

Thompson Parish Council (TPC)
Minutes of Parish Council EXTRA MEETING
(Virtual meeting - held using Zoom)
on Tuesday 15 December 2020

Present:	Jean Kaye	Chair
	Duncan Gregory	Vice Chair
	John Newnham	
	Ian Robertson	
	Angus Welch	
	Kate Winslow	
	Kim Austin	Clerk

Also present: There were 2 members of the public present. Alice and John Crick.

The meeting opened at 19:30

1. To consider accepting apologies for absence

There were no apologies for absence

2. To record declarations of interest from members in any items on the agenda

There were no declarations of interest.

3. To discuss NEW planning application - 3PL/2020/1366/O

Applicant: Mr Roger Parrot

Location: Land to the west of Marlpit Road IP24 1PR

New Dwelling with associated garaging and driveway.

Deadline for comments: 24 December 2020

Meeting suspended 17:34 and members of the public present were invited to speak.

John Crick. Very concerned about this application although it is for only one house (at the moment). We will be objecting for several reasons; Water management, the impact on wildlife, traffic impact and the need to preserve the character and appearance of the village. This application needs to be considered in conjunction with the four properties already approved along Marlpit Road as well as the PIP currently being assessed that borders both Marlpit/Mill Roads. Also has concerns that if they get planning permission for this one, then over a period of time, once one is built, they would then apply for the next piece of the paddock to be built on. And so on until all the land is built on. John asked if planning permission goes ahead would the PC push for it to be legally binding that they do not build on the rest of the paddock or field behind. How could the land be protected from further building development ?

Potential Impact on Wildlife There still appears to be insufficient information provided in respect of ecological implication of the application and to note that the reptile survey was taken at the wrong time of the year. This application falls within a designated site, the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA). Sightings of wildlife and birds is enormous and will be listed in the response on the Breckland Planning website.

Water Management The area around Marlpit Road, Pockthorpe Lane and Mill Road has significant problems with surface water drainage and is flooded most of the time. It is a

Signed

Date

natural soakaway. Few ditches remain, most of which do not connect to form a wider network. Owners of properties abutting the three roads already complain of poor drainage and experience flooding in periods of heavy rainfall both on the land but also along the road. Where the proposed development is sited, this has always been a natural soakaway and this, as well as fields beyond, do not readily drain with frequent standing water being visible. We ourselves, during periods of heavy rainfall required our septic tank to be emptied twice a month. During the August downpour flooding occurred of our entire front garden preventing access to and from doorways. No ditches run along this part of Marlpit Lane.

Traffic Impact Previously commented that the roads in the village of Thompson are in general narrow. Agricultural vehicles and large lorries use this road on a regular basis. The road is also used to access the primary school. This development would generate a relatively low increase in traffic itself, but should be considered in conjunction with the increase generated other applications.

Character and Appearance of Village This is an intrusion into the rural setting. Thompson's character needs protecting. There are 180 Barrett houses being built locally. Thompson doesn't need more dwellings.

Meeting resumed at 7:43.

Cllr. Kaye said there was some ambiguity about the extent of the plot. In one of their drawings, it appears to extend to the point where the two non-road boundaries of the neighbouring properties meet. In the other it doesn't extend that far. Also, it is interesting that the Habitat Plan is entitled Phase 1. Reiterated that this is just Outline Planning and detail would be the subject of a further application.

Cllr. Welch read out a report that he had prepared.

HOU 04 of the local plan is of particular relevance to this proposal as it supports appropriate development immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary. The policy states that 'Appropriate development will be allowed immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary, subject to being supported by other policies within the Local Plan (with the exception of Policy GEN 05) and where all of the following criteria are satisfied':

- 1. It is minor development of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement of up to 5 dwellings.** This is one dwelling
- 2. It would not lead to the number of dwellings in the settlement increasing by more than 5% from the date of adoption of the Plan. The settlement refers to the number of dwellings inside the defined settlement boundary.** This is outside the settlement boundary
- 3. Development provides a significant community benefit.** This is unlikely to be met, as significant implies more than the usual.
- 4. The design contributes to preserving, and where possible enhancing, the historic nature and connectivity of communities;**

The design is new build on a green field site and therefore is not preserving anything. An open space would be removed thereby not enhancing the historic nature of the village. In keeping with Thompson's unique character, development over the plan period should be sporadic, spread out and not concentrated in ribbon development. Therefore, although I'm reluctant to see green field sites built on, the proposal has merit but only if the built vernacular (Flint, red brick, red roof tiles and so on, even though these are reserved matters) is followed. This is something I would like to see enforced by Breckland council.

Signed

Date

5. The development avoids coalescence of settlements. This proposal avoids coalescence. Doesn't join onto the barn.

Conclusion: I accept that Thompson should be open to some measured development and this proposal now mostly complies with HOU4 criteria. It did not before and was why I originally objected. Style and character need to be agreed. I remain very concerned that there might be further attempts (Given some of the odd wording in the proposal i.e. Phase 1 etc. and that every application is judged on its own merits) to develop the rest of the land on the overall plot and would seek some form of reassurance from Breckland council that permission for this would NOT be forthcoming. Therefore, I support the proposal.

Cllr. Robertson had also noted that Phase 1 was written on some of the drawings. He would support this application as it was adjacent to the settlement boundary but would note that any further building on this site would be outside the boundary and should not be allowed for that reason. Would prefer houses round the outside rather than in the middle of the village

Cllr. Newnham said this could be considered as infill. If there was going to be some new development then he was happy that it was here. Noted that further building on this plot would be outside the settlement boundary. In the paperwork, Planning Inspectorate had made a comment about a 'moveable ceiling'.

Cllr. Gregory. Ambivalent. Can speak about future intentions but have to make a decision on this application. Would support as can't keep saying no to everything.

Cllr. Kaye agreed with Cllr. Gregory. Need some growth in the village.

There was a vote and although all councillors would support the application there were concerns and reservations and agreed some conditions and caveats should be set.

- Proper ecological survey should be done (Current one is out of date.)
- Outside the settlement boundary.
- Traffic impact (5-minute drive to nearest bus stop.)

It was stressed that residents should post their own comments on the website too.

The Clerk would post comments on Planning website before the deadline of 24 December 2020.

August flooding in Thompson

Have the fire brigade log but would like to get a fuller picture. Road drains were blocked and the water couldn't get away. Need to find out about which places had a problem but who maybe didn't report at the time. Need to get an idea of numbers. Don't need names and addresses. Cllr. Newnham suggested a flyer asking for help. Cllr. Kaye wanted to gather the councillor's thoughts but would do this by email. A fact gathering exercise. Cllr. Kaye would approach Norfolk Wildlife Trust in January and the UEA. Keen to start making some progress.

The meeting closed at 20.10

Signed

Date