

MINUTES of the proceedings at a Meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT & MARKET COMMITTEE** held at Fakenham Connect, Oak Street, Fakenham on **MONDAY 22 MAY 2017**, at 5.30pm

Present:

Cllr T Duffy (Chairman, Presiding)

Cllrs G Acheson, G Foortse, M Coates, R Crook, A Edwards, J Holdom, J Sandford-Cooke, A Vertigan.

Ann Kerrison – Administration Assistant

2 members of the public

A presentation was made by representatives from Lovell developers regarding the proposed development on Brick Kiln Farm, before the meeting began.

1 TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE TO SERVE UNTIL THE NEXT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Cllr Sandford-Cooke proposed Cllr Duffy, seconded by Cllr Foortse, and agreed unanimously.

2 APOLOGIES

Cllrs C Rockett, R Smith and G Thorpe, Linda Jennings – Town Clerk

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 8 May 2017, having been circulated, were on the proposition of Cllr Acheson, seconded by Cllr Sandford-Cooke, AGREED and signed by the Chairman.

5 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising.

6 TO ADJOURN THE MEETING FOR ELECTOR'S QUESTIONS

A resident voiced her concerns regarding the proposed Northern development of the town. Her concerns were that the new development would become a stand-alone community which was not integrated with the main town; she wondered whether the local medical practice could cope with the increased numbers of patients and whether the works traffic would be using existing roads such as Rudham Stile Lane and Field Lane to access the development site. Cllr Acheson said that he had been in contact with John Fraser, CEO of Fakenham Medical Practice. Mr Fraser said that the surgery had no concerns regarding the extra patients. They have recently acquired 2 new rooms and additional medical staff and will be able to cope. **It was agreed that we need evidence of this and Cllr Duffy will write to Mr Fraser to ask for this information in writing.** Cllr Crook was concerned that he had asked Dist. Cllr Punchard for this information some weeks ago and he had still not provided this. Cllr Edwards pointed out the supporting environmental impact paperwork for the development stated that the medical practice could cope with 6,700 more patients but there were no figures to back this up.

7 TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

PA 4166 (PF/17/0699) – Mr & Mrs Nethercoat – Detached single garage – 50 Warren Avenue NR21 8NP

Councillors offered no objection and no comment

PA 4165 (PO/17/0680) – Trinity College - Outline planning application (All matters except primary means of access reserved for future approval) for residential development of up to 950 dwellings (Use Class C3), employment development (Use Classes B1/B2/B8), a primary school and children's nursery (use class D1), a hotel (use Class C1), local retail (Use Classes A1/A3/A4/A5) and associated public open space and infrastructure – Land North of Rudham Stile Lane & East of Water Moor Lane NR21 9QU

Cllr Duffy pointed out that this development has already been given the go ahead, but it is the detail that Fakenham Council can comment on.

Councillors voiced many concerns that need addressing;

- There are no supporting figures or documents for many of the planning documents associated with the development e.g. the fact that the medical practice can accommodate 6,700 more patients, the economic activity generated by the site, the impact of the additional transport on the environment, the capacity of the existing sewage system.
- The density of the site and how many of the dwellings would comprise social and affordable housing. It was felt that this may mean people would not want to live here long term, and there would be a constant turn-over of residents
- This site was originally earmarked to be built by more than one developer to ensure a mixture of different buildings. Councillors wondered if this was actually financially viable and whether one or two big developers would be employed instead.
- The traffic management of the site, both construction traffic and that of residents once the site was completed. The documents available with the planning application concentrate on construction traffic and not long term management of traffic once the development is complete. It was felt that traffic flow is already a problem during peak holiday periods and the new development will only add to this if not managed properly. It was noted that similar problems had been experienced by Heacham and Hunstanton. **It was agreed to contact these councils to ask their views.** It was suggested that other solutions to the traffic management needed to be debated with the highways department at Norfolk County Council
- Will the Northern Distributor Road around Norwich also have an impact.
- The capacity of the current sewerage system to cope with this and any future developments
- The small shops on the development would prevent residents from coming in to the town, and would marginalise the town. It was also felt that these small shops would not be able to compete with Morrisons and Tesco.
- It was felt that a community space which could be used to unite the new development and the existing town, could be included i.e. a community centre instead of the shops
- What public transport will be available
- It was felt that not enough car parking spaces had been allocated for the size of the development which would result in road side parking

It was agreed that Cllr Duffy & Cllr Acheson will write an outline of the thoughts expressed at the meeting, with the help of the admin assistant, in time for the next meeting on 5 June 17.

On the proposition of Cllr Duffy, Seconded by Cllr Acheson and AGREED by all, the council will postpone giving its decision on the development to NNDC planning department to allow more time to clarify what its thoughts are, following public consultation in two weeks' time. **The D&M meeting on 5 June 17 will be held at a different venue (to be confirmed) and will start at 7pm. This will be advertised to the public, but will be made clear that the development already has the go ahead, but they can voice their opinions on the details.**

