

Rocklands Parish Council (RPC)  
 Minutes of Parish Council Meeting held in Rocklands Village Hall  
 7.00pm on Monday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2016

Present: David Howie                      Chair  
 Nicola Southgate                      Vice-Chair  
 David Witt  
 Shirley Colenutt  
 Cath Jones  
 David Roberts  
 Kim Austin                              Clerk  
 Bill Smith                                District Councillor  
 Cliff Jordan                              County Councillor

Also present: 50 members of the public.

1. **To consider accepting apologies for absence**  
 Apologies were accepted from Cllr. Ian Sholes who was ill.
2. **To record declarations of interest from members in any items on the agenda**  
 There were no declarations of interest.
3. **To approve the minutes of the last council meeting on Monday 9th Nov 2015**  
**RESOLVED** to approve the minutes that had been circulated prior to the meeting as a true and accurate record of the meeting. The minutes were duly signed by the Chair, Cllr. David Howie.
4. **To discuss any matters arising from the minutes (9<sup>th</sup> November 2015) not on the agenda**  
 There were no matters arising from the minutes and no update on Anchor Corner.
5. **To adjourn the meeting for public participation**  
 Meeting adjourned at 19.05 and opened to the public.  
 There were no comments from the public. The meeting re-opened at 19.06pm.
6. **To report on Finance**  
 The Clerk delivered the financial report.

**6.1 Financial position**

The bank account balances as at Monday 4<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016

Barclays Community Account	£	3926.79
Barclays Saver (Reserve) Account	£	702.54

**TOTAL as per bank    £    4629.33**

**6.2 Money in since last meeting**

7/12/15	Barclays Saver Account Interest	£	0.09
			<b>TOTAL IN    £    0.09</b>

**6.3 Cheques out (to sign)**

CHQ 558	Clerk's expenses (4 months)	£	22.83
			<b>TOTAL OUT    £    22.83</b>

Signed .....

Date .....

#### 6.4 Parish Council budget and precept setting for 2016-2017

The Clerk had circulated a budget summary to the councillors prior to the meeting. This included information on last year's precept, expenditure for the year and expected spend for the coming year. Some costs had been reduced over the past few years. No payroll costs, Low Clerk's expenses and no charge for telephone and Broadband usage. Reduced insurance premiums etc. It was therefore decided that last year's precept of £5000 would be adequate for the coming year. The Clerk would complete and return Form B before 31<sup>st</sup> January, requesting a precept of £5000.

#### 7.0 To consider planning applications.

##### 7.1 Planning outcomes since last meeting

3PL/2015/0815/F **Barham/5 The Street** - replacement dwelling (76) **APPEAL/PERMISSION**

3PL/2015/0518/F **Annison/White Hart/NOW 7** (64) **REVISED** to 4 dwellings (80) **REFUSED**  
Cllr. Howie thanked all those attending the Planning Committee meeting. Cllr. Howie also thanked Bill Smith for his support and Victoria McArthur and Harold Neale for speaking at the meeting, putting the objections to this application forward. Everybody had worked together with the desired outcome that the application was refused even though Breckland Council recommended that permission be granted. There may be an appeal which has to be lodged within 6 months.

3PL/2015/1173/F **Amy Gray/Mon Arch land adjacent** - Dwelling & Garage (82) **PERMISSION**

##### 7.2 Planning pending outcomes

3AG/2014/0019/AG **Bidmead/Tuppins Farm/ Extn to exist agri build** - (53) **PRIOR APP REQ ?**

3PL/2015/0678/F **Irwin/Davidson Bell Lane** - Free range chicken unit (74)

3PL/2015/0986/F **Annison/Moorfield/Mount Pleasant** - Retrospective conservatory (81)

3PL/2015/0967 **Pet Food factory** at Snetteron - Referred to planning committee 16<sup>th</sup> Nov.

##### 7.3 New applications since last meeting

3PL/2015/1308/F **Skitmore Two Hedges, Thieves Lane** - **Rear Extensions** (83) **PERMISSION**

This was a new application since the last meeting and permission had already been granted which the councillors were surprised at.

3PL/2015/1369/F **Kerry Foods Factory Little Ellingham** - **Removal of conditions** (84)

This was a new Kerry Foods application to vary the terms. New HGV signs to be posted to stop the passage of vehicles.

3PL/2015/1412/F **Abbey Anchor Villa, Anchor Corner** - **Barn to dwelling** (85)

3PL/2015/1274/F **Bainbridge Plot South of Spinney, Low Road** - **Re-site garage** (86)

3PL/2015/0384/F **Paske/Chapel Street 11 Dwellings (Was 10)** (62/75) (87) **RESUBMITTED**

**Chapel Street.** Another application had been submitted for Chapel Street. To demolish Fredena and build 11 houses instead of 10. New design, access, plan of bungalow and 4 new documents. There had been an interesting letter (31/12/15) from Graham Worsfold, Highways (Norfolk County Council) to Nick Moys (Breckland Planning) which Cllr. Howie read out.

*It is accepted that revised plan (RDC1018/101-RevD) amends the layout of the proposed access such that it is now perpendicular to Chapel Street. However, the fact remains visibility from the proposed access remains substandard and there is a complete lack of pedestrian facilities linking this site to local services. It is standard practice that visibility splays are measured to the nearside edge of the carriageway thereby allowing a driver waiting to exit the side road to have a view over the full width of the road they're joining.*

Signed .....

Date .....

*In this instance the proposed visibility splays are measured to a point at least 1m in from the carriageway edge (to the centre of the carriageway in a westerly direction) and remain unacceptable. In reality the available visibility is likely to measure some 15-20m in both directions only. The developer suggests Chapel Street functions as a shared surface, which if it did would add further weight to drivers exiting the site needing an unobstructed view of the entire width of the carriageway i.e. being able to see all highway users - pedestrians, cyclist as well as other vehicles.*

*A shared surface is a space designed to accommodate a low numbers of residential dwellings and low vehicle speeds. In this instance Chapel Street and The Street are both through roads providing access to commercial facilities, local services and in the case of The Street being one of the main routes in/out of the village centre. Whilst pedestrians may have no choice to but to walk in the carriageway this is due to historic circumstances and is no reason to allow further estate sized development that will increase the number of pedestrian movements within the carriageway to the detriment of highway safety.*

*In light of the above the view of the Highway Authority remains that this application should be refused.*

Cllr. Howie invited the members of the public present to comment on this application.

Michael Laflin (ML) who has a construction and land drainage company said he couldn't see a problem with access to the new development. Definitely not as bad as St. Peter's Close that had been granted permission previously. ML was FOR the development. Cllr. Witt asked ML for his views on the drainage. ML said surface water would be pushed towards the Mere and a proper sewerage system put in. Cllr. Witt confirmed that sewerage was a problem. These houses would not be on mains drainage and couldn't connect because it is a private sewer and not a public sewer. Richard Golke (RG) confirmed that although drainage and sewerage were considered to be a problem there had not been a revised drainage statement. 2 out of 4 tests had previously shown insufficient infiltration to soakaways. The owners of the Mere were not happy with water being sent towards the Mere as they have protected species in the Mere and were obviously worried about pollution. ML couldn't see this being a problem for the Mere. Cllr. Howie said that James Harrold (JH) owner of the Mere was concerned and that this was a serious consideration. ML said existing water was going that way anyway. He would talk to JH.

Chris Sharpe (CS) commented that only the access had changed and the letter from Highways indicated that the access to this site was not acceptable.

All original objections still stand but these have to be revoiced. Everybody present MUST resubmit their comments to make their previous comments stand. It was noted that this new application had been submitted at a most inconvenient time, before a bank holiday and no official notification had been given as far as the PC were aware. A controversial statement had been made that there were pressures to approve applications that really shouldn't be approved because of Council being penalised for not building enough houses. Need to fight for what is RIGHT for the Village !

CS said that in the light of this the Village needs to make decent proposals for new houses. It was explained that this is what the 'Local Plan' is and the new 'Local Plan Committee' are currently working towards such a plan.

Elaine Johnson (EJ) said that a comment from the planning committee indicated that they do consider the feelings of the Community so that Community has to make their feelings known. District Cllr. Bill Smith confirmed that although this was a new application, objections need to be raised again. The Local Development Framework (5 year rolling plan) in terms of building houses, overrides the settlement boundaries but cannot disagree with Highways. Would help to say therefore, that objections are in support of these technical experts. Bill mentioned he didn't agree with the trigger point for affordable housing being 5 houses now.

Signed .....

Date .....

Richard Harris was concerned that 'Local Plans' would be produced and then overridden. Checks and balances are at the sustainability level and how can Rocklands be sustainable when it has zero public transport and the School is full ?

Victoria McArthur (VM) said that all the points of objection for the White Hart (e.g. flooding) could be carried forward to the Chapel Street development. These points had led to the White Hart development being refused.

The shortfalls of the Breckland Planning Website were mentioned. New applications keep the same original number. No variation or version numbers are allocated so not easy to track from the original application to its many revisions as with Chapel Street. Communication is not always good and information not provided in a timely fashion, sometimes leaving very little time to respond. For some reason, this always seems to happen with the more controversial applications.... RG commented on the lack of consistency of the decisions coming out of Breckland Council. One minute they consider builds outside the boundary and then they turn them down. Not going into a logical process.

County Councillor Cliff Jordan said plan has been put in place due to lack of house building. Small building firms are not finding the money for building. Planning Committee do spend time on the detail, so good idea to be able to understand the plans and interrogate the reports submitted.

Cllr. Howie asked for comments on the new Chapel Street application from the Parish Councillors present. They all agreed that nothing had changed and that the original objections were still valid. Cllr. Colenutt reminded everybody that the troops needed rallying and letters should be resent.

Cllr. Howie asked for a show of hands. There was 1 FOR and 35 AGAINST and ~14 abstainers.

#### **7.4 Update on Rectory Road**

The facts had been sent to Breckland Council. Permission had been given for building the garage to go ahead.

#### **8.0 Local Plan update**

The Clerk had emailed and posted the letter for the **designation of a Neighbourhood Area** to Breckland Council (17/11/15). Consultation will end 8/1/16. RPC intention posted in Attleborough Mercury on 10/12/15. As well as advertising in the Mercury, Breckland Council have emailed to all adjoining parishes and ward representatives.

Website [www.breckland.gov.uk/content/neighbourhood](http://www.breckland.gov.uk/content/neighbourhood) plans to see current 'state' of application. Current state is 'consultation'.

#### **9.0 To update on telephone boxes**

BT has confirmed that the disconnection (when it happens) will be at no cost to the Parish Council. Once disconnected will start taking bids again. The other phone box (Library) needs a tidy up.

#### **10 To update on Home Watch**

Disappointed with the Police's response to Home Watch. Good that it is in place but the Police are not passing information on to the Home Watch team.

#### **11 To update on Village Shop and Post Office**

Nothing to report.

#### **12 To update on Trees**

The Woodland Trust is offering free trees for schools and communities. Not needed at the Village Hall or the Churches. 4-5 oaks had been removed from the field next to the Playing Fields. Maybe would be nice to replace them. The Clerk would request them from Woodland Trust if not too late to apply. VM

Signed .....

Date .....

said that with losing all the Ash trees in the village to Ash die back, it would be good to consider succession planting.

**13 To update on Playing Fields**

Nothing to report.

**14 To update on Highways**

Highways sent a list of what jobs the Highway Rangers had done in the Parish when they visited. The Clerk thanked them for this useful communication.

**15 To update on Flooding**

Despite the rain there had been no report of flooding.  
Mill Lane Besthorpe had recently flooded.

**16 To discuss any correspondence**

No correspondence

**17 AOB - To receive items for next agenda**

**Power Cut.** Cllr Witt mentioned there had been a power cut when trees brought down a power cable. The power had been restored very quickly and several people had been asked to complete phone surveys. Darren Green and Cllr. Witt had both given favourable feedback on the service.  
**Wayland Road.** Flagship problems with parking. Cllr. Howie has spoken to Flagship and Breckland Council. There is no money to resolve parking problems by lowering the kerbs.

**18 Date of next Meeting**

Monday 22nd February 2016, 7pm, Rockland's Village Hall.

**The meeting closed at 8.19pm.**

Signed .....

Date .....