



## Meeting Minutes

### Mattishall Parish Council

Monday 7<sup>th</sup> March 2022 at 7 pm  
Poultec Business Park

---

Parish Councillors present: Graham Clarke (Vice-Chairman), David Fowler, Richard Turner (Chairman), Andrea Taylor, John Pickering, Jan Smith and David Piper.

---

The Chair announced to members of the council and public that the meeting will be recorded for minute purposes.

#### 1. Apologies for absence

We received and accepted apologies from Cllrs Norton.

#### 2. Members' declarations of interest in items on the agenda consider any requests for dispensations

Cllr Pickering declared an interest in item 6.2. application numbers 3PL/2022/0138/HOU and 3PL/2022/0143/O.

Cllr Piper declared an interest in item 6.2. application number 3PL/2022/0114/F

Cllr Clarke declared an interest in item 6.2. application number 3PL/2022/0164/F

#### 3. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2022

The minutes of the meeting were approved without amendment and signed by the Chairman as a correct record and unanimously **approved**.

#### 4. Clerks report

- 4.1. The clerk reported that there is no further update regarding the trod path request next to Poultec Business Park.
- 4.2. The clerk confirmed that she had chased BDC reference a replacement village map and is waiting for them to get back to us. Clerk to chase again.
- 4.3. The clerk confirmed that the recently purchased salt bin is unlikely to be filled with salt until next winter. After discussion Cllr Turner kindly offered to store the bin at his home location until then.
- 4.4. The clerk informed the Council that Cllr Clarke and the Parish Clerk will attend an Emergency First Aid at Work (level 3) course on the 6<sup>th</sup> May 2022 at a cost of £75.00 each.
- 4.5. The clerk reported that a light fitting cover had been damaged following last weeks youth activities. The Memorial Hall had been informed and YMCA had offered to pay for the repair.
- 4.6. The clerk updated the Council following the request to supply an additional youth club, a junior youth club between the ages of 6-11. YMCA had confirmed that the cost for this additional youth provision would be £425.00 for 2 workers at 1.5 hrs a week. Cllr Piper attended the recent Mattishall Memorial Hall committee to ask their permission to trial a younger session for a month or two. The committee were in support of this, and the YMCA will confirm a suitable trial date when adult supervision is in place.
- 4.7. NCC & BDC cutting regime will be deferred to our next meeting.

- 4.8. The clerk reported that the Council were not successful in their recent application to the Lottery Heritage Fund for the Church Clock. The clerk also updated that the electrical auto wind will require a faculty which will be discussed at the next Diocesan Advisory committee which will be held on 22<sup>nd</sup> April.
- 4.9. The clerk circulated an application asking the Council for a grant to support a young parishioner in a World Scout Jamboree event in South Korea. A majority had **agreed** to donate £500.00 towards this event and look forward to hearing all about it and the skills learnt. Proposed by Cllr Clarke and seconded by Cllr Smith.
- 4.10. The clerk circulated an application asking the Council for a grant to support CAB, the Council is happy to support CAB but would like to ensure the money is supported to the residents of Mattishall. The clerk was tasked with inviting CAB to attend our Annual Parish Meeting to allow them an opportunity to explain where the money is spent and how it supports the residents of Mattishall prior to allocating an amount.

## 5. Open forum for Public Participation

Three members of the public had voiced their objections and raised their concerns reference planning application 3PL/2022/0220/HOU. The Council encouraged the member of public to submit their objections on the planning portal for BDC and to inform the public that the Parish Council do not make the decisions on planning applications, this responsibility lies with BDC. The members of the Council explained that the application had only just been received prior to this meeting therefore not allowing enough time to raise comments for the Council's consideration and will be discussed at our next Parish Council meeting which will be held on 4<sup>th</sup> April.

Applicant of application no 3PL/2022/0138/HOU commented on their application explaining to the Council that the proposed single storey extension is for residential use only. It was explained that the applicant had employed a professional architect to ensure the extension was designed to ensure it is in keeping of the property and surrounding area, and to ensure it did not affect the light of the neighbouring property.

Jim Freeman from Gaillford Try introduced himself to the Council and explained that they are the chosen constructors for the new A47 North Tuddenham to Easton fly through. Jim Freeman presented a video explaining the scheme and works involved in detail.

The video can be found by clicking onto the link below.

<https://nationalhighways.co.uk/our-work/east/a47-north-tuddenham-to-easton-improvement/>

## 6. Planning matters

### 6.1. To receive results of applications

Clerk was tasked with raising a FOI request for application 3PL/2022/0220/HOU

### 6.2. To receive recommendation from Planning and Monitoring Group on current applications

The Council agreed to submit the following comments to Breckland District Council. Proposed by Cllr Piper, seconded by Cllr Turner and unanimously **agreed**.

**3PL/2022/0143/O:** Land to the West of Rayners Way; Outline planning permission for the erection of 4 new single storey dwellings - Mattishall Parish Council objects to this application for several reasons:

1. The red edged site lies wholly outside the Mattishall Settlement boundary within the adopted Breckland Local Plan. Mattishall has significantly exceeded its agreed allocated housing target as set out within the adopted Breckland Local Plan **Policy HOU03**

2. The Parish Council and local residents have concerns regarding green infrastructure on the site. The site is particularly sensitive, it contains a number of very important trees which contribute significantly to the character of this part of the village. A number of the trees are protected by TPOs and the proposed development would adversely impact on their setting. Additionally, there is a significant line of five Cypress trees that are earmarked for removal by the applicant.

The Parish Council and local residents believe that this grouping of attractive trees is of such merit to warrant protection for future generations. The Parish Council feels that the submitted tree survey and assessment is wholly inadequate and fails to appropriately consider the significance of the trees proposed to be felled. The development proposal does not respond to the location of this green infrastructure and its detrimental effect is contrary to LP **Policy ENV01**, and the adopted Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan Policy **ENV3**.

3. The proposal to develop this currently green space does not adequately demonstrate how net gains for biodiversity would be secured and is therefore contrary to saved Local Plan Policy **ENV02**, and Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan Policy **ENV7**.

4. The Outline planning application fails to provide acceptable details on how the surface water and foul drainage will be dealt with. This is an area of the village that has suffered from incidents of flooding. The proposal fails to provide evidence that the development would not increase green field run-off rates or have a positive impact on surface water flooding in the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policy **ENV09**. Similarly, the proposal presents insufficient information to give confidence that adequate and proportionate consideration has been given to its likely effects on all sources of flooding and surface water drainage, and should not be supported (Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan Policy **ENV9**)

5. Whilst this is an outline application, the indicative plot layout totally disrespects the existing housing alignment on Dereham Road. The proposal has a poor integration with the surrounding area in terms of indicative layout. The housing form along Dereham Road is traditionally linear- this proposal breaks that tradition, turning sideways to the respected housing form. The proposal therefore is contrary to Local Plan Policy **COM01**.

6. The application fails to consider the Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan's saved Policy **ENV02**, which requires proposals to take account views and vistas, in this instance the approach to Mattishall along Dereham Road from the west. The proposed development would adversely impact the village's rural character (Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan Policy **ENV3**) which clearly states that significant trees should be retained as an integral part of the design of any development.

7. Mattishall Parish Council is not comfortable with an Outline Planning Application for a site that sits outside the village settlement boundary. This application is by its very nature vague. We respectfully request that the applicant submits a Full and detailed Planning Application so that MPC and Breckland Officers and elected Members can fully consider the application.

It was noted that a FOI request had been made, the above comments are agreed however could be altered following the FOI received. If any comments are changed the Parish Council agreed to hold an extraordinary meeting to agree new comments.

**3PL/2022/0114/F:** Poplar Farm, 41 South Green; Demolition of existing farmhouse and its replacement with 2 no. dwellings - The Parish Council requests that the Local Planning Authority considers whether these additional dwellings should be considered as part of the wider development in terms of Affordable Housing provision policy. The views of the Historic Buildings consultant should be sought.

**3PL/2022/0138/HOU:** Hall View Barn 88A Dereham Road; Hall View Barn 88A Dereham Road - The Parish Council notes the comments of the Historic Building consultant and the Tree and Countryside consultant and is content that this proposal is sympathetic in scale and materials to the host building. The Parish Council is aware of neighbour concerns and asks that the LPA considers whether there is any adverse overshadowing or overlooking issues.

**3PL/2021/1540/F:** 26 Burgh Lane; Demolition of No. 26 Burgh Lane to form one replacement dwelling and one new dwelling, garaging, revised access drive and amenity - The Parish Council is aware of objections which raise concerns about density and overlooking. Density, with the exception of number 28, all of other properties within the locality are similar to the proposal. Overlooking, in this locality any overlooking is to the opposite side of Burgh Lane and obliquely to numbers 24 and 26. The Local Planning Authority is asked to assess this proposal against Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan policy **ENV2**, which seeks to protect important views and vistas, specifically including that approaching the village along Norwich Road from the East.

**3PL/2022/0164/F:** Four winds, Mill Road; Amended plot design to plots 1 and 2 (including single storey extension to rear and amended garage design/material treatment) - Consistent with previous comments submitted relating to this site, the Parish Council objects to this new retrospective full application. The site lies wholly outside of the Mattishall Settlement boundary within the adopted Breckland Local Plan. Mattishall has exceeded its agreed Local Plan target of housing and therefore this proposal is contrary to Local Plan **Policy HOU03** and should be resisted. Mattishall Parish Council notes that Highway conditions have been unable to be discharged to the satisfaction of BDC and NCC. The Parish Council has previously made BDC aware that this development has proceeded beyond slab level- in fact roof structures are now in place and partially tiled. This is clearly contrary to the condition appropriately attached to the previous approval, and fundamentally necessary on grounds of highway safety. Furthermore, the Parish Council is aware of neighbour concerns that the lack of an effective metalled entrance and failure to widen the road as required is causing great inconvenience. The Parish Council therefore requests that BDC now manages the breach of planning conditions, and whether appropriate highway safety measures can ever be delivered on this site.

**3PL/2021/1423/F:** 88 Dereham Road Mattishall; Erection of 1 dwelling and garage. Re-submission of approval 3PL/2019/1233/F - The Parish Council has considered this revised (omission of garage) application and wishes to restate its **OBJECTION**.

For clarity, below are the reasons for our objection:

1. Full weight should now be given to the adopted Local Plan and Mattishall Neighbourhood Plan policies which did not apply when the previous application was approved by BDC.
2. The proposal lies wholly outside the adopted Mattishall settlement boundary and therefore is contrary to Policy HOU3. Mattishall has identified sufficient housing sites and has exceeded its housing target (Local Plan Policy HOU2). The notification to Mattishall Parish Council of this application states that it is partly in the settlement boundary- this is incorrect and should be amended. This failure to comply with HOU2 is in itself sufficient policy noncompliance to justify a refusal.
3. The Parish Council would draw attention to the Appeal Inspector's report where, in relation to a previous proposal on this site, the Inspector stated that, "The development would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area", "The proposal would appear as a cramped and incongruous form of development that would suburbanise the site, eroding the

rural qualities of the area, resulting in material harm to the character and appearance of the area, which would be clearly visible from Dereham Road." The Parish Council is concerned that this latest proposal, which includes a detached garage to be located closer to the existing dwellings on Dereham Road, would display these similar characteristics and is therefore not compliant with current Local Plan policy.

4. There are concerns around road safety issues through the intensified use of the access track. Local neighbours have also questioned the legality of the access and if proven may impact on the deliverability of the proposal.

5. The immediate surrounding area, particularly Dereham Road, has a history of foul water and surface water drainage. This application proposes to discharge surface water into the mains sewer which would deliver unacceptable additional water into an already overloaded infrastructure.

6. Mattishall Parish Council receives many residents' complaints about flooding issues and is working closely with the LLFA to ensure new development does not contribute to the flooding problem. This application presents insufficient waste water management information. The application has not included a flood risk assessment which BDC has required on neighbouring sites (135 Dereham Road and Hopkins and Moore site Dereham Road). The application's proposed discharge of surface water into the mains sewage system is contrary to current regulations. In the absence of evidence of permission from the water company to receive surface water, it is suggested that BDC further consult with Anglian Water on this specific matter.

7. The application fails to identify any waste collection bin storage area within the application red edge. Contrary to that stated in the application there is no 'existing' bin storage at present. The proposed bin storage area appears to be within the public highway boundary and therefore undeliverable through this application.

8. In accordance with NPPF Paragraph 205 the site should be subject to an assessment of archaeological heritage assets. (Please see recent comments raised by NCC's Historic Environment Officer on an adjacent site).

### **6.3. Denbury Homes development land South of Dereham Road**

The planning working group informed the council that they had met with the Site Manager James Springer, they reported that the site is well managed and organised and is working on the current flooding issues. The group suggested a monthly meeting to cover updates and any issues arising, they are more than happy to accommodate this. The new show house is due to open in June.

### **6.4. Breckland Landscape and Settlement Character Assessment**

Cllr Fowler attended the online workshop. He informed the Council that a supplementary planning document was shared, it is still in its early days, but he will keep the Council updated on any further development.

## **7. Outstanding issues with Breckland District Council**

The clerk shared the excel spreadsheet that detailed the numerous emails and telephone calls to BDC reference the issues raised, regarding planning policies for trees in the conservation area and Malt House Farm. After an in-depth discussion it was agreed to have one final attempt to arrange a meeting with Simon Wood to discuss these issues before making an official complaint.

## 8. Open Spaces Working Group

The Open Spaces Working Group was received with no questions raised.

Cllr Smith asked the Council to review the Burial Policy, the OSWG will review the policy for the Council to consider at the next Parish Council Meeting.

Cllr Piper asked the Council to consider the steel edging fencing (150mm face) on the village green for a circa cost of £1200.00. This was unanimously **agreed** to carry out this work, however the clerk was asked to follow up with another two quotes to ensure best price is reached. Proposed by Cllr Clarke and seconded by Cllr Smith.

It was also **agreed** to add the following items to Mr Edwards list; straighten the SAM2 post on Dereham Road before the Denbury Homes development and sand down, paint and add new stickers to the dog bins, weather permitting.

## 9. Platinum Jubilee

The notes following the recent Platinum Jubilee working group had been circulated for councillor's review.

Cllr Fowler shared the quotations received for the Platinum Jubilee mugs, one side will have "The Queens's Platinum Jubilee 2022" logo whilst the other side will have the "Mattishall" logo. It was agreed to gift a mug to all children at Mattishall Primary School and sale the remaining at Saturdays Platinum Jubilee event. It was unanimously **agreed** to accept Everything Branded quotation for 324 mugs at £845.79 + VAT. Proposed by Cllr Smith and seconded by Cllr Piper.

Cllr Turner shared pictures of sculptures and explained that these were already made and available to purchase, a legacy for marking the Platinum Jubilee. It was unanimously agreed that the sculptures in the pictures shown were not quite what the Council were looking for and decided that a memorabilia bench may be more suited to the occasion with a budget of around £1000.00. The clerk was tasked with sourcing some quotations for the next Parish Council meeting. Cllr Fowler mentioned a family within the village who had kindly offered to sponsor an item for the Platinum Jubilee, the clerk was tasked with making contact with them to discuss the Parish Council plans in providing a memorabilia bench.

The clerk shared the Platinum Jubilee poster with the suggestion that it is enlarged to A3 laminated. The following changes were agreed:

- Queen picture moved to the right and the title moved to the left.
- Enlarge and make bold the section "If you are a village-based business..."
- Add to the bottom "Any donations received will be put towards the provision of Christmas Hampers for the vulnerable in Mattishall".
- Print a dozen for distribution within the village.

The clerk shared the sketch drawings that Cllr Fowler created for the Council to review. It was agreed that we now need to build upon this plan and start to detail the number of stalls and plan out where everything will be placed. Cllr Taylor offered to contact all local businesses to ask if they are interested in participating in this event.

## 10. NPTS Training

All were in favour of Cllr Piper attending the Managing Allotment course in March.

Cllr Turner informed councillors that Norfolk ALC is holding a zoom meeting for councillors on 9<sup>th</sup> March at 7pm, if anyone is interested.

### **11. Finance**

The payments were **approved** by the Council, proposed by Cllr Fowler, and seconded by Cllr Piper and unanimously **agreed**. The list is detailed at the end of the minutes.

### **12. Asset Register**

Cllr Turner advises the Council that the asset register requires looking at in detail and proposes a working group to investigate the assets to ensure it is accurate for auditing and Insurance purposes. Cllrs Turner, Clarke and Pickering were appointed as working group members.

### **13. NWL / A47 LLG**

Update received in item 5.

### **14. 20mph request for Cedar Rise**

All were in **favour** of the road being adopted to 20mph.

### **15. Correspondence**

Councillors noted the correspondence received and reports for the SAM2.

Cllr Taylor left the meeting.

### **16. Items for the next meeting**

Councillors will confirm items prior to the next meeting.

### **17. Resolution (under the Public Admission to Meetings Act 1960) to exclude members of the public and press for the following confidential item: Legal matters concerning the damage to the cemetery wall.**

**17.1.** The county court claim had been submitted with a deadline to respond by 22<sup>nd</sup> March.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9:37pm.

**Payment list (approved at item 11.1)**

<b>Payment to</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Payment</b>	<b>VAT to be reclaimed</b>
A Rose	February Salary (Already Paid)	£973.52	£0.00
A Rose	WAH Allowance	£13.00	£0.00
HMRC	NI & Tax deductions (Feb)	£291.95	£0.00
Norfolk Pension Fund	Clerks pension (Feb)	£366.10	£0.00
21CC Group Ltd	Platinum Jubilee Beacon	£588.00	£98.00
A Rose	Expenses (NCC road closure for PJE)	£22.00	£0.00
A Rose	Expenses (PJE games hire)	£35.00	£0.00
A Rose	Expenses (Name badges)	£36.71	£6.12
A Rose	Expenses (Wix subscription)	£86.40	£14.40
D Piper	Expenses (petrol & face masks)	£18.47	£3.08
D Piper	Expenses (Town Crier costume for PJE)	£124.00	£20.00
Danns Ice Cream	Bike cart and ice cream for PJE	£192.49	£32.09
I Edwards	Expenses (scalpel and blades)	£5.50	£0.00
I Edwards	Expenses Jewsons	£45.48	£7.58
I Edwards	Expenses (Timber cut offs)	£3.90	£0.65
I Edwards	Handyman / Gardening for February	£840.00	£0.00
J Smith	Expenses (Flowers for HB MVH)	£35.00	£0.00
Mansfield Fencing	Installation of football goal sockets	£245.00	£0.00
Mattishall Memorial Hall	Hall hire for youth activities	£60.00	£60.00
Miscellanea	2 Page newsletter	£150.00	£0.00
NPTS	March seminar & Planning Course	164.00	£0.00
Poultec Bus. Park	Room hire Mar-June	£250.00	£41.65
R Turner	Expenses (Court fees for Arborsolve)	£115.00	£0.00
R Turner	Expenses (Zoom Subscription Mar-Apr)	£14.39	£2.40
NPTS	Allotment Course	£48.00	£0.00
		<b>£4,723.91</b>	<b>£225.97</b>

**Payments paid by direct debit taken on or after 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2022**

Total Gas & Power	Electricity supply at village green	£14.73	£0.71
		<b>£14.73</b>	<b>£0.71</b>