

Original message -----

From: Sally Metcalf

Date: 10/02/2019 22:05 (GMT+01:00)

To: "'edward.jinks'" <edward.jinks@btopenworld.com>

Subject: RE: Parish Council

Mr. Jinks,

Thank you for your reply, may I request that this correspondence be posted on the PC website, it is so important that people can access all and any information and make their own decisions of what is right or wrong and we should all look to our own consciences with regards to this matter.

I personally don't think the attitude of 'hold your breath and hope for the best' is the way to go.

Thank you for your time.

Sally Metcalf.

From: edward.jinks [mailto:edward.jinks@btopenworld.com]

Sent: 07 February 2019 00:06

To: Sally Metcalf

Cc: jo andrews

Subject: Parish Council

Sally,

Thank you for your email of 4 Feb.

Jo's email of 25 Jan explained what was agreed at the PC meeting on 14 Jan following our discussion about your proposal for a PC-backed petition. The meeting was attended by 8 of the 9 PC members, so it would be wrong for me to act in contravention of that decision.

My recent email to John Fuller asking him to support the PC in resisting the FW proposal followed my verbal request to him at our August meeting. At that time he said he would not advise his personal views until nearer the time of the DMC meeting. His latest response is in a similar vein. As the meeting has been deferred yet again, I will reiterate the question a week or so before the confirmed DMC meeting date.

I will circulate the contents of your email, and this reply, to other PC members so that they are aware of your comments ahead of our next meeting on 25 Feb.

Edward

Sent from Samsung tablet.

----- Original message -----

From: Sally Metcalf

Date: 04/02/2019 12:28 (GMT+00:00)

To: edward.jinks@btopenworld.com

Subject: RE:

Dear Mr. Jinks,

I hope you don't mind that I am writing to you directly, William gave me your email address and as the next PC meeting is not until the 23rd Feb. I thought this may speed up the process.

The figure of over 99% objection to the proposal sounds good but that's 99% of those that have bothered to comment either way. There are about 250 objections to the FW application, many of which are not from Brooke residents. Although this number of objections is unusually high I would not call it a demonstration of 'widespread resistance', there are around 1400 residents in Brooke so even if the 250 objections were all from Brooke it is still a small percentage and as I have experienced Mr. Fuller tactics first hand I would expect him to highlight this point and he would not be incorrect..

I don't know how you have come to the conclusion that 250 objections and a 'good number of faces' is the best way to influence the planning committee but I feel there is much more that can be done.

A petition of 250 signatures may have less value than 250 individual objections but a petition of 500+ signatures in addition to 250 individual objections can only add worthwhile weight. Official online petitions to governments and organisations take place all the time, you've probably taken part yourself on occasions, they do have an effect. Why not keep trying until the whistle blows?

I read Mr. Fuller's atrocious response to the Parish Councils request for his support. Are the Parish Council going to accept that rubbish? Are they going to respond?

This man tried to take advantage of the Parish Council in January 2018 the moment he told his developer acquaintance to telephone the Parish Council as they were open to large scale development. That was scandalous.

The current construction of the application and whether it will get to committee has no bearing on his ability to comment and I would like to know the reason why he feels it would not do the 'objectors' case any good if he did. He can and should answer your question irrespective of the state of the 5 year land supply or the absence of the government's latest housing methodology. As for only commenting on an application that is capable of being determined one way or another, what exactly does that mean? Isn't any and every application in whatever form, capable of being determined one way

or another? And why does he feel he should be the judge of this, surely that is for the planners.

He needs no further information than, an application has been made for 148 houses in Brooke, to let the PC and residents know if he will support the village in objecting to the FW proposal. His lack of willingness to give his support now is extremely concerning and actually indicates to South Norfolk Council, South Norfolk Planners, Brooke Parish Council and the residents of Brooke that he is in support of this application but does not want to risk his re-election.

Will you ask Mr. Fuller, 'Do you support the principle of large scale development in Brooke'?

After all, we have been told by the officers that it is only an outline application which is to establish the development in principle however once the 'principle' has been established there is no going back and we could end up with a far worse situation.

Kind Regards,

Sally Metcalf.

From: jo andrews [<mailto:joanna-andrews@hotmail.co.uk>]

Sent: 25 January 2019 07:48

To: Sally Metcalf

Subject: Re: feed-back

Dear Sally,

We discussed your email at the PC meeting on 14 Jan, in particular your proposal for a PC-backed petition. The PC's view is that petitions are of very limited value and are not an effective way of influencing decision-makers. We believe that individual letters from many people expressing their individual thoughts is a more effective way of demonstrating widespread resistance to a particular proposal. There have been very many letters submitted to SNC about the FW planning application, with over 99% objecting to the proposal. This is very strong evidence of public feeling. The PC feels that this, together with a good number of people turning up at the DMC meeting, is the best way of influencing the planning decision.

John Fuller's response to our latest request for his support in objecting to the planning application is on the PC website. In essence he is reserving his position until it is clear what is being proposed by FW, and the government's review of the five-year land supply is published. John expressed his personal view is that the application won't be heard until "much later" than Feb 2019.

Kind regards

Jo Andrews

From: Sally Metcalf

Sent: 22 January 2019 21:04

To: 'jo andrews'

Subject: RE: feed-back

Dear Jo,

Thank you for reading out my comments/questions/suggestions, could you tell me if the responses were positive or negative and if the PC will be taking any of them on-board? As I said I am more than willing to help and I think it would be an extraordinarily positive step for the PC as Mr. Fuller and South Norfolk Planning don't seem to pay heed to anything Brooke PC suggests, maybe 'people power' could give you, the PC a little more 'clout'!

Kind regards,

Sally.

From: jo andrews [<mailto:joanna-andrews@hotmail.co.uk>]

Sent: 19 January 2019 15:05

To: Sally Metcalf

Subject: Re: Confirmation

Dear Sally,

Thank you for your emails.

As you know, the Parish Council met on Monday 14th January at which I read out your first email. The Parish Council noted your comments accordingly.

Kind regards

Jo Andrews

Clerk

From: Sally Metcalf

Sent: 17 January 2019 21:53

To: joanna-andrews@hotmail.co.uk

Subject: Re: Confirmation

Could you please confirm that you received my email dated 13/01/19.

Regards,

Sally.

Sally Metcalf
Sun 13/01/2019 20:35
You

□

Hello Jo,

I am afraid I will not be able to attend the Parish Council Meeting on Monday 14th January 2018 but I would like to know if the Parish Council is actively fighting the planning application by F.W.

Properties and if so how?

Are you 'canvassing' the village for support?

Are you taking round a petition for those in the village that do not do computers and would not really 'make a fuss' as they think there is nothing they can do?

Are you calling on John Fuller to declare his position on this subject? If he does not support the village in opposing this application could we have a village vote of 'no confidence' in his representation of Brooke?

The Parish Council are spending 'Parish' funds on opposing the application, surely we should be wearing out some Parish shoe leather to solicit the most opposition we can possibly generate?

You may be saying "why don't you do it"? to which I would reply, "more than happy to but 'jo blogs' going door to door does not carry the weight that an organisation like the Parish Council does".

There would be a lot of people who would be happy to go 'door to door' in the village as representatives of the Parish Council point of view, it may actually connect the Parish Council to the people it can be both enlightening and empowering, if you need shoe leather let me know, if we do not 'win' this one, this village is lost.

Regards,

Sally Metcalf.