

Keswick and Intwood Parish Council Meeting on the 3rd July 2024.
Minutes of the Meeting held at the Reading Room, Keswick at 19:00.

Present: Janet Hill (JH); David Vail (DV); Mike Pilgrim (MP); Monica Warmerdam (MW); Susannah Billington (SB) and Marguerite Russell (MR).

Also present: Samantha Henry (Parish Clerk); PC James Smith and 20 members of the public were in attendance.

Apologies were received from: David Bills (County Councillor).

Prior to the meeting, the Chair made a statement regarding concerns in the village about the Parish Council's involvement in distributing a leaflet highlighting the planning applications listed on this agenda. The Chair assured the meeting that the Parish Council had not produced or distributed the leaflets. JH also explained that meetings of the Parish Council are agreed at the end of each year for the forthcoming year.

2024/30. To consider apologies for absence: N/A. District Councillor Daniel Elmer and District Councillor Deborah Sacks were not present.

2024/31. 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: Councillor Vail had disclosed an interest in item 2024/36, regarding the FreshWater Watch Scheme.

2024/32. To confirm the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council held on the 22nd of May 2024: The minutes were confirmed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

2024/33. To report matters arising from the minutes not on the agenda for information only: N/A.

2024/34. Public Participation:

- *Resolution to adjourn the meeting for public participation and any County and District Councillor reports:* Planning applications 2024/1416, 2023/3810 and 2024/1832 were discussed at this point.
- 2024/1416 – JH explained the outline of the planning application to the meeting. A parishioner discussed the the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP), the development boundary and Keswick & Intwood's role within it. The parishioner was concerned with the precedent that approving the application would set. A parishioner responded with concerns about the GNLP and the lack of land allocated by South Norfolk District Council (SNDC) for land for gypsies and travellers to develop their own land and homes. A parishioner



who had objected to the application explained that he objected due to concerns regarding the additional traffic and people that it would bring. The parishioner asked whether it could be clarified whether additional planning applications would be required to allow further residents on the site. The applicant clarified that no additional residents would be relocating to Keswick, and that the residential buildings were for existing parishioners. A parishioner enquired about the wording of the application, which he found to be ambiguous. A parishioner, who had experience in planning applications, highlighted that SNDC is the body that produces the titles of the planning applications. JH clarified that the document being discussed had been produced by the agent of applicant. The applicant also clarified that the area of land was 6 acres, and that four people would be residing at the site. A parishioner asked why the label of gypsy and traveller is used in the documents, and whether this could be raised with SNDC. JH encouraged the parishioner to put their views and support of the application forward to SNDC. JH asked Councillors whether they had any comments on the application. SB explained that the Council's role of the Council is to consider the application on its merits in conjunction with the GNLP and other SNDC planning laws. MR informed the meeting that she had objected to the application directly to SNDC. JH highlighted that the application was outside of the building zone for the village, and also inside the southern bypass protection zone. It was determined that whether it complied with SNDC's plans regarding gypsy and traveller sites would be up to SNDC to decide.

A member of the public left the meeting.

2023/3810 - JH explained the outline of the planning application to the meeting. The applicant clarified the two separate planning applications. The applicant asked why the parish council would not attend the site to discuss the application, when requested in July 2023. Councillors informed the applicant that Councillors cannot make individual decisions, and that meetings of the Council should be made in public, with notice of the agenda 3 working days in advance of the meeting, so that all parishioners have the opportunity to know what is discussed. Discussions of applications in private with the applicant could be seen as improper conduct. The parishioner enquired as to what the Parish Council would like the land be used for, if it objected to the barn being converted into a home. DV commented that there was no forum for the Parish Council to make suggestions of the use of land, although he agreed that it was a good idea. JH asked about the storage of wedding business décor going forward. The applicant clarified that this was to be kept off site. JH enquired about the allocation of four vehicle spaces on the application. The applicant clarified that this number was correct. JH



the applications. The Council did not agree to support the application either but would submit their comments on the applications. The wording would be uniform for all three applications received for comment. The Parish Council would comment that the applications were outside of the building zone for the village and that the land was inside the southern bypass protection zone.

A member of the public enquired about cutting of the verges on Keswick Hall Road, heading to Low Road, as well as Mill Lane. The Clerk would report this to Highways for investigation.

ACTION CLERK

All members of the public left the meeting.

2024/35. Planning:

- *To discuss any updates relating to the Keswick Industrial Estate and Low Road traffic calming measures (if received):* no updates had been received. The Clerk would contact Highways again to arrange a meeting to discuss the application. **ACTION CLERK**
- *To discuss planning applications received for comment:*
 - 2024/1416 – this was discussed under item 2024/34.
 - 2023/3810 – this was discussed under item 2024/34.
- *To note and ratify planning applications responded to since the last meeting due to the deadline date:* N/A.
- *To consider planning applications which have been received since distribution of the agenda:*
 - 2024/1832 – this was discussed under item 2024/34.

2024/36. Correspondence received:

- *Councillor Vail – regarding the FreshWater Watch Scheme:* it was agreed that the Council would write to the Environmental Agency to ask about their monitoring of the River Yare, and to ask whether they would be able to share their results. **ACTION CLERK**
- *Hornsea – Orsted Community Fund:* DV explained that the Reading Room committee would be putting in a bid for £22k to provide a battery back-up, which it was hoped would lower electricity bills. He explained that 20% match funding would be required in order to obtain the grant. JH suggested that DV should put together a business plan for the initiative. It was suggested that the community should be asked for suggestions regarding what the community fund could be used for.
- *Internal Auditor – regarding the audit for the 2024/25 financial year:* it was **agreed** to employ Sonya Blythe as the Internal Auditor for the 2024/25 financial year.
- *To consider any correspondence which has been received since distribution of the agenda:* Councillor Bills had sent an update regarding the ongoing issue with broadband, and explained that it was unknown at this stage whether Keswick would

enquired about the storage of waste. The applicant clarified that waste was collected by the binman on a weekly basis. The bypass protection zone was discussed. A parishioner asked the applicant about the traffic caused by the wedding business.

3 members of the public left the meeting.

- 2024/1832 – JH enquired about the number of events that would be held annually. The applicant clarified that there would be 10-12 wedding events held on the land. The applicant clarified that this was currently done under a temporary license, but that they wanted to have a permanent structure in place so that all parties understood the boundaries of the venture. Sound levels on the land were discussed, and the applicant explained that decibel readers were used at each event, with music being lowered at 22:30 and turned off at 23:00. JH asked about the sewage capabilities of the land. The applicant explained that portacabins were hired. JH enquired about whether any guests would be staying overnight at the site. The applicant intended to erect 5 bell tents for guests to stay overnight, to ensure that guests were not drinking and driving. The applicant had also erected 5 mph signs and signage asking guests to be considerate of the neighbours when leaving. JH enquired about the capacity of the site. The applicant clarified that there is roughly 100 – 120 guests per event. JH enquired about whether the landowner was happy to have the additional cars on site during events. The applicant clarified this to be true. JH asked whether tipis that were erected for the events would be there permanently. The applicant said that they would not be there permanently. JH enquired about external catering deliveries. The applicant explained that food vans were employed, and their waste was taken away with them. Public liabilities were obtained from all businesses coming onto the site. MP enquired about the noise levels measured by the Environmental Agency (EA). The applicant informed the meeting that the EA had been in contact with them and that they had no concerns with the levels of noise. SB enquired about fireworks being used at the site. The applicant clarified that fireworks would not be used at the site. MR raised concerns about the number of cars, potentially up to 40, that would be using the rural roads nearby Keswick Hall. The applicant explained that the 40 cars were a maximum amount, not an actual figure, and that they would be staggered in arrival and departure. The applicant asked that the Council not to object to the applications.

JH asked Councillors the question of who wanted to object to the applications, who was in favour of the application, and who would like to neither object or favour the application, but send comments of the Council instead. It was **agreed** that the Council would not object to



be included in the second phase, which was currently in the planning stage. The planning stage was estimated to take 2 months to complete.

2024/37. Finance:

- *To agree invoices for payment in accordance with the budget:* the following invoices were agreed for payment by online bank transfer: Hare Cleaning Services (£40.00); NALC annual website hosting (£70.00); HMRC (£165.20). A direct debit for an annual fee of £35.00 to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) was also signed by SH and DV.
 - *To consider becoming a member of Community Action Norfolk:* this would be added to the September agenda for discussion.
 - *To consider becoming a member of CPRE:* The Clerk would contact CPRE to discuss the fees involved in becoming a member.
- ACTION CLERK**

2024/38. Parish Reading Rooms:

- *To receive an update regarding the parish reading rooms and the existing management structure in place:* the relationship between the reading room committee and the parish council was discussed. NALC had suggested that a Service Level Agreement (SLA) be drawn up between the committee and the council to define what the responsibilities and roles of each body would be. An example of a SLA would be obtained for further discussion.
- ACTION CLERK**

2024/39. Items for the next meeting:

- *Orsted Community Fund.*
- *CPRE membership - fees*
- *CAN membership*
- *Parish Reading Room management structure – SLA agreement*

The meeting closed at 22:00.

Signed: 

