

**MINUTES** of the proceedings at a Meeting of the **DEVELOPMENT & MARKET COMMITTEE** held at Fakenham Community Centre, Oak Street, Fakenham on **MONDAY 5 JUNE 2017**, at 7.00pm

**Present:**

Cllr T Duffy (Chairman, Presiding)

Cllrs G Acheson, A Edwards, G Foortse, M Coates, C Rockett, J Holdom, J Sandford-Cooke

District Cllrs: Roy Reynolds, A Claussen-Reynolds, J Punchard

Mark Ashwell – Planning Policy Manager at North Norfolk District Council

Rob Parkinson – Planning Case Officer at North Norfolk District Council

Adam Lazzari – Reporter Eastern Daily Press

Linda Jennings – Town Clerk

Ann Kerrison – Administration Assistant

100 members of the public

**11 TO ELECT A DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE TO SERVE UNTIL THE NEXT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

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

**12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSCENCE**

Apologies were received from Cllrs A Vertigan and G Thorpe

**13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**14 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 May 2017, having been circulated, were On the proposition of Cllr G Acheson, seconded by Cllr G Foortse, AGREED and signed by the Chairman.

**15 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

A letter has been received from John Fraser, Chief Executive of Fakenham Medical Practice, regarding the Practices ability to cope with the extra patients that would be generated by the Northern Development. The last paragraph of the letter states; *“The partners at the practice are as confident as they can be that they should be in a position to accommodate the increased number of patients which the new housing development may bring. There are many matters which may affect the Practice in the future such as rising work demand, ageing patient demographic, shortage of GPs, 7 day opening, as well as the requirement to work at scale with the Sustainability and transformation Plan (STP) for Norfolk within the recently formed Multi Speciality Community Provider company to facilitate this.”*

**16 TO ADJOURN THE MEETING FOR ELECTOR’S QUESTIONS**

A resident stated that it takes 3 weeks to get an appointment at the GP practice now. How can they say they will cope with the extra patients from the new development? **It was agreed that the Council will go back to the Practice with this question.**

17 **TO DISCUSS THE NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT PA 4165 (PO/17/0680)**

Cllr Duffy informed the meeting that the land for this development is already pre-determined for development. The point of this meeting is to look at elements of the development and put forward thoughts and ideas that will benefit the people of Fakenham, and not just the profit of the developers. Cllr Acheson pointed out that the committee had listed their own thoughts on this development, a copy of which has been made available to people attending the meeting.

Mark Ashwell, Planning Policy Manager at North Norfolk District Council (NNDC), explained his role and the proposals for the development. A company called Define, agents for the land owners – Trinity College Cambridge – have applied for outline planning permission for up to 950 dwellings on the land to the north of the town. The proposed development would take place over 10-15 years. (A development of 78 dwellings has already been granted permission on the adjacent Pickens chicken farm site.) It will not be possible to access the town from the site via Watermore Lane. This will be one way from the town to the new development. A small number of the properties (less than 30) will have their frontage on Rudham Stile Lane and will be able to access Rudham Stile Lane. Rudham Stile Lane will need to be improved to take the extra traffic.

The outline planning application was received 3 weeks ago. A public consultation will last for 21 days and all comments should be submitted to the planning department as soon as possible. The planning case office will look at all comments and the planning application and a decision will be made towards the end of the year, beginning of next year. All documents relating to this application can be viewed on the NNDC website.

Questions were taken from the public;

- Who is it envisaged will buy these houses and where will they work? Cllr Duffy said many people currently work in Fakenham but travel here from other places. It is hoped they may purchase some of the houses.
- Will the new development be part of the existing Town community? The proposed lay out and access to the new site suggests that it will be a stand-alone community. There needs to be more integration.
- At a meeting a few years ago when this development was first mooted, there were 800 dwellings proposed on the land right up to the sports centre. The current application is proposing 950 dwellings on a site that is only 2/3 as big as the original site. It was felt that there are too many dwellings planned for the site and that it will be over developed. Mr Ashwell said that there could be up to 1,400 dwellings on the full site up to the Rugby club.
- At the last consultation on this matter in 2012, people were asked to place their questions and concerns in to a box. The resident had a copy of the questions raised. These appear to have been ignored as the same concerns are still being raised and the proposed plans have not taken these in to account. **The resident agreed to give a copy of these questions to the Clerk.**
- A resident said that the proposed extra traffic on Rudham Stile Lane posed a safety issue. Children and parents use this route to and from the High School. The road and Bridge at the junction with Claypit Lane are not safe. This needs to be improved.
- One resident felt that the size of the development, and its layout meant that this would not be integrated with the rest of the town. The road structure and traffic management means that the new residents would head to neighbouring towns rather than come in to Fakenham. This will have an impact on the small retailers within the new development. She was concerned as to what impact the additional residents would have on local facilities such as the surgery. The surgery has stated that they would be able to cope. It is already difficult to secure a routine appointment in a reasonable time, and felt that the council should go back to the practice about this. The surgery may be confident that that can cope, patients are

not. The resident also asked for reassurance regarding the impact of the actual building works on Field Lane, Rudham Stile Lane and Claypit Lane. Will works traffic enter the new development via the proposed access roads? Also where will site workers park their vehicles? The existing residents to the north of the town and high school and college students should have as little traffic disruption as possible. The safety of students walking and biking to school along Rudham Stile Lane should also be taken in to account. She wondered how confident the town council are that their views and concerns will be satisfied.

- The current proposal for traffic flow will cause two main pinch points at the roundabout by Morrison's supermarket, and the new roundabout which is proposed for the A148. There is going to be a lot of extra traffic heading in and out of the new development. This needs to be looked at by Highways.
- Why do councillors think that this development is right for the town? Why did the publicity for this meeting say that the Council would be enthusiastically behind this development if their concerns were met?
- Thorpland Road has not been mentioned in the planning application. Traffic from Rudham Stile Lane will be travelling via Thorpland Road to get to Greenway Lane. This needs looking at. Also, have the planners taken in to account the increased amount of traffic that will be generated in the Rudham Stile lane area when the college moves from its present site to the Academy site. The resident encouraged all members of the public to put their comments on to NNDC website. The more comments left, the more impact they will have. He also noted that as sports facilities are planned for the new development this will detract from other facilities in the town and will go towards this becoming a stand-alone community rather than integrating with the existing town.
- What type of houses will these be and will they be affordable for local people? There are plans to build a junior school as part of the development, but where will they go after that? Cllr Acheson said that the current Junior and infant schools are at capacity and need the new school to be built as part of the first part of the development. The academy say that they can cope with the extra population as they currently have 258 surplus places.

Mark Ashwell stated that there is a housing need, and North Norfolk has to produce 10,000 new homes over the next 20 years. It is NNDCs job to make sure that what type of houses are built and where, matches demand. The main type of growth is elderly people retiring into the area. Therefore, houses are being built to meet this demand. A percentage of properties on a development have to be affordable, but developers have to produce viable properties, so there needs to be a balance.

- A resident said that this development needs to cater for future generations. This means looking at education for young people. Apart from this development other developments are being looked at for the town, such as the Highfield Road car park. There will children living on these developments. What happens in 10-20 years' time when the children need academy places, will the places be there. He felt strongly that the education department should also be involved in these discussions.

District Councillor R Reynolds represents the North Ward of Fakenham which includes the new development site. He said that the new infant school will have 240 places. There will definitely be a roundabout built on the A148, and Norwich Long Lane will be upgraded. He also said that Rudham Stile Lane will be upgraded to cope with the extra volume of traffic. Anglian Water has said that the sewage system is adequate and can cope with the extra dwellings. The surface water will

be collected in attenuation ponds and will not enter the sewage system. Watermore lane will be two-way for buses and one way for traffic headed from the town in to the new site. There will be a new footpath along Rudham Stile Lane to the bridge with traffic calming on the bridge with traffic having to give way to traffic on Claypit Lane.

Cllr Acheson said that the Town Council did not feel that the sewage system could cope and that assurances were needed from Anglian Water. The Council felt that if the new development would take the sewage plant to capacity then the developers should have to connect to the system at Little Snoring, or pay to upgrade the current station so that future smaller developments in the town did not have to bear this cost.

- A resident said that in the past residents were told that the current sewage system would not be able to cope with this development, and that Anglian Water did not have the budget to upgrade the current system. Has work been done to rectify this situation in the last 3-4 years?
- At a consultation meeting a few years ago to discuss this new development, residents were told that no houses would exit on to Rudham Stile Lane. Now we are being told that 30-40 properties would exit here. Have we been misled?
- A resident said that the current roundabouts in this area are already inadequate and adding a further one just a few yards from the one at the shell garage will make matters worse at busy times.
- Another resident observed that if the new development goes ahead it will be worth £35-100m to Trinity College, and £1.5m in council tax to NNDC!
- Another resident felt that this development is on a main artery to the town. This is not interconnected to the town, and the new development will be stand-alone. People from the development are unlikely to work in the town, and will mean the roads in and out of Fakenham will be much busier and will not be able to cope. The roads are dangerous. If this development goes ahead then Highways need to improve the roads in order to deal with this.

Cllr Duffy assured the residents that all these concerns will be forwarded to NNDC, and we have to hope that they take notice of them.

- A resident said that this development is effectively a new village on the edge of the town. This will mean increased noise, pollution and traffic over the next 10-15 years which will affect the whole area. Any development on the college site and Highfield Road car park will also add to this.

Cllr Reynolds said that he had looked at the planning documents and in answer to a previous question, unloading and parking during the building of the development will be on-site as will wheel washing of vehicles to minimise any mud left on the surrounding roads.

- A resident asked why the council were building on arable land. Cllr Duffy pointed out that the council does not own this land. It is owned by Trinity College. The area is already part of the development plan and will go ahead. The Town council are only consultees and can try and get the best out of the development for the town.
- A resident said that the residents of Fakenham don't trust NNDC. We were told in the past that we needed a traveller's site built on the edge of town. This is now a white elephant and there is never anyone on it. **Councillors will use the Freedom of information act to find out what the occupancy of the site is.**

Cllrs Rockett, Reynolds and Claussen - Reynolds left the meeting at this point.

**18**     **TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

PA 4167 (PF/17/0750) – Howard & Mervyn Crighton – Erection of single storey rear extension and front porch – 1 Beech Grove NR21 8QE  
**Councillors offered no objection and no comment**

PA 4168 (PF/17/0765) – Mr M Sizeland and Miss E Last – Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey extension to side – 19 Searle Close NR21 8NA  
**Councillors offered no objection but commented on the overbearing nature of the first floor extension on the neighbouring property.**

PA 4169 (PF/17/0770) – Steel build Masters – Erection of building for light industrial purposes (Class B1) – Busseys & Sabberton Enterprise Way NR21 8SN  
**Councillors offered no objection and no comment**

PA 4170 (PF/17/0716) – Mr & Mrs Pope – Erection of two storey and single storey rear extension, porch to front and walls and fencing to front boundary – 5 Hayes Lane NR21 9EP  
**Councillors offered no objection and no comment**

**19**     **TO RECEIVE NOTICE OF DECISIONS OF THE PLANNING AUTHORITY**

PA 4153 (PF/17/0667) – Jonathan Browne – Construction of 12-space car park within existing walled garden – Barons Hall, Hall Close NR21 8HQ  
***At the D&M meeting held on 24 April 2017 Councillors offered no objection but commented that they would like to see the wall retained and a landscaping scheme.***  
**Application has been withdrawn – no further action will be taken by NNDC.**

PA 4156 (NP/17/0601) – Adam Herculson – Prior notification of agricultural building - – Barons Hall Farm Barons Hall Lane NR21 8HB  
***At the D&M meeting on 24 April 2017 Councillors offered no objection but commented that the proposed structure is on land that adjoins a SSSI site, is in view of a public footpath and bridleway and is in a flood zone 3. They also queried why the building needs to be so tall to house farm livestock.***  
**Application has been withdrawn – no further action will be taken by NNDC.**

PA 4151 (PF/17/0525) – Jack Richards and Sons Ltd – Installation of replacement cladding and ground and first floor windows – 2 Garrod Drive NR21 8NN  
***At the D&M meeting on 24 April 17 Councillors supported this application, but commented that some of the windows were new and not replacements.***  
**PERMIT**

PA 4140 (PF/17/0389) – Mr Peter Jenner – Erection of single storey rear extension and porch to front – 4 Waterfield Avenue NR21 8EU  
***At the D&M meeting on 3 April 17 Cllrs offered no objection or comment.***  
**PERMIT**

PA 4144 (ADV/17/0337) – Kinnerton – Display of 2.no non-illuminated advertisements – Kinnerton (confectionary) Co Ltd Oxborough Lane NR21 8AF  
***At the D&M meeting on 3 April 17 Cllrs offered no objection or comment***  
**CONSENT**

PA 4157 (PF/17/0582) – Mr Southgate – Erection of single storey extension to front and demolition of rear single storey extension and garage – 87 Holt Road NR21 8DZ  
***At the D&M meeting on 8 May 17 Cllrs offered no objection or comment***  
**Application has been withdrawn – no further action will be taken by NNDC.**

PA 4158 (PF/17/0583) – Mr Southgate – Erection of two storey dwelling and formation of new access to serve existing dwelling – 87 Holt Road NR21 8DZ

***At the D&M meeting on 8 May 17 Councillors offered no objection but comment on the highway access and ingress and would like to be reassured by Norfolk County Council Highways.***

**Application has been withdrawn – no further action will be taken by NNDC.**

PA 4152 (PU/17/0541) - Daniel Grocott – Prior approval for proposed change of use of agricultural buildings to restaurant (Class A3) and deli shop (Class A1) – Heath Barn Norwich Road NR21 8LZ

***At the D&M meeting on 24 April 17 Councillors offered no objection but commented that the plans needed to overcome potential highways and pedestrian issues related to the busy road at that junction.***

**Application has been withdrawn – no further action will be taken by NNDC.**

PA 4155 (PF/17/0533) - Mr Douglas Benton – Erection of garage and single storey extension to rear of dwelling – 33 Sculthorpe Road NR21 9HA

***At the D&M meeting on 24 April 17 Councillors offered no objection and no comment***

**PERMIT**

**20 TO CONSIDER PURCHASING NEW PLASTIC ROAD CLOSED SIGNS FOR MARKET DAY**

It was noted that the one of the current signs has been broken and needs replacing. The signs are also heavy and have to be carried a distance to be stored at the end of market day. **It was agreed that the Clerk should go ahead and purchase some new signs.**

**The meeting closed at 20:35 pm**

**CONFIRMED** this

day of

2017.

**CHAIRMAN**