Minutes of Deopham and Hackford Parish Council Meeting in the Gralix Hall on Wednesday 13th June 2018

Present:

Councillors: Jacqie Phoenix Martin Skidmore

Chris Biggs Chris Coath John Chilvers Jayne Allan

Cllr. M. Dewsbury - Norfolk County Council,

Parish Clerk: Rowena Harkness

Parishioners : Bruce Catmur Jill Weatherburn

Tracy & Mark Fillingham Mrs E. Whyte
Helen & Nigel Hawes Trevor Chapman
Rachel, Imogen & Simon Lee Lesley Sharman

Rob Allan John Spratling (Wicklewood resident)

1. Apologies - Mark Howard, Simon & Emma Buckitt, Vanessa & David Mann Cllr. Y. Bendle - South Norfolk Council,

2. Declarations of Interest in items on the agenda

2.1 There were no declarations of interest

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 9th May 2018 were agreed as a correct record. Proposed Chris Biggs, seconded Martin Skidmore.

4. Matters Arising

- 4.1 Land Adjoining 10 Hackford Road, Hardingham, NR9 4ED New Stable Block (App. 2018/0751). This has now been approved
- 4.2 The NALC have been informed of the decision not to be members and not to have the subsidised website and the cheque for £30 has been returned.
- 4.3 The Parish Clerk reported that the new website is up and running and it is called www.deophamandhackfordpc.info. She feels it's a really attractive and easy to manage website and that Steve Jackman who set it up and trained her was really good and is there in the future to help and support especially with a new Clerk.
- 4.4 Berwick, Half Field Lane, Deopham NR18 9DJ Replace conservatory with pitched roof extension (App. No 2018/0832). This has been approved.
- 4.5 Barn at Mill Farm, Attleborough Road, Deopham, NR18 9DQ Conversion of redundant games room into residential accommodation (App. No 2018/0763). Also been approved.

5. Planning

5.1 Poultry sheds east of Ivy House, Victoria Lane, Deopham (App. No. 2018/1017).

The Chair announced that due to the number of parishioners attending with an interest in this item it would be discussed at this point and she suspended standing orders to allow parishioners to speak and contribute to the discussion. She asked people to introduce themselves and to raise a hand if they wished to speak. The Parish Clerk said that Simon & Emma Buckitt and David & Vanessa Mann were unable to attend the meeting but wished

their comments which are on the South Norfolk website to be taken into account.

5.1.1 The Parish Clerk explained that an amendment to the application had appeared on the South Norfolk website that afternoon. In response to comments by the landscape officer regarding the potential for impact on the boundary hedgerows and requirement for their retention, the proposals have been redesigned by the applicant and they have reduced the scale of the development. There are amended drawings of site plan, floor plan, elevations and location plan. The Parish Clerk displayed the revised drawings which showed that the

number of sheds are reduced from 5 to 4 but with same dimensions and 4 feed silos instead of 8.

- 5.1.2 Bruce Catmur referred the meeting to his letter of objection which makes his provisional comments and he particularly wanted to highlight the figure given by the applicant of a 28% reduction in traffic movements, page 13 of the design and access statement and the 'stink map' which is page 19 of Appendix 2.
- 5.1.3 Simon and Rachel Lee who live in one of nearest properties in Victoria Lane raised the noise assessment readings which were done on a Friday and Saturday and felt that inaccurate readings have been provided. The fact that there are to be 700 cockerels per shed (2,800 in 4 sheds) has not been mentioned in regards to potential noise also laying hens are not necessarily quiet!
- 5.1.4 John Spratling queried why the wind direction map / graph had not been laid over the smells graph (stink map).
- 5.1.5 Transport issues were raised by most parishioners Rachel pointed out that lorries are now a lot bigger than in 1974 when the original permission for the farm had been given and even though the number of huts has been reduced this won't mean much less traffic especially as the traffic movement figures provided in the design and access statement don't include the egg collection transport which elsewhere is said to be 3 HGV's a week.
- 5.1.6 The question was asked as to whether Norfolk County Council Highways who are yet to provide their comments will come and actually have a look at the local roads and all the transport issues that people are raising. Simon Lee said he has offered to take the Planning Officer out in his HGV so as he can see the difficulty there is on the small rural roads in Deopham. The Parish Clerk said that until the applicant provided a more detailed Transport Report specifying which direction and the route the HGVs and feed tankers will take ie coming from the A11 or A47 it is difficult to point out the Highway issues.
- 5.1.7 Rob Allan highlighted the broad statements made about the economic advantages and the £2.5m investment being made how true are these sort of statements?
- 5.1.8 At this point the Parish Clerk circulated and displayed a draft response that the Parish Council could make. After some further discussion it was agreed that the response needs to make it clear that the Parish Council is recommending refusal of the application until such time as further information on Transport and other issues is provided. It was also agreed that reference to the local bat population in St.Andrew's church and the buildings down Victoria Lane should be included in the response.
- 5.1.9 The following is the response that has been submitted as the Parish Council response

The Parish Council wish to recommend refusal of the above application for the following reasons:

Traffic

In the response to the scoping request (App. No. 2017/1383), the letter dated 11/July/2017 from South Norfolk (which can be viewed online under that application reference as the decision) did say that a Transport Statement would be required to show that the development does not have a negative impact on the highway network and that the access route is satisfactory or otherwise to cater for the numbers and type of traffic that will be involved. It set out quite specific transport requirements as follows:

- baseline conditions on road widths, speed limits, traffic flows, provision for vulnerable users
- means of access (access width, vehicle swept paths, measured viability splays)

• the volume of traffic to be generated during the construction phase (including construction logistics plan, duration of construction works, route management, size and vehicle types).

We note that a separate Transport Statement has not been provided by the applicant – they have just included a small section in the Design and Access Statement which does not provide what the scoping opinion said would be needed. They cover the 'traffic implications' for the 'existing' operation – ie commercial movements of 414 for the previous operation and commercial movements of 300 for the new proposed operation. They then draw the conclusion that this is a 28% reduction in commercial traffic associated with the site and 'therefore the proposal represents a reduction in traffic and is therefore not severe'. However this does not include the volume of traffic that will be generated during the construction phase, (which the scoping opinion asked for) nor does it include any of the other detailed information asked for.

Until such time as the above detailed information is provided by the applicant, the Parish Council feels it has no option but to object and recommend refusal of the application – because the access and traffic issues are of concern to all of the parishioners who have submitted comments and therefore the Parish Council needs to reflect that concern.

Consultation

We would also like to point out that the scoping request response letter (details as above) did indicate that due to the 'considerable local interest' in the application the applicant was urged to undertake pre-application consultation with local parties eg Parish council and residents.

No approach has been made by the applicant or agent to discuss their proposals with us. Had they done so some of the obvious objections, concerns and questions that are now being raised could have been explained/discussed etc.

In Summary

Until a comprehensive Transport Report is made available, Deopham & Hackford Parish Council wish to object and recommend refusal of the application. There are also some other issues of concern to us

- the visual impact on the Grade I listed Deopham Church, St. Andrews;
- the ecology survey seems to have underplayed the long established bat colonies in the area. Researchers have told local people in Victoria Lane that their barns/buildings are a wonderful site for bats. A report by Defra in 2014 identified a colony of Natterer's bats of 60–80 in the church and there is a far greater potential for bats to be in the buildings than may have been assumed by the report writers in their one-day preliminary ecological survey visit. It may need further assessment by an impartial ecologist.
- potential drainage issues;
- over development of the site and the industrial scale of the operation (intensive factory farming) in a very small agricultural rural village.
- 5.1.10 The Chair thanked everyone for attending and their contributions and said they were welcome to stay for the rest of the meeting if they wished.
- **5.2 Meadow Cottage, Park Lane, Deopham NR18 9HL (App. No. 2018/0969)** Demolition of existing extensions, including garage, new single storey extension and freestanding cart shed with associated external works.
 - After discussion and consideration of the plans it was agreed that the Parish Council had no views or comments on the application.

6. Correspondence

6.1 The Parish Clerk had been contacted by e.mail by two parishioners regarding NCC Highway Issues. Flooding at Vicarage Road and speed of traffic on Low Road, Hackford at junction with Kings Head Lane. The Parish Clerk had raised both issues with Bob West at Highways and both are being investigated.

- 6.2 The letter re NCC Highway Partnership Scheme was circulated. Again the scheme is of no benefit to Deopham & Hackford as the Parish is unable to contribute 50% of the cost of a project because we do not have that sort of money.
- 6.3 Other correspondence was circulated around the table

7. Finance

- 7.1 The account balances as at 18/5/2018 were £490.40 in the current account and £3,327.82 in the deposit. There is 1 unpresented cheque and so the reconciled balance is £440.40.
- 7.2 The payment of £492.85 to Norse Eastern Ltd. for the grounds maintenance six monthly charge for cutting the playing field grass was approved. Proposed John Chilvers, seconded Martin Skidmore.
- 7.3 The payment of £11.70 to Anglian Water for the playing field water supply from 6/2/18 6/5/18 was approved. Proposed Jayne Allan, seconded Chris Coath.
- 7.4 The payment of £120 to Steve Jackman for provision of support to develop new WIX based website and ongoing support for 1 year was approved. Proposed Martin Skidmore, seconded John Chilvers.
- 7.5 The payment of £74.25 to the Parish Clerk to reimburse her for the payment to WIX.com for yearly website provision was approved. Proposed John Chilvers, seconded Martin Skidmore.
- 7.6 The transfer of £1000 from the deposit to the current account was approved. Proposed Jackie Phoenix, seconded Chris Biggs.

8. Deopham Playing Field

- 8.1 Use of Playing Field football pitch by new football team AG Athletic.
- 8.1.1 The Parish Clerk has been contacted by a men's football team AG Athletic who play in the Norwich and District League division 3 and would like to use the playing field for their home games, training and pre-season friendlies. She has spoken to Norse about grass cutting and they are suggesting that any extra cuts that are required be charged per cut. They have quoted £48 + vat per extra cut. After some discussion it was agreed that the team be allowed to rent the field for a rent of £600 + that they be invoiced for any extra cuts they request/require. The Parish Clerk to arrange for them to sign an agreement covering the arrangements and to give them a set of keys.
- 8.2 Report back on Deopham Funday & Music Festival June 10th 2018
- 8.2.1 Jason handed out a breakdown of the income taken at the event and once the expenditure has been paid out the final amount raised **is £1044.81**. Jason will pay out the expenses as necessary and will then hand the balance to the Parish Clerk for banking. Jason was given a round of applause and thanked for all his hard work Helen and Jacqui were also thanked for the support they had given Jason and thanks also to lain Messenger, who was a real help carrying and fetching things for everyone and also Marne Wolmarans from The Grange who used his drive on mower to pick up excess grass. Jason has already started thinking about 2019 and maybe incorporating camping into the event!
- 8.3 New gate post is needed. Jacqui offered to try and get one and Jason offered to fit it.

9. Recruitment Process for new Parish Clerk

- 9.1 The Parish Clerk circulated a timetable for the process of finding and appointing a new Parish Clerk given her announcement in April that she would like to resign/retire after doing the job for 15 years. The draft advert for the vacancy and a draft job description were approved. The advert will be put on the noticeboards, the website and circulated as widely as possible by people.
- 9.2 The results of people applying and the next steps will be discussed at the July meeting.

10. Update on General Date Protection Regulations

10.1 It was agreed to defer this item to the next Parish Council meeting in July due to the time.

11. Hackford Fuel Allotment Charity – Appointment of 4 Trustess

11.1 The four existing trustees have all indicated that they are willing to continue and serve another term of 4 years. They are – John Chilvers, Martin Skidmore, John Perry and Keith Bennett. The Rector is also a Trustee. It was agreed that they be reappointed. The Parish Clerk will write to them and confirm their appointment.

12. Any Other Business

- 12.1 An increase in the donation towards the upkeep of the two churchyards will be considered at the next meeting.
- **13. Date of Next Meeting** Wednesday 11th July 2018, 7.30pm.

There being no further business the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.45pm.