

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD IN  
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, KINGS HOUSE THETFORD  
ON TUESDAY 11<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2016 STARTING AT 7:00PM

Present:

The Mayor, Councillor T J Jermy

Councillors:

R F W Brame

Mrs B J Canham

C Harvey

J Newton

S N H Wright

C R P Burnett

D M Crawford

R G Kybird (Chairman)

M Taylor

Officer in attendance:

Tina Cunnell

Chris Crimmen

Town Clerk

Committee Secretary

The Mayor requested to hold a minutes silence for Councillor J C Moorman.

316/16 DECLARATIONS OF ANY DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS  
Councillor R Kybird declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 320/16 (b).

317/16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE  
Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs S J Armes, M P Brindle, Mrs J Hollis, Ms F Robinson and M S Robinson.

318/16 MINUTES  
To confirm the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2016, received by Full Council on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2016, as a true record and be signed/initialled by the Committee Chairman.

319/16 PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO CONSIDER

a) Plan No 1138 Change of Use

Applicant: Legacy Property Management Ltd Proposed change of use from C3 residential accommodation to A1 self-contained shop unit at ground floor 33-35 Guildhall Street.

Supporter.

b) Plan No 1142 Outline

Applicant: Mr & Mrs D Banks The proposal is to divide the present garden of No.11 Mackenzie Road to create a plot for a single two storey three bedroom house between No. 11 and No. 9 Mackenzie Road.

Objector: Development is not in keeping with character of surrounding area. This is considered an over development with particular objections to the scale of development. A two storey building adjacent to bungalows results in the potential issues of the loss of privacy to neighbouring residents.

320/16 LATE PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AFTER AGENDA WAS PUBLISHED

a) Plan No 0596 Consultation Amendments – Full

Applicant: Mr N Pettit Conversion of existing barn to create one residential dwelling building behind No. 57 Bury Road.

Strong objections: In particular supporting Highways concerns about the dangerous access onto a main road due to lack of visibility. There is also a lack of amenity space and insufficient parking with concerns that the turning area is too small. The access is too narrow and the annex at 57 is not connected raising concerns about its further usage.

b) Plan No 1178 Consultation – Full

Applicant: Mrs Lynne Ripley Erection of 4 dwellings Cotters 60 Croxton Road.

Objector: This is an overdevelopment of the site and there are concerns that the development will further complicate the traffic issues at the junction. The terrace of houses backs onto bungalows and therefore there is a potential issue of the loss of privacy to neighbouring residents.

321/16 BRECKLAND LOCAL PLAN

The Chairman asked Councillors if they wished to make a response to the Breckland Local Plan Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries 2016 consultation that closes 31<sup>st</sup> October 2016. There followed a vote. 5 Councillors were in favour of making a response. 4 Councillors were against with one abstention. After a discussion the Chairman outlined the 3 areas that the consultation should consider:

1. The Local Plan should consider the potential impact of the redevelopment to the Barham Camp site which is continuously within the Town Boundary.
2. The Local Plan should consider the effect of leaving the European Community and the subsequent effect on the EU Bird Directive which has in the past entirely shaped the direction on Thetford's expansion.
3. The Local Plan should consider the delivery of infrastructure for the settlement of Thetford. The Neighbourhood Plan should be the settlement area and not the separate villages.

The Town Clerk will send this response to the consultation.

322/16 TECHNICAL CONSULTATION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING PROVISIONS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING BILL

The Chairman asked if Councillors should consider a response to the Technical Consultation. It was agreed to send a reply.

Question 1 – Do you agree that regulations setting out the detail of the process for modifying an existing neighbourhood plan should replicate as far as possible the existing regulations for making a new plan?

Answer: Yes.

Question 2– Do you agree that a new basic condition is needed to ensure that a neighbourhood plan proposal does not adversely affect any existing plan that remains in place, in areas where neighbourhood area boundaries have changed?

Answer: The Council believe there needs to be a sensible assessment of the effect of existing plans but it should not be seen to disable the modification plan.

Question 3 – Do you agree that local planning authorities should review (and if necessary update) their statement of community involvement at least every five years? If not, what alternative do you propose?

Answer: The Council believe the review should tie in with the electoral period – every four years.

Question 4 - Do you agree that local planning authorities should include their policies on providing advice or assistance to groups preparing neighbourhood plans and their policies for involving interested parties in the preliminary stages of plan-making in their statements of community of involvement within 12 months of Royal Assent to the Bill? If not, what alternative do you propose?

Answer: The Council have no comment on Question 4.

Question 5 - Do you have any other suggestions for further strengthening neighbourhood planning?

Answer: The Council believe that Neighbourhood Planning should be consistent with settlement boundaries and Local Government structure to ensure a consistent approach to Neighbourhood Planning.

Question 6 - Do you have any views about the implications of our proposed changes on people with protected characteristics as defined in the Equalities Act 2010? What evidence do you have on this matter? Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any impacts identified?

Answer: No.

Question 7 - Do you have any views about the potential positive or negative financial implications on local planning authorities, neighbourhood planning groups, or others, of our proposed changes? What evidence do you have on this matter? Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any costs identified?

Answer: The Council believe the Department for Communities and Local Government appear to have decided that Local Councils who are in general responsible for producing Neighbourhood Plans should not have access to the growth in business rates. We feel that is the opposite of delivering localism. If the Town cannot invest in their high streets the districts are often too far away to have that extra presence.

The Town Clerk will send this response to the consultation.

- 323/16 PARKING AND TRAFFIC FLOW STRATEGY  
The Chairman opened the discussion. Councillor T Jermy reported the Ian Parks, NCC has written a report on a traffic survey carried out in Thetford and is willing to address the Council on the report's findings. He went on to say that if Breckland Council could send their representative on their parking survey on the same evening then the Council would have a clear vision on the way forward. Councillor T Jermy stated that prior the development when the Planning Application was submitted he was informed that when the Riverside is ready to be opened there will be no issues or changes needed to the parking and traffic flow. The Town Clerk would arrange the meeting of the Council and invite Ian Parks, NCC (Traffic Flow) and a Breckland Officer Parking Issues, to a Full Council meeting as soon as possible.
- 324/16 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS  
a) JOHN MOORMAN  
The Town Clerk reported she had been informed of the death of Councillor J C Moorman and Full Council has been informed.
- 325/16 PRESS RELEASES  
None.

Chairman