

FOREST HEATH DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL PLAN WORKING GROUP

THURSDAY 16 OCTOBER 2014

4.00 PM - 5.30 PM

Members Present

Mrs R E Burt (Chairman)
W J Bishop
W Hirst
R D S Hood

M J Jefferys
Mrs C F J Lynch
W E Sadler
T Simmons

Councillors D W Gathercole and C Noble were also in attendance.

Also in attendance

M Magnusson, Planning Officer
B Nicholas, Principal Planner
S Robertson, Senior Planning Officer
M Smith, Place Shaping Manager
S Turner, FHDC Cabinet Officer/Committee Administrator

Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R J Millar.

Substitutes

There were no substitutes at the meeting.

SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
282	<u>SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MEETING OF THE LOCAL PLAN WORKING GROUP HELD ON 8 MAY 2014</u> The schedule of recommendations from the meeting held on 8 May 2014 were received and noted.	NOTED
283	<u>SINGLE ISSUE REVIEW (SIR) AND SITE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS (SSA) LOCAL PLAN (LP) UPDATE (REPORT NO LOP14/020)</u> The Planning Officer presented this report which explained that the consultation draft SSA and SIR LP documents were approved for a consultation in early 2014, at the Cabinet meeting of 26 November 2013. Subsequent to this and, as most recently reported to Members of Local Plan Working Group (LPWG) on 8 May	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>2014, the consultations had been postponed on the basis that Officers needed to progress further work with their external consultants and continue dialogue with Counsel, to ensure that the supporting Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) processes were adequately robust for both LP documents.</p> <p>Officers received further advice from Counsel, on 25 June 2014, specifically with regard to progress to-date in preparing the SIR LP SA/SEA. It was the contention of Counsel that further appraisal was required to ascertain whether or not more housing could be delivered within the District, (given the 'constraints' and provisions of the NPPF) within the plan period to 2031, in order to facilitate more of the affordable need being met. Counsel had also advised that the distribution of the final housing figure would require further consideration in terms of 'reasonable alternatives'.</p> <p>The report outlined two Options which would be available moving forward:</p> <p><u>Option 1:</u> Proceed with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Technical Report, derived figure of 7,000, (3,742 affordable), dwellings within the plan period to 2031. Council to progress with consultation as planned on the Submission/Regulation 19 version of the SIR LP and the Further Issues and Options/Regulation 18 version of the SSA LP.</p> <p>In undertaking this Option, the SIR LP document would be adopted in March/April 2016, with the SSA LP document being adopted in October/November 2016.</p> <p>Officers were advising that this was not a preferred option, as there was too greater risk of challenge and the potential for further delays in the longer term, should the Council be 'forced' to reconsider their housing strategy at a later date.</p> <p><u>Option 2:</u> Undertake further appraisal of the District's ability to deliver more housing and, as a consequence, an uplift in AH provision. Bring forward a 'new style' LP combining both SIR and SSA LPs, (from the Regulation 18 Issues and Options stage).</p> <p>In undertaking this Option, the combined SSA/SIR LP document would be adopted in October/November</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>2016.</p> <p>Officers were advising that this was the preferred option.</p> <p>Members were requested to consider the possible options moving forward, in light of Counsel's advice.</p> <p>Councillor M J Jefferys expressed disappointment that the Working Group had not met since May 2014 and considered that Members should have been notified earlier of these issues and the resultant further delay in the Council being able to adopt these documents.</p> <p>Councillor W E Sadler also referred to the external advice from both the Consultants and Counsel and requested that the costs of this advice be provided. Officers agreed that this information would be provided to Members accordingly.</p> <p>That:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The content of the report be noted. 2. The Cabinet be recommended to agree to proceed with Option 2, as outlined in Report No LOP14/020, in preparing the Site Specific Allocations (SSA) and Single Issue Review (SIR) Local Plan (LP) documents. 	
284	<p><u>RED LODGE WASTEWATER TREATMENT/SEWERAGE CAPACITY STUDY (REPORT NO LOP14/021)</u></p> <p>The Planning Officer presented this report which explained that at the meeting of the Local Plan Working Group on 30 October 2013, it was recommended that Officers commissioned an independent review with regard to waste water treatment capacity at Red Lodge, to be able in part, to qualify (or otherwise), the position of Anglian Water, as relayed at that meeting.</p> <p>The key findings of this independent review were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 2021 embargo (on development) was no longer required in terms of compliance with volumetric discharge consents/water quality targets. - The 2021 embargo was no longer required in terms of WRC hydraulic/process capacity. 	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sewerage network capacity was not considered to present a constraint to the proposed development (as identified within the emerging SIR LP) and did not warrant a 2021 embargo on further development. - The current proposed trajectory (as identified within the emerging SIR LP) offered sufficient timeframes for AWS to assess, investigate, design and commission additional capacity post 2021, as required. <p>Members also requested for a copy of the Study to be provided to Red Lodge, Tuddenham and Herringswell Parish Councils, for their information.</p> <p>Councillor W E Sadler expressed his view that the commissioning of this review had been unnecessary, as it was the responsibility of Anglian Water to ensure that the infrastructure was capable of meeting the required demand and requested that the costs of commissioning this Study be provided to Members. Officers stated that advice would be taken as to how the costs of this Study could be disseminated to Members.</p> <p>That the content of the Red Lodge Wastewater Treatment/Sewerage Capacity Study, as presented at Appendix A to Report No LOP14/021, be noted.</p>	NOTED
285	<p><u>FIVE YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY (REPORT NO LOP14/022)</u></p> <p>The Senior Planning Officer presented this report which explained that an assessment had been undertaken of the five year supply of housing land in Forest Heath District as at 31 March 2013. This covered the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2018.</p> <p>This assessment demonstrated that Forest Heath had a 5.1 year supply of housing land, including a 5% buffer. This assessment was based on monitoring data at 31 March 2013 and included updates on the planning status of deliverable sites.</p> <p>The Officer referred to Page 97 of the report and reported on some minor amendments on the figures contained. These corrections did not affect the overall housing land supply figures (amendments highlighted in bold below):</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p><i>Five year supply addressing unmet supply since 2011</i></p> <p><i>Shortfall units 2011-2013</i> <i>Equates to (1,896/351 = 5.4)</i> <i>Plus 5% buffer (1,896/368.5 = 5.1)</i></p> <p>Members noted that as the period in which the five year land supply covered was as at 31 March 2013, Officers were now working on updating this information for publication in early 2015. If there were significant changes in the housing land supply, then this would be reported to the Local Plan Working Group, in the first instance.</p> <p>Members commended and congratulated Officers on the achievement of this five year housing land supply and associated buffer.</p> <p>That:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The content of the five year housing supply assessment as at 31 March 2013, as set out in the Appendix to Report No LOP14/022, be noted. 2. The five year housing supply assessment, as at 31 March 2013, be published for use in development management. 3. Officers to regularly update and publish a five year housing land supply assessment, for use in development management. Any significant changes to the housing land supply, to be reported to the Local Plan Working Group, in the first instance. 	<p>NOTED</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>RESOLVED</p>
286	<p><u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u></p> <p>The following items of Other Business were raised:</p> <p>(a) <u>Brandon Relief Road</u> Councillor W J Bishop referred to the recent scoping report on the Brandon Relief Road, which was proposing a reduction in housing from 2,500 to 1,500. Councillor Bishop requested that Officers considered the detail of this latest report, in relation to the Site Specific Allocations for Brandon.</p> <p>(b) <u>Implementation of the Local Plan Process</u> Following on from Minute No 283. above, Councillor M J Jefferys requested for the Members of the Local Plan Working Group to be</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>kept fully informed, at the earlier opportunity, of any delays with the implementation of the Local Plan process.</p> <p>(c) <u>Joint Development Management Policies Document – Main Modifications Consultation</u> Councillor W Hirst requested Officers to provide further information with regard to this consultation.</p> <p>The Place Shaping Manager explained that following the Examination in Public which had taken place in July 2014, the modifications as proposed by the Planning Inspector, had been received on 9 October 2014. These modifications were now subject to consultation and this was being held from 16 October 2014 to 27 November 2014.</p> <p>Representations on this consultation could be made both online and electronically. Representations must be specific and only relate to the proposed main modifications. If representations had been previously submitted during the pre-submission consultation, then the same documents did not need to be re-submitted as the Inspector would have already taken these into account through the Examination process.</p> <p>All valid representations would be passed, in full, to the Inspector for his consideration. The Inspector would decide if any additional hearing sessions were required and who may participate in such sessions.</p>	