**PRESENT**

Ian Kinghorn (Chair) Corinne King

Simon Covey Mike Gaffney

 Sue Lake – Clerk

14 members of the public

**1. Welcome**

The chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting explaining what the meeting had been called for and how it would operate

**2. Apologies:**

Apologies were received and accepted from Trevor Richards

All District Councillors had also been invited to the meeting and Sue Catchpole and Abu Miah had both advised they were unable to attend. Steve Riley had not responded.

**3. To Receive Members Declarations of Interest in Agenda Items**

None made

**4. MINUTES**

The minutes of the Meeting held 8th January 2025 had been circulated previously and were **AGREED** and signed by the chairman.

**5. To Consider Co-option of any New Councillors**

Matter not raised

**6. To adjourn the Meeting for Members of the Public to Speak**

Included in the following item.

**7. To consider Planning Issues**

Location: Land South Of Fairfields Way Burgh Norfolk
Proposal for 3 no self-build plots

This was the reason for this meeting and was discussed in detail.

Initially the detail of the plan was outlined so everyone was aware of what was being proposed.

The previous week a residents meeting had been held and Mike Gaffney had the details of that meeting and headlined the main points that had arisen as follows:-

* The GNLP had stated no new housing in Burgh
* There was no proven need, and 500 houses have been approved for Aylsham
* No village amenities
* No public transport
* Surrounding roads not suitable
* Fairfields Way is often used as a passing place
* Lack of grid capacity
* No public drainage system and flooding has been experienced previously
* Loss of privacy
* Fairfield Way is an unadopted road
* Threat of further development of remainder of the field
* Reduced from 4 to 3 to keep the development under 0.5 hectare
* Compromises conservation area
* May set a precedent
* When parts of the field were sold to neighbours last year a covenant was added to ensure no development on the sold land
* Under 0.5hectare means biodiversity net gain does not need to be considered.

Following this report Simon Covey then gave his view of the application. Loss of arable land should be discouraged but consideration of this plan must make reference to the GNLP. This states that windfall sites (which is what this application would be classed as) must be within settlement boundaries and be infill. In his opinion this application would not appear to be infill and could increase the risk of further development. His main objections were:-

1. Government policy to increase the supply of houses nationally is on the basis of Brownfield First; the proposed site is not brownfield.
2. The proposal will result in loss of farmland currently involved in food production.
3. The proposed site is not an infill site as defined but more within open countryside and it does not demonstrate that it fits with the existing village form.
4. Development of the proposed plots will result in enclosure of a larger area of farmland closer to the village which will then become at risk of infill development. It will also increase the risk through precedent of development at additional farmland sites around the Parish.
5. In my view, the proposed site is not within or well-related to the existing settlement of Burgh in contravention of GNLP Policy 7.4
6. Regardless of the type of housing being proposed, the development will extend into arable farmland increasing its prominence in the landscape in contravention of GNLP Policy 7.4.
7. New developments comprising upwards of 450 houses in Aylsham will be 1 km to the west of Burgh. Any new local developments must take account of greater pressure on services in Aylsham, on increased traffic through Burgh, and on the already fragile river Bure environment.

Following this the chairman opened the floor for residents comments. The applicant wished to address the meeting regarding the points raised. She advised that the application had strong eco-credentials unlike previous applications on the site. The development was at the top of the site to reduce impact on neighbours. They had recently sold parts of the field to neighbours making it clear no development would be allowed on the sold areas so were unlikely to build on the remainder of the field. She had circulated a letter advising of the intention and nobody had approached her or invited her to the residents meeting. The intention is for the homes to be self-build so there is likely to be a variety of designs. No trees will be lost and all hedgerows will remain. The issue of nutrient neutrality has been addressed. The drainage issues have also been addressed. The owners will live in one of the units so they would not wish to see further development on their doorstep. She intends to build a Heb Home which won the 2021 Broadland Design Award. All homes are to be single story so there are no DDA compliancy issues.

One resident advised that the planning decision must be made on planning grounds and the initial matters mentioned would not be considered material issues.

The meeting then went back to the Parish Council. It was proposed and **AGREED** that the Parish Council could not support the application as it stands due to the reasons stated by Simon Covey. The clerk will send the response to Broadland.

The chairman reminded the public that they can also make their comments direct to the planning authority.

It was asked whether the application would be called in. The response will be sent to the District Councillors with a request for them to consider whether they feel able to call the application in.

**8. TO NOTE ITEMS FOR INFORMATION/FUTURE AGENDA**

The clerk advised that the application for building on the Burgh Road site in Aylsham has been passed by Broadland District Council.

She also advised that the next meeting would involve reviewing policies so she will be sending them to councillors over the next few weeks.

**9.** **Date of Next Meeting**

This was confirmed as the 5th March 2025 at 7.30pm at Burgh Reading Rooms

The meeting closed at 8.10pm