In Attendance: Cllr M Hill (Chairman), Cllr H Glaves, Cllr J Moon, Cllr H Gauthier, Cllr K Morris

Parish Clerk Anne Rayner County Councillor Colin Foulger District Councillor Phil Hardy 116 members of the public

- **1 To consider apologies for absence** Apologies were received and accepted from Councillor Lidington.
- 2 To receive declarations of interest None to declare.
- 3 To approve the following payments:

Chq no	Amount	Payee	Notes
100238	£4020.00	Westcotec Ltd	Speed awareness machine
100239	£ 186.96	S Michlmayr & Son	Service of Church clock
100240	£ 40.00	A Moore	Shelving for phone box

All payments were unanimously approved.

3 Open Forum – District Councillor Hardy began the session by reading a statement on behalf of South Norfolk Council (Appendix 1). He also explained the planning process and reported that the enforcement officer from South Norfolk Council suggests that the stable currently on site has been built in accordance with the planning permission granted. As the recent changes are the subject of a live application, enforcement action will not be taken but should the application be refused, enforcement action will take place to ensure the site is returned to the condition that adheres with the existing planning permission.

Members of the public present were in attendance at the meeting solely in relation to planning application 2018 / 1658. The Chairman invited comments and a sustained period of open forum followed, which included the following points:

- The existing stable building appears to be significantly larger than the planning permission granted.
- The breach of planning was reported to South Norfolk Council by more than one resident and by the parish council and, verbally, officers at SNC appeared to agree that the building did not adhere to the planning permission. Residents expressed their dissatisfaction and disappointment that enforcement action was not taken.
- More than one resident reported issues with submitting comments via the SNC website. From
 the site crashing, to being timed out and receiving error messages. This does not appear to be
 satisfactory, given the tight timescales residents and consultees have in which to submit their
 comments.

Signed: 11 September 2018 Page 1

- The Chairman asked if, given the issues relating to the website, the deadline for comments could be extended. Cllr Hardy confirmed he will ask for an extension.
- Residents asked why it was necessary for names and addresses to be published on the website and also if this specifically breached any GDPR legislation. Cllr Hardy confirmed that he would check this point.
- The matter of the applicant receiving advice from SNC planners was raised. The Chairman confirmed that it is not unusual for applicants to speak to planning officers, prior to submitting an application. However, where this result in a change to the application it would normally be recorded on the application form.
- The designation of the field was queried. It is listed as residential in the application. This is incorrect, however, given that the building has never been used as a stable, it is unclear as to whether the change of use should be from stable etc. or from meadowland.
- It was noted that there is little access to services in the area.
- Members of the public voiced their frustration that due process has not been followed and feel that members of the settled community would have attracted the attention of enforcement officers, should a resident start to build on a meadow in the village.
- The existing traffic issues, particularly at school time, on Mill Lane were noted. The lane is
 rural and narrow with little opportunity for passing. Mill Lane is wholly unsuitable for vehicles
 the size of the touring caravans. It was acknowledged that Spratts Coaches do not use Mill
 Lane, for the reasons listed. Similarly, Travis Perkins encourage their drivers and delivery
 drivers not to drive through the village.
- Some discussion took place regarding the possibility of legal representation. The Chairman confirmed that he has sought advice and the parish council will consider paying for advice and assistance should the process continue in a way that suggests it may be required. Residents can, of course, appoint someone to put forward their case. Several residents voiced their agreement that they will be willing to contribute to a collection to fund this.
- During discussion regarding this, District Councillor Hardy confirmed that he will be calling the
 application in, meaning that it will definitely be heard at planning committee. The parish
 council will be given an opportunity to speak at committee, although the time allocated is
 only five minutes and less time is allocated to any members of the public who may wish to
 speak.
- Residents agreed that the whole application felt deceitful, given that there was clearly never any intention for the site to be used for a stable and a pony.
- Concern over the environmental and ecological damage already done was mentioned. Little owls, previously regularly seen at the site, have all but disappeared. Lights seem to be left on overnight, which is likely to have an impact on the owls and other wildlife in the area.
- A member of the public asked about the correspondence online between the planning officer
 and the applicant, relating to the traveller status of the applicant. The answer was evaded
 and it seems unclear if the applicant can claim traveller status. This point must be established.
- A member of the public reported that there are vacancies on traveller sites at Harford and New Costessey.
- A member of the public suggested that those present who wished to lodge an objection to the application, look at South Norfolk Council's own policies regarding Gypsy & Traveller sites.
- Members of the public voiced incredulity that SNC officers were unable to recognise that the building on site is not a stable and is not entirely constructed from wood, as per the planning

Signed: 11 September 2018 Page 2

permission. The doors and widows alone suggest that the building was never intended to be a stable.

- A member of the public asked why SNC are even considering the application when it is incomplete. There is no design & access statement, no ecological report and no flood or drainage assessment. Again, residents felt that an application would not be considered without these documents, from the settled community.
- A member of the public asked if there is any way to speed up the process. This related to a concern about the further damage that is being done to the site whilst the application is being considered. Councillor Hardy confirmed there isn't any way of fast tracking the procedure, the time limits being defined by statutory national guidelines.
- A member of the public asked how long the appeal process may take, should the application conclude in that way. Councillor Hardy confirmed the planning inspectorate is currently working on a three to six month backlog. However, a stop notice may be issued during this time, meaning that further works could not carry on whilst the appeal was being considered.
- A member of the public asked about the provision of wheelie bins and the registration for Council Tax. Cllr Hardy confirmed bins have been supplied and will be collected and an assessment will take place for Council Tax.
- A member of the public asked why no planning officers from SNC were present, as they had been invited. Cllr Hardy confirmed that he was the SNC representative.
- A member of the public suggested that a class action be taken. County Councillor Foulger confirmed that more weight would be carried by individual responses to South Norfolk Council rather than class actions or petitions.
- A resident asked if any weight would be given to the lack of attendance at this meeting by the
 applicant. Cllr Hardy confirmed it would not, applicants do not have to attend parish council
 meetings at which their application is being discussed, in fact most applicants do not.
- Anyone wishing to lodge an objection to South Norfolk Council was reminded to base their objection on the material facts relating to the application.
- The Chairman asked for a show of hands to confirm if those present were in favour of, or against the application. All those present confirmed they were against the application.
- A member of the public referred to the original parish council meeting where the first
 planning application for the land was being discussed. The applicant was present at that
 meeting and she was asked if she had any intentions of living on the site. She confirmed she
 did not.
- 4 To consider planning application 2018 / 1658 Land adj. to village hall, Mill Lane Change of use, stable to day room, standing of 1 mobile home, two tourers and three concrete pads Councillors agreed that the parish council would object to this application. It was agreed that the clerk would collate comments and circulate them for agreement, before submission to South Norfolk Council.

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 10.05 pm.

Signed: 11 September 2018

Page 3

Appendix 1

Introduction

Disagreement and differences of opinion play a necessary role in governance, especially when it comes to planning. The key with this planning application is to focus on the material planning considerations that can be taken into account when determining the planning application and not to engage in personal attacks against those who express different views. In addition, I will not accept any comments of a racist nature against the travelling community therefore please refrain from using any such language. Not that I believe anyone will, but doing so is considered a hate crime and I would be obliged to leave the meeting.

Background on Stable Block

Planning permission was granted on the 15 January 2018 under application number 2017/2831. Concerns were expressed that construction works were not be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. These were checked by the Council's Enforcement Officer and the Council have confirmed to me that the stable block and associated works as constructed have resulted in there being no breaches in planning control. The site was last viewed on the morning of Saturday 21 July 2018 and again no breaches of planning were seen. The stables have not been technically brought into use as stables as they have not been used for the keeping of horses, but the planning department have told me they could have been.

On 23 July, a planning application was submitted for the proposed development now being considered under application number 2018/1658. The site was visited on the same day by the Council's Enforcement Officer who confirmed that there were 2 caravans on the site. On 9 August 2018, it was noted that there was only 1 caravan on the site and the site was being occupied for residential purposes.

In view that a planning application is now being considered, no enforcement action will be taken until the outcome of the planning application is known. This is in line with the Council's Compliance and Enforcement Policy. If the application is refused then the Council will then need to consider whether it is appropriate to take enforcement action.

Current Application

Application number 2018/1658 will be considered on its own planning merits and in accordance with national and local plan polices. Comments on the planning application are welcome and should relate to material planning considerations.

The Council is seeking clarification on the number of hard standings being proposed from the applicant but they understand it is one planning unit comprising of a day room (use of existing building on the site), 1 mobile home and 2 touring caravans with the mobile home/caravans being positioned on a total of 3 concrete pads. The Council has also asked the applicant to confirm whether

Signed: Chairman Minute Reference 13 08 2018 4

they are requesting the application to be considered as a traveller site, and if this is the case a statement will need to be submitted by the applicant, in accordance with the Government's policy produced in August 2015, by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG at time), titled 'Planning policy for traveller sites'.

Key material planning considerations, in accordance with national and local plan policies, will include:

Principle of development
Location of the development
Status of applicant if being pursued as a traveller site
Impact on residential amenity
Visual impact of proposal – landscape and on character of the area
Highways impacts
Impact on drainage and flood risk
Ecology impacts

Anybody at the meeting who is uncomfortable posting on the Council's website for any reason can email me at my private email address and I will raise everything with the council. Issuing individual objections, however, carries more weight in planning terms. Finally, I have called in the decision to the planning committee so everyone who would like to speak would have the opportunity to do so, including the Parish Council and local residents.

Post meeting note

These actions were noted by Cllr Hardy during the meeting and have been answered by Helen Mellors, Development Manager, South Norfolk Council, on 20 August 2018.

- To put back the closing date for comments given the obvious problems people were having with the web-site [Done]
- 2. Talk to SNC IT about the on-line comments/registration issue is there a reason for these problems, can it be resolved?
 - We are happy to help anyone who is experiencing difficulties with registering on the planning pages of the website to enable them to comment online. As far as I am aware, we have not been contacted directly to notify us of anyone experiencing difficulties. Details are given on the Council's website, the consultation letters and site notices about alternative methods of submitting comments which includes by e mail or in writing.
- 3. Confirm the default basis for a planning application when no (real) evidence presented for Traveller status.
 - Any application is always considered on its own merits and in accordance with national and local plan polices and any other material considerations. If the applicant submits evidence to say they meet the definition of a traveller, for planning purposes, then this will be a material consideration and the application considered in accordance with local plan policy DM3.3. A new dwelling outside the development limits would also need to be considered in light of paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and local planning policy DM1.3. Material consideration would also need to be given to the Council's housing land supply in the rural area and at present the Council is applying material weight to evidence in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which shows we have a shortfall. Clearly

Signed: Chairman Minute Reference 13 08 2018 5

other policies in the local plan will also apply and will need to be taken into account as appropriate.

- 4. Clarify this applicant's status with regard to being a Traveller

 The case officer is currently seeking clarification from the applicant and once received this will form part of the application.
- 5. Examine whether there is a breach of GDPR in insisting that names & other details are to be published and not offering to withhold them. (perhaps a "name & address supplied" option?). We reviewed all processing of personal data before the GDPR was implemented with the Information Governance Manager, which included publishing comments received regarding planning applications on our website. I have also discussed the publishing of contributor's names and address with the Council's Senior Governance Officer & Deputy Monitoring Officer who considers that there is not a breach of the GDPR as the Council has set out how the data will be used in the privacy statement which is set out above as part of the lawful processing of the application. Details on the website also highlight that Members of the public can send their comments to their District Councilor who can raise them as appropriate, so they can be taken into account when the application is considered.