

**Minutes of the Meeting of Tunstead and Sco-Ruston Parish Council held at Tunstead Village Hall on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2021 at 7:30pm.**

**Present:** Chris Oakes, Chairman  
Jason Coward  
Gilly Foulds  
Rob Hetherington  
Brenda Jones  
Jimmy Miller, Clerk

**Also present:** Nigel Dixon, NNDC and NCC and four members of the public.

**1 Public forum**

A parishioner read out the following statement:

*I would like to make the Parish Council aware of my objection and concerns over the planning application on tonight's agenda. It is applying for access to a proposed development of 4 detached residential properties which my home and all properties bordering the site will overlook and which will all overlook my home, The White House.*

*One of my concerns is that of safety at the proposed access point. I don't believe the applicant owns sufficient land to be able to have adequate visibility to the right when exiting the site. Should myself or future residents of The White House choose to increase our fence-line on our property, visibility would be severely diminished from where it is now. We removed the overgrown hedging due to too many near-misses when exiting our driveway where the opening was located just 3 metres from the proposed access, and we moved the opening to our drive centrally within our property boundary to give us maximum splay. Should we or the future owners of The White House wish to reinstate the hedge or run the fence all the way to the boundary line, it would put anyone exiting the proposed site in great danger. A development of 4 large houses should not be built where easy access is only afforded by the goodwill of neighbours. This goodwill can never be guaranteed by future occupants.*

*The proposed access is for a narrow and long driveway to pass between my home and my neighbour's home, Orford House. Our houses are at a very close proximity to this access point and both have windows overlooking it. I understand that the construction of a new dwelling (whatever size) is considered in highways terms to generate on average 6 vehicle movements a day. That's 24 vehicle movements being made between our properties, plus all the service vehicles which will require access. All of this will significantly and detrimentally reduce our residential amenity.*

*The amount of traffic within Tunstead is already significant given the need to use private vehicles to access amenities and work. Building yet more dwellings will increase the vehicular movement in our village. We don't have an adequate bus service which could be relied upon. Residents of Tunstead are very much reliant upon private vehicles for shopping, work and socialising outside of the village. Policy SS1 & SS2 of the Core Strategy is there to steer development away from such villages which don't have amenities to support wide growth without the dependence on private cars.*

*The fact that discharge of surface water is proposed via main sewers is unfathomable. In the 6 years of living here the man-hole covers at the front of my property have flooded every occasion of just moderate rainfall. Anglian Water have finally discovered that there are many breakages in our sewerage system allowing surface water in. Yes they're in the process of getting it sorted but it is by no means a completed task. Even if this does get sorted, should we really be supporting new developments which discharge their surface water into such sewerage systems which were never*

*designed to take surface water? Our poor pumping stations are having a hard enough time as it is.*

*Finally, should this development go ahead, it sets a dangerous precedent within the village for other such parcels of land which aren't big enough for planning gain for Tunstead, but all together they will lead to the village being over-run with vehicles and diminished of its open spaces and rural living.*

*For all of these reasons, I believe that the proposal in principle is totally unacceptable and should be refused. There are no advantages which outweigh the harm of this proposed development.*

Another parishioner was concerned about water being put into the sewers.

Another parishioner said that if access was approved, this would then lead to all sorts of other issues further down the line. She said that there were plenty of other sites available where dilapidated buildings could be developed. She said that any development allowed by this access being approved would not benefit the village.

## **2 Report from Nigel Dixon, NNDC**

Nigel reported that there were budget issues at NCC and that there is a funding gap of approximately £40m. There will likely be a public consultation on how to close this gap

NNDC are in a better situation regarding their budget but the likelihood is that council tax will rise by around 4% for council tax payers..

Nigel spoke about the local plan and said that the North Walsham West development would be a part of that plan. He said that Tunstead has not been allocated any housing at present.

## **3 Report from Tom Gibbs, Norfolk Constabulary**

None.

## **4 To receive and approve apologies for absence**

Cllrs Place, Rich and Coston sent their apologies.

## **5 Declarations of interest for items and applications for dispensations**

None

## **6 Approve minutes of 21st September 2021**

Cllr Hetherington proposed approving the minutes; seconded by Cllr Foulds. Unanimous decision in favour of the motion.

## **7 Approve minutes of 19th October 2021**

Cllr Coward proposed approving the minutes; seconded by Cllr Foulds. Unanimous decision in favour of the motion.

## **8 To receive and note the Clerk's report**

The Clerk's report was noted.

## **9 Planning**

### **a) Applications received**

#### **(i) PF/21/2718**

**Ivy Farmhouse Anchor Street Tunstead Norfolk NR12 8HW**

**Installation of 2no. air source heat pumps**

Cllr Foulds proposed that TPC support this application; seconded by Cllr Coward. Unanimous decision in favour of the motion.

**(ii) PO/21/2966**

**Land North Of Market Street Tunstead Norfolk**

**Erection of up to 4 no. dwellings (access only, all other matters reserved)**

Cllr Hetherington proposed that TPC object to this application on the grounds that it doesn't meet ss1 and ss2, that there is not sufficient control of land to provide for adequate visibility for site access, which is detrimental to highways safety which is contrary to development plan policies, and that there are concerns regarding where any surface water resulting from such a development will be discharged, given that Tunstead has a flooding problem; seconded by Cllr Jones. Unanimous decision to object to the application on the grounds cited.

**(b) Applications received since 11<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

None.

**(c) Planning decisions**

None.

**(d) Planning Decisions received since 11<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

None.

**10 Correspondence**

# Correspondence list was issued previous to the meeting.

**11 Finance**

- a) To note Bank Reconciliations (if available)
- b) To note Accounts (if available)
- c) To approve items for payment:

J. Miller	Salary for November 2021	£179.84
J. Miller	Home office for November 2021	£10.00
J. Miller	Mileage (meeting November 2021)	£14.40
J. Miller	Laptop	£358.99
CGM	Grass cutting	£122.40

The Clerk said that he had still not received any bank statements though was receiving marketing material from the bank.

Cllr Coward proposed paying the items above; seconded by Cllr Jones. Unanimous decision in favour.

**d) To approve payment of invoices received since 11<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

None.

**12 Next year's budget**

The Clerk had sent out a proposed budget previous to the meeting. In the budget the new precept would be £7,801 which would mean a 19.7% increase on the parish council for a band D household which is an increase of less than £5 per year.

Cllr Coward proposed approving the budget and the precept; seconded by Cllr Foulds. Unanimous decision in favour of the motion.

### **13 Vacancy on Parish Council**

One person had so far e-mailed the Clerk and expressed an interest in becoming a councillor.

### **14 Parish Partnership scheme**

Cllr Coward proposed that the Clerk look into getting three gateway signs for Tunstead using the Parish Partnership scheme plus Nigel Dixon's money; seconded by Cllr Jones. Unanimous decision in favour of the motion.

### **15 Grant applications**

Cllr Hetherington said that he had applied for a grant from the Prince's Countryside Trust for gazebos, chairs and tables for the village hall. He hoped to get a reply by the end of the month.

### **16 Wreath for Remembrance Sunday**

Cllr Oakes paid for the wreath and was thanked for this.

### **17 Flooding within the Parish**

Cllr Foulds said she intends to make a map of the areas where there are problems, where there could be ditches to take the water away, etc. She said that this could be used in requesting money from Nigel Dixon's highways budget for the year 2022-23. She would also like this map to be used for the next highway inspector's visit to Tunstead.

### **18 B1150 and highways**

The Clerk said that the response from NCC regarding getting a safety audit carried out at Sco-Ruston on the B1150 was that TPC would have to pay for the audit themselves. However, he said that when the next consultation period comes up with the North Walsham West development, he would request that they carry out a safety audit as part of their own investigation.

### **19 North Walsham West development**

*See agenda item 18.*

### **20 Village Hall**

The Clerk said that he would contact Cllr Rich to see what will be happening within the next few weeks regarding driving the village hall forwards.

### **21 Grass cutting**

The Clerk said that grass cutting is now being done once a week.

### **22 Defibrillator**

The defibrillator needs to be registered with the ambulance service but Cllr Oakes was unsure as to whether it could be registered without a lock.

### **23 Agenda items for meeting in January 2022**

Cllr Coward suggested creating a calendar of key dates during the year for TPC.

Cllr Hetherington suggested eligibility for being a parish councillor as there had been some confusion as to what the eligibility criteria are. He read out the Electoral Commissions eligibility conditions for being a parish councillor as there had been some confusion regarding this during the last co-option process.

The meeting closed at 9:00pm.

**Date of next Parish Council meeting: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2022**