Reedham Neighbourhood Plan Meeting

**Tuesday 16th January 2024 at 19.00**

**Attendees:** David Breeze, Wendy Gitsham, Maureen Haycock, Chris Mutten, Simon Pittam, Claudia Dickson (Parish Council Clerk), and Mark Thompson from Collective Community Planning.

1. **Chairman**: David Breeze was elected Chairman of the meeting.
2. **Apologies** : Tony Noon.
3. **Declarations of Interest:** CM owns Middle Field, the GNLP1001 site, and some redundant farm buildings (Policy 14).
4. **Minutes**: The Minutes of the meeting on the 31st May 2023 were approved.
5. **Regulation 16 Consultation feedback and comments from the Examiner:**

Broadland held the Regulation 16 Consultation and, in consultation with the steering group, appointed Mr Andrew Ashcroft as the Examiner. The responses from the Reg 16 Consultation (summary attached) and comments from the Examiner (attached) were circulated to the steering group for consideration. MT drafted some responses (attached). The steering group approved the following:

Policy 1

The suggested response from MT:

Planning is always a balance between harm and benefits and between different objectives. Although the community would like to see Middle Field retained for its openness, some impact on this could be acceptable when balanced against overriding community benefits afforded by the provision of a new village hall or school.

And the suggested amendment from Broadland:

Development within the area of land identified in Figure 7, will be permitted where:

• It is for an appropriate community use or development, such as a new village hall, school or playing field or where it accords with another specific policy or allocation of the development plan;

and,

• would not significantly erode or otherwise undermine the sense of openness between the two parts of the village settlement.

The steering group confirmed there have been no costs or proposals for a new village hall, new school or playing field

Policies 2 and 3

The slightly amended response from MT:

The District Council’s concern seems to be around a conflict between the Reedham HNA (which refers to 40% affordable housing being required) and the JCS and emerging GNLP (which refer to 33%). It is suggested by the District Council that an erratum be attached to the HNA to address the conflict and avoid any confusion. This seems a sensible way of dealing with it.

And

No. The Reedham HNA does says that while AECOM has made suggestions for the split of different affordable products within the tenure split, this should be considered indicative as it will be subject to wider considerations of costs, viability and the availability of funding for particular products. This could be explained more clearly in the plan itself.

Policy 4

The policy would need to be adhered to as much as possible, maybe with any divergence from it being fully justified by exceptional circumstances.

Policy 5

The steering group wished to retain the policy (removing reference to GNLP3003) for the, now removed, site GNLP3003 in order to retain the ambition for a playing field for the school should further development of the site come forward.

Policy 6

The steering group wished to keep the policy as is and agreed MT’s response:

The plan could refer to SUDS and cross-reference Policy 11 on flood risk.

Regarding the minimum size of a garage, this is from Figure 68 (p57) of the Design Codes. The county council’s parking standards referred to by the District Council concern parking spaces rather than garages and so this is different. It is known that garages are used for all sorts of things such as storage and bikes and this needs to be taken into account or the garage simply will not be used for parking the car, or could even deter cycle ownership and use if there is nowhere to store the bike securely.

Policy 7

It was agreed to modify the policy in line with the NPPF and remove any specific references.

Policy 13

The suggested response from MT:

It does partly relate to para 121, but is not restricted to that as it is wider support for other development proposals that would provide for better social interaction. The reference to ‘significant weight’ is meant to indicate how important it is and that due weight should therefore be given to such proposals. The NPPF also uses terms such as ‘substantial weight’ to emphasise the high level of support for particular policy areas.

Policy 14

The steering group wants to encourage small businesses. The policy in the submitted plan refers to Use Class E and it was agreed to add Use Class F to the allowed development.

Policy 15

It was agreed to amend the title of the policy to “New Parking Provision, including for Reedham Primary and Nursery School”.

Policy 16

The policy is solely for non-designated heritage assets and therefore the wording at the start of the policy should be amended.

The steering group also approved the following responses to representations made to the plan during the Reg 16 Consultation:

* the Broads Authority; RNP-07, RNP-09, - agree with suggested changes.
* RNP-10, local area really just means that enhancements should be delivered as close as possible if within the parish is not possible. RNP-12 refers to Policy 14 and the lack of clarity as to what ‘certain types of commercial uses’ means and this does need clarifying (see earlier).
* Savills; Essentially Savills (RNP-16) set out that Middle Field is ideal for housing and that Policy 1 is restricting this potential by using a type of designation that does not appear as a ‘type’ in either the NPPF or local plan. The Group highlights that ‘important views’ are also common designations in NPs and this also does not appear in the local plan or NPPF. That said, the group could agree with the proposed changes put forward by BDC, which it think largely avoids the ‘designation’ issue but still protects the openness (see earlier).
* Norfolk Constabulary; The full representation (summarised in RNP-17) is that they would like to see policing and crime reflected more in the NP, such as Secure by Design. The Group feels that this is not an issue particular to Reedham and that matters such as Secure by Design are already effectively covered in higher order policies, such as the emerging GNLP Policy 2 (Sustainable Communities).
* Norfolk Wildlife Trust; RNP-18 – The Group does not agree that the following should be added to Policy 7, “Development should incorporate green roofs and green walls as appropriate, including on any new community buildings”. This would be out of keeping with the character of the area and there are better ways of supporting biodiversity.
* NWT also suggested adding the following, “Buffer zones should be implemented around designated and sensitive wildlife sites, including County Wildlife Sites, as appropriate, to minimise development impacts on these sites”. The Group, however, thinks the plan is too advanced to make such a significant change. NWT also suggested adding a map of green corridors, but again the Group thinks it is too late for this. Agree to minor suggested amendment.
* Norfolk County Council; Re the suggested re-wording of BNG legislation (RNP-26), the group suggests that this should be suitably imprecise given yet further delays (see earlier). The Group has no comment regarding the LLFA and its representation, but welcomes its support and has particularly welcomed its engagement. Regarding the Minerals Authority representation concerning mineral reserves and safeguarding in relation to Middle Field and Policy 1 (RNP-30), the Group understands that this would be an automatic process if an application were to be submitted. That is, the minerals authority would be consulted during the determination of an application and so this matter would be raised. The Group is therefore unsure whether there is anything to be gained by highlighting this in the policy or supporting text.
* and
* the two comments from property owners about the proposed Quay Terrace Local Green Space (LGS3). The Group continues to support the designation of this parcel of land as a Local Green Space. There is no implication in the policy that this provides for public access of recreational use, and the land would remain private. For information, the Broads Authority is looking at allocating the open space on Reedham Quay as amenity green space as shown in the map in its full response which includes the area that the group wish to allocate as Local Green Space.
* Broadland District Council proposes a series of revisions to certain policies in the Plan. It would be helpful if the Parish Council commented on the suggested revisions (beyond the matters already raised in this note on a policy-by-policy basis). Most matters have already been considered above. RNP-40. To explain, opportunities for ‘home-working’ was included as it was felt by the Group that this would support the community, given its poor access and relative remoteness.

**Actions:**

MT to finalise the response and circulate to the steering group before submitting to Broadland.

1. **Financial matters:**

There is £1,350 remaining of the Locality grant, that has to be spent by the end of March or it will have to be returned.

£3,068.06 remains of the Broadland grant. There is an additional £1,500 to be claimed.

1. **Items for next meeting:**

None received.

The next steps are for MT to finalise the response to the Examiner, the Examiner finishes his report including any recommended changes, either BDC or Reedham makes the changes, the final plan is put to the village in a referendum.

1. **Date and time of next meeting:** to be arranged. The meeting finished at 20:42.