

**BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**

**JOINT MEETING OF THE REGENERATION & DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT & COMMUNITY PANEL**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Joint Meeting of the Regeneration & Development and Environment & Community Panel held on Wednesday, 2nd September, 2015 at 6.00 pm in the Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn**

**PRESENT:**

Councillors L Bambridge, Mrs C Bower, A Bubb, Mrs S Collop, C Crofts, Mrs S Fraser, G Hipperson, M Hopkins, M Chenery of Horsbrugh, M Howland, P Kunes, Mrs K Mellish, P Rochford, C Sampson, M Shorting, T Smith, Mrs S Squire, J M Tilbury, Mrs E Watson, Mrs J Westrop, D Whitby and Mrs A Wright

**Portfolio Holders**

Councillor P Beal, Portfolio Holder for Coast and Tourism  
Councillor A Beales, Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Industrial Assets  
Councillor A Lawrence, Portfolio Holder for Community  
Councillor D Pope, Portfolio Holder for ICT, Leisure and Public Space  
Councillor Mrs V Spikings, Portfolio Holder for Development

**Officers:**

Chris Bamfield, Executive Director Commercial Services  
John Clement, Principal Planner LDF  
Geoff Hall, Executive Director, Development and Environment  
Ray Harding, Chief Executive  
Jemma March, Planner  
Ostap Paparega, Regeneration and Economic Development Manager

RD&EC41 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs J Collingham, N Daubney, B Long, J Moriarty and A Tyler.

RD&EC42 **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED:** The minutes from the meeting held on Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

RD&EC43 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There was none.

RD&EC44 **URGENT BUSINESS**

There was none.

RD&EC45 **MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

There was none.

RD&EC46 **CHAIRMAN'S CORRESPONDENCE**

There was none.

RD&EC47 **MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PANEL FROM OTHER COUNCIL BODIES AND RESPONSES MADE TO PREVIOUS PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUESTS**

The Panel noted the response made by Cabinet to the recommendations from the Joint Panel Meeting on 22 July 2015 in respect of the following item:

- Hunstanton Heritage Gardens – Heritage Lottery Fund Parks for People Application.

RD&EC48 **UPDATE ON THE WORK OF THE NORFOLK COAST PARTNERSHIP**

Tim Venes from the Norfolk Coast Partnership provided the Panels with an update on the work of the Norfolk Coast Partnership. He explained that the purpose of the Partnership was to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Norfolk Coast.

The Partnership was made up of organisations all working together to manage the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Partnership included Local Authorities, Statutory Agencies, Landowners and the local community. The Panel was provided with an overview of the Partnership's funding arrangements.

Tim Venes informed those present that the Borough Council had a statutory duty to produce an AONB Management plan and review it in conjunction with other local authorities. The Norfolk Coast Partnership carried out this function on behalf of the relevant Local Authorities and reviewed the plan every five years. The Norfolk Coast Partnership also provided information and advice and assisted with generating funding.

The Panel was informed that the Norfolk Coast Partnership had been successful in awarding funding to community based projects. £430,000 had been distributed to local groups over the past ten years. The Norfolk Coast Partnership had also secured funding to run the Nine Chalk Rivers Project for AONB river catchment restoration.

More information on the work of the Partnership was available at [www.norfolkcoastaonb.org.uk](http://www.norfolkcoastaonb.org.uk).

The Chairman thanked Tim Venes for the presentation and invited questions and comments from the Panel, as summarised below.

Councillor Mrs Watson referred to the England Coastal Path and asked if this was the responsibility of the Norfolk Coast Partnership. Tim Venes explained that a coastal path would be created all the way round England which would include some existing paths and the creation of some new coastal paths. Natural England was managing the project and Norfolk County Council would be responsible for maintaining the footpaths in their area.

The Chairman asked if there was a map available of all the footpaths in the area. Tim Venes explained that Norfolk County Council should have details of all footpaths which had been adopted, but offer to assist the Chairman if required.

**RESOLVED:** That the update be noted.

RD&EC49

### **CABINET REPORT - NAR OUSE BUSINESS PARK ENTERPRISE ZONE**

The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager presented the Cabinet report which outlined the key elements of Enterprise Zone status and provided information on the proposals to be put forward. He explained that Enterprise Zones were built on two principles:

- That the Government believed that the Private Sector was the generator of wealth.
- That in order to achieve growth the Government should offer incentives to the private sector.

An Enterprise Zone was a designated area of land which had with it a package of incentives for business occupiers. In terms of financial incentives, the business occupiers would not have to pay Business Rates for a period of five years. In terms of planning incentives a Local Development Order could be established which would cover the area and could allow for automatic planning permission to be granted if it met development requirements. Local Enterprise Partnerships would retain the business rates for 25 years.

The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager informed those present that the first wave of Enterprise Zones had been announced by Government in 2011 and 21 had been established across England. The second wave of Enterprise Zones had been announced in July 2015. The New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) had subsequently invited applications for Enterprise Zone Status to be put forward to Government.

The New Anglia LEP invitation had stated that the site proposals should be sector focussed. The New Anglia LEP had recognised that it could be unfair to retain Business Rates for 25 years so had come up with a Business Rates sharing formula as follows:

- 10% would go to the Local Authority.
- 35% would be ring-fenced for further development in the Enterprise Zone area
- 55% would be paid to the LEP for future development projects.

The Panel was provided with details of the NORA site and the proposed area to be put forward for Enterprise Zone status. It was anticipated that this area would create 48,000 square metres of employment space for Advanced Manufacturing and Engineering. Up to 2,200 new jobs could be available as calculated by the Government Employment Density Guidance formula.

The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager referred the Panel to the options considered as set out in the report. He highlighted the benefits of developing the NORA land with Enterprise Zone status, which included, accelerated development, which could result in the creation of jobs and further investment, ring-fenced funding from the LEP which would be reinvested in the area from Business Rates and prioritised enhanced marketing by UK Trade and Investment and New Anglia LEP.

The Panel was informed that the Borough Council was only made aware of the opportunity to put forward a site for Enterprise Zone status six weeks' ago so had put together the proposals within a short timescale. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager reminded those present that the proposals were still subject to Cabinet and Council approval, although the Regeneration and Economic Development Manager had worked closely with the Leader of the Council and other Cabinet Members in putting the proposal together.

The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager referred those present to page 14 of the agenda which contained the New Anglia LEP Enterprise Zone submission from the Borough Council.

The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager informed those present that, subject to Cabinet and Council approval, the proposal would be submitted to the New Anglia LEP Executive Team for initial assessment and then would be appraised by an Independent Consultant. If successful through the preliminary stages the proposal would then be considered by the LEP Board and then submitted to Government. If successful it was likely that Enterprise Zone Status would be granted in April 2016.

The Chairman thanked the Regeneration and Economic Development Manager for his report and invited questions and comments from the Panels, as summarised below.

Councillor Kunes referred to page 16 of the agenda which stated that the site to be put forward was clean and clear. He asked if there were any contamination issues on the site and the Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that there were some contamination issues on the site, but the areas in question were not currently in the Councils control. The Council was currently in negotiations with Morston's Administrators regarding the possible acquisition of the rest of the NORA land and it was possible that there would be some contamination issues. The areas not currently in the Council's control had been left out of the proposal at this stage, but the New Anglia LEP was aware that the Council could gain control of the site and if the contamination was cleared it was possible that the site could be included at a later date.

Councillor Shorting commended the Regeneration and Economic Development Managers report and referred to table B on page 11. In response to a question from Councillor Shorting, the Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that the figures within the table had been added up vertically rather than horizontally.

Councillor Shorting highlighted the importance of making sure that the roads to be put in were of good quality and not subject to flooding, like Nar Ouse Way.

Councillor Mrs Bower commented that it was good to see that there had been a lot of external inward investment enquiries. She asked if the local enquiries were for businesses just relocating or if they were planning on expanding operations. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager confirmed that the figures contained within the report were from before the opportunity for Enterprise Zone status had been made available.

The Vice Chairman, Councillor Mrs Bambridge asked if the proposals would have any consideration to infrastructure surrounding the site such as the A17 and A47. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that the New Anglia LEP had delegated transport issues to Norfolk and Suffolk transport bodies and the Council had been encouraged by the LEP to put forward road infrastructure proposals to Government. The Council would ensure that the key priority areas were included and a strong case for improvements was put forward.

Councillor Rochford asked for clarification on Business Rates retention. The Chief Executive explained that currently 40% was retained by the Council, 10% went to Norfolk County Council and the other 50% went into the Business rates pool. Local Authorities in Norfolk could then bid

for funding from the Business rates pool for small style infrastructure projects.

The Chief Executive went on to explain that the LEP offer through the Enterprise Zone was that 10% would be retained by the Council and 35% would be ring-fenced for reinvestment in the area. 55% would then be retained by the New Anglia LEP which the Council could bid into, similar to the Business Rates pool.

In response to a question from Councillor Mrs Mellish regarding timescales, the Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that the proposal needed the relevant approvals before Enterprise Zone status was granted. If successful work could start on providing the relevant infrastructure, this could be in accordance with the layout provided in the existing Masterplan which had been created for the site or new plans could be produced. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager reminded those present that there was already outline planning consent on the site.

In response to a further question from Councillor Mrs Mellish, the Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that any funding awarded did not have a time limit for commencement of works attached to it, however the Council had a good reputation of delivering projects in the past and a good working relationship with the New Anglia LEP so any issues could be addressed at an early stage.

Councillor Smith asked if all of the NORA land was earmarked for Business use and the Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that if all business enquiries materialised the demand would outstrip the supply of Business use land at the NORA site. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that other areas of land in different locations were available for business use if required.

The Chief Executive responded to a further question from Councillor Smith and explained that there were two further tranches of Business use land on the NORA site, which were currently not under the ownership of the Borough Council. The Council were in discussions with Morston's Administrators regarding the possibility of acquiring the sites. The sites available were business use and housing land. The Chief Executive reminded those present that the New Anglia LEP were aware of the situation and there was flexibility to expand the borders of the Enterprise Zone in the future if necessary, subject to the remediation of any contamination issues.

Councillor Mrs Watson referred to the jobs which could be created and commented that if more jobs were available more housing would be needed. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager reminded those present that the Council was providing housing through the NORA development and the Major Housing Project.

Councillor Bubb asked if the development of businesses on the NORA site would enhance the chance of a Railway Station at South Lynn. The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Industrial Assets explained that the creation of jobs in the area could strengthen the case for improved infrastructure.

Councillor Tilbury referred to the focus on advanced manufacturing and engineering. He felt that the skills gap needed to be addressed if the area wanted to become a centre of excellence in that field. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that the King's Lynn Innovation Centre would become a hub for knowledge transfer and that there were over twenty of the world leading manufacturers operating in the area.

The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager acknowledged that there was an issue with skills. Other projects were addressing the skills gap and the Greater Peterborough Greater Cambridge LEP had funded a project designed to engage with existing employers in providing education and training. He reminded those present that the College of West Anglia had also secured funding to become a University Centre and the National Construction College in the area was an advanced construction institute. The Regeneration and Economic Development Manager explained that dealing with the skills gap was a long term issue and was a high priority for the LEP's.

The Chairman reiterated the comments made by Councillor Bubb in that it would be beneficial to have a Railway Station serving the Enterprise Zone area. He felt that this intent should be specified within the plan so that it could be taken into consideration in the long term. He explained that Network Rail's funding period worked four years in advance so discussions to progress the possibility of a Railway Station would need to be looked at in the near future.

The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Industrial Assets, Councillor Beales, thanked the Panels for their debate and comments on the proposals. He thanked officers for putting together the proposals within a short timescale. Councillor Beales reminded those present that the NORA site was currently underutilised and the opportunity to gain Enterprise Zone status would give the opportunity to develop the site. He also reminded those present of the opportunities available through the scheme to reinvest and retain some of the business rates.

**RESOLVED:** That the Regeneration and Development & Environment and Community Panel supported the recommendations to Cabinet as set out below, with an additional recommendation 4.:

It is recommended that Cabinet:

1. Approves the submission of Nar Ouse Business Park for Enterprise Zone status as part of a multi-site New Anglia Enterprise Zone, as outlined in Appendix 1.

2. Endorses the proposed Business Rates Growth sharing formula, as described in paragraph 8 of this report.
3. Delegates authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council to undertake any further negotiations with the New Anglia LEP to enable the Enterprise Zone proposal to be submitted to Government by 18 September 2015.
4. That the comments made by both panels be taken into account.

RD&amp;EC50

### **CABINET REPORT - SOUTH WOOTTON AND BRANCASTER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS**

The Executive Director, Development Services presented the Cabinet report and explained that the Localism Act 2011 had introduced the provision for Neighbourhood Plans to be created. The intention of this was to engage local communities in the planning process and give them ownership and control over development in their area.

South Wootton and Brancaster had embraced the opportunity to create a Parish Plan. South Wootton had anticipated significant growth going forward and therefore wanted to shape how development took place.

The Executive Director, Development Services provided brief details of the Government's process for creating neighbourhood plans, there were lots of steps and processes to be gone through, which were out of the Council's control. The Council had worked with the Parishes to develop their plans.

The Executive Director, Development Services commended both the Parish Council's and the officers involved in bringing the Parish Plans to this stage as there had been a lot of work involved.

The Panel was referred to the recommendations within the report which set out how the Parish Plan process could move forward. The recommendations had regard to the recommendations made by the Independent Examiner and the report set out the proposed modifications to the plans before they moved to the referendum stage. The Executive Director, Development Services informed those present that if adopted the Parish Plans would have the same status as the Local Plan, the Parishes would also receive a greater proportion of any Community Infrastructure levy if they had a plan in place.

The Chairman thanked the Executive Director, Development Services for his report and invited questions and comments from the Panel, as summarised below.

Councillor Mrs Watson referred to Brancaster Parish Plan and informed the Executive Director that the Parish Council would be discussing the proposed modifications to the Parish Plan at their next meeting. She asked for clarification on when a referendum was likely. The Principal Planner (LDF) explained that, if the recommendations were agreed by Cabinet, a consultation exercise on the modifications would then be

required. If the consultation exercise resulted in no further amendments it was likely that a referendum would be held mid to late November 2015.

Councillor Mrs Wright commented that she was impressed with South Wootton Parish Council's ideas as contained within their plan. She asked how it would be ensured that developers would be considerate of the plan when submitting planning applications to ensure that South Wootton's vision was achieved. The Principal Planner (LDF) explained that the Parish Plan would form part of the overall development plan and would become the starting place for decisions on applications. The Planning Committee would need to take the Parish Plans into account when determining planning applications. Developers would need to consider their plan when shaping their proposals and the Plans would influence the type of development acceptable in the area.

Councillor Smith referred to page 25 of the agenda and asked if the Independent Examiner had considered the area beyond the Parish Plan boundary. The Principal planner LDF explained that the Parish Plan boundaries could be extended if there was a strong strategic demand and influence on the surrounding area, but in these cases there was considered not to be any major influences beyond the Parish boundary. The Examiner would have considered this during the examination and had not recommended that the boundaries be expanded.

Councillor Mrs Bower referred to part 3.3 of the report, which set out the Examiners proposed changes to the Brancaster Parish Plan. She felt that limiting the size of houses was a good idea as this was a problem along the coastal strip. She felt that the amount of large second houses could exclude the opportunity for local people to live in the area. The Principal Planner LDF explained that the Examiner had recommended that the Parish Plan should identify what cases could be considered as an exception and what would be reasonable.

Councillor Tilbury asked if the Borough Council would support the views of the Parish Plans in the future. The Principal Planner LDF explained that the Borough Council had advised and assisted with the formulation of the Parish Plans as it had a legal obligation to do so. The Borough Council did not have to agree with the content of the Parish Plan, they just had to ensure that it met the statutory requirements.

**RESOLVED:** That the Regeneration and Development & Environment and Community Panel support the recommendations to Cabinet as set out below:

1. That the submitted South Wootton Neighbourhood Plan:
  - a) be amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Independent Examiner; and
  - b) so modified, should proceed to a local referendum covering the area of South Wootton Parish.

2. That the submitted Brancaster Neighbourhood plan:
  - a) be amended broadly in accordance with the recommendations of the independent Examiner but, subject to consultation, with detailed variation from those recommendations, as set out in Appendix 5; and
  - b) so modified, should proceed to a local referendum covering the area of Brancaster Parish.
3. That authority to be delegated to the Executive Director, Environment and Planning, in consultation with the Planning Portfolio Holder, to consider responses to consultation on the proposed decisions differing from the Examiner's recommendations, and determine the final changes to be made to the neighbourhood plan before it proceeds to the referendum.

RD&amp;EC51

### **CABINET REPORT - SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN - PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

The Executive Director, Development Services presented the Cabinet report and provided a broad overview of its content. He explained that the report set out the Council's response to the Inspectors questions which had been raised on the opening day of the Examination. On the first morning of the Examination the Inspector had looked at the technical aspects of the plan and checked that it met certain criteria. The Executive Director explained that the Council had to provide a Habitat Regulations Assessment which detailed how the Council would regulate the impact of growth on designation sites and mitigation requirements.

The Executive Director explained that throughout the process of creating the Habitat Regulation Assessment lots of meetings had been held with relevant organisations to determine the way forward to mitigate the impact of growth on designation sites. On the first day of the Examination one of the relevant organisations which had been involved in the process had expressed a concern regarding the mitigation strategy and how money would be raised to protect designated sites. The Inspector had therefore raised concern that the issue had not been addressed in enough detail so he had adjourned the Examination so that the Council could formulate a response.

Once the Examination had been adjourned the Council had asked the Inspector for information on any other issues which he was likely to raise, so that they could be addressed before the Examination reconvened. The Inspector also raised issues in relation to flood risk, the flexibility and delivery of sites and the plan review process. The Cabinet report set out the Council's response to the issues raised by the Inspector.

The Chairman thanked the Executive Director, Development Services for his report and invited questions and comments from the Panels, as summarised below.

Councillor Crofts referred to the affordable housing threshold and explained that he had recalled that a recent Cabinet report had changed the threshold to ten, however, the report stated that the threshold was five. He asked if Parish Councils would be made aware of the change to the affordable housing threshold. The Executive Director, Development Services explained that the Government had introduced the change in February 2015 and subsequently a report had been presented to Cabinet outlining the changes. Following the introduction of the legislation several Councils had taken the matter to a Judicial Review as they felt there was no evidence to support the change, it was irrational and the Government had not conducted an adequate equality impact assessment. Subsequently the policy was thrown out, Planning Policy Guidance changed and the threshold withdrawn. The Government were not intending to challenge the courts and the Council had no choice but to go back to their previous position.

Councillor Crofts requested, and the Panel agreed, that Parish Council's be informed of the position in relation to affordable housing and the Executive Director agreed to send out a briefing note.

The Vice Chairman, Councillor Mrs Bambridge referred to the habitat mitigation levy which had been set at £50 and asked how the figure had been calculated. The Executive Director explained that it was difficult to know how many people would access the protected areas, if there would be an impact and what mitigation work would be required. In setting the levy the Council had looked at what other Councils had charged and their approaches. He felt that the figure wouldn't detract development from coming forward.

The Executive Director explained that a Board would be established to look at what would be required to offset the impact of development and they would review the levy on a regular basis if required.

The Panel was reminded that the Community Infrastructure Levy would also divert funds to where they were needed and would contribute to offset the effect of development. The Executive Director reminded those present that they could only look at the impact of additional growth, not the existing impact on the protected areas.

Councillor Crofts referred to correspondence, which had been sent to potential developers who had put sites forward to be included in the Plan, to inform them of the adjournment of the Examination. The Executive Director confirmed that correspondence had been sent out to explain the situation and stated that the developers may wish to seek professional advice.

In response to a question from Councillor Crofts regarding the five year land supply, the Executive Director confirmed that some developers had submitted applications during the adjournment of the Examination and it was within the developer's right to do so. The Executive Director

explained that 'flexibility' information was included within the revisions to the plan, at the Inspectors request, which could assist with the five year land supply deficit. He explained that the allocation figures set out in the plan were the minimum figures and if an application came forward with more units for development and fit in with the rest of the scheme it would not necessarily be refused. He explained that the Planning Committee would have a flexible and pragmatic approach when determining applications.

Councillor Mrs Mellish referred to the Board which would be established relating to the mitigation of the impact of development on protected areas. She explained that the report stated that it would be chaired by a Cabinet Member and include the Cabinet Member for Environment. She asked if the Cabinet Member for Development would be involved. The Executive Director explained that this was a matter of detail for the Cabinet to decide at the appropriate time.

Councillor Mrs Mellish highlighted the following sections of the report and asked for clarification. The Executive Director agreed to make amendments to the documents as appropriate in relation to typos and minor errors:

- Page 277 – Councillor Mrs Mellish requested that hyperlinks be inserted to the document when referrals to other documents available were made.
- Page 278 point 3.3.2 – the dates relating to the Visitors Surveys to be corrected.
- Councillor Mrs Mellish referred to the report header which stated that the Local Development Framework Task Group had been consulted on the report. In clarification the Executive Director explained that a meeting of the Task Group had been held to update them on the proposed modifications to the plan following the Inspectors comments.
- Page 426, appendix 5. It was clarified that this was part of the amendment of the sustainability appraisal which accompanied the plan. This particular amendment related to aggregate scoring and summary scores, consequent on the various individual policy or site appraisal amendments show elsewhere in the report. These in turn reflected, for example, more recent information which was now available.
- In response to a query from Councillor Mellish, the Principal Planner LDF explained that there was a requirement to keep the Local Plan under review. There was only eleven years left of the current plan and the Council needed to plan for fifteen years in advance so a review would commence soon. The Inspector required detail on how and when the document would be reviewed and this had now been provided.

In response to a further question from Councillor Mrs Mellish, the Principal Planner LDF clarified that the Inspector had not found the plan not to be sound, he had just requested that additional information be provided in relation to early review, flood risk and habitat regulations. The additional information had required only a few amendments to the plan and detailed site appraisals. Most of the

information required had already been considered, it had just not been contained in writing within the plan.

The Executive Director informed those present that the relevant organisations had been consulted on the strategy and it was unfortunate that one of the organisations had challenged the Council's position on the initial day of the Examination. The Council had no way of anticipating the challenge. He explained that the plan had been put forward with the information available at the time and that it would be unfair to comment that in hindsight more information should have been included within the plan as there was no way of anticipating what could happen during the Examination. He explained that Planning Policy Guidance was in constant flux and it was not always possible to incorporate all changes before moving forward with the plan.

The Executive Director explained that the Secretary of State had recently written to the Planning Inspectorate to encourage them to not block plans from going forward unnecessarily and that they should take a flexible and pragmatic approach.

In response to a question from Councillor Mellish regarding windfall development, the Executive Director explained that this was the most frequent type of development to come forward and was usually the infill or redevelopment of small sites, which were difficult to predict in advance.

Councillor Mrs Mellish asked if the Community Infrastructure Levy was likely to be restrictive to developers. The Executive Director explained that it as a small levy and viability and costings of sites would be taken into account when applications came forward, he did not think that it would prevent development. He reminded those present that Section 106 agreements were put in place on large developments and had not restricted the amount of large scale development coming forward. He reminded the Panel that some of the Community Infrastructure Levy would go back to the Parish Councils and would be used to offset concerns in relation to growth.

Councillor Mrs Mellish referred to the proposed allocation site at West Winch and stressed the importance of providing adequate infrastructure. The Executive Director explained that infrastructure would be installed on sites as appropriate, discussions were held with land owners and it was hoped that as sites came forward they would pump prime development. He confirmed that the Inspector was working to the allocation figures as set out in the Core Strategy.

The Vice Chairman, Councillor Bambridge referred to page 317 of the agenda and the Executive Director agreed to remove any mention of the development of a marina within the report as this was no longer one of the Council's aspirations.

Councillor Smith referred to page 200, point 4.2.1 which stated that the Council had potentially lost some capacity from the allocations in the Plan from Lynnsport and Marsh Lane. The Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Industrial Assets confirmed that this capacity had now been lost and the word 'potentially' should be removed from the document.

**RESOLVED:** That the Environment and Community & Regeneration and Development Panel support the recommendations to Cabinet as set out below:

That Cabinet:

1. Notes the content of the Inspector's request for further information in respect of the SADMP Examination.
2. Endorses the content of the Mitigation and Monitoring Strategy. In particular agrees that:
  - a) A Habitat Mitigation Levy at a rate of £50 be introduced for new housing in the Borough.
  - b) A Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring/Green Infrastructure Co-ordinating Panel be established and chaired by a Cabinet Member from the Borough Council.
3. Agrees the following actions in respect of a 'fall back' position to ensure a flexible and deliverable supply of new housing:
  - a) Endorses the use of housing resulting from windfall permissions to count as a source of flexibility bolstering delivery from allocated sites.
  - b) Notes the position that potentially more intensive use can be made of existing proposed allocations.
  - c) An early review of the Local Plan is proposed.
  - d) A site at West Winch be included in the Plan having had regard to the assessments presented with this report.
4. Notes that the above decisions have been taken having had regard to the effects outlined in the Strategic Environmental Assessment/Sustainability Appraisal updates for the policies and proposals as new/amended.
5. Requests to the Inspector that the modifications as proposed and others that may arise at the Examination Hearings, be subject to public consultation once the initial hearing sessions have concluded.
6. Delegates Authority to the Executive Director Environment and Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Development, in the authority to make minor amendments to enable suitable documents to be presented to the Examination.

RD&EC52

### **WORK PROGRAMME AND FORWARD DECISIONS LIST**

The Chairman invited Members of the Panel to contact her if they had any items which they would like to add to the work programme.

**RESOLVED:** The work programme and forward decision list was noted.

RD&EC53     **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Regeneration and Development & Environment and Community Panel was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 30 September 2015 at 6.00pm in the Committee Suite, King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn, Norfolk, PE30 1EX.

**The meeting closed at 8.30 pm**