

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL HELD IN THE CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP CHURCH, COPPERLANE, HINGHAM ON TUESDAY 13 JUNE 2023. THE MEETING COMMENCED AT 7.30pm.

Present

Cllr Amey – Chair

Cllr Barnard, Cllr Christien, Cllr Dunnett, Cllr Eldridge, Cllr Hardy, Cllr Roberts Clerk, Alison Doe

There was one member of the public present.

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Foord, Cllr Overton, Cllr Sta Ana, Cllr Thompson

2. Public participation session, (members of the public may make a statement or ask a question of not more than three minutes duration)

A representative (Mr Nichols) from Lanpro attended the meeting to speak to the Town Council regarding the land submission (Hardingham Road) made during the call for sites for the

Neighbourhood Plan. It was advised that of the 9 hectares of land it was being proposed that 70% be put to community uses with housing numbers being limited to approximately 85 dwellings of mixed types including 1st homes and bungalows. It was explained that the proposal would include vehicular access to the site would be via Hardingham Road and pedestrian access to the community facilities would be via The Fields.

It was advised that housing numbers could be allocated in a neighbourhood plan in addition to those allocated in the local plan if it meets national planning conditions. It was noted that the Hingham Neighbourhood Plan was not seeking to allocate land for housing.

Cllrs commented that the proposals appeared to be a good plan with the benefits of land for community uses, however there were concerns regarding the access point on Hardingham Road and that this would make the land unsuitable for development.

The Council thanked Mr Nichols for attending and speaking at the meeting, Mr Nichols thanked the Council for the opportunity to attend.

Mr Nichols left the meeting.

3. Declarations of interests with regard to items on the agenda and to consider requests for dispensations

Cllr Amey and Cllr Roberts advised that they are on the Hingham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

Cllr Christien advised that she lived adjacent to land allocated in the Greater Norwich Local Plan. It was agreed that these declarations did not prevent the Cllrs from participating in the discussions under agenda item 10.

- 4. To agree a Chairman to preside over any agenda items of this meeting, if both the Chairman and Vice Chair are unable to preside due to (agenda item 1) Apologies for absence and /or (agenda item 3) Declarations of interests**

Cllr Amey to Chair all agenda items.

- 5. General Correspondence (information/circulars etc)**

None.

- 6. Correspondence (not for public inspection) as addressed directly to Hingham Town Council (from residents etc. and may contain personal information)**

None.

- 7. To discuss and agree any required responses/actions in relation to any item(s) of correspondence**

None.

- 8. To agree and approve the accounts for payment**

No invoices had been received.

- 9. To consider the Exclusion of the Press and Public under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 to discuss the following matters:'**

The following agenda item requires discussion which will make reference to properties and land under private ownership and reference to individuals as owners and therefore is considered to be confidential.

NOTE: The draft Neighbourhood Plan as discussed under agenda item 10 is not yet a final version that will be put for public consultation and is therefore not for public release. It is anticipated that the public consultation on the Draft Hingham Neighbourhood Plan will take place between 03 July and 25 August 2023, during which time the Draft Plan will be available for the public to read and comments on the Draft Plan will be invited.

It was agreed to discuss agenda item 10. without the public present.

- 10. For Hingham Town Council to:**

- a. consider and discuss the Draft Hingham Neighbourhood Plan and associated documents as necessary**
- b. agree any amendments that the Council consider should be made to the Plan**
- c. consider the proposal to put the plan forward for public consultation (with required amendments – however noting that amendments suggested may not be possible under the general legal scope and requirements of a Neighbourhood Plan)**

A copy of the draft Hingham Neighbourhood Plan and links to associated documents had been forwarded to all Cllrs prior to the meeting.

The Council firstly considered the Plan visions and objectives, which were all agreed as appropriate and then considered each policy in turn.

Suggestions were made for amendments to the plan policy wording and some queries were raised (see table in appendix A), these are to be forwarded on to the consultant. It was noted that there were some typing errors within the Draft plan document and Cllrs will forward these to the Clerk so they can be forwarded on to the consultant for amendment. It was agreed that the Draft plan should go forward for consultation on the suggested dates (03 July 2023 to 25 August 2023) and that prior to the consultation suggested amendments should be made (where possible).

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm

SignedChair 04 July 2023

Appendix A – table of points raised from agenda item 10

PAGE	POLICY	PARA	ISSUE/POINT RAISED/QUESTION/SUGGESTION
3	N/A	N/A	REQUESTS FOR DOCUMENT IN OTHER FORMATS – HOW ARE THESE FORMATS TO BE PRODUCED AND BY WHOM? (FOR THE CONSULTATION) UNDERSTAND ONE IT IS ADOPTED IT WOULD BE THE TC RESPONSIBILITY TO PRODUCE ALTERNATIVE FORMATS
48 AND OTHER PAGES WHERE THIS OBJECTIVE FEATURES (INC. PAGE 85)	OBJECTIVE 4	N/A	REMOVE THE END “S” FROM THE WORDS PEDESTRIANS AND VEHICLES TO MAKE THEM SINGULAR (LEAVING THE WORD ROUTES AS PLURAL)
58	HING 2	4	AS CURRENTLY WORDED IT CONTRADICTS THE GNLP. ADD THE WORDS (OR SIMILAR) “(BEYOND THE LAND ALLOCATION IN THE GNLP)”, AFTER “NORWICH ROAD”
58	HING2	5	IT WAS FELT THAT THE WORDING “SEAMLESS RELATIONSHIP AND CONNECTIVITY BETWEEN THE EXISTING DEVELOPMENT..... IN TERMS OF LAYOUT, DESIGN, DENSITY, CHARACTER..... “ WOULD PROMOTE HOPS 2 BEING BUILT IN EXACTLY THE SAME STYLE AND FORM AS HOPS 1 – WHICH IS SOMETHING WE WERE AIMING TO AVOID IN THE NP – NEED TO PREVENT LARGER DEVELOPMENT BECOMING A “FACSIMILIE” OF EXISTING DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD POTENTIALLY CREATE AN OVERBEARING DOMINATING FEATURE IN THE TOWN – DEVELOPMENT NEEDS TO BE IDENTIFIABLE AS CHARACTERISTICS OF “HINGHAM” NOT JUST “DEVELOPER CURRENT STYLE PREFERENCE”
64	HING 3	4	AFFORDABLE HOUSING - CAN THIS DIFFERENTIATE

			BETWEEN AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND SOCIAL HOUSING - COUNCIL KEEN THAT SOCIAL HOUSING I.E HOUSING TO RENT FROM THE LOCAL AUTHORITY SHOULD HAVE A PRIORITY FOCUS - THE COUNCIL WOULD LIKE TO SEE MORE SOCIAL HOUSING BROUGHT FORWARD FROM DEVELOPMENT – IS THIS POSSIBLE – IF SOCIAL HOUSING IS INCLUDED IN THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING UMBRELLA CAN THIS BE EXPLAINED (BY A FOOTNOTE PERHAPS)
67	HING4	2	AGAIN, THIS IS UNLIKELY TO PREVENT HOPS 2 BECOMING A COPY AND CONTINUATION OF HOPS 1? THE LAND ALLOCATED FOR HOPS 2 DOES NOT HAVE A CHARACTER AREA OF ITS OWN BUT IS NEAREST IS HOPS 1 –
67	HING 4	4 LAYOUT III	THE WORD “ADEQUATE” (REF PAVEMENTS) IS NOT STRONG ENOUGH – PAVEMENTS ON ALL ROADS
68	HING4	4 - LAYOUT V	CAN THE WORDS /SOCIAL HOUSING BE ADDED WITH “AFFORDABLE HOUSING”
69	HING4	9 LANDSCAPE AND GI XI AND XIII	INCLUDE WILDFLOWERING – AND MAXIMISING OPPORTUNITY FOR BIODIVERSITY
70	HING4	12 DRAINAGE	REQUESTED THAT “NUTRIENT NEUTRALITY MITIGATION BE WITHIN THE PARISH” – BE INCLUDED (SOMEWHERE IN THE PLAN IF THIS IN NOT AN APPROPRIATE PLACE)
70	HINGH4	12 SUSTAINABILITY XXVI	INCLUDE HEDGEHOG MOVEMENT FRIENDLY FENCING. THE END WORDS “IS ENCOURAGED” IS NOT STRONG ENOUGH - REPLACE WITH (OR SIMILAR) “MUST BE INCLUDED” (SEE POLICY HING19 – USES WORD “MUST”) ALSO INCLUDE (OR SIMILAR) “DEVELOPERS SHOULD SEEK ADVICE FROM RELEVANT AUTHORITY FOR NATURE CONSERVATION”
74	HING5	3	WORD “FENESTRATION” - USE PLAIN ENGLISH “WINDOWS” (OR INCLUDE AS FOOTNOTE)
78	HING6	1	TO “(PHYSICAL, MEDICAL, EDUCATIONAL... “ ADD “CULTURAL” AND “LEISURE”
78	HING6	2	END OF PARA WORDS “WILL BE SUPPORTED” THIS IS TOO DEFINITE THE SENTENCE READS THAT ANY (AND EVERY)

			<p>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THAT PROVIDE ANY KIND OF COMMUNITY FACILITY WILL BE SUPPORTED</p> <p>SO – THEORETICALLY IF A DEVELOPMENT OF 300 HOMES – OR SEVERAL LARGE-SCALE DEVELOPMENTS COME FORWARD AND IF EACH CONTAIN A PROPOSAL FOR A COMMUNITY FACILITY (THIS COULD BE A SMALL PLAY AREA) – THEN ALL (EVERY SUCH) PROPOSAL WOULD BE SUPPORTED –</p> <p>SUGGESTED THAT “WILL BE SUPPORTED” BE REMOVED AND REPLACE WITH ALTERNATIVE WORDING – OR PARA BE REWORDED</p> <p>THIS “WILL BE SUPPORTED” SCENARIO APPEARS IN THE WORDING OF OTHER POLICIES</p>
78	HING6	4	<p>EXISTING COMMUNITY FACILITIES –</p> <p>THIS PARA IS NOT CLEAR ENOUGH AS TO WHO WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT A REPLACEMENT FACILITY WOULD BE BUILT</p> <p>FOR EXAMPLE - IF A DEVELOPER BUYS THE SITE OF THE LINCOLN HALL, TO KNOCK IT DOWN AND BUILD HOUSING – (UNLIKELY BUT JUST USING IT AS AN EXAMPLE) – WOULD THAT DEVELOPER BE RESPONSIBLE FOR BUILDING THE NEW COMMUNITY FACILITY ELSEWHERE – AT THE MOMENT IT READS THAT ANY SUCH DEVELOPER COULD SAY THAT A NEW FACILITY “COULD” BE BUILT ELSEWHERE WITH NO OBLIGATION FOR IT TO BE BUILT ALSO, THERE WAS AN QUESTION OVER ONGOING OWNERSHIP, MAINTENANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF ANY SUCH NEW FACILITY</p>
80	HING7	1	<p>“WILL BE SUPPORTED”</p> <p>SAME SCENARIO AS BEFORE – IT’S TOO DEFINITE COULD LEAD TO HAVING TO SUPPORT SEVERAL LARGE DEVELOPMENTS IF THEY ALL PROPOSE NEW SPORTS FACILITIES</p>

81	HING8	1	<p>“WILL BE SUPPORTED” - SAME ISSUE COMMITTS TO SUPPORTING ALL (AND EVERY) PROPOSALS IF THEY INCLUDE ANY PROVISION OF ANY TYPE OF GREEN SPACE</p>
83	HING9	1	<p>ADD THE WORD “POTENTIAL” – SO IT READS MIX OF POTENTIAL COMMUNITY USES -</p>
93	HING12	4	<p>END OF LAST SENTENCE IN PARA ADD “ON ALL ROADS”</p>
94	HING12	6	<p>REWORD TO READ DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD RESULT IN AN INCREASE IN TRAFFIC GENERATION WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED, OR WOULD BE DETRIMENTAL TO HIGHWAY SAFETY WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED</p> <p>THE COUNCIL ASKED HOW THE WORD UNACCEPTABLE WOULD BE QUANTIFIABLE? AND IS PROBABLY BEST OMITTED REGARDING THE WORD “PERMITTED” - IT WAS FELT THIS SHOULD BE SUBSTITUTED FOR “SUPPORTED” - (AT END OF PARA 6)</p>
95	HING13	3	<p>PARAGRAPH NEEDS RE WORDING AS DOES NOT MAKE SENSE WITH REGARD TO “GATES AND STYLES” AND PROW BEING ACCESSIBLE TO ALL USERS INCLUDING THOSE WITH MOBILITY IMPAIRMENTS. IN THE SAME PARAGRAPH SUBSTITUTE THE WORD “COMMUNITIES” WITH THE WORD “LOCALITIES” (DUE TO THE CONNOTATIONS OF THE WORD “COMMUNITIES”)</p>
95	HING14	3 AND 4	<p>AGAIN, THERE IS THE “WILL BE SUPPORTED” SCENARIO SUBSTITUTE THE WORD “SUPPORTED” WITH “ENCOURAGED”</p>
100	HING15	3	<p>LIVING OVER THE SHOP ...“WILL BE SUPPORTED” - IT COMMITTS TO SUPPORTING SUCH A PROPOSAL EVEN IF IT IS NOT APPROPRIATE</p>
106	HING17	POINT7 AND 8	<p>RE GREEN SPACES ON FAIRLAND AND MARKET PLACE – STEERING GROUP AGREED TO PUT A SIDE NOTE REGARDING THESE AREAS THAT PORTIONS OF THESE GREEN SPACES MAY BE REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS</p>

106	HING17	GENERAL POINT	SHOULD THE CEMETERY BE INCLUDED?
116 /117 AND 119	IMPORTANT VIEWS GENERAL AND HING18		<p>ADDITION OF AN IMPORTANT VIEW – FROM THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY FOOTPATH LOCATED SOUTH OF FROST ROW/WATTON RD – LOOKING TOWARD THE CHURCH</p> <p>ALSO, THE STEERING GROUP AGREED THAT THE CHURCH SHOULD BE HIGHLIGHTED ON THE MAP AND A NOTE INCLUDED WITH THE MAP THAT THE CHURCH PROVIDES A FOCAL POINT FOR MAY OF THE IMPORTANT VIEWS – PLEASE CAN THIS BE INCLUDED.</p>
123	HING19	5	END OF PARA SUBSTITUTE WORDS “SHOULD BE REFUSED” WITH “WILL NOT BE SUPPORTED”
125	HING20	2	THERE IS AN EDITING “NOTE TO SELF” STILL PRESENT – PARA UNFINISHED..... (NATURE BASED SOLUTIONS IN HERE)
128	HING21	5	IN THE FIST SENTENCE OF THE PARA – ADD WORD “SCHEMES” – TO READ THEREFORE, LIGHTING SCHEMES WILL ONLY.....
			Other request /points
			HINGHAM IS NOT USED AS A LOCATION FOR NUTRIENT NEUTRALITY CREDITS TO BE APPLIED OUTSIDE OF THE PARISH
			RE CEMETERY - REQUEST THAT IT BE INCLUDED IN THE GREEN SPACES – OR IF NOT APPROPRIATE CAN IT BE INCLUDED IN NON DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS
			<p>CAN A POINT BE MADE REGARDING THE CORRELATION BETWEEN THE SITES OF HOUSING AND INDUSTRIAL AREAS</p> <p>E.G HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT BE SITED IN SUCH A PROXIMITY TO INDUSTRIAL AREAS WHERE IT WOULD HAVE EITHER OR BOTH THE EFFECT OF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HAVING A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON RESIDENTS WELLBEING DUE TO NOISE/LIGHT/FUME POLLUTION

			<p>OR INCREASED TRAFFIC FROM INDUSTRIAL AREA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HAVING A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE BUSINESS <p>ABILITY TO EXPAND (IN TERMS OF SIZE OR OPERATIONAL HOURS) OR OPERATE IN GENERAL DUE TO POTENTIAL OF COMPLAINTS REGARDING NOISE/FUMES/LIGHTING POLLUTION OR INCREASED TRAFFIC</p> <p>THE PROXIMITY OF HOUSING TO INDUSTRY COULD HAVE EITHER A ONE OR TWO WAY NEGATIVE IMPACT – IF SITED TOO CLOSE TOGETHER - CAN WE INCLUDE THIS SOMEWHERE IN WORDING THAT WOULD PREVENT THIS ?</p>
--	--	--	---