### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BROOKE PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT 7.30PM ON MONDAY 20<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2018 AT BROOKE METHODIST CHURCH

**Present:** Mr Jinks, Mr Sanford, Mr Warman, Mr Mears, Mrs Powell, Mr Harrison, Mr Tobin, Mr Musgrave and Mrs Andrews (Clerk)

In Attendance: John Fuller (District Councillor), Giles Hankinson (School Governor) and 18 Members of the public.

### 1. Apologies:

Apologies were given by Mrs Beardsell.

Mr Jinks proposed at this point in the meeting, that given the degree of public interest in specific agenda item 6.1 regarding the new application number 2018/1780, that this item is moved up on the agenda and dealt with first. All present agreed.

# 2018/1780 – Proposed outline planning application for a primary school and up to 148 residential units, together with associated highway and landscape works at land east of Norwich Road, Brooke.

Mr Jinks summarised the planning application 2018/1780 and some of the online p/a documents as follows:

- Outline p/a is for a new school, 148 houses and highway works
- Proposed housing mix:
  - o 8 one bed houses
  - o 18 two bed houses
  - o 6 two bed bungalows
  - o 70 three bed houses
  - 6 three bed bungalows
  - $\circ$  31 four bed houses
  - 9 five bed houses
- The application documents include a very detailed pre-application written feedback from a SNC (South Norfolk Council) planning officer - the summary was that the proposals could, with some modifications, satisfy the three tests for sustainable development. SNC policy DM 1.3 states that development can be permitted outside the development boundary if there are overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development
- Norfolk County Council's comments are that there is a need for a new school in the wider catchment area; the earliest date for funding for the school is May 2019 onwards, but this would be subject to judging it against other priority claims on NCC's capital spending
- The applicant's Planning Statement contains the following comments:
  - $\circ$   $\;$  the first phase of development will include the provision of the serviced school site

- 20% of the housing will be "affordable" which is lower than the previously suggested
  29% due to the cost of providing the serviced school site
- there is "identified need" for the new educational and residential uses
- the strategic housing market assessment (SHMA) in June 2017 showed that the current land supply is only 4.38 years, which is below the minimum requirement of 5 years
- the proposed Section 106 Agreement to accompany any planning permission would cover:
  - o provision of "affordable" housing
  - provision of open spaces
  - o off-site highway improvements
  - Mr Jinks said he could find no reference to the s106 Agreement covering the new school.

Mr Jinks expressed the opinion that the Parish Council should recommend refusal of the application for the following reasons:

- The current Local Plan identifies Brooke as a service village with an allocation of 20 new houses, which has already been exceeded by planning permissions granted for around 26
- In his view the new Local Plan to 2036 should allocate around 20 new houses again
- FW's proposal is too large and would damage the scale and character of Brooke
- The proposed roundabout would open up land to the west for more new housing, which the village does not want
- If 148 new houses are approved, this would set an unwanted precedent for more large scale development in Brooke in the future
- The proposal is outside the current development boundary and in his view the provision of a school would not provide "overriding benefits" to justify this
- A s106 Agreement would not guarantee that the school is built
- NCC funding for a new school cannot be guaranteed

Mr Jinks' suggestions for next steps:

- To appoint a planning expert to prepare a detailed response setting out the PC's objections based on planning law and policies
- To consider asking the expert to represent the PC's views at the SNC planning committee meeting, to make best use of the limited time available for verbal comments
- To agree an allocation of funds from the PC's reserves for this appointment, possibly up to £3,000
- To consider the conditions to be imposed if p/p is granted, including:
  - Serviced school site to be provided before any houses are sold
  - The school is built before an agreed number of houses are sold
  - Affordable housing to be at least 29%
  - Developer to provide footpath links to the east of the site, linking with The Street

Mr Jinks said it will be important for members of the public to submit their own individual comments on the p/a to SNC.

Mr Warman stressed that members of the public must state factual information and salient points if objecting to the application, that petitions are not effective, and that as many individual representations as possible must be made.

Mr Tobin suggested that the funds to appoint a planning consultant could be raised independently by asking members of the public to donate. The suggestion was discussed but it was agreed that the Parish Council should fund this appointment.

A member of the public asked whether Mr Spurgeon had made an application and Mr Jinks advised that, to his knowledge, no application has been made.

It was agreed that owing to the importance of letting as many people know about the application as possible, and encouraging as many people as possible to make representations, a leaflet drop to every house in the village should be organised, to include details of how to submit comments. Mr Jinks agreed to draft the wording for the leaflet and circulate for approval by PC members, Mr Tobin volunteered to arrange the printing and Mrs Powell agreed to organise the leaflet drop.

Mr Hankinson, School Governor asked whether if the application is approved, an appeal could be made. Mr Fuller advised that only the applicant can make an appeal. Mr Jinks said he thought that anyone who is unhappy with a planning decision can call for a Judicial Review, but this is limited to challenging the legality of the decision-making process and can be an expensive procedure.

Mr Tobin asked whether the fact that the proposed development land is next to the conservation area boundary will make any difference. Mr Fuller stated that it would not, and that the lack of a 5 year land supply is the key issue. He stated that without this, development boundaries in the current Local Plan are not legally enforceable. What the conservation area status does is control development more tightly.

Mr Warman read an extract from the Conservation Area Document (CAD) regarding scale, appearance etc and stated that if the document is adhered to, there would be no question of a new development such as the one proposed. A member of the public asked if a copy of the CAD could be obtained. Mr Fuller advised that he would make sure it was available on the South Norfolk Council website tomorrow.

Mr Jinks proposed that the application is recommended for refusal. All Councillors were in agreement.

Mr Jinks proposed that a planning consultant is appointed up to a cost of £3000. All Councillors were in agreement.

Mr Jinks also proposed that the County Council should be pressed to reinstate the capital funding for a new school, which all Councillors agreed.

It was also agreed that, if planning consent is granted, conditions should be put in place regarding the provision of the school site, the building of the new school, the number of affordable houses and the creation of footpath links to The Street.

The application deadline for comments is 7<sup>th</sup> September however Mr Fuller was confident that South Norfolk Council would agree an extension of time given that this case will be heard by the Planning Committee and it will probably not be heard until the December meeting. All present agreed that the Clerk would request an extension of time.

With regard to the appointment of a planning expert it was agreed that three parties be approached. A member of the public suggested that Mike Haslam would be a suitable candidate. Mr Warman agreed to approach Mr Haslam and Mr Jinks agreed to identify and approach two other parties.

### 2. Declarations of Interest:

Mr Tobin declared an interest in agenda item 6.1 relating to application number 2018/1474.

### 3. Minutes of full meeting 25<sup>th</sup> June 2018:

The minutes had been previously circulated to all Councillors, they were agreed to be true records and duly signed by Mr Jinks.

### 4. Matters arising from meeting 25<sup>th</sup> June 2018:

### 4.1 Conservation area

A deferment of the Conservation Area Review has been agreed but no timescale has been given. Mr Fuller confirmed that it would be at least a year.

### 4.2 Adoption of phone boxes

Mr Jinks wished to review some of the wording before signing it. It was agreed that a cheque for £1 could be signed and held back until the wording had been agreed.

### 4.3 Bus stops

The Clerk contacted Highways to chase progress on the provision of a new signed bus stop at the crossroads with the B1132, Church Road and Littlebeck Lane. They agreed to chase the Ketteringham depot but have not come back with a response. The Clerk will chase them again.

### 4.4 Finger posts at meres

Mr Tobin is meeting a contractor on site on Thursday 23 Aug to obtain a price for sand-blasting in-situ.

### 4.5 Posts at meres

The posts are ready to be installed and are awaiting the Mens Shed to do the work. Mrs Powell agreed to contact the Mens Shed to progress this work.

### 5. Public meeting 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018:

#### 5.1 Meeting notes

The Clerk and Mrs Powell took notes at the public meeting and had circulated a copy to all Councillors prior to this meeting. All Councillors agreed that they are a true record and they were signed by the Chairman accordingly.

### 5.2 Matters arising

Mr Spinks took a sound recording of the meeting which he had sent to the Clerk via dropbox. The Clerk does not have a dropbox account. Mr Mears expressed concern that, if a sound recording was put on the website via a link to dropbox, it would not be secure and could be interfered with. It was therefore agreed that Mr Spinks would put it on a memory stick (to be provided by the PC) which the Clerk will store in a secure place.

### 6. Planning:

### 6.1 New and amended planning applications.

### 2018/1533 – Proposed front extension to dwelling, for the creation of additional parking space and other minor alterations to 8, Old Hall Gardens.

The application was recommended for refusal with the following comments:

The Parish Council recommends refusal on the grounds that this is part of the conservation area and we are not happy with the proposed demolition of the existing old front wall, which we feel should be retained with its existing materials and without the addition of new windows.

### 2018/1178 – Proposed 2 storey extension and alterations to 87, The Street.

The application was recommended for refusal with the following comments: The Parish Council recommends refusal on the grounds that the proposal would introduce vehicles onto the footpath at the point where there is no visibility round the 90 degree corner. The proposed extension should be amended so that vehicular access onto the site can remain in its existing position between 83/5 and 87 The Street, and this should continue to be the only vehicular access to the property.

Following further consideration of this application, further comments were then made as follows:

The Parish Council have further considered this application. In view of the Parish Council's concerns about the safety of people using the footpath, we recommend that, if planning permission is granted, it should include a condition that physical safety measures are introduced on the footpath to minimise the risk of collision between people and vehicles. Please take into consideration these further comments when you are considering this application.

## 2018/1474 and 2018/1519 (listed building)– Proposed removal of existing garden room and replacement with new extension and new extensions to kitchen and studio areas at The Porch House, 32 The Street.

The application was recommended for approval subject to the conservation officer being happy.

### 2018/1515 – Proposed rear and front extension and conversion of garage to bedroom to 5, Dovecote Close.

The application was recommended for approval.

### 2018/1687 – Proposed removal and replacement of 2 front elevation windows at 23, The Street.

The application was recommended for approval.

### 2018/1733 – Proposal building of 2 storey oak posted carport with tiled roof.

The application was recommended for approval.

### 6.2 Planning appeal – 2017/2141 – Proposed replacement of 49/49A, High Green with 2 new dwellings.

The Parish Council had previously recommended this application for refusal. It was agreed to reiterate the comments previously made.

### 6.3 Neighbourhood Plan

Mr Jinks and Mr Mears attended a meeting at South Norfolk Council. The creation of a Neighbourhood Plan is a long and complicated process which can take up to 2 years. Having a NP does not stop new development, even in a conservation area, but may give more leverage as to where the allocated new development would go within the parish. The cost would be around £10-15,000 and is a massive undertaking, requiring significant local support. Mr Jinks said that a similar exercise at Mulbarton culminated with a local referendum which produced a turnout of less than 20%. On balance, it was agreed that it would be a huge amount of work and money for very little gain and would not be pursued.

### 6.4 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The Clerk advised that 15% of the CIL received from developers goes to the Parish Council. Mr Jinks asked if the other 85% could be allocated specifically to Brooke by SNDC. Mr Fuller advised no, it is distributed more widely. A member of the public asked if a developer gifting land for a new school would be exempt from paying CIL and Mr Fuller confirmed not.

### 7. County and District Councillors reports:

Mr Stone (County Councillor) was not present to give a report.

Mr Fuller (District Councillor) reported that the work goes on in providing broadband to outlying properties in rural areas.

### 8. School Governor report:

There was no one present to give a report on behalf of the School Governors.

### 9. Public Spaces:

### 9.1 Meres

The water level is currently low revealing some fallen branches which need to be removed. Mr Harrison feels that the meres are in need of some maintenance work. He feels that current maintenance being carried out by Clinks Care Farm needs to be reviewed. It was agreed to meet at the meres at 9.30am on Saturday 15<sup>th</sup> September to agree what needs to be done.

### 9.2 Bollards

The reflective material on the bollards on Norwich Road has peeled and is no longer reflective. The bollards are non-lit so now present a hazard. It was agreed that the Clerk would report them to Highways and copy in Barry Stone as previous notifications to the Highways rangers has not resulted in action.

There is also an ash tree on the verge outside number 37 Norwich Road which is obstructing the footpath and reducing visibility. The Clerk will report this to Highways.

### 10. Finance

### 10.1Clerk's financial statement

The Clerk's financial statement was circulated prior to the meeting, and was accepted by all present.

### 10.2 Cheques to be authorised

The following cheques were approved and signed accordingly:

£10.00	Brooke Methodist Church	Hall hire
£88.40	M Tobin	Reimbursement of printing costs
£2304.60	Clinks Care Farm	Grass cutting, meres maintenance, village sign area
£45.20	J Andrews	Overtime

### 11. Parish Council Administration:

### 11.1 Annual Audit

The Clerk submitted the required forms to PKF Littlejohn and published documents on the website and noticeboards. PKF Littlejohn acknowledged receipt. The Parish Council has therefore fully complied with requirements and there is nothing more to be done regarding the 2017/18 financial year.

### 11.2 P C website

The Clerk updated Councillors as to recent updates to the Parish Council website. She invited Councillors to make suggestions as to possible improvements. All Councillors were satisfied that the current website is satisfactory.

### 11.3 Timing of issuing of minutes

Mr Tobin suggested that the procedure for approving and publicising minutes of meetings should be reviewed. The current procedure is that draft minutes are prepared by the Clerk and circulated to Councillors and then approved at the following meeting, after which they are published on the website. This procedure also applies to the Annual Parish Meeting minutes, which are therefore not approved and published until after the next APM, a year later. Mr Tobin suggested that it would helpful for members of the public to be able to see the minutes as soon as possible after each meeting. Mr Jinks proposed that draft minutes for all PC meetings should be prepared by the Clerk, reviewed by the Chairman, then circulated to Councillors and simultaneously publicised as draft on the website pending formal approval at the next PC meeting. All Councillors agreed.

### 11.4 Social media

It was suggested at the last meeting that the Parish Council should set up a Facebook page to provide up to the minute updates on parish matters. It was agreed that the Parish Council already has a website for up to date information, and that extra resource would be required to administer a Facebook account. Concern was expressed that not everyone has access to Facebook therefore it would not be reliable method of communicating with the whole village. The Clerk already administers the website and uses the noticeboards, the Parish magazine and occasional leaflet drops to keep people up to date. Mr Jinks proposed that the current tools for disseminating information would continue for the present time. Mr Warman seconded the proposal with all present in agreement.

### 12. Brooke play park

The Play Park Committee has recruited four new people and hopes to have a full committee again very soon. They are currently obtaining another quote for repairs/replacement of the damaged equipment.

### 13. Correspondence:

The Clerk asked Councillors if they were happy with the current procedure for disseminating information, which is to email relevant information as it comes in and not then repeat it at meetings. Discussion at PC meetings is limited to correspondence not previously circulated, and to record decisions made between meetings by email exchanges between PC member. All Councillors agreed.

### 14. Items for Agenda of next meeting 8<sup>th</sup> October:

Phone boxes The Kings Head (Mr Harrison to seek clarification on the purchase) Bus Stop Meres - Finger posts Maintenance Roadside posts

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 9.55pm.