

## **DRAFT**

### **Keswick and Intwood Parish Council Meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> March 2018. Minutes of the Meeting held at the Reading Room, Keswick at 19.00.**

*Present:* Kevin Hanner (KH) (Chair); Janet Hill (JH); Sue Hendry (SH); Tim Love (TL); Therese O’Leary Jones (TJ) and Phillip Brooks (Clerk).

Apologies were received from Councillor Christopher Kemp (CK) (Cringleford Ward Councillor).

Seven members of the public were also in attendance with David Bills (County Councillor Humbleyard Division) (DB) and Garry Wheatley (GW) (Cringleford Ward Councillor).

*2018/18. To consider apologies for absence:* it was resolved to accept apologies from Linda Thursby (LT) and Marguerite Russell (MR).

*2018/19. Declarations of Interest: a) in accordance with s.31 of the Localism Act 2011, Members to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in items on this Agenda; and b) the Clerk to report any written requests for dispensation in respect of items on this Agenda:* JH declared an interest in Agenda item 2018/22. *Planning: To consider Planning Application 2018/0468. Location: Former Stables Mill Lane Keswick Norfolk Proposal: Demolition of existing stables and erection of two storey dwelling.*

*2018/20. Public Participation: Resolution to adjourn the meeting for public participation and any County and District councillor reports:* there were no District or County Councillors reports. KH invited members of the public and councillors to participate in other Agenda items as they arose.

*2018/21. To confirm minutes of the Parish Council Meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2018:* it was resolved to accept the minutes as a true and accurate record.

*2018/22. Planning: To consider Planning Application 2018/0468. Location: Former Stables Mill Lane Keswick Norfolk Proposal: Demolition of existing stables and erection of two storey dwelling: (JH left the meeting for this discussion.)*

*2018/22/1.* KH invited the Applicant’s representative to comment on the Application. In response he apologised for the Applicant not being able to attend in person. He said it was the intention to build a single family home on the site and not four houses as previously suggested. Discussion about plans for the single dwelling had taken place with South Norfolk Council as there were concerns (by SNC) about the disagreeable “top heavy” visual impact of the proposed building. The extent of the possible changes could result in withdrawal of the present Application and another being submitted. Furthermore, a “flood assessment” for the site was necessary which was (in part) within the Environment Agency’s Flood Zones 2 and 3. The complexities and impact of the South Norfolk Five Year Land Supply and the demand for new housing possibly being lower than first anticipated were considered. Both could impinge on any building outside established development boundaries. However, as the land supply figure is close to being achieved, the prospect of extending or creating new boundaries appeared to be lessened.

2018/22/2. Opponents of the scheme stressed that this was amenity land and not a development plot. Moreover, a previous submission to SNC had been rejected for precisely the same reasons of its being outside of the development boundary and within proximity of the Environment Agency Flood Zone. Furthermore, the development would be considerably detached from the rest of the village facilities and connectivity accordingly poor. Additionally, the proposed construction would have a negative impact on the distinctive landscape of the area and there were possible highways issues too. The building itself was intended to be of a modern design which did not match well with the surrounding buildings including Keswick Old Hall (a listed building) and Eaton Gate comprising traditional farm building designs. Objectors also stressed that the Applicant did not enjoy an unencumbered right of access to the site from the public highway by way of the private road serving Eaton Gate.

2018/22/3. Supporters of the Application said they had no objections to one house being built. It was said the land had been left in an awful mess by the previous tenants of the stables and was now a source of vermin. There was also the prospect of unwelcome dwellers. Furthermore, they would be glad to see the end of disagreeable activities which were now taking place there. Their own land shared a boundary with the stables and the building of a single house would ease concerns about security.

2018/22/4. KH asked if anyone had any further comments before closing the public participation section of the meeting. There were none. Councillors (excluding JH) then voted unanimously to refuse the Application. Apart from the uncertainty about exactly what was being proposed, the principle reasons for refusal were that the intended development was: outside the existing development boundary; contrary to landscape protection policies; partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3; and subject to issues regarding access. Finally, the Five Year Land Supply for future development appears close to being achieved and demand for new housing is likely to be lower than first anticipated. These additional factors provide further support for the Council objecting to any future ad-hoc housing development which is contrary to existing policies.

The meeting closed at 19.50.

Phillip Brooks  
Parish Clerk  
31<sup>st</sup> March 2018.