

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF BROOKE PARISH COUNCIL HELD AT 7.30PM ON MONDAY 3RD
DECEMBER 2018 AT BROOKE METHODIST CHURCH**

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

In Attendance: Members of the public.

1. Apologies:

Apologies were received from Mrs Powell, Mr Sanford and Mr Stone (County Councillor).

2. Declarations of Interest:

Mr Tobin made a declaration of interest regarding item 5.1 on the agenda in connection with application number 2018/2638.

3. Minutes of full meetings on 1st and 8th October 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 meetings 1st and 8th October 2018:

4.1. Adoption of phone boxes

This item was deferred until the next meeting.

4.2. The Kings Head pub

Mr Jinks expressed concerns regarding the delayed purchase, by the tenant, of The Kings Head, which is a registered 'Asset of Community Value'. The Parish Council served notice in December 2017 which triggered a 6 months moratorium on the owner's previous proposal to sell the pub by auction. The moratorium ended in June, by which time it was hoped that the tenant would have completed the purchase. The purchase has still not been completed but the tenant has advised that the sale should complete in January 2019.

4.3. Bus stops

The Clerk had contacted Highways again to chase progress on the provision of a new signed bus stop at the crossroads with the B1132, Church Road and Littlebeck Lane. They once again 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 advised that it is not the right time of year to sand blast and wash the finger posts for repainting. This work should be carried out in the spring. In the meantime, Mr Tobin will obtain a quote for re-painting which will need to be done (or at least the primer) within a day or two or they will start to rust.

4.5. Posts at meres

The new posts have been installed by The Mens Shed. Previously, they had advised that they would not invoice for the work specifically but would welcome a financial

contribution for their labours. Mrs Beardsell will find out how long the job took and whether they had a figure in mind.

4.6. New bench at the meres

Mr Mears advised that he had looked in to the possibility of installing a new bench on the verge at the meres where there is an unofficial bus stop opposite the White Lion pub. It had been suggested that the bench should carry a dedication to Adrian Gunson. He advised that the bus stops in a different place depending on which direction it is coming from. There is no natural step up on to the verge. The matter was discussed, including whether it would need a concrete plinth, which way the bench would face and whether a double sided one would be suitable. Mr Mears will make further enquiries, including with Trish Gunson to gauge her feelings about a dedication.

4.7. CIL

CIL funds have been received in the sum of £12,178.00. This money cannot be spent on general maintenance. It was agreed that this sum should be kept separate as a reserve amount in order that it can be properly accounted for.

4.8. Assets of Community Value

Mr Mears is in the process of renewing the Asset of Community Value status of The White Lion pub. Mrs Beardsell will look into whether a strip of land around the conservation area can be listed to provide protection against development. The Clerk will find out how long status lasts before renewal is required.

4.9. Play park

Aaron Patel, Play Park Committee Chairman gave a short report, summarised as follows: A new Committee has been formed, comprising 5 members who are dedicated to ensuring that the play park is reopened. Much of the equipment is dangerous and must be removed as a matter of priority. Some equipment can be reused. Quotes are being obtained to remove the existing equipment for which they have sufficient funds. The intention is to reopen the park with minimal equipment as soon as possible and then obtain further grants to fully reinstate new equipment. The PPC would like to request funding from the CIL monies. Mr Jinks proposed that a separate meeting is arranged between representatives from the Parish Council and the Play Park Committee.

5. Planning:

5.1. New and amended planning applications.

2018/2290- Proposed extension and build new garage to The Bungalow, Howe Lane.

The application was recommended for approval as an improvement to an existing dwelling.

2018/2007 – Proposed replacement of signage to front of property and road signs. All with new company logo at 11, The Street.

The application was recommended for approval subject to the tops of the freestanding signs being no higher than 1.2 metres.

2018/2006 – Proposed replacement of all existing windows and external doors and external lighting, repainting of property at 11, The Street.

The application was recommended for approval.

2018/2308 – Proposed 2 new bungalows with integral garages at Land North of the Bungalow, Howe Lane.

The application was recommended for refusal with the following comments:

1. the site is outside the village development boundary - the PC strongly believes that the development line must not be breached during the life of the Local Plan, which was agreed after extensive consultation
2. the Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Local Plan both identify Brooke as a service village which should accommodate no more than 20 new dwellings during the life of the current Local Plan
3. in our view there are no material considerations that would justify departing from the current Local Plan - the housing need projections in the SHMA (June 2017) are at odds with the more recent projections by the Office of National Statistics, so the JCS (and the development boundaries in the current SNLP) should continue to apply until the government issues its revised standard method for assessing housing need
4. planning permissions have already been granted in Brooke which exceed the 20 new dwellings anticipated in the current Local Plan, so further permissions are not justified
5. there are no overriding reasons for permitting development outside the village development line, so any such development would be against current SNC planning policy
6. the site is in a rural location well away from the main village of Brooke, with no physical links to the village
7. the proposed development would not be a natural extension to the village and would create a mini-settlement away from the main village
8. although the site adjoins an existing dwelling, this is essentially a country lane; development would amount to developing in open countryside
9. the site is one mile away from the services available in Brooke, which would only be accessible by vehicle transport - new development here would not therefore be sustainable

2018/2338 – Proposed porch to front of dwelling at 40, Burgess Way

The application was recommended for approval.

2018/2263 – Proposed rear extension (revision to consent 2017/1567) to 32, Brecon Road.

The application was recommended for approval subject to the 1st floor windows being obscure glazed on the side elevations as to not create privacy issues for neighbouring properties.

2018/2547 – Proposed variation of condition of permission 2018/0868 to Land North of Howe Lane

This is an amendment to an application recommended for refusal by the Parish Council but approved by SNDC. There was some debate as to whether to recommend the amendments for refusal on the basis that the original application had been recommended for refusal. On balance, it was agreed that Councillors would study the detail of the amendment on the SNDC website and forward their comments to the Clerk.

Mr Tobin raised concerns regarding SNDC's agenda regarding new builds which they consider 'self builds'. He stated that SNDC are encouraging builders to build more properties than they had originally planned. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to the Chief Planning Officer, copying in John Fuller raising these questions.

2018/2638 – Proposed erection of single storey detached dwelling at land rear of 29, The Street.

The application was recommended for refusal with the following comments:
The proposal would be outside the Local Development line. It would be a back land development and would break out into open countryside.

5.2. 2018/1780 – Proposed new development on Norwich Road

The application was recommended for refusal with the following comments:

“Brooke Parish Council very strongly objects to this planning application. If approved it would result in a break out into open countryside (the whole development would be outside the village development boundary), would adversely impact the setting of the Conservation Area (which directly adjoins the site), would lead to an increase of some 30% in the population of the village, and create a dangerous precedent not only for Brooke but also for other South Norfolk villages. We feel that the proposal is totally unacceptable for a small village with few public services. Our main reasons for objecting are set out in the following paragraphs.

Planning Policy

The application fails to comply with the policies in either the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) or the South Norfolk Local Plan and we feel there are no overriding benefits to justify approval.

The JCS identifies Brooke as a service village where “land will be allocated for small-scale housing development subject to form and character considerations...it is envisaged that allocations will be within the range of 10 – 20 dwellings in each Service Village”

South Norfolk Local Plan (SNLP)

1. the Site Allocations DPD identifies Brooke as a “Service Village in which land will be allocated for small scale housing growth in the period 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2026, within the range 10-20 dwellings, subject to form, character and servicing constraints”
2. Planning permissions have already been granted for a total of 30 new dwellings in Brooke in the Plan period
3. Policy DM1.3 The sustainable location of new development

1) All new development should be located so that it positively contributes to the sustainable development of South Norfolk as led by the Local Plan. The Council will work with developers to promote and achieve proposals that are:

- (a) Located on Allocated Sites or within the development boundaries of Settlements defined on the Policies Map, comprising the Norwich Fringe, Main Towns, Key Service Centres, Service Villages and Other Villages; and
- (b) Of a scale proportionate to the level of growth planned in that location, and the role and function of the Settlement within which it is located, as defined in the Local Plan.

2) Permission for development in the Countryside outside of the defined development boundaries of Settlements will only be granted if:

- c) Where specific Development Management Policies allow for development outside of development boundaries or
- d) Otherwise demonstrates overriding benefits in terms of economic, social and environment dimensions as addressed in Policy 1.1. “

4. Policy DM 4.10 Heritage Assets

4.1. The last part of this policy states:

“Proposals which adversely affect the significance of a heritage asset will only exceptionally be permitted where clear and convincing justification is provided.”

As the application fails to comply with either the JCS or policies DM1.3 and DM4.10 of the SNLP, we feel it should be rejected.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018

The following extract is particularly relevant to this application:

“192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.”*

In our view the application meets none of the NPPF 2018 criteria and should be rejected.

The 5 Year Land Supply Issue

The JCS is less than 5 years old and it is still appropriate to use its housing requirement for assessing this application having regard to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 1994. This Act requires planning decisions to be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

We do not believe that there are material considerations to justify approving this application (and departing from the development plan) bearing in mind the recent conflicting calculations of future housing requirements.

In June 2017 an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was published for Central Norfolk (the Greater Norwich authorities plus North Norfolk and Breckland). The SHMA assessed the Objectively Assessed Need for housing between 2015 and 2036 using the then most recent evidence available. The SHMA indicated that the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing in the South Norfolk Rural Policy Area (RPA) is significantly greater than the annual housing requirement under the adopted JCS: an annual requirement of 326 homes per annum in the SHMA compared to 132 homes per annum in the JCS.

However, the Government issued a new standard method for assessing household need in July 2018 and the use of this method will be a requirement for all Local Plans submitted for examination after 24 Jan 2019. The housing requirement figures for the emerging new Local Plan have not yet been published and in these circumstances we urge the District Council to be extremely cautious and adopt the cautionary principle. We ask you to continue using the JCS housing requirement as the basis for making decisions on planning applications for housing in the rural area until new figures are adopted in accordance with the Government's standard method for assessing household need.

If, following the re-calculation of housing need, a deficit remains in the rural part of South Norfolk we believe that such need should be met across a range of villages, rather than by such a large amount of development in one small village as is proposed by this application.

Impact on the Brooke Conservation Area

The southern part of the application site abuts the conservation area and the proposed development therefore impacts on its setting. The duties imposed on the District Council by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 apply to the consideration of this application:

“General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.

(1) In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.”

The application must also be considered against the policies contained in the current Brooke & Kirstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal (June 2002). This includes Policy BEN 17 - Development in Conservation Areas, which provides that:

*“planning permission will not be granted for development proposals in Conservation Areas **or proposals outside Conservation Areas** but which would affect the character, appearance, setting or views into or out of the*

Conservation Area”unless the criteria specified can be met by the proposals.

The application clearly will, if approved, have a negative impact on the setting of the conservation area and this is recognised by the Heritage Statement submitted by Bidwells (on behalf of the applicant) in support of the application.

Furthermore Historic England (HE) has concerns about the impact of the proposed development on the conservation area and have made the following recommendation to the Council:

“Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds due to the large amount and density of development proposed. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 184, 192, 193, 194, 196 and 200 of the NPPF. In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.”

We share HE’s concerns which we feel justify refusal of this application.

The Proposed School Site

A new school site is demonstrably not required to serve a development of 148 dwellings in Brooke and this has been publicly confirmed by the chair of the School Governors. The existing school has 97 pupils, but has capacity for up to 150, so there is plenty of room for growth.

The applicant is proposing that the provision of a new school site is secured by a Section 106 obligation, but in our view such an arrangement would not satisfy the relevant statutory tests for s106 Agreements.

Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 applies:

“Limitation on use of planning obligations

122.—(1) This regulation applies where a relevant determination is made which results in planning permission being granted for development.

(2) A planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is—

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

(b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.”

This statutory limitation is backed up by the following extract from the NPPF 2018:

“56. Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
- b) directly related to the development; and*
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.”*

It is clear from the above that the proposed section 106 obligation for a new school site would not satisfy any of the three statutory tests. In these circumstances we feel that the District Council cannot grant planning permission based on such an obligation.

If a new school is required to serve a wider area (Brooke, Poringland, Stoke Holy Cross, Alington and Bergh Apton) then Poringland, with its much larger population and better public transport links, is a more logical location. This begs the question as to why a new school site was not sought when the planning applications for substantial numbers of new houses in Poringland (which were approved) were at the application stage. We do not feel that such a requirement should be imposed on the small conservation village of Brooke, particularly as it would involve a large number of unwanted new houses.

The submitted plans do not make adequate provision for parking for parents collecting their children at the end of the school day and we note that this point has also been picked up by county highways in their comments on the application. Currently some 36 parents' cars are parked daily on High Green to collect children from the existing village school, which currently has only 97 pupils. It is inevitable that a fully populated new 210 place school (with many children from other villages in the wider catchment area) will generate far more vehicles - the application does not make adequate provision for these.

Vehicular access to the development

We consider the proposed roundabout junction on the B1332 to be inappropriate and unacceptable.

Firstly the roundabout as proposed in the application would not be off-line, meaning that it would be built effectively on the existing highway, causing major disruption to traffic during its construction. Brooke road users have suffered severe traffic disruption on the B1332 in Poringland over the last two years - we feel it would be unreasonable to impose further misery on road users for a prolonged period.

Secondly a roundabout on the B1332 would potentially open up land to the west for further extensive housing development, which we would not want.

For both reasons we feel that a T-junction would be more suitable than the proposed roundabout.

Pedestrian Access to the village from the development and the School Site

The application proposes three new footpath-only accesses between the development and the rest of the village. We feel that the design of these footpaths

is inadequate as they will not be fully accessible to all potential users. They need to be hard-surfaced and wide enough to allow children in pushchairs and the elderly in wheelchairs or mobility scooters to gain traffic-free access to the rest of the village from the development and the School site.

One of the proposed footpath links is across the village hall playing field, which would not be possible to achieve. There has been no discussion about this proposed link between the developer and the Village Hall Committee (VHC), who are responsible for the management and maintenance of the Village Hall site, including the football pitch.

The VHC will not agree to the creation of a footpath link across the playing field.

The existing football pitch actually extends across the whole site to the western and eastern boundaries of the playing field - the outline of the pitch shown on the application plans is not correct and is therefore misleading. If a footpath were constructed in the position shown on the application plans the football pitch would fall below FA Standards.

Affordable Housing

We consider that the application should include full compliance with the District Council's adopted affordable housing policies. For the reasons set out above, we do not accept that the new school site is a necessary requirement of the development and is not therefore a justifiable reason for reducing the provision for affordable housing.

Viability Study

We feel that the viability study submitted in support of the application is fundamentally flawed and must be re-written. It wrongly refers to the provision of a new school site, which is demonstrably not required to service the proposed development. It should include the effects of full compliance with the District Council's affordable housing policies.

Surface Water Drainage

We are concerned about surface water drainage in the area, which is a serious issue due to the clay sub-soil. The recently built new houses on Norwich Road that back onto the application site are experiencing surface water drainage problems, including the flooding of gardens, despite their drainage arrangements having apparently been recently approved.

We are also aware of existing ground water and run-off issues experienced by the residential properties abutting the southern boundary of the proposed site as described in the objection letter (with photographs) submitted by the owners of 7 The Street.

We remain to be convinced that the arrangements proposed for this site will not exacerbate the current problems.

Summary

We firmly believe that our comments in this note confirm that the application does not comply with any of the adopted planning policies for Brooke, and has not taken account of the advice contained in paragraph 192 of the NPPF.

For the reasons set out above we believe that the applicant's assumption that there is no longer a 5 year land supply in the rural area of South Norfolk is flawed and the application should accordingly be refused.

The application will have a negative impact on the Brooke Conservation Area. The District Council has a general duty under the Listed Buildings Act 1990 - special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The advice of Historic England is clear, the application is unacceptable.

A new school site is not required to serve the development and the proposed section 106 obligation does not accord with the requirements of CIL Regulation 122 or NPPF 2018. There are also detailed matters of concern about the school site set out above.

The application does not comply with the council's policy for the provision of affordable houses.

Conclusion

We urge the District Council to refuse planning permission for the development"

Claire Curtis has advised that the application will not be heard at the December Planning Committee meeting. It will now be discussed at the meeting in January (date to be advised).

Mr Patel (Play Park Committee Chairman) advised that when contacting Mr Fuller, District Councillor regarding grants for the new play area, he was told to hold off replacing equipment until they could take advantage of section 106 re: the new development. The PPC wished it to be recorded that they were disassociating themselves with this and would be going ahead with their existing plans.

6. GNLP – New, Revised and Small Sites Consultation:

The consultation for new, revised and small sites is open until 14th December 2018. Mr Mears felt that in the climate of the new development proposal looming, commenting on individual smaller sites would not be appropriate. He suggested that the PC should reject all sites as Brooke has already had building over and above its allocation and if the PC were to indicate that it would accept any of the smaller sites proposed, Brooke could end up with the new development and these smaller builds as well. Mr Tobin felt that it would be dangerous to resist all proposed sites as it gives the impression that the PC is not open to any development which could weaken its credibility. Mike Haslam had given advice as to how to respond to each additional site put forward and the contents were discussed. It was

agreed that the Clerk would submit comments refusing each individual site using wording to be agreed with Councillors.

7. Speed restriction request:

A letter had been received from Mr Travis of Joydon House at the Brooke Industrial Park. He had made a request to Highways for a speed restriction of 40mph for the stretch of the B1332 from the Industrial Park to Brooke Village. Highways have advised him that individual requests cannot be considered and that any such requests should come through the Parish Council. He has concerns over safety and noise as since a turning lane was created at the entrance to the Industrial Park, vehicles tend to take a straight line across the newly created bend, running over the road studs as they do so. Councillors agreed that safety is a particular concern at this location due to the traffic movements to and from the Industrial Park and The Dove Pub and that a 40MPH restriction would be a good idea. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to Highways (copying in Mr Stone and Mr Travis) supporting Mr Travis' request and reinforcing the safety concerns raised.

8. County and District Councillors reports:

Neither Mr Stone or Mr Fuller were present to give a report.

9. School Governor report:

Mr Hankinson (Chair of Governors) sent his apologies but forwarded his report which the Clerk summarised as follows:

“The children and staff have all worked incredibly hard during the term, and are now very much looking forward to the Christmas break. A precursor to this, is of course the school Christmas Fayre and we would like to give special mention to both the PTFA who did so much to make this event happen, and to the organisations within the Parish (and also from the wider area), who gave so generously. The donations were even more meaningful, as they were given without thought to receiving anything in return, and being a Church of England school this matches the ethos we teach the children.

We would also like to express our thanks to all the families and friends who supported the event, as the moneys raised by the PTFA at events such as this, enable the school to provide educational enhancements for the children, that it would otherwise be unable to afford.

To help parents and carers with childcare, the breakfast club has been complemented with the addition of a new afterschool club. This launched last week November and provides much needed flexibility for working parents and carers.

The school has also produced a fantastic new prospectus, a copy of which can be obtained from the school secretary.”

10. Accident on B1332 (Norwich Road):

Following the recent fatal accident on the B1332 by the bollards to the North of the village, the safety concerns over the bollards was discussed again. The accident occurred in the early hours of the morning and it appears that there were no witnesses. The Police are investigating the cause of the accident. Councillors felt that the fact that the bollards are not lit and the reflective covering is defective may have been a contributory factor. Concerns over the safety of the bollards have been raised with Highways several times but no action has been taken. All Councillors agreed that the bollards are dangerous and should be removed altogether. The Clerk will write to Highways stating that the Parish Council has had longstanding concerns regarding visibility of the bollards and would like them removed.

11. Number 87 bus service:

A member of the public; Mrs Sanders contacted the Clerk to advise that the number 87 bus service (Konect) which stops in Brooke at 10 to the hour is being withdrawn as from January 2019. The 88 service, which stops in Brooke at 20 past the hour will continue. Mrs Sanders explained that concessionary bus passes cannot be used before 9.30am so the first bus they will be able to catch in the morning would be 10.20am. She was concerned that services are being reduced. Councillors agreed that it was disappointing to see services reduced but understood that the 87 service was underused. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to Konect expressing disappointment.

12. Public Spaces:

Mr Jinks reported that he, Mrs Powell, Mr Harrison and Mr Warman had met with Doeke from Clinks Care Farm to discuss additional annual maintenance works required at the meres and some one- off works needed more immediately. A quote has been received for £300.00 + VAT for additional annual works and £650.00 + VAT for the one off works. The 3 year contract with CCF is now at an end. They have quoted £1591 + VAT for grounds maintenance excluding any additional works which is a 5% uplift from the previous contract. The contract for the next growing season and the additional annual maintenance works will be discussed at the next meeting once the precept has been discussed and the Parish Council's financial position is clearer. Mr Mears proposed that the quote for one off works of £650.00 + VAT is accepted. Mr Harrison seconded the proposal with all present in agreement.

A quote of £145.00 has been received from Simon Aylmer for cutting back the trees on the Brecon Road amenity area which are overhanging the footpaths and highways. Mr Mears proposed that the quote is accepted. Mrs Beardsell seconded the proposal with all present in favour. The Clerk will check with Robin Taylor at SNDC whether permission is required.

The metal fence around the meres has been damaged (probably by vehicle collision) at the west end of the west mere by the large oak tree. The fence is owned by Highways. The Clerk will report it.

The benches at either end of the meres need some maintenance. The Clerk will ask Clinks Care Farm to quote to refurbish them as they did with the ones at the village sign area.

13. Finance

13.1 Clerk's financial statement

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

13.2 Cheques to be authorised

The following cheques were approved and signed accordingly:

£10.00	Brooke Methodist Church	Hall hire
£390.00	South Norfolk District Council	Balance of dog bin emptying (2017/18)
£954.60	Clinks Care Farm Ltd	Grass cutting
£588.00	South Norfolk District Council	Dog bin emptying (2018/19)

13.3 Cheques to be authorised from the Village Hall account

£350.00	D G Howard	Shed base
£2350.00	J Riches Sheds	New shed

13.4 Precept

The Clerk had prepared draft precept calculations for consideration prior to the next meeting. SNDC will be sending precept request forms with details of the tax base and top up grant in the next few days. The deadline for returning the completed precept request form is 21st January 2019.

14. Parish Council Administration:**14.1 Meeting dates**

It was agreed that the next meeting would take place on 14th January to sign off the precept request form. The Clerk will send Councillors suggested further meeting dates for agreement.

15. Correspondence:

No correspondence had been received which had not already been discussed.

16. Items for Agenda of next meeting:

Phone boxes
 The Kings Head
 Bus Stop
 Assets of Community Value
 Play park
 Meres - Finger posts
 New bench
 Precept
 Play park
 2018/1780 – Proposed new development on Norwich Road

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.00pm