

# Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group – Local Development Framework Working Group

## Agenda

## Date

Monday 21 April 2008

**Members of the  
Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy  
Group  
– Local Development Framework Working Group**

### Representing Broadland District Council

Cllr Andrew Proctor (Chairman)  
Cllr Anthony D Adams  
Cllr Stuart Clancy  
Cllr Joella C Cottingham  
Cllr Kim Davis-Claydon  
Cllr Roger R Foulger  
Cllr Shelagh Gurney  
Cllr Shirley Peters

### Representing Norwich City Council

Cllr Jenny Lay  
Cllr Tom Llewellyn  
Cllr Judith Lubbock  
Cllr Steve Morphew  
Cllr Brian Morrey  
Cllr Adrian Ramsey  
Cllr Brian Watkins

### Representing South Norfolk Council

Cllr Vivienne Bell  
Cllr Derek Blake  
Cllr Daniel Cox  
Cllr Leslie Dale  
Cllr Colin Gould  
Cllr Murray Gray  
Cllr Keith Weeks  
Cllr Martin Wynne

### Representing Norfolk County Council

Cllr Evelyn Collishaw  
Cllr Adrian Gunson

### Officers

Sandra Eastaugh GND Partnership Manager

## Time

2.00pm

## Place

The Ballroom  
Pinebanks  
9 Yarmouth Road  
Thorpe St Andrew  
Norwich

## Contact

**Martin Thrower** tel (01603) 430540

Broadland District Council  
Thorpe Lodge  
1 Yarmouth Road  
Thorpe St Andrew  
Norwich NR7 0DU

Fax: (01603) 430411  
E-mail: [martin.thrower@broadland.gov.uk](mailto:martin.thrower@broadland.gov.uk)



**Please note:** an induction loop system is available for the hard of hearing in the Council Chamber and the Godfrey Room. To make use of this facility adjust your hearing aid to the "T" position when attending meetings in these rooms.

**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS - FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE  
FLOWCHART OVERLEAF**

**MEETING:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ITEM NO:** \_\_\_\_\_ **AND TITLE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**NATURE OF INTEREST: (Please write in this space a description of your interest)**

	YES	NO
Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members' Interests?		
If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?		
Your own		
A family member (state name)		
A close associate (state name)		
Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate (state name)		
Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors (state name)		
Any company in which your family member/close associate has shares with a face value more than £25,000 (state name)		
Any of the following in which you hold a position of general control or management: outside organisations, other public authorities, charities, pressure groups, political parties or trade unions (state name)		
Does the interest (a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above? <i><b>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</b></i> (b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above? <i><b>(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)</b></i> (c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to? <i><b>(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)</b></i> (d) relate to the functions of the council in respect of housing (except your tenancy), statutory sick pay, an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members, any ceremonial honour given to members, or setting the council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. <i><b>(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)</b></i>		
<b>PREJUDICIAL INTEREST</b> If you answered Yes to (a) or (b) is the interest one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest? <b>If Yes the interest is PREJUDICIAL. If you answered Yes to (c) the interest is PREJUDICIAL</b>		
If prejudicial do you intend to attend the meeting to make representations, answer questions or give evidence?		

**Signed:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

# DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to my interests?

- A** Does it affect my entries in the Register of Interests?  
**OR**  
**B** Does it affect the well being or financial position of me, my family or close associates; or my family's or close associates'  
 • employment, employers or businesses;  
 • companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value;  
 • business partnerships; or  
**C** Does it affect the well being or financial position of the following organisations in which I hold a position of general control or management:  
 - other bodies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the council;  
 - other public authorities;  
 - charitable bodies;  
 - bodies whose main purpose is to influence public opinion or policy
- More than the majority of other people in the ward?**
- D** Is Overview and Scrutiny considering a decision I made? If so you have a prejudicial interest.

NO

Disclose the existence & nature of your interest

You have a personal interest in the matter

YES

Is the interest financial or relating to a regulatory issue e.g. planning permission?

NO

The interest is not prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

YES

You may have a prejudicial interest

- This matter relates to
- housing (except your tenancy)
  - statutory sick pay from the council
  - an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members
  - any ceremonial honour given to members
  - setting the council tax or a precept

YES

NO

The interest is prejudicial withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence). Do not try to improperly influence the decision

YES

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?

NO

Personal Interest

Prejudicial Interest

## **A G E N D A**

**Page No**

- |          |   |                 |
|----------|---|-----------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>To receive declarations of interest</b>        |                 |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Apologies for absence</b>                      |                 |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Minutes of meeting held on 22 January 2008</b> | <b>1 - 4</b>    |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Matters arising therefrom (if any)</b>         |                 |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Summary of Consultation Results</b>            | <b>5 - 43</b>   |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Draft Copy of Preferred Options</b>            | <b>44 - 170</b> |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Next Steps</b>                                 |                 |

# Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

---

Minutes of a meeting of the **Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group – Local Development Framework Working Group**, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **21 April 2008 at 2.00pm** when there were present:

	Cllr Andrew Proctor - Chairman	Representing
Cllr Anthony Adams		Broadland District Council
Cllr Joella Cottingham		Broadland District Council
Cllr Kim Davis-Claydon		Broadland District Council
Cllr Roger Foulger		Broadland District Council
Cllr Shelagh Gurney		Broadland District Council
Cllr Shirley Peters		Broadland District Council
Cllr Vivienne Bell		South Norfolk Council
Cllr Derek Blake		South Norfolk Council
Cllr Leslie Dale		South Norfolk Council
Cllr Colin Gould		South Norfolk Council
Cllr John Fuller		South Norfolk Council
Cllr Trevor Lewis		South Norfolk Council
Cllr Martin Wynne		South Norfolk Council
Cllr Evelyn Collishaw		Norfolk County Council
Cllr Daniel Cox		Norfolk County Council
Cllr Adrian Gunson		Norfolk County Council
Mr M Burrell		Norwich City Council
Mr P Morriss		Norfolk County Council
Mr R Doleman		Norfolk County Council
Mr K Barnes		South Norfolk Council
Mr A Gomm		South Norfolk Council
Mr R Burroughs		Broadland District Council

## **11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Clancy, Cllr Lay, Cllr Llewellyn, Cllr Lubbock, Cllr Morphew, Cllr Morrey, Cllr Ramsey, Cllr Watkins, Cllr Gray, Cllr Weeks, Mr P Kirby and Ms S Eastaugh.

## **12 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2008 were confirmed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

## **13 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESULTS**

Alan Gomm presented a report summarizing the results of the consultations

## Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

---

responses received. He stressed that the document represented a very early draft of the document that would eventually be the Preferred Options version of the Joint Core Strategy. It contained potential policies / proposals, and in some cases rejected options. It was by no means the finished article, but the Planning Group preparing the document felt it would be helpful to share the work at this earliest stage for internal consultation only.

The working Group was invited at this stage to make constructive comment as to whether:

- The emerging options seemed reasonable
- Was there any obvious omissions?
- were there problem areas that need to be flagged up before they escalated?

A detailed critique was not required at this stage, but pointers or general areas of concern were considered more appropriate. Members were asked to concentrate effort on the sections marked 'Preferred Options'; which had been boxed and shaded for ease of reference. Sections of the document had been titled 'What we have learned', and this drew together evidence from the consultation, the sustainability appraisal, studies etc. Some of this was still work in progress. In order to meet the very tight deadlines set for the JCS it would be necessary to work in parallel with the emerging evidence and refine ideas as the matters progressed, so there was not at this stage a neat trail of the background work undertaken. It was accepted that the document was not complete and the content in some areas appeared patchy, however the Group was asked to express its comments on the basis of the information now provided.

The document contained the draft policies dealing with the suggested strategic distribution of the growth (housing and employment) and Members were specifically asked to consider these matters carefully and to give an indication as to the acceptability of the strategy offered.

The next stages of the process would be:

- Policies would be subjected to sustainability appraisals.
- Further internal consideration.
- A further meeting of the Joint LDF Group will be held in May.

Prior to detailed consideration of the proposals the Group stressed the need for the report to send out a strong message that the proposed growth would only be accepted if infrastructure which was meaningful, deliverable and which worked was provided – put bluntly **NO INFRASTRUCTURE – NO GROWTH.**

The following comments were then made:

## Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group

---

- More work was needed on the Spatial Vision to provide fuller details based on the examples provided by other authorities
- Linkages between infrastructure and housing needed to be provided in appropriate places within the document
- A more holistic approach needed to be reflected throughout the document
- Delivery of the growth needed to be made in a phased way
- The market needs to have the ability to ensure delivery
- Suitable text needed to be provided on the new eco town at the former RAF Coltishall (6-8000 new homes which will be in addition to the RSS requirement) and attention drawn to the infrastructure implications for the GNDP area.
- Details of completions to date and extant permissions be included in the development programme
- Redraft the text on gypsies and travellers to make it less specific and reflect the need for a number of smaller pitches and the likely level of provision needed after 2012.
- The reference to the rail link to London should include reference to the availability of trains for the service
- Text be included to refer to the need for rail improvement to Cambridge
- The improvements at Longwater be highlighted and more detail be provided on the A11/A47 Western Corridor
- Redrafting take place to differentiate between generic issues and locally focused issues.
- Suitable text be included to reflect the importance of separation and the retention of communities to retain local identities
- Specific reference be made to issues around development on flood plains
- Specific reference be made to renewables and in particular issues around wind turbines
- The Spatial Hierarchy Policy be widened to include the fringe parishes.
- School capacities referred to in the document be reviewed to ensure a consistent approach, reflecting the ongoing discussions with Children's services on the schools' reorganisation.
- The document should reflect the possibility of small scale social housing developments being allowed on rural sites where there was an appetite for it.
- The content of the settlement hierarchy and town centre hierarchy be amalgamated.
- Text be included to indicate that if the NDR was built this would lessen the demand on roads in the centre of Norwich and the main feeder roads into the city
- The Members for Wymondham do not support any proposals for significant development to "bolt on" a major residential area comprising 4-7000 homes in effect doubling its size. The view of the local Members was that they wished for Wymondham to remain a rural

## **Greater Norwich Development Partnership Policy Group - Local Development Framework Working Group**

---

historic market town. Development on the scale proposed would have a significant detrimental impact on the town's conservation area and limited parking facilities and there was limited scope for the town centre to be developed or expanded. The Members had accepted that there were a number of smaller sites around the town which could be developed but a single developer was driving one major development scheme.

- Issues around the B1108 needed to be flagged up.

The Chairman advised the meeting that the Officers would now review the comments made at the meeting and any other representations received and would draft proposals based around evidence and professional opinion. This would drive the settlement hierarchy and result in the preferred options.

It was agreed that a further meeting be held on 14 May at 2.00pm to consider a further draft.

*The meeting closed at 4.45pm*