

RECORD OF CO-OPERATION FOR MID SUFFOLK

Appendix 2

Addendum

Copy e-mail and attachment from

Tim Horspole
Planning Policy Manager
South Norfolk Council

Dear Stephen

Thanks for putting together a first draft of a scoping for the topics which could form the basis of our council's dialogue on strategic planning issues. I agree with you that we need to be more formal in recording our discussions and interactions on planning issues in order to be able to demonstrate how we fulfil the duty to co-operate. I have made suggested some tweaks, and from my point of view is a good starting position for a document that will be dynamic, shifting in emphasis to reflect changes in policy and events.

I must say that my Council acknowledges and appreciates the way Mid Suffolk has sought views in the preparation of planning policy. This has not restricted to the formal consultation stages. This has been illustrated well in the recent efforts of Mid Suffolk District Council to engage with South Norfolk Council on the development of its proposals for the former airfield at Eye. This area has potential for bringing benefits for the wider area, including residents and businesses in South Norfolk.

From a South Norfolk point of view, I appreciate your continued engagement with our site specific proposals, in particular the proposals at Diss, Long Stratton and the A140.

I will keep you up to date on the Diss Town Council's intentions on preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan. It could be an exciting opportunity to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan that extends across the county boundary and covering parishes in both districts.

Regards

Tim

Tim Horspole
Planning Policy Manager
South Norfolk Council
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2EX
01508 533806
thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk
www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

Note of discussions attached.

Duty to Co-operate: Current scope of the strategic issues between Mid Suffolk District Council and South Norfolk Council

1. The strategic importance of the A140 is common to both local planning authorities. Dualling the road would be preferred but there is some understanding of the Suffolk County position.
2. No objections to the Council's delivery of aspirations for improvements at Eye Airfield but wishes to be kept abreast of the proposals. South Norfolk Council valued the visit and discussion with the Consultant working on behalf of Mid Suffolk on the development brief and welcome opportunities to continue in these discussions. Both Councils recognise the benefits that this development can have for local residents and businesses in their areas.
3. Recognising that the Eye development workforce may well be pulled across the Suffolk Norfolk border; the Councils may wish to consider sharing infrastructure costs through development of a transport package funded by a joint CIL arrangement. The package may include cycle and other initiatives such as electric hook up points. Such arrangements should be based on the Eye airfield "catchment" which would include settlements Long Stratton and Diss.
4. Diss Neighbourhood Plan – It is understood that the Town Council may wish to make proposals for the future of the town using the neighbourhood plan process. This may examine the potential for a joint Neighbourhood Development Plan extending to include the parishes that neighbour Diss. This would include parishes in both Districts, and would reflect the "hinterland" of Diss as a local market town. It was agreed that both District Councils would wish to actively participate in the process. Respective portfolio holders would be informed.
5. Long Stratton by-pass would need to be developer funded and these levels of development may have a significant impact on the area.
6. Rural housing and affordability. There may be a slight difference in emphasis in the approach to the delivery of rural and affordable homes in the non key service centre villages. In view of the reduced funds being made available to support affordable housing in MSDCs area the Council is willing to consider initiatives that see the delivery of affordable homes on the basis of a strictly controlled form of cross subsidy. (The Suffolk Coastal District Council approach) This implies that the interpretation of rural housing policies may be different among villages that could be quite close at hand and lead to differing land values.