not a barrier to submission". Is this the same legal advice that was taken regarding the Joint Core Strategy and its then successful legal challenge?

Ladies and gentlemen, once more the repercussions of this vote are huge. If CIL is to be considered, it needs more time, time without any constraints or any impositions. The CIL proposal, if I were a councillor I would move that this CIL vote be either cancelled, or at the very least, deferred until this Council does have an adopted plan in place.

69 JOINT CORE STRATEGY – INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

Members received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive which invited Council to consider the report of the independent person commissioned to undertake a review of the processes and procedures followed during the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy with particular regard to the selection of the North East Growth Triangle for strategic growth in Broadland, as requested at the Council meeting on 22 March 2012.

The Deputy Chief Executive referred to the emphasis placed on the need for the review to be independent and drew Members' attention to the measures taken to appoint an independent person and the brief given to them to undertake the review. The "Summary Report" which had been prepared by Mr Shadarevian in the interests of economy did not include any long narrative of background documents and their relevance but represented his findings based on his extensive reading of all background material. He reminded Members that the Council, along with its partner councils on the GNDP, had taken legal advice to help with complying with the Court Order from Mr Justice Ousely and that Mr Shadarevian's report was a separate exercise.

Members then heard from the Leader of the Council who stated that Mr Shadarevian's report was welcomed not just because it confirmed what was already known but, more importantly, it was a valuable yardstick against which the processes and procedures that the GNDP had gone through could be measured following Mr Justice Ouseley's judgement and Order for the repair work to the JCS.

The effect of the Court Order was that a part of the Joint Core Strategy concerning the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area, a total of 9,000 dwellings, had been remitted. This meant that the partners needed to give further consideration to the distribution of those dwellings and produce a new Sustainability Appraisal for that part of Broadland in the Norwich Policy Area. The GNDP was required to re-examine the preferred "north east growth triangle" option and give detailed consideration to any reasonable alternatives to it.

Whilst the rest of the Joint Core Strategy remained adopted, the remitted parts of the Joint Core Strategy were to be treated as if they had only been taken up to the pre-submission stage and had not been examined in public by a planning inspector nor adopted.

The Leader pointed out that at sections 3 and 6 in the report, Mr Shadarevian was incorrect in using the word "quash". Mr Justice Ouseley's Judgment was very clear to remit certain parts of the policies and text of the JCS. Quash and remit were two totally different things. At section 1, Mr Shadarevian had commented "in respect of its housing policies and particularly housing numbers and distribution". The Leader stated that housing numbers of 9,000

were not remitted – just their spatial distribution. The action brought by Mr Heard was not just against Broadland but against Broadland, Norwich & South Norfolk councils collectively as the LPAs forming the GNDP producing the JCS.

The Leader stated that the GNDP was not a decision making body, currently or in the past. Whilst it was accepted that meetings of the GNDP Policy Group (which in its early stages comprised Conservative Councillors from Broadland, Liberal Democrats from South Norfolk and Labour from Norwich) and the all party LDF Working Group had not been held in public, the decisions taken by the individual planning authorities as members of the GNDP and based on recommendations from the GNDP Policy Group had been in public either at those authorities' Cabinet or Council meetings or both. The GNDP recommendations had been tested and challenged by the elected members of the relevant authorities before they had made decisions on how to progress. He reported that recent meetings of the GNDP Board had been held in public and all relevant documentation published.

The Leader went on to state that there was no point in commissioning a report of this nature if there was no learning from it. Key issues to be considered as part of the learning were - have the processes and procedures that had been gone through for the repair work to the JCS been robust, sound and legal? Did the GNDP do things differently this time? Have the terms of the order been complied with? He stated that the answer to these questions was in the affirmative.

The Leader stated that the repair work had started with a blank sheet of paper to scope the implications of the Order and to do the work summarised in the agenda papers for the next item on the Council agenda. In fact there had been a number of parallel and interrelated pieces of work done by GNDP officers, who had legal advice from NPLaw and William Upton of Counsel. URS undertook the SA work and POS Enterprises had provided an external professional perspective and challenge.

When all put together, the Leader stated it was clear and obvious that the GNDP had gone about this detailed piece of work in a very professional and painstaking manner and he was able to confidently say to Members that the processes and procedures that had been gone through for the repair work to the JCS were robust, sound and legal. This had been part of the learning. He went on to state that the matter of evidencing all stages of the repair work was also robust, sound and legal. 18 growth locations had been initially identified. They had been tested against the scale of strategic growth required and considered against the existing adopted elements of the JCS not subject to remittal. 3 reasonable alternatives had emerged from that detailed, robust sound and legal work that had been fully appraised in accordance with Mr Justice Ouseley's Order. No stone had been left unturned in this work. Again,

this had been part of the learning.

The Leader of the Council went on to state that Broadland was not alone in producing the JCS as a development plan for the future. All the GNDP partners remained committed to working together to deliver plans for growth across the greater Norwich area, providing jobs, homes and prosperity for future generations. He stated that he could therefore confidently say that all the GNDP Members had put into place and actioned Mr Justice Ouseley's Order. The issues raised in Mr Shadarevian's report before Council had not just been addressed, but learnt from. He then proposed, duly seconded, that Council:

1. thank Mr Shadarevian for his report and note its contents;
2. accept that the issues raised in the report have been addressed by the GNDP in the repair work to the JCS.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition proposed an amendment that the Council thank Mr Shadarevian for his report but that the Deputy Chief Executive be instructed to draw up an action plan on how the Council will address the learning arising from Mr Shadarevian's report to be considered at the next meeting of the Council and that any decision on the Joint Core Strategy be deferred until after consideration of the action plan.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition expressed concerns that the Council had received the agenda papers including the report on the next steps for the Joint Core Strategy before the report on the review had been considered. Despite reassurances from the Leader of the Council, Members had not received any report on the outcome of the findings nor an action plan and he felt it was short sighted to have commissioned a report and not demonstrate fully that the recommendations had been taken on board. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition drew attention to Mr Shadarevian's comments in paragraph 17 of his report relating to the fact that he had not been instructed to have regard to the efficacy of the decision making process in relation to other subject areas of the JCS and likened the claim that the remainder of the JCS was therefore sound to the analogy of a heart doctor having examined a patient's heart and found it sound then declaring the patient to have a clean bill of health. He also referred to paragraph 15 of the report which made reference to a comment that the JCS process was infected at the outset and failed to adequately and properly address alternative spatial strategies and suggest the Council appeared to be accepting this and pushing ahead. He felt it was premature to proceed at this point and that the opportunity should be taken to reflect on the learning from the independent report.

There were other concerns raised about the report and that consideration of the alternatives had been rushed and support was expressed for drawing up an action plan. Comment was made that the Council had not listened to the views of the public.

The Leader of the Council reiterated that the Council had learnt from the judicial review process and the independent review. Meetings of the GNDP Board had been held in private but that body was not a decision making body but instead made recommendations to partner Councils. He stated that he hoped that Members would trust that lessons had been learnt and acted on, indeed recent meetings of the GNDP Board had been held in public.

Members then proceeded to vote on the proposed amendment that Council thank Mr Shadarevian for his report but that the Deputy Chief Executive be instructed to draw up an action plan on how the Council will address the learning arising from Mr Shadarevian's report to be considered at the next meeting of the Council and that any decision on progress on the Joint Core Strategy be deferred until after consideration of the action plan.

It was requested that a recorded vote be taken. In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and with at least one sixth of the Members present standing, a recorded vote was taken.

FOR THE AMENDMENT – 9

Mr Balcombe, Mr Couzens, Mr Harrison, Mr Joyce, Mr Kular, Mr McGilvray, Mr Roper, Mrs Rix, Mr J Starling

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT – 27

Mr Adams, Mrs Bannock, Mr Bracey , Mr Carrick, Mr Carswell, Mr Clancy, Mrs Cottingham, Mrs Davis-Claydon, Mr Dunn, Mr Emsell, Mr Findlay, Mr Fisher, Mr Foulger, Mrs Hempsall, Miss Keeler, Mr Knowles, Mr Leggett, Mr Mackie, Mr Mallett, Mr Nash, Mr Pettman, Mr Proctor, Mr Shaw, Mr Snowling, Mr Thompson, Mr Vincent, Mr Woodbridge

ABSTENTION - 1

Mrs Gurney

The amendment motion was LOST.

Members then voted on the proposal and, with 26 Members voting for, 9 against and 2 abstentions,

RESOLVED

to

(1) thank Mr Shadarevian for his report and note its contents;

(2) accept that the issues raised in the report have been addressed by the

GNDP in the repair work to the JCS.

70 JOINT CORE STRATEGY FOR BROADLAND, NORWICH AND SOUTH NORFOLK – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND NEXT STEPS

Members considered the report of the Head of Planning inviting the Council to decide on the next steps to be taken in relation to the Joint Core Strategy following the receipt of the Judgment and High Court Order and the work undertaken by the Council, its various committees and the GNDP Board following the Judgment and Order.

Members also received copies of the Minutes and recommendations of the GNDP Board meeting held on 19 July 2012 and the Place Shaping Committee meeting held on 25 July 2012.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning stated that the decision which needed to be taken was to take forward the strategic development plan for the Broadland elements of the Joint Core Strategy through to 2026 and he highlighted the following key issues:

- the question of whether the Council had complied with the terms of the Order from Mr Justice Ouseley dated 29 February 2012 in reviewing the spatial distribution of housing growth in the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area? The issue was only the distribution, not the numbers proposed of 9,000 in the plan period.

- Was the Council satisfied that the process of evaluating reasonable alternatives was robust, sound and legal. It had been undertaken by GNDP officers, a "critical friend" from POS Enterprises, URS as consultants preparing the Sustainability Appraisal, (SA) and supplemented by legal advice.

- As a result of the detailed work that had been undertaken, 3 reasonable alternatives had come forward that were covered in the report and addressed in the SA.

- that the conclusions of the SA to date and officers' recommendations from all the evidence considered indicated that Alternative 1 was the preferred way forward to take to pre-submission consultation.

With regard to the Order, the Portfolio Holder for Planning reminded Members that the elements of the Joint Core Strategy concerning the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area, a total of 9,000 dwellings, had been remitted. This meant that the partners needed to give further consideration to the distribution

of these dwellings and to produce a new Sustainability Appraisal for that part of Broadland in the Norwich Policy Area. The GNDP was required to re-examine the preferred "north east growth triangle" option and give detailed consideration to any reasonable alternatives to it. While the rest of the Joint Core Strategy, which set out plans to deliver 27,000 new jobs and 37,000 homes by 2026, remained adopted, the remitted parts of the Joint Core Strategy were treated as if they had only been taken up to the pre-submission stage and had not been examined in public by a planning inspector nor adopted

With regard to the process, the repair work had started with a blank sheet of paper to scope the implications of the Order. This work was summarised within the papers presented with the agenda. A number of parallel and interrelated pieces of work had been done by GNDP officers, who had taken legal advice from NPLaw and William Upton of Counsel. URS had undertaken the SA work and POS Enterprises provided an external professional perspective and challenge.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning stated that, when all added together, it was clear and obvious that the GNDP had gone about the necessary work in a very professional and painstaking manner. The approach taken had been agreed and approved by the Place Shaping Committee and the Portfolio Holder for Planning stated he could confidently report that the processes and procedures undertaken for the repair work to the JCS were robust, sound and legal.

With regard to the alternatives, the Portfolio Holder for Planning stated the evidencing of all stages of the repair work was also robust, sound and legal. 18 growth locations had been initially identified. They had been tested against the scale of strategic growth required and considered against the existing adopted elements of the JCS not subject to remittal. 3 reasonable alternatives had emerged from that detailed, robust sound and legal work that had been fully appraised in accordance with Mr Justice Ouseley’s Order. No stone had been left unturned in this work.

With regard to the scale and dispersal of the 9,000 dwellings, the analysis indicated that dispersal of c2,000 dwellings was the appropriate level and that all alternatives should have a small sites allowance on the Broadland part of the NPA of 2,000.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning then highlighted the key elements detailed on page 99 of the report, para 4.9.3. The Sector Evaluation illustrated that of the 18 growth locations, 7 locations had potential for strategic scale growth. The table (4.5) showed the potential growth which each location could accommodate. The reasons why the remaining 11 growth areas had been rejected were set out at pages 93 to 98. The Growth Opportunities setting out possibilities of where 7,000 dwellings could potentially go by overlaying onto

the existing landscape of the adopted JCS were set out in table 4.6 on page 104. 3 growth opportunities had the potential, while 4 did not have the potential and had been rejected.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning stated that 3 alternatives for SA testing were set out in section 4.12.12 on page 106 and the detailed work and appraisal of these 3 alternatives was set out on pages 110 to 121. The Appraisal Summary and conclusions were shown on pages 122 and 123. Attention was drawn to the process flow matrix, stage by stage, to ensure a comparable assessment of the 3 alternatives covering social and environmental and economic considerations to determine the respective merits of the alternatives set out at page 18.

The key outcomes of Alternative 3 were set out in Section 5.3, on page 20, and indicated this was the weakest of the three reasonable alternatives hence why Alternative 3 had been rejected. The key outcomes of both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 were set out in Section 5.4, 5.5 and 5.6, on page 20, giving the reasons why Alternative 2 was weaker and why Alternative 1 was being recommended.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Council, the Porfolio Holder for Planning thanked officers for all their efforts and hard work over the last few months and he proposed, duly seconded, that Members support the recommendations contained on page 1 of the agenda papers.

The Leader of the Opposition stated that he was unable to support the proposal. The legal challenge had provided the Council with an opportunity to take a step back and revisit the issue of numbers of dwellings allocated and it had failed to take this opportunity to renegotiate what had been a bad deal for Broadland. He suggested there was nothing in the legal challenge to prevent this re-appraisal the opportunity to displace the allocation. In any event there was a need to deal with the issue transparently. He stated that the arguments for Alternatives 1 and 2 cited in the report were finely balanced and that Alternative 2 needed to be given more detailed examination. To this end, he suggested it should form part of the public consultation. Concern was raised that the Council had not had regard to public opinion and it was suggested that consultation on both options would enable the Council to take full account of the views of the public. It was also stressed that it was important to be open having been criticised for not being so.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning responded that the issue of the number of dwellings allocated was not part of the Order. Regarding the displacement of numbers, consideration had been given to other options and the conclusions were evidenced in the reports. Alternative 2 had been fully considered and assessed as part of the work undertaken.

Reference was made to various opportunities given for public participation in the JCS process over a considerable number of years including workshops

held. The north eastern growth triangle had ultimately been identified as the more suitable area. Meetings with businesses at the time had identified a demand for more business premises and more homes in that area. In terms of biodiversity and transport it was suggested that alternative 2 was less favourable than Alternative 1.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development stated that the recent census had confirmed the need for more housing in the Broadland area. The recession had caused a drop in construction and there was a need to kick start building and move forward as soon as possible. He made reference to previous developments at Thorpe Marriott and Dussindale which, whilst not well received at the time of construction, had proven to successfully meet the need for housing at the time. The current proposals would also benefit from funding to support infrastructure.

It was noted that Alternatives 2 and 3 could lead to challenges in deliverability rates and, on balance, the appraisal summary had concluded that alternative 1 was the favoured option.

In response to a question about which alternative would best protect the Thorpe Woodland, the Leader of the Council stated that Alternative 2 would likely create more pressure on environmental assets and affect land not required for development and as an area of environmental excellence, the woodland area at Thorpe would be better protected under Alternative 1.

The Leader of the Council stressed that the JCS was a plan for the future looking ahead to 2026. He stated that the Place Shaping Committee had considered at length the alternatives put forward. He also stated that the issues raised in Mr Shadarevian's report regarding processes, procedures and evidence had been addressed. In accordance with Mr Ouseley's instructions, the Council had gone back to the pre-submission stage and re-evaluated the options. He now urged the Council to move forward with the JCS.

Members then proceeded to vote on the proposal that support be given to the recommendations contained on page 1 of the agenda papers.

It was requested that a recorded vote be taken. In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and with at least one sixth of the Members present standing, a recorded vote was taken.

FOR THE PROPOSAL – 26

Mr Adams, Mrs Bannock, Mr Bracey , Mr Carrick, Mr Clancy, Mrs Cottingham, Mrs Davis-Claydon, Mr Dunn, Mr Emsell, Mr Findlay, Mr Fisher, Mr Foulger, Mrs Hempsall, Miss Keeler, Mr Knowles, Mr Leggett, Mr Mackie, Mr Mallett, Mr Nash, Mr Pettman, Mr Proctor, Mr Shaw, Mr Snowling, Mr Thompson, Mr

Vincent, Mr Woodbridge

AGAINST THE PROPOSAL – 9

Mr Balcombe, Mr Couzens, Mr Harrison, Mr Joyce, Mr Kular, Mr McGilvray, Mr Roper, Mrs Rix, Mr J Starling.

ABSTENTIONS - 2

Mrs Gurney and Mr Carswell

The Proposal was carried and it was accordingly

RESOLVED

(1) that, having considered the screening of reasonable alternatives set out in section four of the draft Sustainability Appraisal and the supporting evidence base,

(a) Alternative 1 is chosen as the most appropriate option and ;

(b) Alternative 1 be taken forward to pre-submission.

(2) to approve the pre-submission documents and

(a) approve the pre-submission publication of the remitted parts of the JCS

(b) to delegate authority to the GNDP Directors and the GNDP Manager, in consultation with the respective portfolio holders, to make further minor changes prior to publication to reflect emerging evidence and any necessary corrections.

71 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FOR BROADLAND, NORWICH AND SOUTH NORFOLK – COMMENTS ON REGULATION 16 PUBLICATION OF DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULES AND PROPOSED SUBMISSION

Members received the report of the Head of Planning regarding the proposed submission for independent examination of the draft charging schedule for the Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning commended the report to Members and invited them to support the recommendations contained on page 2 of the agenda papers. In response to a request for clarification, the Chief Executive commented that, in order to adopt a CIL, a charging authority needed to have an adopted local plan in place. In respect of Broadland, South Norfolk and Norwich City Councils, this was the Joint Core Strategy. With the exception of the policies relating to the distribution of housing growth in the Norwich Policy Area part of Broadland, the JCS was in place and legal advice had been taken by the Partnership which confirmed the CIL could be taken forward on the basis of the adopted plan. Assuming the CIL was adopted, each Partner Council would be responsible for determining how the CIL was implemented in their area.

Members then voted on the recommendations contained on page 2 of the agenda papers and, with 26 Members voting for, 10 abstentions, it was

RESOLVED

to

(1) agree a minor change to the CIL charging schedule for Norwich so that the £100 per sq m rate of CIL applied to flats of 5 storeys and above and publish the evidence supporting this change;

(2) publish the Statements of Modifications and evidence in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and submit these (and necessary submission documents as set out in paragraph 4.1 of the covering report) for examination by an independent examiner;

(3) continue to work together towards the indicative timetable set out in the report and

(4) delegate authority to the Chief Executive as the Director representative on the GNDP Board, following discussion with the relevant portfolio holder, to agree any minor changes to any of the documents to ensure consistency and clarity.

The meeting closed at 8:40pm