

FOREST HEATH DISTRICT COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP

TUESDAY 9 FEBRUARY 2010

4.00 PM - 5.15 PM

Members Present

R J Millar (Chairman)	I P Radford
D W Gathercole (Vice-Chairman)	N A Roman
Mrs R E Burt	T Simmons
S C Flack	J E Waters
W Hirst	

The following Members were also in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman:

R Dicker	(Ward Member for South)
Mrs M S Fairman-Smith	(Ward Member for Exning)

Also in attendance

N George, Head of Planning
M Magnusson, Planner
S Turner, Committee Administrator, (Team Leader)

Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

Substitutes

There were no substitutes at the meeting.

SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
202	<u>SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 19 JANUARY 2010</u> The schedule of recommendations from the meeting held on 19 January 2010 were received and noted.	NOTED
203	<u>PROPOSED SITE ALLOCATION PLAN FOR CONSULTATION – MILDENHALL, BECK ROW, WEST ROW, KENTFORD AND EXNING (REPORT NO LDF10/066)</u> This report considered a number of issues previously deferred from an earlier meeting of the Working Group.	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>This report dealt with the settlements of Mildenhall, Beck Row, West Row, Kentford and Exning and covered the sites which were previously referred back or where questions had been raised. The schedule of sites showed the up-to-date position on all of the sites, whether rejected or included.</p> <p>Members were reminded that the proposals put forward were still the subject of a full Sustainability Appraisal report, which was a key requirement of the Act. That would be available at a future meeting for consideration, but a draft of the appraisal had now been received by Officers and had provisionally been taken into account in preparing these recommendations. There were also sites which were subject to the Habitats Regulations and would need an Appropriate Assessment undertaken before final submission of the document.</p> <p>It was also reported that the submitted Core Strategy provided the context for decisions about the sites to be allocated. Before the document could be finally approved, an assessment would need to be undertaken of the Inspector's Report on the Core Strategy and take account of any changes he recommended. Allowance for that stage was now built into the timetable before consultation on the two documents.</p> <p>Officers also explained that in relation to the settlements being considered, there were certain additional matters which had arisen since the previous consideration relating to the issue of aircraft noise and also constraints due to the need for replacement or extension of sewage treatment works identified at both Lakenheath and Red Lodge.</p> <p><u>Mildenhall</u></p> <p>The key constraints for this site were highlighted by Officers in relation to Habitats Regulations, flooding and aircraft noise.</p> <p>Officers also explained that subsequent changes had been made to the settlements since last considered by the Working Group on 9 November 2009:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land to rear of St Johns Community Centre (Site SSAM34) be included as a 'preferred site' for mixed use development. 2. All references to a relief road had been removed as this 	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>was not deemed a requirement within the Plan period, based on the AECOM Transport Study and following the discussions held at the Examination in Public (EiP) on the Core Strategy.</p> <p>3. Requirement from developers for contributions towards improvements to the road network in the Town Centre and improvements to the frequency of public transport services resulting from development, had been included within the policy wording.</p> <p>4. Site SSAM37 (proposed Sainsbury's store) and SSAM39 (Site of Proposed Social Club), had been identified as 'preferred' options as construction had yet to commence.</p> <p>Members confirmed that construction had now commenced on the proposed social club site with completion due in May 2010 and the new Sainsbury's Store due for completion by the end of the year.</p> <p>Officers explained that Core Strategy Policy CS7 had allocated a total of 1,330 dwellings for Mildenhall. The Plan had allocated 1,380 dwellings.</p> <p>Members then considered the Proposed Settlement Plan for Mildenhall as presented.</p> <p>Councillor N A Roman explained that land had previously been identified (along the road to West Row) for commercial development in relation to the relocation of Marshalls Aerospace to Mildenhall. Even though this relocation was not now happening at this stage, there may be a possibility that this decision could be reviewed in the future.</p> <p>Councillor N A Roman also referred to the removal of the Mildenhall relief road from the Plan. He stated that he wanted the relief road to remain in the Plan as the road was necessary for the development of the Town and was also vital for the Marshalls development, if it was to come to Mildenhall in the future.</p> <p>With the vote being unanimous, it was recommended that the revised Proposed Site Allocation Plan for Mildenhall (as set out in Appendix 2a to the report) be noted and that the Working Group be <u>'minded to include'</u> this section of the document in the final Consultation Document, subject to the following identified amendments/actions:-</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p>

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>1. Officers to investigate further the land previously identified for commercial development along the road to West Row.</p> <p>2. The relief road for Mildenhall be included back in the Plan.</p> <p><u>Beck Row</u></p> <p>The key constraints for this site were highlighted by Officers in relation to aircraft noise and flooding.</p> <p>Officers also explained that subsequent changes had been made to the settlements since last considered by the Working Group on 9 November 2009:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. References to the Mildenhall relief road had been removed. However, Officers confirmed that this would need to be reviewed in light of the previous decision made in relation to the Mildenhall Site Allocation Plan. 2. Contributions towards improvements to the road network in Mildenhall Town Centre had been added. 3. Sites SSABR05 (Land off the Grove) (this site had been identified as being in a less sustainable location) and SSABR06 (Land South of Rookery Drove) (this site had been identified as having a poor relationship with the sewerage works and also to the caravan park) had been identified as 'rejected' sites. 4. Site SSABR07 (Land to rear of Skeltons Drove) had been extended to encompass the entire area, subject of extant planning permission (mixed-use including overnight visitor accommodation, residential and retail). <p>Officers explained that Core Strategy Policy CS7 had allocated a total of 175 dwellings (assuming an even split amongst all of the Primary Villages). The Plan had allocated 108 dwellings.</p> <p>Members then considered the Proposed Settlement Plan for Beck Row as presented.</p> <p>With the vote being unanimous, it was recommended that the revised Proposed Site Allocation Plan for Beck Row (as set out in Appendix 2b to the report) be noted and that the Working Group be <u>'minded to include'</u> this</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p>

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>section of the document in the final Consultation Document, subject to the following identified amendments/actions:-</p> <p>1. Officers to review the removal of the Mildenhall relief road, in light of the decision made to include the relief road within the Mildenhall Site Allocation Plan.</p> <p>Councillor R Dicker then joined the meeting at 4.20 pm during the voting on the Proposed Site Allocation Plan for Beck Row.</p> <p><u>Exning</u></p> <p>The key constraints for this site were highlighted by Officers in relation to flooding and to the presence of the A14 Trunk road to the east and south east of the settlement.</p> <p>Officers also explained that subsequent changes had been made to the settlements since last considered by the Working Group on 12 November 2009:</p> <p>1. Site SSAE03 (Land to rear of Laceys Lane, including the allotments at Frogmore), was now 'preferred'. There was a requirement for development to be subject to adequate and appropriate access arrangements and replacement/maintenance of allotments.</p> <p>2. Site SSAE04 (Land to the South of Burwell Road) had been confirmed. This would not be derived from the Drift as previously identified, but via a more substantial and existing access between nos. 75 and 77 Burwell Road.</p> <p>Officers explained that Core Strategy Policy CS7 had allocated a total of 175 dwellings for Exning (assuming an even split amongst all of the Primary Villages). The Plan had allocated 189 dwellings.</p> <p>Members then considered the Proposed Settlement Plan for Exning as presented.</p> <p>Councillor Mrs M S Fairman-Smith explained that both Sites SSAE03 and SSAE04 had access problems with the junction at the bottom of Windmill Hill and the access along Laceys Lane and Ducks Lane and this had not been particularly highlighted within the Plan.</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Officers also explained that subsequent changes had been made to the settlements since last considered by the Working Group on 23 November 2009:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An alternative option for the Kentford settlement expansion had been identified for the consideration by Members showing Sites SSAK04 (Land north of Bury Road), SSAK05 (South and East of Flint House), SSAK06 (Land opposite 1 to 4 Bury Road) and SSAK09 (Land at Fothergills) as 'preferred' and Site SSAK11 (Land at the Animal Health Trust, Bury Road) as 'rejected'. <p>Officers explained that Core Strategy Policy CS7 had allocated a total of 175 dwellings for Kentford (assuming an even split amongst all of the Primary Villages). The Plan had allocated 281 dwellings.</p> <p>Members then considered the Potential Settlement Plan for Kentford as presented.</p> <p>Councillor R Dicker (Ward Member for South) declared a personal interest as he operated his business within Kentford. He also stated that he would also need to declare a personal and prejudicial interest in Site SSAK09 (Land at Fothergills), due to his business relationship with Fothergills, if a detailed discussion was to take place on this particular site.</p> <p>Councillor R Dicker then expressed his views on the Potential Settlement Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the following sites should be 'rejected': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSAK03 (Land north of A14) – this site was in an unsustainable location • SSAK01 (Land east of Moulton Road) – this site was in a flood zone • SSAK06 (Land Opposite 1 to 4 Bury Road) – this site was outside of the development boundary; it was a forest area and it was also next to the landfill site. 2. Site SSAK02 could possibly be appropriate for development as only half of the site was in a flood plain. However, there may also be access problems to the site. <p>Officers replied by stating that the vast majority of Site SSAK02 was within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and would, therefore, be reluctant to include that site within the Plan.</p>		

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>Officers also confirmed that in relation to Site SSAK06, this was not considered to be in a sustainable location.</p> <p>It was then moved and duly seconded, that Site SSAK04 be removed from within the Plan, due to the site being of a high density, in very close proximity to the A14 Trunk Road.</p> <p>Councillor R Dicker explained that he did not wish to be too specific about what sites should be included as part of the consultation process, as he felt that it was a decision for the residents and the Parish Council to decide on the amount of development in Kentford.</p> <p>Following on from the comments made by Councillor R Dicker, the proposer of the motion that Site SSAK04 should be removed from within the Plan, then withdrew that motion.</p> <p>With 5 voting for the motion and with 3 abstentions, it was recommended that:</p> <p>1. The Working Group be <u>'minded to include'</u> the following sites for Kentford, within the final Consultation Document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSAK05 (South and East of Flint House, Bury Road) • SSAK09 (Land at Fothergills) • SSAK10 (Land west of Herringswell Road) <p>as the required housing numbers could be achieved from those sites.</p> <p>2. The following be listed as 'rejected' sites, but still be included as part of the Consultation Document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSAK04 (Land north of Bury Road) • SSAK06 (Land opposite 1 to 4 Bury Road) • SSAK11(Land at the Animal Health Trust, Bury Road) <p>3. The wording be strengthened within the Consultation Document with regards to infrastructure and community facilities investment.</p>	<p>RECOMMENDED</p>

ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
<p><u>West Row</u></p> <p>Councillor J E Waters declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and left the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon.</p> <p>The key constraints for this site were highlighted by Officers in relation to aircraft noise and flooding.</p> <p>Officers also explained that subsequent changes had been made to the settlements since last considered by the Working Group on 23 November 2009:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sites SSAWR04 (Land at the junction of Jarman's Lane and Beeches Road), SSAWR05 (Land North of Mildenhall Road), SSAWR06 (Land North of Mildenhall Road) and SSAWR19 (Land at junction of Mildenhall Road and Jarman's Lane) were no longer 'preferred' options as a consequence of aircraft noise issues, distance from the established settlement centre and potential access problems. 2. Sites SSAWR22 (Land to rear of 21 Beeches Road), SSAWR07 (Land East of Beeches Road) and SSAWR08 (Land off Beeches Road) were now 'preferred' options as a consequence of their close proximity to the established village centre, greater distance from the airfield perimeter and that the establishment of appropriate access was more likely to be more straightforward. 3. All references to the Mildenhall relief road had been deleted as the AECOM transport study, undertaken for the Core Strategy, had identified that this was not essential to support the growth proposed within the Plan period. However, Officers confirmed that this would need to be reviewed in light of the previous decision made in relation to the Mildenhall Site Allocation Plan. 4. Contributions towards improvements to the road network in Mildenhall Town Centre had now been included. <p>Officers explained that Core Strategy Policy CS7 had allocated a total of 175 dwellings for West Row (assuming an even split amongst all of the Primary Villages). The Plan had allocated 197 dwellings.</p>	

	ITEMS OF BUSINESS	RECOMMENDATION
	<p>Members then considered the Proposed Settlement Plan for West Row as presented.</p> <p>With the vote being unanimous, it was recommended that the revised Proposed Site Allocation Plan for West Row (as set out in Appendix 2e to the report) be noted and that the Working Group be <u>'minded to include'</u> this section of the document in the final Consultation Document, subject to the following identified amendments/actions:-</p> <p>1. Officers to review the removal of the Mildenhall relief road, in light of the decision made to include the relief road within the Mildenhall Site Allocation Plan.</p> <p>Councillor W Hirst left the meeting at 5.08 pm, during the discussion and prior to the voting, on the Site Allocation Plan for West Row.</p>	RECOMMENDED
204	<p><u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u></p> <p>The dates of the future meetings of the Working Group were noted as follows (all scheduled to take place at 4.00pm):</p> <p>Thursday 18 February 2010 Monday 8 March 2010 Tuesday 16 March 2010 Tuesday 30 March 2010 Tuesday 13 April 2010</p>	NOTED