



AYLSHAM TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF AYLSHAM TOWN COUNCIL HELD IN AYLSHAM TOWN HALL, ON WEDNESDAY 18 MARCH 2020 at 7.00p.m.

PRESENT: Lloyd Mills Chairman Mr D Curtis
 Mrs J Bennett Mr D Harrison
 Mr T Bennett Mrs M Evans
 Mr R Clark-Ward Mrs A Overton

Sue Lake Town Clerk

0 members of the public

Prior to the start of the meeting the chairman advised that this would be a reduced meeting in line with advice on gatherings during the Covid 19 outbreak and would only discuss urgent matters.

1. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES

Apologies were received and accepted from
Mr B Lancaster
Mr P Prekopp
Mrs V Shaw
Mr S White
Mrs E Springall

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST & REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS

David Harrison declared his interests as a District and County Councillor

3. MINUTES

The minutes of the Town Council Meeting held on 19 February 2020 had previously been circulated and were **confirmed and signed by the chairman.**

4. INFORMATION ON MATTERS ARISING NOT ON THE AGENDA

Item deferred for future discussion

5. REPORTS FROM POLICE, COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILLORS

Item deferred for future discussion

6. ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This item was not required.

7. QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

Item deferred for future discussion

8. PLANNING ISSUES

a) **APPLICATIONS DETERMINED** - Information provided with the Agenda was **noted**.

b) **APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION**

20200351 Land off Woodgate, Aylsham

Change of use to campsite including erection of site office and shower/toilet block. Siting of 6 static caravans, provision of visitor car parking, pumping station and creation of new access onto Woodgate

Lane

Town Council Response – Object. There had been several objections raised by neighbours and also CPRE. Members felt the road conditions and lack of footway were serious issues not addressed. Also, the placement of static buildings/caravans on the site were too close to neighbours.

For all future plans the agreed planning protocol will now come into force.

c) **STREET NAME FOR GAS HOUSE HILL DEVELOPMENT**

Item deferred for future discussion

9. GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN (GNLP)

The agreed response to the GNLP was noted and would be added to the minutes for future clarity.

10. FINANCIAL MATTERS

Item deferred for future discussion

11. TOWN CLERK'S REPORT

Item deferred for future discussion

12. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The chairman proposed the following:

In response to the Covid-19 outbreak in the UK and in the event that it is not possible to convene a meeting of the Town Council in a reasonable time, the Town Clerk shall have delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the council where such decision cannot reasonably be deferred and must be made in order to comply with a commercial or statutory deadline. This will be carried out where possible by consultation with members by electronic means or telephone. The clerk will further consult with the chairman for guidance as necessary. The delegation does not extend to matters expressly reserved to the council in legislation or in its Standing Orders or Financial Regulations. Any decisions made under this delegation must be recorded in writing and must be published in accordance with the relevant regulations. This delegated authority ceases on the first meeting of the Town Council after the council meeting at which the delegation was put in place.

The Scheme of Delegation to the Town Clerk will be extended to include areas currently delegated to the Town Council.

The original Scheme will be reinstated once the Town Council re-convene.

This was unanimously **AGREED**.

It was further proposed and **AGREED** that the Town Council staff be paid as usual during this time.

It was also proposed and **AGREED** that the clerk will have the authority on how the office runs i.e. whether it is open to the public during this period.

The Town Hall will be shut, the Annual Meeting will be postponed and all events cancelled.

The chairman will have completed his designated four-year term in May and it was questioned if that could be extended. The chairman remains the chairman until a new one is elected so that will be discussed at the next meeting which would probably be the Annual Meeting of the Town Council although most likely not in May.

13. DRILL HALL

Item deferred for future discussion

14. PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

Item deferred for future discussion

15. TO CONSIDER CITTASLOW ANNIVERSARY MATTERS

Item deferred for future discussion

16. TO CONSIDER CITTASLOW MATTERS

Item deferred for future discussion

17. STREETLIGHTS

b) To agree to apply for borrowing permission for £50,000

This matter had been discussed in November but no formal resolution was made. It was proposed and **AGREED** to seek approval of the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to apply for a loan of £50,000.

c) To agree to apply to Salix Energy Efficiency Loan Scheme £50,000

It was proposed and **AGREED** to apply to Salix Energy to borrow the £50,000 over a period of five years, interest free, with annual repayments of £10,000.

18. BURE VALLEY RAILWAY

Item deferred for future discussion

19. EVENTS COMMITTEE

Item deferred for future discussion

20. RECREATION GROUND

Item deferred for future discussion

21. TO NOTE ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/FUTURE AGENDA

Item deferred for future discussion

22. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

To be decided.

23. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Item not required

24. STAFFING ISSUES

Item deferred for future discussion

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 7.25p.m.

I confirm these minutes are a true reflection of the meeting subject to confirmation from the Town Council at the next meeting

Minutes Agreed.....
Lloyd Mills (Chairman)

DRAFT

Response to GNLP Consultation March 2020

Responses to the Strategy

Do you agree with the proposed Settlement Hierarchy and the proposed distribution of housing within the hierarchy?

Although at this stage it is not of direct interest to Aylsham and its residents there is a view that too much emphasis has been placed on school catchment areas rather than geographical links

Do you support, object or have any comments relating to the specific requirements of the policy?

The policy on flooding (item 9) could be strengthened by actually encouraging no additional hard surfaces outside the highway within a distance of one mile into a flood plain. Recent issues have shown the devastation excessive rain can have when rivers fill and although this has not been an issue for Norfolk the situation is only likely to get worse.

Do you support, object or have any comments relating to approach to the built and historic environment?

There is a lack of acknowledgement within the policy that the historic asset maybe underground rather than visible on the surface. This is also badly covered in the NPPF. This would be an opportunity to ensure discovery and then protection of unknown sites

Do you support, object or have any comments relating to approach to transport?

There is nothing in the plan regarding connecting the market towns to Norwich and onward sites through long-distance all-weather cycle paths. This would appear to be an opportunity missed

Do you support, object or have any comments relating to approach to affordable homes?

With regard to affordable housing there is a need, from past experiences, to ensure there is no wiggle room for developers over the 33% figure. We would also like to see an addition so that the development is 'tenure blind'

41. Do you support or object or wish to comment on the approach for specific towns (Aylsham, Diss (with part of Roydon), Harleston, Long Stratton and Wymondham)? Please identify particular issues.

Aylsham

Whilst it is true that Aylsham has good transport links both North and South via the A140, there is an issue with transport through the town itself. The roads in the historic centre were not built for cars let alone the large buses that now regularly cross the town. The Town Council would like to address this through the provision of a transport hub to look at solutions for both the bus situation and the long-term parking issues experienced by the town. The Town Council does not agree with the chosen site – the full details of which are provided in the response to sites consultation.

The town is fortunate to have the long-distance trails of the Weavers Way and Marriots/Bure Valley Way. However, both these paths necessitate crossing the extremely busy A140 with no assistance to the pedestrian – this will need to be addressed.

Although the Town Council welcomes the addition of the school the policy does not specifically include this. The notes to the policy claim a new primary school which would indicate a third school will be built but the Town Council have been informed that it is more likely that an existing school will be moved and extended on a new site. This is not clear in the policy and is not the wished for expansion of primary education in the town

Do you support or object or wish to comment on the overall approach for Small Scale Windfall Housing Development? Please identify particular issues.

Clarification for size of site would be useful as how the policy stands it might not meet the requirement in your vision for homes:

Homes

To enable delivery of high-quality homes of the right density, size, mix and tenure to meet people's needs throughout their lives and to make efficient use of land.

Also, what measures are there in place to prevent repeated applications for three houses from small developers on basically the same site?

SITE RESPONSES

POLICY GNLP0311, 0595 and 2060 Land south of Burgh Road and west of the A140, Aylsham (approx. 12.86 ha) is allocated for residential development. The site is likely to accommodate at least 300 homes, 33% of which will be affordable, and new primary school.

This is the favoured site from the GNLP Board but Aylsham Town Council do not feel it is suitable for the development planned.

The policy indicates two entrances to the site, these will both need to be via Burgh Road. This road is a busy narrow road with no scope for widening as it heads towards the town centre. The junctions with Oakfield Road and Norwich Road will cause issues if more traffic utilises this road. Plans for a primary school on this road especially if it is a moved school will exacerbate the issues. The roundabout is still in its infancy and was not planned with this development and a school and as such there is no data on whether it could cope with the additional traffic this development would bring.

This is a higher density than other sites put forward. In view of the fact Aylsham took a larger number of houses than allocated in the last plan there should be scope for reducing the number this time.

This site is amber for flood risk.

The site is within the consultation area of a safeguarded water recycling centre. Any future development on this site will need to address the requirements of Norfolk Minerals Waste Core Strategy Policy CS16.

The close proximity to the A140 does not make this a good site for a school.

Do not understand the need for two entrances – have asked for a response from Highways but this has not been received.

POLICY AYL3 Land at Dunkirk Industrial Estate (west), south of Banningham Road, Aylsham (of approx. 1.0 ha) is allocated for employment use. This will accommodate B1, B2 & B8 uses.

The Town Council would welcome new employment to the area subject to the review of vehicular movements to the site and any emissions resulting from the business

POLICY AYL4 Land at Dunkirk Industrial Estate (east), south of Banningham Road, Aylsham (of approx. 3.0 ha) is allocated for employment use. This will accommodate B1, B2 & B8 uses.

The Town Council would welcome new employment to the area subject to the review of vehicular movements to the site and any emissions resulting from the business

Next to River Bure

GNLP0336

Support – this site would require an additional roundabout onto the A140 and is too close to the flood plain to be considered.

Norwich Road	GNLP0596
---------------------	-----------------

Object – If Aylsham is to have a further site this is the site most favoured by the Town Council. The Town Council feels that the information used by the GNLP to investigate this site was flawed. There is the opportunity for two exits – again the Town Council still have not been advised of why this is a requirement – and Norwich Road is more capable of accepting the additional traffic. The site would provide an ideal location for a transport hub as requested by the Town Council.

North of Marriotts Way	GNLP0287	
-------------------------------	-----------------	--

Support – this is not a suitable site for expansion. This would put additional pressure on the existing estate roads and is an unwelcome urbanisation of the Marriotts Way. Its distance from the town centre makes this unsustainable

B1145 Henry Page Road/ Norwich Road	GNLP2059
--	-----------------

This small piece of land is not suitable for housing development. Any entrance would be too close to the roundabout with the A140. The site is also outside the natural boundary for the town.