

**Minutes of Deopham and Hackford Parish Council Meeting  
in the Gralix Hall on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> August 2018**

**Present:**

Councillor : Jacqui Phoenix                      Martin Skidmore  
                  Chris Biggs                                Chris Coath  
                  Jayne Allan

Cllr. Yvonne Bendle - South Norfolk Council

Parish Clerk : Rowena Harkness

Parishioners : Bruce Catmur, Liz & Alastair Whyte, Janette & Nigel Delbarre, Rachel Lee, Mark & Tracy Fillingham.

**1. Apologies** - John Chilvers, Mark Howard, Cllr. M. Dewsbury – Norfolk County Council

**2. Declarations of Interest**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest

**3. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> July 2018 were agreed as a correct record.  
Proposed Martin Skidmore, seconded Chris Coath.

**4. Matters Arising**

4.1 The Lilacs, Church Lane, Hackford NR18 9HN – (App. No. 2018/0723) – change of use of paddock to residential curtilage, new vehicle access and car parking. Approval given

4.2 Hall Farm Barns, 1 Low Common, Deopham, Norfolk NR18 9DZ – (App. No. 2018/1403) - erection of porch. Revised proposals submitted as previous plans not acceptable to listed building officer. Parish Council agreed no further comments to make.

4.3 Recruitment of new Parish Clerk – the interviews were held on Monday evening and it was agreed to appoint the person subject to references and confirmation by this meeting to appoint her. The meeting confirmed it was happy for the appointment to go ahead.

**5. Planning**

5.1 Poultry sheds east of Ivy House, Victoria Lane, Deopham (App. No. 2018/1516) – Demolition of existing poultry buildings and erection of replacement poultry buildings, hard standings and drainage attenuation pond (revised).

5,2 The Parish Clerk gave an overview of the revised application which includes a change of the type of poultry farm. It will be a floor rearing system for pullets involving the erection of 5 new poultry buildings, each housing 11,400 birds – a total of 57,000 birds. The use of the site will remain as the 'existing' site ie pullet rearing from day old chicks through to point of lay at 16-17 weeks old. The application does include a transport report this time.

5.3 There then followed a discussion with the parishioners present expressing similar concerns as for the last application. Those concerns include: the road width, no footpaths, the safety of pedestrians and dog walkers and school buses using the already narrow single carriageway lanes. The bridge at Low Common which has a single track road over it and has been damaged previously. Also it was felt that the smell and odour issues were being underplayed as the odour graphic does not take into account prevailing winds. It appears to people that this development, whilst having to meet the welfare standards for poultry, neglects the well-being of local people. The point was also made that the drainage run off of water contaminated with ammonia into local streams and ponds is contrary to rules governing local farmers who are not allowed to fertilise near water courses. The setting of

the development and proximity to the Grade Listed church at Deopham and Hall Farm were also raised along with other landscape concerns about the size and industrial nature of the poultry sheds.

- 5.4 Cllr. Y. Bendle said that she will request it go to the development management committee for a decision based on the traffic and road safety concerns. This will mean that objectors and the Parish Council will be able to speak directly to the Councillors making the decision. She will inform the Parish Council as soon as she has a date for that meeting – possibly the 12<sup>th</sup> September or 10<sup>th</sup> October.
- 5.5 The Parish Clerk circulated some reasons, based on the South Norfolk Local Plan policies, why the Parish Council could recommend refusal. After discussion the Parish Council agreed that they would recommend refusal for the following reasons:

**South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM2.7 Agricultural and forestry development**

The policy says that **“The proposed development should be appropriate to the location in terms of use, design and scale and is sensitively sited to protect the amenity\* of existing neighbouring areas in the locality; and It is designed to avoid significant adverse impact on the natural and local environment and the appearance of the locality, integrate the proposals with existing features and respect and enhance the character of the surrounding landscape / area”**.

We would argue that the proposed poultry farm is not appropriate to the rural location (due to its size) and does not protect the amenity\* of existing areas in the locality – it will have a significant adverse impact on the natural and local environment and the appearance of the locality.

*\*definition of amenity for planning purposes is ‘the desirable features of a place that ought to be protected or enhanced in the public interest’*

**South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM3.11 Road Safety and the free flow of traffic**

The policy says **“On all sites development will not be permitted that endangers highway safety or the satisfactory functioning of the highway network”**

We would argue that the highway network serving the site is inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of its restricted width and stretches of single carriageway road with no obvious passing places – particularly Hall Lane, Low Common and Victoria Lane which we are told would be the route all traffic would use. This is clearly not enforceable and the other route of Church Road, Vicarage Road and Wymondham Road is also not satisfactory for traffic of the size proposed due to tight bends and narrow road width, with again no passing places.

A road width of 5.5m is usually considered to be the minimum for 2 large vehicles to pass each other and a width of 4.8m for a large vehicle and a car. Of the roads that would be used to access the site – eg Victoria Lane, Low Common, Hall Lane – none of these have the road width of 5.5m or the capacity for a large vehicle to pass a small vehicle except by overrunning of the verge.

The traffic that the development will generate will endanger road safety on a stretch of road that has no footpaths, dangerous right-angled bends, a single width carriageway bridge and is used by 3 separate school buses/coaches twice a day. As there are no footpaths pedestrians, cyclists, dog walkers, horse-riders all have to use the road and should two large articulated lorries from different directions meet there would be no-where for them to go – an accident waiting to happen.

The transport statement argues that the net reduction in vehicular movements has a net beneficial impact on the local road network – but the net reduction is a bogus figure based on the ‘existing’ traffic generation. We would argue that the application should be considered and evaluated against the actual vehicular movements that will be generated and should take into account the number of large agricultural vehicles that already use the road network in the vicinity of the development. When the original chicken farm was given permission back in 1974 the sizes of HGV lorries and tractors would have been much smaller than today and there would have been less vehicles on the roads generally and so to do to a comparison of existing and proposed traffic numbers is disingenuous.

We consider that the proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety contrary to Policy DM3.11

**South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM3.13 Amenity, Noise and Quality of Life**

The policy says “**Planning Permission will be refused where proposed development would lead to an excessive or unreasonable impact on existing neighbouring occupants and the amenity\* of the area**”.

For planning purposes ‘*amenity*’ is defined as ‘the desirable features of a place that ought to be protected or enhanced in the public interest’. The desirable features include maintaining privacy and light and ensuring that existing occupiers are protected from pollution including that in the forms of noise, odour, vibration, air, dust, insects or artificial light pollution.

We would argue that the character of the local area is of an agricultural rural village with undulating topography and that the proposed development would have an excessive and unreasonable impact on the existing occupants and the desirable features of a small rural village (when desirable means quiet countryside) will no longer exist. The issue of odour and noise pollution are of particular concern and we feel that the air pollution diagram fails to take into account the prevailing winds. The well-being and quality of life of the existing neighbouring occupants seems to be neglected in favour of polluting the environment with noise, smell, and ammonia contaminated water run-off into local streams and ponds.

**South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM4.5 Protection and Enhancement of Landscape Character**

The policy says that “**All development should respect, conserve and where possible, enhance the landscape character of its immediate and wider environment. Development proposals that would cause a significant adverse impact on the distinctive landscape characteristics will be refused**”.

The landscaping information provided does not demonstrate that the development can be accommodated without having significant adverse impact on the landscape by virtue of the visibility of the development when viewed from viewpoints other than those 8 chosen by the LVIA authors. The points chosen and the angles that the 8 photographs in the report are taken from are very misleading. Wymondham Road, which is the highest point at 50m /164ft (despite the report saying that the topography is ‘relatively flat’) has 3 viewpoints none of which are looking directly at the site.

We therefore think that the application is contrary to Policy DM4.5

**South Norfolk Local Plan Policy DM4.10 Heritage Assets**

The policy says “**All development proposals must have regard to the historic environment and take account of the contribution which heritage assets make to the significance of an area and its sense of place**”.

The Grade I listed building Deopham St Andrew's Church, sits 0.46km to the south west of the site and though is surrounded by mature landscaping it has a significant tower which is very visible from the surrounding countryside, particularly from the east. Hall Farm House and Hall Farm Barns to the west of the proposed development are Grade 11 listed.

Because the church tower is so tall and can be seen from a distance the proposed development can be considered to be within the wider setting of the church. Both the Church and Hall Farm and barns are set in open agricultural land largely populated with traditional buildings – more recent housing is modest in scale and though there may be some modern agricultural sheds in the area, they are not very large and are of a style common to the rural setting – the proposed poultry sheds would be larger and of a more industrial appearance. The development therefore has the potential to have a negative impact and harm the setting and significance of the listed buildings.

We consider the application is contrary to Policy DM4.10 and at the very least we feel Historic England should be consulted before a decision is made.

**6. Any Other Business**

6.1 Payment of £10.35 to Anglian Water for playing field water supply

6.2 Planning – Mill Farm, Attleborough Road, Deopham – Replacement Dwelling (App. No. 2018/1711). Comments are required by 28/8/18 hence the requirement to discuss the application at this meeting. The Parish Clerk explained that this is for a 4 bed replacement dwelling to supercede the approval given in May 2018 for a 3 bed replacement dwelling. After consideration of the plans and drawings it was agreed that the Parish Council had no views or comments to make.

6.3 The Chairman will ask Dougie Rostrum to cut the Playing field edges where the footballers are having difficulty with lost balls in brambles etc,

**7. Date of Next Meeting**      Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> September 2018, 7.30pm.

There being no further business the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 8.45pm.