



# PORINGLAND PARISH COUNCIL

Poringland Community Centre, Overtons Way, Poringland, Norfolk, NR14 7WB  
Tel: 01508 492182 Email: clerk@poringlandparishcouncil.gov.uk

Clerk to the Council: Vacancy  
Chairman: Mr Tim Boucher



## NOTICE OF MEETING AND SUMMONS TO ATTEND

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of Poringland Parish Council at 7pm on Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2018 at Poringland Community Centre.

The business to be transacted at the meeting is as follows:-

- 1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Declarations of interest for items on the agenda and applications for dispensations**

Members are invited to declare personal or pecuniary (prejudicial) interests in any items on the agenda. It is a requirement of the Parish Council (Code of Conduct) that declarations from a Member include the nature of the interest and whether it is pecuniary or an interest other than pecuniary. In the case of a pecuniary interest being declared and no dispensation being sought or approved, the member must disclose the interest and withdraw from the meeting when the item is discussed. If any Member has made a public comment and/or reached a predetermined view prior to attending a meeting it could invalidate the Council's decision, therefore the Member concerned cannot take part in any discussion and an interest must be recorded.
- 3. Minutes of the meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018**
- 4. Matters arising including Clerk's Report**
- 5. Report from the Chairman**
- 6. Adjournment for public participation, district and county councillors, and councillors with any pecuniary interests**
  - a. District Councillors (7 mins total)
  - b. County Councillor (5 mins total)
  - c. Public Participation (15 mins total)
- 7. Planning**
  - a. Applications Received
    - i. 2018/2370 5 St Marys Road: Proposed single storey extension to side of existing property. Demolition of existing flat roof detached garage.
    - ii. 2018/1882 4 Green Fall: Retention of access gates at front of property
    - iii. 2018/2480 1 Norwich Road: Erection of chalet and demolition of existing garage
    - iv. APPL/L2630/W/18/3214238: Land South of Burgate Lane Poringland Norfolk
- 8. Correspondence and Consultations**
  - a. Greater Norwich Local Plan Consultation
  - b. Public Space Protection Orders
  - c. Solar Powered Light – Village Green Youth Shelter
- 9. Finance**
  - a. Receipts, payments and bank reconciliation for October 2018
  - b. Accounts for payment
  - c. Fidelity Statement

**10. Committee and Advisory Group Reports and Recommendations**

- a. Finance & Governance Report
- b. Neighbourhood Plan Committee Report

**11. Other matters**

**12. Exclusion of the Press and Public under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 to discuss the following matter:**

- a. HR Matter

**13. Date of next Parish Council meeting: Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2019, 7pm, Poringland Community Centre**

Dated the 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2018

*Assistant Clerk*.....

**Minutes of the Meeting of Poringland Parish Council**  
**Wednesday 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018 7pm Poringland Community Centre**

**Present:** Trevor Spruce (Vice-Chairman)  
Steve Aspin  
John Henson  
David Hewer  
John Joyce  
Lisa Neal  
John Overton  
Chris Walker  
Rachel McCarthy (Assistant Parish Clerk)

**Also attended:** 8 members of the public in attendance.

**1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Tim Boucher, David Gooderham & James Landshoft.

**2. Declarations of Interest and Applications for Dispensation**

Lisa Neal declared an interest in item 7 as a member of the South Norfolk Council Planning Committee. John Joyce declared that he was a resident in the same street as the development featured in item 7.a.iii.

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> September 2018 were **agreed**, with an acknowledgement on page 2 that the detailed planning application hadn't needed permission and had not been discussed. Proposed by David Hewer, seconded by John Henson, all in favour.

**RM**

**4. Update on matters arising from the minutes**

The Clerk presented her report into matters raised and confirmed that whilst the snagging issues at Rosebery Park had been rectified, the surrounding path had not been left in a satisfactory condition and would be followed up.

**RM**

John Joyce described a site visit with Highways at Devlin Drive following the concern raised about speeding and driving standards. He advised that Norfolk County Council would fund the white linings being considered for funding under the Parish Partnership Scheme and that prices were being obtained for "Think" signs to go up around the first roundabout. Relocation of the SAM2 machine to include Devlin Drive also being instigated.

The County Councillor offered some 'speed aware' wheelie bin stickers which could be issued to local residents to utilise as well.

**5. Report from the Chairman**

The Chairman acknowledged the new Clerk to Council, Faye LeBon, in the public gallery and formally welcomed her to the Parish.

The Ping! table was the now the property of the Parish Council following a very successful initiative by South Norfolk Council over the summer.

Councillors were reminded about the Memorial Service on Sunday 11<sup>th</sup> November.

Work on the footway at Rosebery Park was running on schedule but would not be finished until Mid-November due to UKPN.

The Craft Fair on 24<sup>th</sup> November was sold out for stallholders and Jukebox Rogues on 8<sup>th</sup> December has 3 tables left.

## **6. Public Participation**

*Standing orders were suspended to allow members of the public to speak, proposed by John Henson, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.*

### **a) District Councillors**

Cllr Overton advised that Trevor Holden had been awarded the Managing Director's jobs at Broadland and South Norfolk Council and advised that the Burgate Lane development was being appealed.

Chris Walker raised concern about the amendment to the brown bin collections, specifically that the scheduled collection on 5<sup>th</sup> November had been postponed to the 15<sup>th</sup>.

Cllr Neal confirmed that she had received similar complaints and that South Norfolk officers had offered their apologies for the inconvenience but that the changes to collection were necessary and this was the quietest time of year to do it. Free bags are available for anybody with an excess.

### **b) County Councillor**

The County Councillor detailed the "Call For Sites" initiative within the Greater Norwich Local Plan, with over 500 development sites proposed for consideration.

He discussed the "Vision for Norfolk" in 2021, and strategies involved in the "Caring for our County" initiative.

He confirmed the consultation on the proposed dualling of the A47 was closing and that a consultation on the future of Children's Centre Services was also ongoing.

Suggestions on measures to take when paying anyone to dispose of waste were offered, including asking to see a license, recording the registration number of the vehicle and obtaining a receipt. Information on how to avoid being the victim of scams could also be obtained from [www.norfolk.gov.uk/business/trading-standards/scams](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/business/trading-standards/scams).

Cllr Neal queried the continuation of the yellow bike scheme in the city. Cllr Thompson confirmed that the scheme was being moved back to London.

### **c) Public Participation**

A member of the public added his disappointment about the brown bin collection amendments.

A member of public questioned if the blocked drains along The Street/Saxonfields had been reported by the Clerk. The Assistant Clerk confirmed that they had been referred to the Highways Rangers. The same member of the public raised concern about a hedge impairing visibility on the junction of The Ridings/Devlin Drive. John Joyce confirmed that during the site visit the hedge had been discussed and that it is considered to be a natural means of speed calming and that visibility is sufficient if vehicles are travelling at 20mph. The member of the public queried if “no parking” markings could be added to the corner of Devlin Drive. It was confirmed that this would not be possible. Another member of the public queried why the Spine Road could not be open to relieve the pressure on the roads. Cllrs Overton and Neal said this would not be possible until Norfolk Homes were finished on the site due to the heavy machinery in operation.

*Standing orders were reinstated. Lisa Neal left the meeting.*

## 7. **Planning**

### a) Applications Received

#### i) 2018/2212 37 Stoke Road: Sub-division of garden to form residential building plot

John Henson had viewed the plans and visited the site. The proposal saw the removal of an existing garage with the installation of a new double garage and a complete new build in place of existing pigeon lofts. He felt that the development was inappropriate and overcrowded, and that surface water drainage would be insufficient.

It was **agreed** to object to the application based on the above comments, proposed by David Hewer, seconded by Chris Walker, all in favour.

**RM**

#### ii) 2018/2223 4 Highland: Remove and relocate air heat pumps

John Henson had viewed the plans and visited the site. He advised that this was an ongoing matter and that the relocation of the air heat pumps would not resolve the problem of disturbance for neighbouring properties.

It was **agreed** to object to the application based on the above comments, proposed by John Joyce, seconded by Chris Walker, all in favour.

**RM**

#### iii) 2018/2267 Land South West of Sebald Crescent: Proposed new chalet bungalow and a log cabin annexe

David Hewer had viewed the plans and visited the site. He advised that the site was outside the boundary area and was inappropriate for the area.

It was **agreed** to object to the application based on the above comments, proposed by John Henson, seconded by Chris Walker, all in favour.

**RM**

- b) Planning Decisions
- i) 2018/1803 Land to the East Of Rectory Lane: Dwelling with double garage, access from Green Fall **REFUSED**
- ii) 2018/2059 Land South Of The Ridings: Non material amendment to permission 2017/0495 – Plots 9 & 10 amended house types and relocated with on-plot parking and garages; Plot 28 house type amended and re-orientated to provide entrance to road junction; and garage re-located, boundary treatment to street scene amended; Plots 9, 10, 27 and 28 revised garaging and additional spaces provided; Plots 11 and 27 amendment to size, shape of garden and fence line.

**APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

**8. Correspondence and Consultations**

None received

**9. Finance**

a) Receipts, Payments, and Bank Reconciliation

The receipts, payments and bank reconciliation for September 2018 were presented and **noted**. The Assistant Clerk advised that the error in the previous month's cheque list was due to a typing error.

b) Accounts for Payment

It was **agreed** to pay the following accounts, proposed by Chris Walker, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour. David Gooderham and Steve Aspin would authorise the payments.

	Staff Salaries	£4,660.87
HMRC	PAYE / NIC	£1,198.08
Norfolk Pension Fund	Pension Contributions	£1,311.71
BT	Telephone & Broadband	£47.06
Microshade	Hosted IT	£217.62
Norfolk Copiers	Printing	£50.57
Total Gas & Power	Electricity	£737.05
ESPO	Gas	£50.78
Hugh Crane Cleaning Eq	Cleaning Materials	£77.98
Norwich Electrical	Electrical Repairs	£91.56
MCL Mechanical Supplies	Water Cooler Quarterly	£85.80
P Bowyers Associates	Grease Trap Cleaning	£150.00
WorldPay	Card Machine	£4.99
Public Works Loan Board	Loan Repayment	£4,356.63
Name Withheld	Exclusive Rights Refund	£250.00
Total Gas & Power	Electricity (3 months)	£317.77
Top Mark Cleaning	Carpet Cleaning	£105.00
Poppy Appeal	S137 Donation – Wreath	£75.00
Tina Eagle	Six Administrator	£74.39
Heritage Contract Services	Relief Caretaking (Aug/Sept)	£1,920.78
Veolia	Waste	£74.23
Garden Guardian	Grounds Maintenance	£1,059.29
Vortex	Grounds Maintenance	£191.66
Spruce Landscapes	Grounds Maintenance	£945.00
Barclaycard	Maint/Website/Stamps	£663.46
Small & Co	Craft Fair Refund	£20.00
M Daws	Decorating Pavilion	£1,230.00

Name Withheld	Exclusive Rights Refund	£250.00
Hugh Crane Cleaning Eq	Cleaning	£30.43
Spruce Landscapes	Reinstate following library works	£120.00
Norfolk Copiers	Printing	£13.67
Norfolk Copiers	Printer Rental (Quarterly)	£172.76
R McCarthy	Petty Cash Top Up	£49.56

## 10. Committees and Advisory Groups

### a) Finance & Governance Report

The report was presented by Chris Walker together with an email from David Gooderham regarding the redevelopment of the Fiveways Roundabout. It was suggested research be made into the agreement from David Wilson Homes about their investment. He asked for any thoughts on any additional local investment needs but there were none.

**RM**

### b) Neighbourhood Plan Committee Report

The report was presented by John Henson. The Neighbourhood Plan is presently at a critical moment with pressure to get the pre-submission draft to council in the new year.

## 11. Other Matters

None

### **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

It was **resolved** to exclude the press and public for the duration of item 12a due to the contractual nature of the business to be transacted.

## 12.

### a) Community Land Project – Lease

The length and terms of a lease for the Men's Shed within the Community Land Project space were discussed. It was **agreed** to offer the Men's Shed, a 99 year lease at a peppercorn rate, on the understanding that the organisation continue in it's present form and that any development of the site or merger with another organisation be referred back to the Parish Council for consideration. Proposed Lisa Neal, seconded by David Hewer, all in favour.

**RM**

## 12. Date of next meeting:

- Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2018, 7pm, Full Council, Community Centre.

The meeting closed at 9.00pm.

**CHAIRMAN**

### Clerk's Update on Matters Raised at Previous Meetings

The following matters have been raised at previous meetings, and updates are noted below for information. This document does not include matters within the agenda.

- **Rosebery Park S106 Transfer** – Power ducts and Dog Bin removed. Pavement resurfaced. Landscaping and grounds maintenance ongoing. **Assistant Clerk to monitor. COMPLETE**
- **Community Land Project Transfer** – Legal transfer in hands of solicitors. Meeting scheduled December 2018. **To be progressed by Assistant Clerk. ONGOING**
- **White lining on Norfolk Homes estate roads** – Highways confirmed 24.10.2018 will fund. **To be progressed by Assistant Clerk. ONGOING**
- **New burial ground** – **Project to be handed to the new Clerk. ONGOING**
- **Redesigned pavement Shotesham Road** – Work commenced 24.09.18. Awaiting UKPN involvement mid-November. **Assistant Clerk to monitor. ONGOING**
- **Dog Park** - this will be discussed at the next Strategic Whole Council Advisory Group meeting. **Project to be handed to the new Clerk. ONGOING**
- **Groundwater at Cemetery** – Final chase letters sent to last few respondents week commencing 26.11.18. **Assistant Clerk to monitor and chase responses. ONGOING**
- **Devlin Drive Hedge Proposal** – NCC confirmed no model contract in place for PC's to maintain hedges and likely to only fund cutting every 5 years. **Project to be handed to new Clerk. ONGOING**
- **Dog Bin at Norfolk Homes Walkway** – To be installed week commencing 26.11.2018 – **Assistant Clerk to progress. ONGOING**
- **Poor design of stone area at Budgens** – reported to SNC and LetLord 30.07.18. Responses chased 21.11.2018. **Assistant Clerk to progress. ONGOING**
- **Speed Awareness Wheelie Bin Stickers** – letters hand delivered to residents of Devlin Drive and Rectory Lane offering priority access to speed stickers. Available to all residents from 26.11.18
- **Timed yellow lines St Marys Road** – Project unfeasible at the present time. **COMPLETE**
- **Tree Works** – Deadline extended for works as insufficient number of tenders received – **Assistant Clerk to progress. ONGOING**
- **Youth Shelter Anti-Social Behaviour** – Price for solar light obtained. On Agenda for decision by council – **Assistant Clerk to progress. ONGOING**

Rachel McCarthy  
Assistant Clerk to the Council, 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2018



13<sup>th</sup> November 2018

### **GNLP – Regulation 18 Consultation – Stage B**

Dear GNLP,

During our recent meeting with Phil Morris and Adam Banham on 3<sup>rd</sup> October, we were assured that although this consultation is primarily site-specific in nature, more general points will be accepted as part of the process. CPRE Norfolk therefore has the following comments of relevance to Stage B of the Regulation 18 Consultation.

- 1. The real level of demand in the housing market will accord with the evidence supplied by the latest ONS statistics on household creation, even though the Government has chosen to ignore this data in its calculations and is requiring housing targets to be based on older 2014 statistics. The actual level of demand that will occur reinforces the CPRE Norfolk case for new housing to be phased.**

We are disappointed that the Government has not accepted the most recent ONS statistics on household creation which show a reduction of 51,000 in the number of households created annually - down from 210,000 to 159,000. If it had accepted this evidence, it is quite clear that current housing commitments in the Joint Core Strategy would have addressed housing need up to 2036 without the need for additional housing to be incorporated in the GNLP. However, because the 2014 statistics will continue to be used, the GNLP will have to accommodate around 7,200 extra houses.

In reality while the Government has not applied the new ONS statistics the real level of demand in the housing market will accord with the evidence supplied by this new data, and actual demand will be in line with these reduced numbers. Therefore in the real world, as already stated, the current commitment in the core strategy (i.e. housing that has been allocated but not yet built) will be more than enough to cater for the actual demand. CPRE Norfolk considers this to be a powerful argument supporting its campaign for a phased approach to housing delivery. As the 7,200 extra houses are not really needed surely they can be put on a reserve list, in confident knowledge that they will not be required.

In terms of the GNLP site specific allocations, this means that, not only are the 200+ sites being consulted on this time unnecessary, but so are the 550+ previous sites already submitted for inclusion. If the sites that are chosen from these submissions are not placed on a reserve list many will be cherry-picked for early development, and as a consequence the problems relating to the land-banking of existing sites will be exacerbated. Only by phasing new development, so that existing sites are developed first, can the issue of land-banking be effectively addressed, especially against this backdrop of reducing housing demand.

**2. Recognising the practical implications of the most recent ONS Household Creation Statistics is important for local authorities facing the threat of sanctions resulting from a failure to comply with Housing Delivery tests. The use of phasing and a Reserve List could reduce this threat.**

The JCS has consistently failed to deliver housing in line with target predictions. This fact alone should encourage the GNDP to take a more cautionary approach when setting its overall housing target for the GNLP, in order not to fall foul of the sanctions imposed by central government for failing to meet Housing Delivery targets.

The failure of the Government to apply the most up to date ONS statistics on the rate at which new households are being created increases the threat level for local authorities in terms of compliance with housing delivery tests. This is because actual delivery is more likely to accord with the most recent ONS data rather than reflecting the 2014 figures with which the Government is insisting local planning authorities comply. Therefore the much reduced rate of household creation indicated by the most recent data will, as already stated, lead to reduced demand in the housing market and therefore a reduction in the number of houses built. The gap between the high targets based on the 2014 figures and the actual rate of delivery in line with the most up to date data will increase, and local planning authorities will increasingly fall behind with their delivery of new housing, and the threat level of sanctions resulting from a failure to deliver will rise sharply.

The GNDP can demonstrate that it has recognised and allowed for the likely discrepancy between a trend based on “old” data and the reality of housing delivery associated with the most recent statistics by creating a Reserve List on which the sites (other than those located on Brownfield land) for the 7,200 extra houses incorporated in the GNLP would be placed. Sites on this Reserve List would only need to be brought forward for development if the Government’s reliance on the 2014 data proves, over time, to have been the right choice – the GNDP will have allowed for this possibility by creating its Reserve List. If however, delivery trends comply with the most recent ONS data these Reserve List sites (including some of the 200+ that are the subject of this consultation) will never need to be developed.

Surely the use of a Reserve List (with its attendant phasing opportunities) is a prudent and cautious approach for the GNDP to take. It represents a very realistic attempt to comply with actual rates of delivery and if properly presented and explained to central government could reduce the possibility of penalties being imposed under Housing Delivery tests rooted in old (2014) unreliable data.

**3. Increased land banking and the potential for the “cherry picking” of new sites included in the GNLP (if they are not placed on a Reserve List) endangers the soundness of the Plan-Led approach and strategy of the JCS and risks undermining the validity of large-scale infrastructure projects included in the JCS. These infrastructure projects, whose purpose is to facilitate new housing delivery on already allocated sites, could become expensive irrelevancies if the existing allocated sites are not built out. Phasing is the best way to ensure that these infrastructure backed sites are developed first.**

It is extremely important for the plan-led process that the problem of land-banking of Joint Core Strategy sites is addressed. This plan went through a rigorous inspection process and was declared sound as recently as 2014. At its heart are a number of expensive infrastructure projects, such as the Broadland Northway (NDR), designed to facilitate the planned housing. If that housing is not delivered, these infrastructure projects could become very expensive white elephants. Only by tackling this land-banking through phasing can this problem be solved, and the sound spatial strategy of the JCS, essentially based on the concentration of development, be delivered.

If a whole new cohort of sites is created (i.e. from the 200+ new sites which are the subject of this consultation and the 550+ sites already submitted for inclusion in the GNLP) and if these sites are made available for development in 2020, this would make a mockery of the existing JCS plan-led approach. Studying the detail of all the proposed sites, CPRE Norfolk is very aware that many of them are dispersed widely throughout the more rural parts of the plan area and are not located in areas related to the JCS infrastructure. Given that the current plan makes a distinction between the Rural Policy Area and the Norwich Policy Area, and is essentially a plan for the concentration of development closer to Norwich, if the proposed sites are not phased and are developed ahead of land-banked sites, this would indicate a very different spatial strategy that contradicts the rigorous, Inspector approved, plan-led strategy envisaged in the JCS.

The JCS still has eight years to run (to 2026) and the GNLP should at least ensure (through phasing) that for its entire duration new housing permissions should be limited to sites allocated in the JCS in accordance with the plan-led logic embedded in that strategy.

#### **4. Support for some new housing does not equate to support for the Dispersal Option(s) for development in the GNLP.**

CPRE Norfolk is concerned that the legitimate desire of Parish Councils and residents to have some new housing in their parish can be misinterpreted as support for the dispersal options in the GNLP. In reality JCS current commitments in villages which have not been built-out, together with windfalls, a constant and reliable source of new housing, and exception sites, mean that most villages already have under the existing JCS significant potential for new housing.

For example, the Service Village of Hempnall has a JCS site for 20/30 houses that has not been developed, and the Parish Council is negotiating with Saffron Housing for up to 20 social houses to be built on an exception site. When these numbers are added to windfalls, Hempnall, under current plan arrangements, could receive approximately 50 new houses. Given that there are currently about 430 houses in the village this represents a greater than 10% increase in the housing stock. This amount of new housing can be assimilated without producing a dramatic and unwelcome change to the society and nature of the settlement and demonstrates how legitimate requests for some new housing can be met under the existing plan (JCS) without requiring new site allocations from within the 750+ (200+ and 550+) sites put forward for inclusion in the GNLP.

The Hempnall scenario, whereby the desire of many residents and parish councils to have some new houses is already addressed via current allocations, exception sites and windfalls, is replicated in many Service and other villages throughout South Norfolk and Broadland. The dispersal option in the GNLP is therefore not needed to address legitimate calls for some housing in villages.

If fully implemented, the Dispersal Option(s) would swamp many Service Villages with excessive numbers of extra houses additional to existing and adequate current allocations. These large numbers could not be assimilated into the existing community, but would become large commuter-based estates, which would be unwelcome and disruptive to the society and form of such settlements.

- 5. Landowners and developers who have failed to build out sites allocated under the JCS should not be rewarded with additional sites in the GNLP. They have demonstrated their failure to deliver and therefore cannot be relied on to build housing on new sites that they have put forward for inclusion in the GNLP.**

CPRE Norfolk has noticed that many of the new sites included in the 750+ sites submitted for inclusion in the GNLP have been put forward by landowners who have yet to deliver on their existing JCS allocations. As a matter of principle, CPRE Norfolk does not think these landowners should be rewarded with new allocations when they have failed to deliver on their existing sites. If the allocation of new sites to this group of landowners was made conditional on them delivering existing sites first, this would be one way of introducing a phased approach to development.

- 6. CPRE Norfolk supports a continuation of the existing Settlement Hierarchy and opposes the Village Groups' approach to development. We believe that environmental concerns are best addressed through concentrating development close to Norwich and wherever possible by using Brownfield sites.**

CPRE Norfolk continues to strongly support the existing settlement hierarchy of six separate tiers, and does not support the "village groups" approach. As already stated most villages already have adequate allocations of new housing yet to be developed under existing arrangements and therefore the Village Groups' approach, which would increase dispersal of housing, is not needed, and in fact could have some very unfortunate consequences. Not only does it contradict the plan-led more sustainable concentration approach of the JCS, it also contradicts other existing policy e.g. the Norfolk County Council Safe-Routes to school policy, which discourages development in places that do not have safe footway connections to a school in a neighbouring village.

It is quite clear from the table on page 80 of the GNDP papers of 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2017 (available at: <http://www.greaternorwichgrowth.org.uk/planning/greater-norwich-local-plan/> ) which summarises a range of factors, including environmental impacts, relevant to each spatial option, which unfortunately is not included in the consultation documents, that the Urban Concentration option is the least damaging in terms of environmental impacts, whilst the Dispersal Option, into which the Village Groups' approach would presumably be integrated, is the most damaging and least sustainable. As already stated, many of the 200+ sites, and a large

number of the 550+ sites already submitted are located in rural locations and these sites should not be approved for inclusion in the GNLP because of some artificial construction of Village Groups or Clusters. In most instances these locations are not supported by infrastructure and the increase in car journeys and pollution attendant upon adopting the Dispersal Option(s) would be most undesirable.

There is potential for a considerable amount of new housing development in and adjacent to Norwich on Brownfield sites. The Colmans' site, when it becomes available, could accommodate 1,000 dwellings and the 600 plus houses planned for the Deal Ground site have yet to be delivered. CPRE Norfolk strongly favours the Concentration option with priority afforded to Brownfield sites.

The Concentration option would facilitate a continuation of the JCS spatial strategy which allows for a Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and a Rural Policy Area (RPA). CPRE Norfolk has always supported the protection from excessive development that the RPA provided for many rural parishes and would like to see the NPA and RPA retained in the GNLP with current boundaries intact.

#### **7. Windfalls should count.**

Given the NPPF requirement for 10% of new housing development to be on small sites of under 1ha CPRE Norfolk considers that windfall sites should be counted as contributing to this percentage. They have proved to be a reliable source of new housing and should therefore be an integral part of the housing target, not an addition to it.

#### **8. CPRE Norfolk supports the provision of Affordable (Social) housing on Exception sites adjacent to development boundaries in villages where there is a proven need and where the size of the site is in keeping with the size of the settlement. It also considers that Brownfield sites in Norwich and market towns, when developed for housing, should be required to accommodate enough social housing to address local needs.**

It is very clear from the AMR Reports of the JCS that the vast majority of new housing being built is 3/4/5 bedroom market homes, whereas what is really needed is affordable social housing. CPRE Norfolk would like to see this pressing need delivered as a stand-alone provision on exception sites adjacent to existing settlements and not as a percentage of an unnecessary and artificially high housing target. Rarely, if ever, is the agreed percentage delivered.

#### **9. Conclusion.**

Unless a firm positive approach encouraging the development of existing sites first is employed, the agreed current JCS plan-led approach together with all its associated expensive infrastructure will be seriously compromised.

CPRE Norfolk believes that the most recent ONS household creation statistics reinforce the case for phased development and together with our Parish and Town Council Alliance partners throughout Norfolk (142 across Norfolk including 64 in Broadland and South Norfolk) we call upon the GNLP to create a Reserve List of sites to include all new sites allocated as part of the GNLP to ensure that all these sites, other than Brownfield sites, will

not be built out until the vast majority of existing JCS allocations (included land-banked sites) have been brought forward for development.

Realistically, before 2036 the end date for the GNLP, there are likely to be at least two more revisions of the Plan, which would lead to even more houses being added to the targets, in addition to the 7,200 planned for the GNLP. It is therefore probable that before 2036 over 21,000 extra houses could be added to the existing JCS current commitment (not yet built) of around 35,000 dwellings. This scenario would apply if the two extra revisions increased targets by 7,000 each time. The total number of new houses that could be built (2018-2036) might therefore exceed 56,000 (35,000 + 7,200 + 7,000 + 7,000.)

In reality the delivery of new houses will probably continue at its historic average (since 2001) of around 1,500 per year and therefore there will only be around 27,000 houses built over the 18 year period 2018-2036 (18 x 1,500). The current commitment of 35,000 houses clearly covers this and there is therefore no need for the 200+ sites that are the subject of this consultation or for the 550+ sites already submitted. With the predicted decline in the number of households being created, it is highly unlikely that the rate of housebuilding will increase.

Without a requirement to phase development the new GNLP allocation together with the subsequent allocations, all of which will enter the targets at further plan revisions before 2036 and could be cherry-picked for development, could conceivably cover most of the development that will occur between 2018-2036 (21,200 houses could be added in and the total likely to be built is 27,000). If a phased approach prioritizing existing sites is not employed the land-banking of JCS sites will become a chronic problem and expensive infrastructure projects will be wasted. This clearly would not be a logical **Plan Led** outcome.

The JCS is a plan based on the concentration of development and to contradict the whole basis of its spatial strategy by introducing new sites for development widely distributed throughout the rural areas of Broadland and South Norfolk, that could be built out as early as 2020 (assuming the GNLP is introduced on schedule), would undermine the sound planning logic embodied in the JCS and could dismantle the current plan-led process. The JCS was designed to guide development up to 2026 not 2020. In order to enable the JCS to function as it was designed please consider our request for a Reserve List and phased development which is supported by a very wide cross-section of Parish and Town Councils (see below for a full list) throughout the GNLP area very seriously.

We thank you for your attention to the detailed comments CPRE Norfolk has made.

Yours faithfully,

David Hook  
Chair, Vision for Norfolk Committee, CPRE Norfolk

Michael Rayner  
Planning Campaigns Consultant, CPRE Norfolk

The CPRE Norfolk campaign for phased development within the GNLPA area is supported by the following Broadland and South Norfolk Parish and Town Councils:

**Broadland**

Acle  
Attlebridge  
Blofield  
Brandiston  
Buxton with Lamas  
Cantley, Limpenhoe and Southwood  
Drayton  
Felthorpe  
Frettenham  
Great Witchingham  
Hainford  
Hevingham  
Horsford  
Horsham St Faiths  
Lingwood and Burlingham  
Reedham  
Reepham  
Salhouse  
Stratton Strawless  
Swannington with Alderford and Little Witchingham  
Upton with Fishley  
Weston Longville  
Wood Dalling  
Woodbastwick

**South Norfolk**

Ashby St Mary  
Barford & Wramplingham  
Barnham Broom  
Bawburgh  
Bergh Apton  
Bracon Ash and Hethel  
Brockdish  
Broome  
Caistor St Edmund  
Colney  
Costessey  
Cringeliford  
Dickleburgh and Rushall  
Ellingham  
Framingham Earl

Forncett  
Great Melton  
Hempnall  
Hethersett  
Hingham  
Keswick and Intwood  
Kirby Cane  
Langley with Hardley  
Loddon  
Marlingford and Colton  
Mulbarton  
Saxlingham Nethergate  
Shelfanger  
Shelton and Hardwick  
Shotesham  
Stockton  
Surlingham  
Thurlton  
Thurton  
Thwaite St Mary  
Tivetshall St Margaret  
Tivetshall St Mary  
Trowse with Newton  
Winfarthing  
Wreningham

**Total = 64 Total parishes in Broadland & South Norfolk = 182**  
**% signed = 35.2%**





August 2016

**URGENT: Join us in opposing damaging new housing targets**

Dear Parish/Town Council

We are writing to all parish and town councils in Norfolk to share our concerns regarding the unnecessary and damaging development which will happen if new unjustified housing targets, currently under consideration, are included in revised local plans to 2036.

We believe that parish and town councils are best placed to shape the future of Norfolk and we are seeking to enlist your support in a campaign to ensure that no new sites are allocated for house building until all existing allocations have been developed. By working closely together we will be able to influence the key policies and decisions made as part of the current revision of local plans.

In all parts of Norfolk existing local plans to 2021, 2026, or 2030, known as core strategies, already contain inflated housing targets. CPRE campaigned against these, warning that the damage to the countryside would be substantial. This damage is now being revealed as Greenfield developments take place but we have only had a glimpse of what is to come as the delivery of housing has failed to keep up with the targets set, which in itself implies that the targets were set too high, and in many parts of Norfolk less than half of current housing allocations have been completed.

In spite of their failure to meet existing targets local authorities are already seeking sites to accommodate a substantial increase in housing numbers for inclusion in plans to 2036. In our meetings with Norfolk planning leaders and the Housing Minister we have been told that the imposition of these additional housing targets is not inevitable and housing market assessments\* need not be slavishly followed if local authorities can present a convincing case that the environmental harm caused by adopting the new targets is serious enough to outweigh potential benefits.

Your parish is covered by the Joint Core Strategy for Norwich, South Norfolk and Broadland and this plan has allocated sites for 60,000 houses to be built (see footnotes) during the period 2001 - 2026. By the end of March 2015 only 21,323 of these dwellings had been completed.

Norwich, South Norfolk and Broadland are considering adding additional sites for a further 12,000 dwellings in the new plan to 2036, making a total housing target of 72,000 new houses for the period 2001 - 2036. Norwich will almost double in size. With allocated sites for around 39,000 houses still available within the 2026 targets there is no absolutely no need for this new allocation.

Similar unnecessary large housing allocations are being considered by all Norfolk District Councils as plans are updated to 2036.

It is likely that some of these sites will be in more rural locations than sites allocated in existing plans because most Brownfield and suburban options have already been used up to meet the current high targets. Once included in the new plans, due to come in to force in 2020, developers will be able to "cherry pick" these new more attractive rural sites for development while continuing to land bank existing allocations.

P.T.O.

Please join us in an alliance to oppose the inclusion of additional housing targets in the 2036 local plans by signing the enclosed pledge of support. By presenting a strong collective case we can influence decision making at all levels of government and persuade District Councils to produce a convincing case as to why the adoption of increased targets would cause unacceptable damage to the environment and landscape of the county we all love.

Please discuss this matter at your next meeting and we look forward to hearing from you in anticipation of your council joining with us in this most worthwhile of causes.

Yours faithfully  
CPRE Norfolk

The 60,000 target for new housing (2001 - 2026) in Broadland, South Norfolk and Norwich comprises:

- 37,500 (target for 2001 - 2021)
- 10,000 added in to the JCS for the period 2021 - 2026
- Estimated windfalls of 4,500 - not included in the site specific allocations
- 8,000 additional allocations to 2026 (through the bulk builders exploiting a lack of a 5 year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area and through extra housing being allocated in the North East growth triangle)

It is important to understand that the Joint Core Strategy always refers to housing targets as minimum allocations.

The above numbers were confirmed in discussions with Simon Marjoram (SNC Policy Team).

**CPRE Norfolk:**

- Supports the provision of affordable housing and sufficient housing for the retired and those needing care - this should be a stand alone provision not dependent on inflated overall targets
- Is committed to prioritizing development on Brownfield sites
- Seeks to protect agricultural land from development
- Is campaigning for a Greenbelt around Norwich and for Greenbelt principles to be applied to all towns in Norfolk
- Is working to prevent changes to the National Planning Policy Framework which would make it even more difficult than it is now to influence local planning decisions
- Is concerned that new local plans to 2036 may overrule many neighbourhood plans that have been completed and adopted



## THE PLEDGE

\_\_\_\_\_ Parish / Town Council supports CPRE Norfolk in its campaign aimed at ensuring that no new sites are allocated for house building in revised local plans to 2036 until all existing allocations in current core strategies have been developed.

We consider that unrealistic and unnecessary new housing targets, currently under consideration, would cause unacceptable damage to the environment and landscape of Norfolk.

This council therefore asks that our local authorities prepare cases to demonstrate that the environmental harm caused by slavishly following housing market assessments\* is serious enough to outweigh potential benefits and in so doing enable the adoption of local plans to 2036 that do not elevate housing targets beyond existing levels.

We note that the Annual Monitoring Reports of local councils reveal that housing delivery is considerably below target levels and that large areas of land already allocated for development remain available and therefore there is no need for new allocations to be made.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

\* Furthermore these Strategic Housing Market Assessments, which pre-date Brexit, are now unreliable.

### Footnotes

Pledging support will not increase your council's workload. We will submit all pledges to the relevant planning authorities.

JCS

## CPRE document responding to GNLP

It is clear which parishes that the CPRE is speaking for.

1) They are dead set against the projected policy of 'dispersal', ignoring the threat to the viability of villages from their ageing population and lack of diversity. They use the example of Hempnall which is not a good one – seeking to sugar the pill by saying that it's a good idea to have an 'exception' site on the edge of the village for social housing. This is saying, in effect, that they are a privileged village, they wish to remain so and that they do not wish to share the burden of the Government edict to produce ¼ million houses a year – even for their own residents. Hempnall is baulking at absorbing an increase in inhabitants by 10% - and are happy to expect Poringland to have an expansion of what, 30%, 50%, 60%?

2) CPRE are asking for a legislated 'Green Belt' around Norwich but fail to say where it begins or ends. I will guarantee that it will begin at Crown Point and finish at Boundary Farm – making our village an even bigger focus for development. They forget that this legislation is not going to get anywhere near Government who would not vote for it since it would cut across their push for more homes.

3) The only sites for major development 'near the city' are offered as the Colemans site and the Deal Ground. Forgetting for the moment that the Deal Ground is a flood plain and that it has contamination and Knotweed infestations, the track record of the City Council in progressing developments is lamentable in the extreme. The Norwich Area has been used by the City to dump its housing obligations upon South Norfolk in the main and Broadland. The Deal Ground has been, to my knowledge, grinding on for 18 years and is the subject of a submission by the developer to evade any low cost housing on the site. I cannot believe that the Coleman's site will come 'on stream' before 2036 as it will require extensive and expensive restoration of the many asbestos containing industrial buildings and the numerous wells that have been drilled on the site. So, the next nearest places to the City to be developed are – guess where?

4) The calculation of the numbers of housing allocations appears to me to be 'playing with the figures'. Occupation density of houses in the UK is high compared with the rest of the EU and it is clear that there is huge unmet demand for decent housing from young people who are having to live with parents for decades more than my generation had to. I don't like the calculation set out in the GNLP but it is not up to Parishes to stick their heads in the sand and say 'we want fewer houses built than the GNLP states'.

5) The demand that extant permissions be fulfilled before granting new ones is a sensible one. The practice of 'land banking' is one that adds to the inflated costs of land in the expectation that this will give land holders inflated capital returns before the homes are built. This means that there are significant sites within the City, undeveloped and awaiting the push from the City council. One method of stopping or reducing this land banking is to have a principle of 'one in one out' - develop the existing permissions before another one is granted. This, in Poringland, would have meant that we would have avoided the horrendous impact of having three major sites under development in and around the village all at the same time.

This then is the usual pleading by the CPRE to protect their special version of 'rural England' and they have induced some of our neighbouring parishes like turkeys, to vote for Christmas. It is a special interest lobbying group which I do not see as including this Parish within its golden umbrella.

I therefore urge council not to add our name to this flawed document.

Regulation 18 sites being offered in and around Poringland:

GNLP2093 Land to the south of Caistor Lane

This land has no natural or planned connection with the settlement of Poringland except through a substandard junction on the B1332. It will be 'semidetached' with no planned or existing connection to either Caistor which offers no facilities or to Poringland serving only to expand the village area with no environmental or community gain. The drainage would be dependent upon system installed by David Wilson Homes and is part of the Poringland Sustainable Drainage scope. Therefore it would need to positively drained to sewer or it would otherwise pose a flooding risk to Highlands and other properties in the area. This site would certainly be exclusively dependent upon car for travel to work and school. It offers no planning or social opportunities to the village – it would be semi-detached from the village and be nothing more than a dormitory. It is UNSUSTAINABLE.

GNLP2094 land abutting 2093 to North of Stoke Road

A development on this site would follow that of David Wilson Homes to the west which has had to pile the footings of the homes nearest to this site due to the underlying failure of the land to support buildings. . As part of the Poringland Sustainable Drainage area, drainage of surface water would not be possible unless by drainage to surface water sewers and it will add significantly to the flow rates of surface water to Boundary Way a known flood risk area. It is well off regular bus routes and would be car dependent for travel to work and school. It offers no planning or social opportunities to the village – it would be semi-detached from the village and be nothing more than a dormitory. It is UNSUSTAINABLE

GNLP2121 land to south of Poringland Road and Boundary Way

This area is detached for the urban area of Poringland and has a reducing bus service in the area. It will need to be drained according to the Poringland Sustainable Drainage Scheme and will add to the known flood risk area of Boundary Way. It will in no way be linked or provide a continuous flow from the existing – it will be only connected to the village by busy highways. It offers no planning or social opportunities to the village – it would be semi-detached from the village and be nothing more than a dormitory. NOT SUSTAINABLE

GNLP2127 Land off Burgate Lane towards Alington

We have commented upon this sites neighbour GNLP 0003 and have noted its isolation from established settlements and its access along a severely substandard Burgate Lane and is therefore NOT SUSTAINABLE

GNLP2153 Land off Burgate Lane (Gladman's proposal) – being discussed under appeal:

Outside the development land boundary

Access along severely substandard lane

Severe effect on Gull Lane – substandard single track lane with springs emerging in the surface

Detached from village and so dependent upon car use

Limited safe access to schools

No drainage survey completed but subject to Poringland sustainable Drainage Scheme.

Drainage route highly likely to be into the headwaters of the Chet

UNSUSTAINABLE

Poringland needs time to consolidate and absorb anything up to 1400 homes and their inhabitants. That being my submission, we should maintain the development boundary for a significant time and then ensure that developments are integrated and permeable with the rest of the village – otherwise we end up with what are no more than atomised, gated communities with a consequent effect upon community resilience and cohesion.

<b>PORINGLAND PARISH COUNCIL</b>				
<b>Payments List 28 November 2018</b>				
<b>Payee</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Chq no.</b>
S Cunningham	Salaries	Administrator		SO
R McCarthy	Salaries	Asst Clerk		SO / BACS
J Dodman	Salaries	Bar Staff		BACS
S Cunningham	Salaries	Bar Staff		BACS
L Gooderham	Salaries	Caretaker		SO
S Warminger	Salaries	Cleaner		SO
S Duffell	Salaries	Project Off / Temp Admin		SO / BACS
C Moore	Salaries	Interim RFO		BACS
			£4,919.45	
HMRC	Salaries	PAYE & NIC	£1,196.59	BACS
Norfolk Pension Fund	Salaries	Pension Contributions	£1,304.06	BACS
BT	General Administration	Telephone & Broadband	£47.18	DD
Microshade	General Administration	Hosted IT	£217.62	SO
Business Web Page	General Administration	Website & Email Hosting	£246.00	BACS
Hollinger Print	General Administration	Printing - Newsletter	£145.00	BACS
Total Gas & Power	Community Centre	Electricity	£832.14	DD
ESPO	Community Centre	Gas	£94.72	DD
Hugh Crane Cleaning Eqt	Community Centre	Cleaning Materials	£242.79	BACS
Fantastical Entertainment	Community Centre	Character Appearance	£275.00	BACS
David Michael Productions	Community Centre	Juke Box Rogues	£1,620.00	BACS
Pitkin & Ruddock	Community Centre	Air Con Maintenance	£819.60	BACS
WorldPay	Community Centre	Card Machine	£5.29	DD
Parker Planning Services	Projects	Neighbourhood Plan Consultant	£960.00	BACS
API Cleaning	Comm Centre / Playing Field	Relief Caretaking (Oct & Nov)	£1,392.00	BACS
Veolia	Comm Centre / Burial Ground	Waste	£99.56	DD
Garden Guardian	Comm Sums / P Field / Verges	Grounds Maintenance	£1,059.29	BACS
Vortex	Commutated Sums	Grounds Maintenance	£191.66	BACS
Spruce Landscapes	Comm Centre / B Ground / Mem Gard	Grounds Maintenance	£945.00	SO
Barclaycard	Comm Centre / General Admin	Bar / Maint / Vodafone	£1,222.63	DD
			<b>£22,755.03</b>	

---

**Poringland Parish Council**

**Bank - Cash and Investment Reconciliation as at 21 November 2018**

---

	<u>Account Description</u>	<u>Balance</u>
<u>Bank Statement Balances</u>		
1	Barclays Current	0.00
1	Unity Trust	95,319.78
2	Barclays Deposit	0.00
2	United Trust	50,000.00
2	CCLA	40,000.00
2	Unity Trust Deposit	155,171.29
2	Santander Bond 1	60,000.00
2	Cambridge & Counties 120 Day	75,311.82
2	Hampshire Trust Bond 1	55,000.00
2	Nationwide Instant Access	60,758.25
		<b>591,561.14</b>
<u>Other Bank &amp; Cash Balances</u>		
	Petty Cash	550.00
	Cashbook Suspense	0.00
		<b>550.00</b>
		<hr/> <b>592,111.14</b>
<u>Unpresented Payments</u>		
1	22/08/2018 300060	500.00
1	22/08/2018 300065	250.00
1	28/10/2018 DD	50.78
1	31/10/2018 BACS	280.09
1	31/10/2018 BACS	68.00
1	31/10/2018 BACS	501.78
1	31/10/2018 BACS	192.00
1	31/10/2018 BACS	1,198.08
1	31/10/2018 BACS	1,311.71
1	31/10/2018 BACS	50.57
1	31/10/2018 BACS	405.25
1	31/10/2018 BACS	91.56
1	31/10/2018 BACS	91.20
1	31/10/2018 BACS	85.80
1	31/10/2018 BACS	150.00
1	31/10/2018 300077	250.00
1	31/10/2018 BACS	105.00
1	31/10/2018 300078	75.00
1	31/10/2018 BACS	74.39
1	31/10/2018 BACS	1,920.78
1	31/10/2018 BACS	1,059.29
1	31/10/2018 BACS	191.66
1	31/10/2018 300079	20.00
1	31/10/2018 300080	1,230.00
1	31/10/2018 300081	250.00
1	31/10/2018 BACS	30.43
1	31/10/2018 BACS	120.00
1	31/10/2018 BACS	13.67
1	31/10/2018 BACS	49.56
1	31/10/2018 BACS	77.98

---

**Poringland Parish Council**

**Bank - Cash and Investment Reconciliation as at 21 November 2018**

---

			<u>Balance</u>
	<u>Account Description</u>		
1	28/03/2018	300001	75.00
			<b>10,769.58</b>
			<hr/>
			<b>581,341.56</b>
			<hr/>
<u>All Cash &amp; Bank Accounts</u>			
Current			84,550.20
Bonds & Savings			496,241.36
Other Bank & Cash Balances			550.00
			<hr/>
<b>Total Bank &amp; Cash Balances</b>			<b>581,341.56</b>
			<hr/>



**Report of the meeting of the Finance and Governance Advisory Group held on  
Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> November 2018**

The meeting was attended by John Henson, Tim Boucher, Trevor Spruce and Chris Walker. The following matters were discussed with observations and recommendations being made to Council.

**1. Updates on Matters Arising**

- **Parish Partnership** – Four “Think” speed signs for Devlin Drive should cost £500/£600. **Recommendation:** Apply for funding and decide whether to pursue project if bid successful.

**2. Grounds Maintenance**

**Recommendation:** that the following contracts be entered into for the 2019 season:

- **Burial Ground** – Spruce Landscapes at £5,600 per annum (combined discount)
- **Memorial Garden** – Spruce Landscapes at £1,500 (combined discount)
- **Community Centre** – Garden Guardian at £1,980 per annum.
- **Devlin Drive** – Garden Guardian at £807 per annum.
- **Verges** – Garden Guardian at £2,556 per annum.
- **Mulberry Grass** – Vortex at £1,150 per annum.
- **Mulberry Grounds** – Vortex at £1,140 per annum.
- **Playing Field Grass** – Garden Guardian at £978 per annum.
- **Playing Field Grounds** – Garden Guardian at £1,656 per annum.
- **Rosebery Park** – Vortex at £1,750 per annum.
- **Trafalgar Square** – Vortex at £1,160 per annum.

**3. Budget 2018/19**

The draft budget for 2019/20, including staffing, recurring expenditure, and capital expenditure, was discussed in detail.

The Group discussed the redesign of the Fiveways Roundabout. **Recommendation:** to abandon the project due to no formal agreement with DWH being in place and the cost involved. It was **recommended** to retain the funds allocated to the Car Park Extension and put the project on hold. It was **recommended** to budget £10,000 for both researching the new burial ground and starting a ‘sink fund’ for the Community Centre.

The Group assessed the quotes obtained for the treeworks, installation of rear electric doors and the re-flooring of the Gents Toilets. **Recommendation:** to budget for MPS Doors and Broadland Flooring to undertake the work at £5,838.75 and £1,063.14 respectively. Further quotes were required for the treeworks. **Recommendation:** to budget £3,500.

Reserves were in place for both the Neighbourhood Plan and Community Land Project, and inclusion made in the Staff Budget for additional hours as required.

The final budget will be brought to Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2019 for agreement. The Group is aiming for no more than a 5% increase in Band D precept.