



## COUNCIL

**Minutes of a meeting of South Norfolk Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on Monday 30 July 2012 at 7.30pm**

**Members Present:** Councillors Bell, Bendle, Bills, Blake, Dewsbury, Edney, Ellis, Foulger, Fuller, Gould, Gray, Herbert, C Kemp, Kiddie, Legg, Lewis, McClenning, Neal, Palmer, Riches, R Savage, J Savage, Spratt, Thomson, Walden, Watt, Webster, Weeks, Wheatley, M Wilby and J Wilby

**Apologies:** Councillors Billig, Blowfield, Dale, East, Goldson, Hardinge, Hornby, W Kemp, Mooney, Overton, Pond, Tilcock and Ward.

**Officer in Attendance:** The Chief Executive

### 3137 PERSONAL

The Chairman welcomed back the Vice-Chairman of the Council, Cllr C Gould, who had been absent during recent weeks due to an operation. Cllr Gould thanked all officers and members who had sent him cards and best wishes whilst he was recovering.

### 3138 JOINT CORE STRATEGY PRE-SUBMISSION PUBLICATION FOLLOWING THE LEGAL CHALLENGE TO THE ADOPTION OF THE JOINT CORE STRATEGY

Cllr J Fuller reminded members of the background to the legal challenge to the Joint Core Strategy (JCS), which had resulted in a High Court Order, remitting parts of the JCS concerning the Broadland part of the Norwich Policy Area.

Following the court judgement, the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Board had reconsidered the distribution of 9,000 houses and 25 hectares of employment land in the Norwich Policy Area and the work undertaken had been to generate and test reasonable alternatives, if any, to those parts remitted. In total 18 alternatives had been considered and after a desk top analysis, 3 of these alternatives were considered to be reasonable options:

#### Alternative 1

7,000 homes in the combined north east of Norwich, inside and outside of the Northern Distributor Road (NDR), all of which would be in Broadland District Council's area

### Alternative 2

7,000 homes inside the NDR, all of which would be in Broadland District Council's area

### Alternative 3

Growth would be focussed south west of Norwich, with 4,600 additional homes in the area of Hethersett, Cringleford and Wymondham, with 2,400 additional homes in Broadland.

The Greater Norwich Development Policy (GNDP) Board had considered the three options in detail, at its meeting held on 19 July 2012. The third option was found to be the weakest of the 3 options, as it would have adverse impacts on the character and form of the settlements along the A11 corridor and would not deliver Bus Rapid Transit across the whole of the Norwich Policy Area. It was also unlikely to deliver the growth that was needed within the period of the plan. The second option, whilst having some merit, did constrain development to a smaller area. The first option was not constrained and offered sufficient land to provide a buffer to the Broads Authority Area and more scope to develop green infrastructure. The GNDP had therefore recommended Alternative 1 as the most appropriate option.

Members' attention was drawn to an additional paper provided by the GNDP, regarding the feasibility of Alternative 2, tabled at the meeting. This paper was requested by Broadland District Council members ahead of its Council meeting on 2 August. Broadland members had felt that more information was required regarding this alternative, before any consideration could be given to rejecting it.

Cllr Fuller also drew member's attention to some corrections required to the Sustainability Appraisal document; the historic parkland surrounding the remains of Melton Hall, at Great Melton had not been referenced, and some of the agricultural land within the South West area had been classified as Grade 1, rather than the lower quality Grade 2. Cllr Fuller stressed that it was important that members considered whether or not this information would change any support they might have for Alternative 1 and also suggested that any consequent changes that may be required to the Sustainability Appraisal and its appendices, be delegated to the Head of Localism and Growth, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition (as per recommendation c of the report).

During discussion, members indicated their support for Alternative 1. Cllr Gray had originally felt that there would be some merit in supporting Alternative 2, but following the additional information issued by the GNDP (tabled at the meeting), he believed that Alternative 1 was the best option. All members agreed that Alternative 3 could not be supported.

Cllr C Kemp hoped that any expense incurred by the Council, following the High Court Challenge to the JCS, would be paid by Broadland Council. He welcomed the rejection of Alternative 3, stressing the importance of the Southern Bypass Protection zone. Cllr G Wheatley agreed that Alternative 1 would provide an opportunity to provide sufficient landscape protection in conjunction with industrial and housing development.

Cllr D Bills, local member for Hethersett, expressed his support for Alternative 1, suggesting that Hethersett could not have taken on the additional development required under Alternative 3.

Cllr V Bell believed that Alternative 2 would bring about more uncertainty and would be more open to challenge. She expressed her support for Alternative 1.

Cllr T Lewis explained that he had been unable to find a reference to particular sites at Caistor St Edmund in the Sustainability Appraisal and Cllr Fuller agreed this matter would be investigated further outside of the meeting. He also sought clarification regarding the impact on the Council's 5 year land supply. Cllr Fuller explained that 12-1300 permissions would need to be granted to meet South Norfolk's 5 year land supply. He envisaged that by October, a substantial amount of permissions would be in place to assist in meeting this target. However, Cllr Fuller stressed that the issue was complex and he suggested that the matter be discussed further outside of the meeting, with relevant officers, and Cllr Lewis welcomed this approach.

It was unanimously

- RESOLVED:**
- (a) That having considered the screening of reasonable alternatives set out section four of the draft Sustainability Appraisal and the supporting evidence base, that Alternative 1 (the remitted text of the Joint Core Strategy) is the appropriate option;
  - (b) To agree that reasonable Alternative 1 meets the tests of soundness, that the Sustainability Appraisal is finalised and reasonable Alternative 1 is taken forward to pre-submission, and
  - (c) To give delegated authority to the Head of Localism and Growth, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition, to make further minor changes prior to publication to reflect emerging evidence and any necessary corrections.

### **3139 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION TO THE EXAMINER**

Cllr J Fuller reminded members that South Norfolk, Broadland, Norwich and Norfolk County Councils had jointly published a draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule for public consultation, which ran 3 October to 14<sup>th</sup> November 2011. Following this consultation, a revised draft charging schedule was published for public comment, following which a small number of modifications were proposed to the charging schedules.

Cllr Fuller drew attention to the modification relating to multi storey flats which related to Norwich City Council's schedule only. Members were informed that evidence had suggested that flats more than 5 storeys high (not 6 as originally envisaged) should attract a lower level of CIL to reflect the higher costs of building. Cllr T Lewis referred to proposed development, which included flats, at the Deal Ground, a small part of which fell within the South Norfolk boundary. Cllr Fuller agreed to look in to the matter after the meeting.

Referring to paragraph 5.3 of the report, Cllr P Allen queried what proportion of the CIL would be passed on to town and parish councils. Cllr Fuller explained that it was proposed that 5% of the income derived from CIL would go directly to towns and parishes. He stressed that no significant receipts would arise from CIL until 2014 at

the earliest. However, he reminded Council that the Neighbourhood Fund would distribute up to £1 million to local communities by 2015; CIL was not the only fund supporting the localism agenda.

It was unanimously

**RESOLVED:**

To:

- (a) Publish the Statement 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 GNDP report) for examination by an independent Examiner;
- (b) Continue to work with GNDP partners towards the indicative timetable set out in paragraph 6.2 of the report;
- (c) Agree that any minor changes to any of the documents to ensure consistency and clarity be delegated to the Head of Localism and Growth in liaison with the Leader of the Council and the Leader of the Opposition.

The Council concluded at 4.47 p.m

---

CHAIRMAN