

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CATFIELD PARISH COUNCIL HELD at 7pm ON WEDNESDAY 4th
AUGUST 2021 IN THE VILLAGE HALL

Attendance: Dr Bacon in the Chair, Mr Edwards, Mrs Gardiner, Mr Harris, Mr Hill, Ms Johnson, Mr Jordan, Mr Read, Mrs Wickens, Cllr Price (County Councillor), Ms S. Vergette (clerk) and nine members of the public.

Dr Bacon welcomed everyone to the meeting, he stated that the meeting was being recorded for the purpose of producing the minutes and Standing Orders would be followed for procedures.

1. **To Receive and Approve Apologies for Absence:** Mr Filgate, Cllr Grove-Jones (District Councillor), Cllr Millership (District Councillor).
2. **Declarations of Interest.** Mr Jordan declared that his wife is a tenant for the land at the stables, Wood Street.
3. **To approve the minutes of the previous two meetings.**

Dr Bacon stated that the last minutes took very many hours for the clerk to put together and he felt that the clerk must be hurt if not angry that the last minutes were not accepted at the last meeting. Mr Read said that they were very inaccurate, that some bits were missing and that there were lots of grammatical errors. As the minutes are near verbatim any grammatical errors are probably in the grammatical errors of the speakers rather than the person transcribing them. Dr Bacon stated that he asked Mr Read to be specific about what he found wrong with the minutes and his reply was "have you got all night". Dr Bacon stated that he found this insulting to the clerk, to say "have you got all night" to find what is wrong with her minutes. Mr Read did not give any examples of what he thought was wrong with the minutes, Mr Harris had given one example of, which was probably a typo, of where 'us' was 'as' or 'as' was 'us'. Mr Harris stated that this changed the sense dramatically, Dr Bacon agreed but stated this was the only example that was given. Dr Bacon went on that the idea the Parish Council is still producing verbatim minutes is very unusual, they amount to 38 pages this time and hopefully soon we can get back a standard format or minutes which would probably be more like four pages. Last meeting it was discussed that some people felt, Mr Read in particular, that correspondence should be included in full within the minutes. Dr Bacon stated that this would be unique amongst parish councils, he could not think of another example of that if the Parish Council does want to have particularly important pieces of correspondence connected to the minutes he suggested that there is an appendix to the minutes which can include any particularly important pieces of correspondence which are relevant to what is said in the minutes.

Dr Bacon asked the Parish Council to consider the minutes from the past two meetings.

Mr Harris stated that the issue of the minutes goes back to November of last year, in November, and this is accurately recorded in the last set of minutes, Mr Beckley and Mr Harris had an exchange on the minutes which got quite a long way to resolving the issue. They were only marginally apart and what was then said is that the Parish Council would consider the minutes which were recognised to be a problem at the 360 meeting. Mr Harris went on to say that has not happened and the person who was responsible for the present minutes was the Chairman because he said there were so many adjustments being made that the Chairman thought that almost verbatim was what was required. Mr Harris thought that in trying to get a balanced view of what was said ought to be taken into account. Mr Harris stated that he had been pushing for the 360 discussion so this issue is addressed which he spent quite a bit of time trying to sort out.

Dr Bacon stated that as far as he knew there is a date for the meeting. Mr Harris replied now it is August and it was November when that was agreed and when that exchange took place, which is recorded in the minutes. Dr Bacon replied that it had not been himself holding up the 360, it was delegated to other people to organise and he had been waiting for it to happen.

Cllr Price commented on the minutes of 7th July, page 75 paragraph 4 line 9 which quoted him as saying "it does not affect Catfield" Cllr Price stated that he actually said "to consider the affect on Catfield" which is the exact opposite meaning.

Dr Bacon asked for comments on the minutes, there were none. Mr Read proposed both sets of minutes should be accepted, this was seconded by Mrs Wickens with all in agreement. Ms Johnson stated that she was not at the last meeting, Dr Bacon replied that she could just not vote.

- 4. Public Participation.** Dr Bacon stated that Standing Orders say that contributions should be limited to three minutes and in some cases if they raise an issue what should happen, according to Standing Orders, is that the issue gets raised under Public Participation, but then gets discussed in the relevant part of the meeting.

Mrs Filgate (a parishioner) asked why the public participation was at the beginning, is it because the Parish Council want to get rid of the public and they can leave because she would prefer to have it where it used to be at the end where the public can comment on things that have been spoken about. Dr Bacon replied that there are various practices in different Parish Council, some have it at the beginning, some at the end, some in the middle. We are now having it at the beginning, usually Dr Bacon would ask if there are any other things to be raised after 'Any Other Business' that the public want to raise as well. Dr Bacon stated that the point, as in the Standing Orders, is that members of the public raise an issue at the start of the meeting, that can then be noted to be discussed in the relevant section of the meeting. For example if a highway was raised now then when highways is reached on the agenda it can be discussed, if it was left to the end of the meeting, the meeting would have been over then the issue could not be discussed.

Mrs Filgate asked if she could raise an issue about planning now, she had some information that Sarah Butikofer (Leader of NNDC) gave Mrs Filgate. This will be brought up under planning.

A member of the public commented about the minutes, she was glad that it will be discussed at the 360. She thought that the verbatim style are doing the parishioners a dis-service, they are difficult to follow and must take an age to produce and an age for the person who is checking them to check and they cannot be put on the notice board. In terms of adding the correspondence to the minutes, she thought a better move would be to include the correspondence and any other documents, proposals as an appendix to the agenda and they could be publicly available immediately. If the Parish Council want to record dissention on any particular issue which she thought may be the case there could be a recorded vote and it would be stated in the minutes who voted for, who has voted against and who cannot make up their mind. Dr Bacon replied that the Standing Orders do provide that any member can request a recorded vote so that can happen. The member of the public thought it might be a good idea if councillors could identify themselves.

The Councillors introduced themselves.

- 4.2** There was no report from Cllr Grove-Jones.
- 4.3** Cllr Price gave a Covid update as of this evening the total number of cases in North Norfolk stands at 3,934 and increase of 222 in the last week, an increase of 761 since the last meeting.

The infection rate currently stands at 217 per 100,000 people, last week was 207 and at the last meeting it was 39. The issue is still very much with us and therefore space and handwashing are still very crucial to avoid further increases. 90% of North Norfolk's population have had their first vaccination and 79% have had both.

Last meeting the Boundary Commission Parliamentary constituencies review was discussed which proposed that Catfield move into Great Yarmouth and Cllr Price was pleased to report that there has been a meeting of all the Norfolk and Suffolk MPs, all the Group Leaders, all the Chairs, all the agents across every single party and they all agreed and signed a counter proposal which has been submitted to the Boundary Commission and that proposal meets the Boundary Commission criteria so that would keep Catfield where they belong in North Norfolk. However, the Boundary Commission are a law unto themselves.

Cllr Price went on to say that Norfolk County Council have set up, for the coming four years, a community road safety fund, there is one million pounds invested in it and this would help with issues in communities particularly around road safety and speeding. This is being rolled out district by district because it is not possible to tackle the whole of Norfolk in one go and they are starting in the west in year one, North Norfolk is going to be year two which Cllr Price was a good position to be in because they can look at what has happened in year one and the mistakes can be looked at. The details have been sorted out and they are on the agenda for the September Cabinet meeting at County. Cllr Price recommended that the Parish Council and residents should start thinking about what the major road safety/highway issues are because he wants to be sure that he can give details when it comes to North Norfolk's turn. One of the key problems in rural villages is potholes, particularly where there are long roads with one name trying to identify when it comes to reporting the exact location of the potholes. One of the parishes said that What Three Words could be used to identify the location. The Fire Brigade use What Three Words, Cllr Price has put this to the Highways Cabinet holder and the head of Highways and they have agreed and it is being set up and implemented, hopefully this will be in operation before Christmas. This should speed things up for the Highways Engineer to find the locations.

5. Matters Arising

Dr Bacon stated that at the last meeting Mr Harris referred several times to the 'rule book' Dr Bacon thought that it needs to be clarified that the 'rule book' is the Standing Orders, the last meeting lasted nearly four hours and Standing Orders 3x says that the meeting should last a maximum of two and half hours. It is no good thinking in terms of the Chairman therefore after two and a half hours should stop the meeting because amongst other things Lea Road would not have been discussed. The importance there is that Councillors try to keep what is said brief and not repeat themselves too much.

Dr Bacon went on to say that the last three quarters of an hour of that meeting, twelve pages of minutes, was 'Any Other Business' which consisted mainly of Mr Harris trying to reverse the earlier decisions of that meeting and the previous meetings to have a public meeting instead he wanted to have either a Parish Council meeting, extraordinary meeting, special meeting but it had been previously decided to have a public meeting. Standing Order 7a says that a decision cannot be reverse a decision which had already taken, this cannot be reversed without a certain time limit of at least one meeting or more or special circumstances if a certain number of people request in writing, before a meeting, to reverse a decision. In that extra time, 'Any Other Business' Mr Read and some of the public walked out after the vote, the vote was three people for something, three people against and three abstentions, that put Dr Bacon in the unenviable position of having to cast the Chairman's vote and Standing Order 3r says that is the correct procedure, where there is a tie the Chairman has a casting vote. Some of the people who walked out at that stage, he thought, he was unsure if they were upset about the decision of the vote or the way that the vote was carried out, but several

people left in some kind of protest about that vote. Dr Bacon asked Councillors to read the twelve pages of 'Any Other Business' and then consider was all that three quarters of an hour necessary.

Mr Harris replied that when he refers to the 'rule book' he is talking about the body of rules which govern the councillor's behaviour which don't just consist of the Standing Orders, they consist of a whole host of things, the financial things, the Code of Conduct, one of the several problems which he had commented on before is that set of rules has not been updated or looked for a long time and there is still on the agenda, there was a useful offline meeting where a lot was sorted out because Mr Harris did all the work. The rule books have not been updated, looked at agreed by the body for a long time and that is wrong, it is not in the best practice. The second thing, why there was, and he agreed, a very disagreeable part the end of the last meeting was in part or largely because what the Chairman was doing which led to discomfort among the audience and what some of councillors, and if you read this carefully and he did this with Mrs Gardiner at the end was try and make sure that there was a public meeting which was organised by this body because the public clearly wanted it, there was a very successful meeting the previous night which we succeeded because Mrs Gardiner, himself and the clerk actually tried to find a middle way through that and if the Chairman had been doing more of that and been a proper chairman rather than disputing round the back of the hall we would have got through that much quicker. Mr Harris said if you read those ten pages, he thought they should be struck from the record because they are so disagreeable. Mr Harris said to Dr Bacon that he had to look his own role in that and also look at those who were trying to find the middle way which they successfully did by the end of the evening and agreed an announcement which went into Catfield News which then led to one of the more successful meetings since he had been in Catfield with a degree of constructiveness and good atmosphere which unfortunately has not been prevalent in this body since he has been a witness of it and Dr Bacon should look at his own role in that.

Dr Bacon stated that as Mr Harris, and he had said, he hoped people would read those last twelve pages and throughout there Dr Bacon kept repeating that what had been agreed at that meeting and earlier meetings was to have a public meeting but for some reason Mr Harris kept repeating that he wanted a Parish Council meeting, a special meeting, an extraordinary meeting and various ways Mr Harris phrased it when Dr Bacon kept constantly saying what had been agreed was there would be a public meeting. Mr Harris replied, a public meeting and you will see it very clearly in there is you wish to spend your time, you will see it was to be organised under ? of this body because why there was a walkout is because they thought Dr Bacon was doing a Pontius Pilate and saying "you Scott, this is down to you to organise now", nothing to do with this august body at all, it is down to you if you want a public meeting, you have a public meeting. That was the problem and if Dr Bacon had spent more time trying to draw the sides together rather than calling a quick vote when it wasn't even declared what it was about, we would have ended up much more quickly, we would have saved that hour and we would have laid the rules for the successful meeting which took place the previous evening. Mr Harris stated that Dr Bacon should have sorted the meeting out. Dr Bacon replied that he had not called a quick vote, Mr Harris had proposed it, it was in the minutes.

Mr Hill asked what Mr Harris meant by "middle way", did he mean by the Parish Council calling a public meeting. Mr Harris replied "yes". Mr Hill stated that it was his understanding that was what would happen all the way along. Mr Harris stated that was not the understanding in the hall, that is why they walked out. Mr Hill said it was the Parish Council's understanding all along and Mr Harris was asking for a parish meeting when it had been agreed that it was to be a public meeting that was what prolonged the whole process, as Mr Hill understood there was no dispute about who was going to organise the meeting but there was dispute about what type of meeting it was going to be under aegis of the Parish Council. It is in the minutes of the Parish Council, so the Parish Council would ensure that the public meeting which had

been talked about before took place which is at the end of it which the three at the end of the table succeeded in doing.

Dr Bacon thought this should be brought to a close but again, as Mr Harris said, Councillors all read the last twelve pages carefully and make their own minds up about exactly what happened.

Dr Bacon stated that it mentioned at the last meeting to help with the minute taking the idea of having a transcribing programme. The clerk tried three versions and the results were not good. Dr Bacon stated included in the papers which had been circulated was the best version of the transcription which is gobbledegook, unless someone has another program it is probably not worth pursuing that idea.

Ms Johnson asked if the 360 was going ahead on 11th August, the clerk replied that was the date that everybody except one could make. Ms Johnson stated that she had someone who could chair the meeting, Sheila Watts, Vice-President of Marshall Insurance in Norwich and Chair of the Swallowtail Federation and nothing to do with the Parish Council. She has a lot of experience and is very fair. That date was set for 11th August at 7pm in the village hall.

Mr Edwards thought the meeting would be a waste of time if there is not an agenda in advance, he was not sure what items councillors thought should be on the agenda. He thought the Council needs to know where they are going with it. He could not see how the problems could be sorted out in one meeting. Ms Johnson replied that the meeting would give people the chance to speak freely, get things off their chest and start respecting each other again and working together in the right way, it is important.

Mr Edwards said that if that is the case, if the Council does as Ms Johnson says, air the differences there is still a list of outstanding matters that need urgent attention. There are outstanding documents they had been discussed and adopted, there is the website, minutes, they are a farce. This will not be done in one meeting, he was unsure what Ms Johnson's plans are. Ms Johnson replied that the idea of the meeting was to get personalities working together properly and things like the minutes as they have gone from the sublime to the ridiculous, we need to get back to where we are happy with what we are putting in the minutes reflects an accurate interpretation of what has happened without being verbatim and the way the minutes are being developed from the structure, how the action points is really good but we need to get away from the hundred percent writing down everything he said, she said and learn to accept a succinct set of minutes. Ms Johnson stated that we need to accept how we go forward with thinking about some of the other rules and procedures. There will need to be different meetings for other things, this meeting should help the council get back on track.

Dr Bacon agreed, he thought this probably would not be a once and for all meeting, it may well be the first of a series of meetings and the Council will need to sort out some of the remaining policies that need renewing and adopting but he thought it was important that a start is made so next week will be a start.

Mr Harris agreed, we should start, he made a suggestion last time which is accurately reported in the minutes, he put down ten things that he thought were going wrong and suggested that others might like to do the same. He suggested Mr Jordan might like to comment as well. He suggested this would be a start because as Cllr Price said last time, he thought the council should have the training rather than the 360 but Mr Harris said like alcoholics anonymous you have got to recognise that there is a problem and therefore what is the problem and that is why Mr Harris tried to write it down. Mr Harris stated that councillors might disagree but it would be helpful if people, before the 360 meeting, thought about those points on the list and made their own comments. Mr Harris suggested what would be an agenda, are the ten items

right? are they true that we have those issues? if not it is a good starting point and this is what he would suggest because he did suggest it last time but he did not think anyone had responded.

Ms Johnson said that people can send her their thoughts and they can be confidential and then work on how we can put them in place in the session. Many things have happened in the last year where people have been hurt badly and she thought the biggest problem that has been caused is not working effectively for the people out there which are the people the Council represents. This is why the council needs to get back on track so they represent, because everyone is very good at what they do in different ways, everyone has different skill sets but working together they could be a force to be reckoned with. Mr Harris replied this was the number one item on his list.

Mr Harris suggested that the clerk send the list out again, it is in the minutes as well.

There had been a reply from Flagship regarding the lighting behind Limes Road. One of the lights is pointing the wrong way and the contractors have been asked to look at it and provide a quote to turn it round. They have also been asked if the lights could be dimmed.

The clerk had contacted the police regarding children at the playground. The Beat Manager has been on holiday so the clerk will chase him again. Mrs Gardiner earlier told the clerk that there are a lot of children causing problems at the moment. Dr Bacon reported that a neighbour told him a ball was kicked over the village hall onto the vehicles or property in Neaves Close. Mrs Gardiner added that there are about thirteen children in the evening, not much older than 13 going around the village starting at the village hall but also going to the play area and they even disturbed the camp at the school. This needs to be nipped in the bud plus provide them with something to do. They are ganging up each night.

Mr Edwards stated that he had heard today that it would appear during the meeting the previous meeting someone's van had been broken into in Limes Road and £3,000 worth of DeWalt tools were taken, he thought this was the second time a theft had taken place in as many weeks. While he has every sympathy for the man who had the football land in his garden he thought the police need to be more proactive.

Ms Johnson saw an incident which had been reported on NextDoor.co.uk where somebody had an air rifle fired into their garden, a couple of pellets, she thought it was in Thorn Road. This had been reported to the police.

6. **Correspondence.** Mr Edwards read a letter out that had been dropped through his letter today. The writer, Mr Edwards believed, is a long-standing employee of a company on the Industrial Estate. The letter says that Catfield is a lovely village but he was sad to hear about the planning application and the effect on biodiversity. The writer requested a new bat survey from Flagship and note their report is almost three years old and they were unable to finish the survey due to not being able to access certain areas where they believe bats roost. He noted that the adjacent development had a bat survey completed in the same year, this showed bat paths heading to the CAT01 site, it also stated a new survey should be done in 2019. The writer asked that new bat surveys are carried out so that bat legislation can be upheld. This information will be passed to the Planning Department. **Action Points, clerk to pass this on.**

7. **Planning matters**

7.1 Flagship Housing, Lea Road. Dr Bacon congratulated all concerned for a successful public meeting, it was well organised, well conducted and the audience was well behaved. Dr Bacon hoped that everyone could agree that the public meeting format was the right way to proceed.

It was a good meeting. The point of this item on the agenda is for the Parish Council to make its formal response to North Norfolk about this particular proposal and they have said the council has until 6th August to respond.

Mr Read stated that he thought after the meeting and the way the parishioners spoke and the questions that were asked and the answers, they were getting from the District Council and from Mr Jones from Flagship, Mr Read thought it was the Parish Council's duty as Parish Councillors, they are here for the people of the village, to recognise what they said and vote accordingly on it when the time comes.

Mr Edwards reiterated what Mr Read said, his view is that it would not matter what his personal views are on any subject he is here to represent the parishioners and the previous night it was clear that the hall was filled to capacity and Mr Edwards did not hear one voice say that they would support the application, everyone was opposed to it. The Parish Council has to listen to that. There was some very compelling evidence coming out suggesting why the development can't go ahead but the Parish Council has to make a decision how they feel on the matter. Mr Edwards would like to see a unanimous vote that says the Council opposes it, he could not see why not. Mr Edwards thought the most important thing is to decide on what items need to be added to the objection, which are the most relevant and have the most weight with the planners. For example the water one seemed a very compelling argument. The traffic and school side of things are important, even though they tried to dismiss it last night. Mr Edwards asked for a recorded vote on this matter to tell people how councillors behaved on the night.

Ms Johnson said that she is not against housing in the village, we do need more housing however the way the site is and the problems it will cause are her greatest concern. Ms Johnson thought that it is important that the Council looks at the aspects that will carry the most weight, biodiversity, bats, water etc whilst she might think that one of the highest priorities is the fact that Lea Road do not have an access there, we have to accept that might be one of the weaker areas. All these factors need to be mentioned and she thought the Council has a good case with biodiversity and flooding which is really important. Ms Johnson had no idea about the culverts that Dr Bacon talked about the previous evening that ran across the land, the impact other houses around the area as well not just Lea Road.

Mr Harris thought it was very good thing that Sarah Butikofer turned up, she said some interesting things, including John Toye. First of all, that if this thing had come forward now it would not have been accepted but it was accepted in 2009 for whatever reason. Secondly, that this was the start of the process, it was not the end but the start of the process and there was clearly a lot of new evidence produced which showed changes from 2009, very compelling which had not been responded to and Mr Jones was unable to respond to a lot of it. A lot of the data is disappointing that it is out of date and the bat one is just one of many of the papers which have been there which have not been forthcoming. Mr Harris thought the Council should bear this in mind, it should be represented if that is what they wish to do, that is what Sarah Butikofer said, this should be borne in mind. Firstly this would not have been approved now if this was 2009 and secondly, this is the start not the end of the process.

Mrs Gardiner stated she was surprised at the complete lack of knowledge by Flagship of what and where he was going to put this and how important the area is for all sorts of things. Mrs Gardiner asked about water and drainage and sewage they should be in place and she thought there is so much that Flagship must do before the application is even considered and so many reports that were not there and certainly not up to date.

Ms Johnson thought that Mr Jones took the easy way out by saying he did not know the answers to those things. Mrs Gardiner went on to say that the school is extremely important

it is unable to take children now and that is awful because it was coping when it was an infant school but now it is a junior school and it is full, they must consider that.

Mr Harris thought the problem was, and this can be seen in the cover note that came from the Council, they thought that this was a tick box exercise, and it would go straight through. The quality of a lot of the papers was not there so they thought and unfortunately North Norfolk thought this was just an open and shut case and we should just say amen because it had been allocated in 2009. Mr Harris said that they said if it was now, they would not have approved it and secondly there are these very substantive issues which have not been addressed either by Flagship which was self-evident nor by North Norfolk, one has to look at North Norfolk on this and clearly those things needs substantive answers, there needs to be a complete habitats directive assessment which North Norfolk will do. Mr Harris believed this would now be done or get a legal challenge. Mr Harris went on to say that the meeting was extremely constructive because what he found compelling unlike most of the Council's discussions and most of the discussion he had had in this hall, is the parishioners came, not saying "this is in my backyard I don't want it" they didn't say "I don't think housing" they just said they have specific issues about how are kids going to get to school, a very real issue which they have not been addressed and therefore it is not adequate what is happening and the Council has to recognise that in how they represent the views of the parishioners and that is what comes out of it, councillors should recognise. This is the biggest meeting Mr Harris has seen since he has been in Catfield, it was a constructive meeting, well chaired and well organised and this should be recognised.

Mr Hill stated that he does not wish to upset anybody by what it he says but the residents here last night do have to acknowledge that there were a lot of people that the Parish Council represents in Catfield who also chose not to come. Mr Hill did not know the views of those people who were not at the meeting but he thought in a democracy all correct processes should be followed at every step and clearly as Mr Harris and others have pointed out, they are a long way behind where they currently need to be in order to follow those correct and right processes and it is very important that the Council do everything that they can to ensure that everything is addressed rightly and properly as it should be.

Mr Edwards responded saying that Mr Hill said it was democracy, the result of any election is decided by those who chose to come to the ballot box, last night's events was won whole heartedly who opposed when they came to the ballot box. No one in favour of this project turned up, the Council did not receive their votes, we have to act accordingly. We can only go on the mandate that was given not the mandate the Council might have been given if people had chosen to come to challenge what was there.

Mr Harris stated that he did some research and he read from the minutes 22nd July 2009, chaired by Mr Beckley. *"Mr Beckley stated that he thought the mushroom site CAT09 would be a better choice for development, it is an eyesore, it would be cheaper to develop and it is much better for access as traffic would not have to go through the centre of the village. Mr Phillippo, Mr Gibson and Mrs Walker all agreed with these comments. If rural land can be changed for development then surely industrial land can also have a change of use.*

Mr Gardiner stated that when this matter was originally discussed and the Council opted for CAT01 the industrial climate was very different from now; this should be borne in mind.

Mrs Filgate commented that brownfield areas should be used before Greenfield areas.

Mr Beckley proposed that the Council opt for CAT09, this was seconded by Mr Phillippo there were five votes in favour and two abstentions (those who had declared an interest earlier). A letter will be sent accordingly."

Mr Harris stated that he found this interesting in 2009 the policy of this body was to go to the mushroom site, how that was reversed in which vote he did not know. Mr Harris asked the Chairman

to elucidate, Dr Bacon replied that he could not as far as that meeting was concerned presumably he was absent that day.

Mr Harris said that talking of changing a policy, he said to Mr Hill when he (Mr Harris) first came on and the Council voted in favour of trying to look at the mushroom site again which is self-evident it should be happening that is the policy. Mr Harris said that Mr Hill kept asking him where was the vote, there was a vote when Mr Hill was not present. Mr Harris found it remarkable. Mr Hill thought there had been a vote since 2009 which he had never been able to establish when that vote was taken, he was happy to accept that there was a vote in 2009. Mr Harris stated that there was another vote when he first brought up the mushroom site, he found it remarkable that we have that, talking about reversing a policy and revoting. Dr Bacon replied that presumably reversing a policy presumably did not happen at the next meeting, there is nothing wrong with reversing policies as long as it is not done at the same meeting.

Mr Jordan stated that he supports all thoughts so far and he thought things like the substation where we don't know the location of where it will be very wishy washy and could have quite an effect on the site when they do decide. He found it interesting what benefits the parish could look into having in terms of a development, possibly not this development, like doctors and schools, footpaths. The Parish Council should perhaps look at what benefits they want to see for the village so we know to look at those in the future should any other housing go forwards.

Mr Harris thought this was part of a different point, this has been talked about before but again not done anything about it. What the parish Council needs to be done now, is there was a very successful well organised meeting last night, we now need to actually try and get the views of parishioners where future development should go, the Parish Council is not anti-development they should just see it done in the right places for the right reason not actually people looking to make a buck from developing their farmland. The Parish Council needs to know what the village's view would be because that would make it so much easier to sell these issues to the village and he agreed that once this is decided what the village would like, and he made it clear last time, if you come up with his land he would have to look at that.

Mr Hill stated he agreed with what Mr Harris was saying. Mr Harris replied then we should get on with it and organise, like last night those of us who were involved, to have a proper consultation when we ask all parishioners those who want to take part where this should go because we are coming up to another round of consultation shortly, this committee did not participate in the Regulation 18 last time, it is one of the point on Mr Harris's list of how the Parish Council has not been functioning, we need to be proactive and we need to get the views of parishioners.

Dr Bacon invited members of the public to speak and asked to keep the points brief and hopefully not go into too much fine detail.

Mrs Filgate stated that Mr Harris had said the Parish Council was following the 2009 decision. It was actually rejected because of the number of houses and also the access because it was a different access so we did not start as that as accepted. Mr Harris replied that his point was a different one that policy of this body (Parish Council) was to ask for that so it is not relevant to this. Mrs Filgate went on to say that after the meeting, we should think of an alternative use of the land because it is right in the middle of the village and if money could be found it could be bought from the owners it could be an park, green space, they manage this on the outskirts of Norwich, there is funding. Mrs Filgate spoke to Sarah Butikofer at the end of the meeting and she said they had a fund they are building up not for green space but for brownfield site up to £100,000 although this is not that much money it is a good indication that NNDC planners are looking to what the Government want which is focus on brownfield sites. That sort of support could be given to the owner of the mushroom site as she wants to develop her land which would include housing, although it would be holiday lets, this would bring money into the village. This should be the focus for the future. Mrs Filgate thought John

Toye was very good, she felt heartened that they are these people who do not really know what the parish wants. She felt optimistic.

Scott Snelling, on behalf of Lea Road and interested bodies he thanked the Parish Council for the meeting the previous evening which was held by Ray Read. They also would like to thank Richard Price, Sarah Butikofer and John Toye from NNDC for being able to come to the meeting. It was a huge turnout almost fifty people and was it clear how many parishioners have concerns and disapprove over CAT development. Mr Snelling hoped the Parish Council had a chance to read the Michael Rayner consultation report, it covers the concerns of the residents. The parishioners ask for the Parish Council's help and support and thanked them.

Jennifer Harris asked to bring up something that Mr Harris had said about asking the villagers what they would like in terms of future development. It was one thing that stood out for her at the meeting the previous evening how Flagship housing was only going to be for band a and b on the council register not for people like her daughter who would be in a few years time looking for a property in Catfield and that lack of property in the more affordable range is an important thing and that would not be met by any Flagship Housing, it needs a mixture of housing, this is key. Dr Harris said we don't want to stop any development in Catfield but we want the right development and the key thing about the meeting that she heard which makes Catfield stand out from the rest of north Norfolk is the Fen and we need to use that as a key point of the argument, everybody can argue about pavements and kids walking to school whilst that is important the thing that Catfield has as an outstanding feature of our village is the Fen and the fact that that it is unique or whatever in the whole of western Europe and that needs to be key. Dr Bacon said a USP. Dr Harris agreed and said if Sarah Butikofer could not overturn 140 houses with poor access and school how was she going to turn down a few houses in Lea Road, you need to have a unique selling point, the unique selling point is Catfield Fen and we should embrace that it is key not to pollute the water. It is a heritage to protect it for our children for the future, once it is damaged you can't get it back.

Mrs Harris said to Mr Hill he was saying the people the previous evening were only part of the village when Flagship did their so called consultation if you look at their results you would see at every point people said they don't want the development and that completely different consultation than last night, Mr Hill should have looked at that.

Julie Beard said everybody seems to be concentrating on the little kids going to Catfield school what about the bigger children, they have further to travel into Stalham or to Flegg. Mrs Beard said that Mrs Gardiner mentioned about children hanging around, how many children of that age will be coming into this development, are they going to join them, she expected so. We can't have that, the village is not built for that, we don't get the help we need as it is from the police, things get left. There is no end of things going on in the village that need addressing and whether or not the Parish Council see fit to look at these things she did not know, Lea Road is just one of them and Mrs Beard thought instead of all the squabbling between councillors they should see what the parishioners want.

Cllr Price stated that he said what he needed to say the previous evening but he added a couple of other points. He was a District Councillor for twelve years and sat at times on the planning committee and has huge respect for the officers, they are very professional and very attentive and do carry out their jobs well, far better than the politicians. Picking up on Mr Harris's point earlier about tick box, the political cycle is four years and North Norfolk District Council you have two parties, the Conservatives and Lib Dems and most of the meetings they are trying to score points off each other. Building new houses used to be extremely important because of the financial gain to the District Council from Central Government based on the number of new houses that were built that changed a few years ago, it's how many new houses are built above the certain level. The idea is to incentivise district councils to build more houses and one of the other points at district council is they built so many affordable houses this year, they can be used as scoring points and it comes back to the people they represent and it is important that people have their say. Cllr Price has given his point on the

District Council website, he criticised the website because it asks a lot of questions in order to register before a comment can be lodged. When he went to log his comment as the Local Member, the system would not accept a County Council email address so he had to log in as a private individual but for openness his first statement in the submission was to explain that he was the elected County Councillor and at the beginning of the meeting the previous evening Sarah Butikofer explained about the need for improved communication and how the frustration from the public and the Parish Council about not having seen the elected, not one but two, District Councillors and how they had not been attending the meetings and Cllr Price understood that as far as Cllr Grove-Jones was concerned it was because she had underlying health issues although it was not for him to say that to the Parish Council and the public, it should have come from the district council. Apparently, that is not correct but does apply as far as Cllr Millership is concerned, she has serious health issues and also a family member with major surgery undergone. Cllr Price went on to say that Sarah Butikofer said the reason Cllr Grove-Jones had not been attending is because she is chair of the Planning Committee and the reason for not attending was to try and maintain a distance which is fair enough but there is no reason why a District Councillor needs to stay for a whole meeting particularly if there is a sensitive area, as Parish Councillors step outside if they are involved in a particular issue, having declared an interest. Cllr Price stated that there should be a lot more faith in the officers. Cllr Price stated that one of the officers at County has suggested that there are archaeological remains on the site and that an excavation report needs to be done, submitted before anymore steps are taken.

Mr Harris stated that Cllr Price raised a point which he mentioned in the note he sent, a lot of people have had trouble getting stuff on the website and he had taken it up with North Norfolk and last night and they admit the website is malfunctioning. Mr Harris thought in any communication the Parish Council has with them we should respectfully point out that parishioners had trouble getting the stuff on and for a long time there were only the papers sent by the developer and they did not have the papers from the other side, and it took a lot of effort to get any of those on. Mr Harris thought that need to be referred to because unfortunately it is not the first time the planning website has been malfunctioning for quite a period of time and that is very difficult for parishioners to come to terms with because they can't find out what is going on and in this particular case it was particularly severe.

Dr Bacon added to what Cllr Price said about Cllr Grove-Jones' position as chair of the planning committee, he was a North Norfolk District Councillor for eight years on the Planning Committee and also on the Broads Authority and those planning committees had a quasi-judicial function and it is very important that members of those planning committees and particularly the chair of the planning committees stand back from issues so they can make an impartial judgement on them rather than get involved, even if it happens to be in their own constituency or ward. Dr Bacon stated that it is wise of Cllr Grove-Jones to keep out of the issues because she is ultimately going to be the person who has to chair the meeting which will make the final decision.

Mr Harris replied that Cllr Grove-Jones had been mixing in this issue for a long time, she was quoted as telling Mrs Snelling to move when Mrs Snelling asked Cllr Grove-Jones what to do. Was Dr Bacon saying she should now stand down as the chair of the committee, she should recuse herself at that point, that is the logical conclusion. She is already deeply involved.

Mr Edwards stated that he took Dr Bacon's point where he says Cllr Grove-Jones should keep her distance, he could see the logic in that but as Mr Harris said she has not kept her distance, there was a Zoom meeting where she was very vociferous, quite hostile in fact. Mr Edwards went on to say that the reasons that the Council has been led to believe that she has not been attending meetings, all she had to do was say "I won't be coming to your meeting because of that very reason, I don't want to involve myself in this contentious issue because my position on this committee" but we have had stories that she is on holiday, we have had stories that the District Councillors had permission not to attend on health reasons, Covid reasons, all she had to do was tell the truth. Mr Edwards thought the business of Cllr Grove-Jones staying away is a conflict of interest, he thought it only started last night. He thought the Leader of the Lib Dem Council was so mortified to hear some facts yesterday when Mr

Edwards was in communication with her, he thought they got their heads together and thought they better come up with a reason why Cllr Grove-Jones has not been here.

Cllr Price mentioned the need for both District Councillors to communicate would be better so he said about Cllr Grove-Jones health and was told no and Sarah Butikofer said that she would be telling the meeting that when she got up to speak. It Cllr Price's understanding that Sarah Butikofer was at the meeting to explain this.

Mrs Filgate asked with regard to John Toye, she said he was on the portal and Mrs Filgate did not understand what that was, is he a councillor. John Toye is a Lib Dem District Councillor. Dr Bacon explain that the District Council has a Cabinet system where they have a Cabinet of about eight people who have different portfolios and he is the Member who has the portfolio of planning. Mrs Filgate replied that Cllr Toye said if people had difficulty getting on the website they could email him and he would put it on which she is going to do, because she had spent a lot of time doing this.

Mr Hill stated that had spoken to other people in the village who say they have no objection, but they have not actually been here to say that.

Dr Bacon stated that he wanted to make his position clear, he had been criticised, or it has been commented about, what people think his opinion is on all of this. Dr Bacon stated that his background is that he was born in a council house in Catfield in Elderbush Lane, he lived until he was twenty-two in a council house in St Catherine's Avenue. Dr Bacon is a great believer in social housing and he thought it was a great shame when they brought in policies for selling off council houses. Dr Bacon's father and grandfather were both on Catfield Parish Council and fought to get council houses built in Catfield back in the 1930s and 1950s. Dr Bacon stated that he thought there were particular problems with this application and so when it comes to the vote he would abstain.

Mr Edwards proposed that the Parish Council voice an objection to the proposal and asked what are the options, clearly it can be opposed but he thought Dr Bacon previously said that the Parish Council could write and say what the objections are. Dr Bacon replied that the likely outcome is that Parish Council would say they oppose the planning application and then give as much details as they want in terms of backing that up. Dr Bacon stated that if there was a vote now there would probably be the result that the Parish Council opposes the application what they then need to do is either thrash out here or thrash out outside the meeting the precise wording of what things the Parish Council wants to have included in that and it may be better in such a complex issue to leave that to a smaller group to thrash out precise wording of which things they want to mention and how much detail to go into.

Mrs Bailey stated that there was a really good report which had been sent to the Parish Council put together by Michael Rayner, it has all the relevant points on it surely the Parish Council should be using those points to oppose.

Mr Harris thought it was clear, there was a clear meeting last night which was well publicised, enormously well attended, well chaired, very fair. It was clear at the end of it, no one spoke in against it, the decision was absolutely clear and the Parish Council should say that they oppose this. Mr Harris stated and there should not be any conditions on it the parish was against it, Sarah Butikofer said this was the beginning of the process and it would come back. If it comes back the Parish Council can form a different view, Mr Harris thought, and he tried to help the clerk who very kindly and wisely tried to summarise what she thought the points were. Mr Harris wrote to the clerk from his own notes saying what he thought they were. Mr Harris thought there should be a flat 'we oppose it' because of what has happened but he thought it would not be a bad thing for the clerk not to link it to our proposal because otherwise you get into this condition this, condition that, which is what happened at the Sands site, very similar circumstances and Mr Harris is mistrustful of that. He would like to see all those conditions back. Mr Harris stated that the Parish Council should say, the meeting that took place which was kindly attended by Cllr Price, Sarah Butikofer and John Toye these are the issues that parishioners

brought up and which we paid attention to, there may be other issues that come because we are starting the process not finishing a process. Mr Harris proposed that to represent the parishioners there should be a flat refusal and say we oppose this and if they chose to come back that is their affair.

Dr Bacon asked for clarification, was Mr Harris just saying oppose the application and add no detail? Mr Harris replied that the Parish Council should just say on the basis of what has been presented and having consulted the with the parishioners the Parish Council opposes it but then not make it a condition but then as a matter of information these are the points that came out of the things because the risk is you get a tick box, he has considerable experience of this, they go through trying to say they have looked at that issues, they have looked at that issue tick and that is what the Council needs to avoid. If you want to see how that is done just look at the habitats directive which is one of the weakest documents he has ever seen.

Mr Harris stated that he was proposing that the Parish Council represents the parishioners by a flat refusal at this stage, just we don't agree on the basis of the evidence submitted. Mr Edwards stated that this made sense and seconded the proposal. Mr Edwards proposed a recorded vote, this was agreed.

There were six votes in favour: Mr Edwards, Mrs Gardiner, Mr Harris, Ms Johnson, Mr Jordan, Mr Read. Three abstentions; Dr Bacon, Mr Hill, Mrs Wickens. **Resolved** to oppose the application. **Action Point clerk to draft a letter and circulate. This will then be sent to NNDC.**

Mr Harris stated that the clerk should say 'these are the points' because he was asked the previous evening. Dr Bacon read out the list. Appended to the minutes. Mr Harris asked for a comment to be added about the website being inadequate.

8.40pm Cllr Price left the meeting.

A member of the public commented that Flagship supposedly sell their old stock of housing to raise funds for new houses and the gentleman the previous evening said that they had an age to them, she believed that was true. Mr Harris stated that he found it interesting that Sarah Butikofer did not know about that and was upset. Mr Harris had been trying to look at Flagship and Victory Housing on the web and he had a suspicion that Flagship is a lot more profit orientated than what was there before, the gentleman having been in business for forty years struck him as more business-like than supporting the poor and the homeless.

7.2 Planning application PF/21/1516 Land at Wood Street. An update had been received which had been circulated. Mr Harris stated that the planning officer had come up with a very interesting and reasonable suggestion, but he had drafted what he thought was an appropriate reply for consideration and Mr Harris read the letter out, appended to the minutes. Mr Harris asked what is the permission up there, that is all the letter is saying and explaining why the Parish Council made the request. Mr Harris suggested this letter should be sent.

Mr Hill stated that the Parish Council should focus on what they were asked to consider, which was a roof over a muck heap and that should be that.

Mr Read responded that the Parish Council has not got the numbers which were asked for which then they would tell you how much muck you are going to get and how long it lays there, when its going to fill the shed up in two weeks or two months but we have never received numbers from them and until we get actual numbers how can we justified whether the shed is too big, too small or exactly right it depends on the number of horses and we have not been sent these details.

Mr Harris stated that there is a concern at that end of the village that this has been growing and they haven't been consulted, they had no idea of exactly what is happening. Mr Harris said that it struck

him as a reasonable request for parishioners to say actually what was the planning permission given on this and he found it surprising that they have not readily got this on file. He said it was very similar to Lea Road in one respect, in Lea Road they don't know what the restrictions were on Traymaster, they are unable to say and therefore this is a simple thing if you give planning what were the terms on which you gave it.

Mr Hill replied that this is not what the Council is being asked, they are being asked to consider a roof being put over a muck heap, it does not come much simpler than that, the Council has been aware that the meetings have been going on a lot longer than necessary and this is a good example of something that is very straight forward and should not take very long and it is being made to take much longer and the request that have been put in are not relevant to the application that the Council was asked to consider.

Mr Harris replied that the Council put in that request last time, it had been agreed and he has come back and Mr Harris could see no reason why the Council should not in the interests of the people who raised this question say what are the numbers. Mr Hill asked who raised the question? Mr Harris replied parishioners in that end of the village. Mr Hill replied that he had not seen any correspondence come to the council raising that specific. Mr Harris replied that they had been in correspondence directly. Mr Hill went on to say that when the gentleman from the District Council responded he thought the letter said that he did not see what this has got to do with a roof over a muck heap. Mr Hill thought the gentleman was quite right, we were asked to consider a very simple application and the Council focused on what they were asked to do, if somebody brings up a separate issue then by all means the Council could address that issue but that has not been presented.

Mr Harris stated that the concern was expressed and the Council did say the use of the portal should be restricted because the suspicion is there has been a creep in using the lighter agricultural planning so there has been a significant increase and all that the residents are asking is what has been authorised or not, it is a reasonable request.

Mr Hill stated that Mr Read recently said that the construction if it goes ahead should be restricted to covering a muck heap and not change appearance, that is perfectly reasonable but how many horses are down there and what permission, or the traffic on the Plumsgate Road is not relevant to this request that the Council has been presented with.

Mr Harris stated that it is the growth of that particular enterprise is relevant to the traffic down what we have restricted to traffic for commercial activities down that road and Mr Harris has been very concerned about it, Mr Harris said that it strikes him, as last time, a very reasonable request to say what have you got on file for the planned number of horses in that livery because they have a very significant effect.

Dr Bacon stated that this is going backwards and forwards over the same argument, he stated as a resident of Wood Street he did not particularly have a problem with the number of horses or cars in Wood Street. Dr Bacon felt the same as Mr Hill and the officer concerned that the Council was asked to consider covering a muck heap and that is what should be dealt with and that the Council should request restrictions such as it should not be in future that the muck heap cover should be turned into some form of extra stabling to expand the amount of stabling but if the Council wants to ask separate questions about the operation of the business in Wood Street it should be done separately to this particular planning application there is nothing wrong with the Council requesting separately for further details about what planning restrictions already operate there as a separate issue but the Council should not try and tie it to a straight forward issue of covering a muck heap.

Mr Read stated that his understanding of it was the letter that was sent was part of it asking for numbers and they declined to give them because that seems as though their records up there are a complete shambles because he said he could not find them. We have requested further information,

they have not been forthcoming with this information. If you have one horse, why do you need a muck heap cover that big, if you have twenty horses that may be too small.

Mr Hill replied that what the gentleman said in his response was that it was not relevant to this application, the Council has been asked to consider a roof over a muck heap it is as simple as that. No one asked the Council to consider how many horses were there or the use of Plumsgate Road. Dr Bacon stated that there is a danger of repeating things, he agreed with Mr Hill that the two issues should be separated, a request for information about the existing use of the site is one thing, a planning application to cover a muck heap is a separate thing and the Council should treat them separately.

Dr Harris stated that she is a resident of Wood Street, at Wood Street Farm and she understood the application also get put down as that. Dr Harris stated that the suspicion is that the Parish Council is approving a roof over a muck heap but what about the change of usage, she already suspects that these horses were being looked after by the stables and now are DIY, she had concerns about traffic particularly on Plumsgate Road, she walks there every day and there is much more traffic than there ever was. She walked just after 9am and twenty cars passed her on the short stretch, it is not usual traffic for a single track road. If people are doing DIY horse care and are going in twice a day, it makes a big difference, they are often going fast and pedestrians have to climb up on verges. The traffic does impact on the Council's decisions as does the question of whether they are respecting what the original approval was, if it was originally approved for livery stables only, not DIY and a change of usage has happened that has impacted significantly on traffic. If that is the case she cannot be sure that this manure stable won't have some wooden sides on it and be converted to stables. She has no faith in that and thought there is disquiet in Wood Street. Dr Harris stated that she has spoken to a number of residents in Wood Street and this just gets expanded because they do not know about, it comes under agricultural rules, it is only because it was rejected that it has come up here in the public forum so she thought that the original agreement of what was put down for the stables is key because it is being respected, it has impacted significantly on traffic.

A member of the public stated that she agreed with Dr Harris, she does not live in wood Street but she walks the route nearly every day and it is very dangerous with all the cars and at all times of the day especially the mornings. There is a large amount of litter that is thrown out of the cars. The lady said that as a parishioner she would like to formally ask to have the use of the stables investigated.

Another member of the public stated that there is DIY at the stable because she knew someone who has horses and they go down there twice a day.

Mrs Harris stated that originally it was pure livery and she remembered seeing Dr Bacon when Mr Alston just had the small livery there that Dr Bacon complained that he turned the agricultural field into a field for horses and even that step was illegal at that time so therefore there is a whole trail of how the livery has grown and Dr Bacon did not like the shepherd's huts on the road because of the traffic Dr Bacon objected to that but he is quite happy with the livery traffic. Dr Bacon stated that he did not object to the shepherd's huts because of traffic it was for other reasons. Mr Harris stated that he did comment on the traffic.

Another member of the public asked why does somebody want to cover a muck heap, Dr Bacon explained that the Government is encouraging farmers to do this because the idea is that if the muck heap is in the open the rain on it washes liquid out of the muck heap which then runs down, in this particular case into the road, into a ditch and the idea is by retaining it under a cover there is less liquid run-off. Mr Hill confirmed this, it prevents anymore effluent than is necessary coming out of the muck heap so this is purely an environmental consideration. It is cleaned out every so often but the idea is we get about twenty-four inches of rain a year so that is twenty-four inches of water that doesn't land on the muck heap and wash any effluent out into the surrounding area so that is an

environmental consideration and the muck is then taken away at the appropriate time and spread on the land.

Mrs Harris said it could be put on a covered trailer and then twice a month put it onto the fields. Mr Hill replied that if the muck is in a building during the wet winter the muck in the building is not exposed to any rainfall so there is no chance of washing effluent, if you take it on the trailer and put it out on the field you will then have the rain land on the muck heap in the field and that would then disperse into the soil so Mr Hill thought it was a better environmental option to keep it completely dry as much as one possibly can rather than expose it to the elements, that is why it is requested that this is done. People would not normally choose to put up a shed to put a muck heap in, it would be vastly too expensive. Dr Bacon stated that the Government actually pays farmers money to do this cover because they think it is such a worthwhile thing to do.

A lady asked if the muck heap was on the ground. Mr Hill was unsure if there was a concrete pad underneath but stated that horse muck in general is quite dry. The lady replied what about all the water run off everywhere else that seeps into it anyway so if you talk about the water and it going into the muck heap, there is more to consider than just a roof over the top of it, it is what is happening around it as well because it does get quite wet around there.

Dr Bacon stated that he thought there had been enough detail about the practice and theory of controlling muck heaps, he did not think it was necessary to go into much more detail but a conclusion is needed on what the Parish Council wants to do.

Mrs Filgate stated that she had horses for a long time and had never covered her muck heap, horse muck is quite solid, and the man used to take a truck and store it on the field so if it went through the truck onto the ground he would have spread the muck anyway. Mrs Filgate thought this is typical of twenty-first Century trying to invent new ways of what over hundreds of years have been done.

Dr Bacon asked for a decision on the planning application. Mr Harris stated that this is another one where we have heard from the floor that there is quite considerable concern from parishioners who do go round, either live there or use that road, that is the issue and they would just like the Parish Council to ask this question which seems to be, if the Parish Council is reflecting the parishioners, what is wrong with asking the question. Mr Hill stated that it has not been brought in front of the Parish Council through the correct channels, if that question is brought to the council and appears on the agenda and says please will you consider that then Mr Hill thought it was quite right.

Mr Harris stated that the council wrote that and discussed it in the previous meeting, Mr Hill replied that it was not what the Council was asked to consider last time. Mr Harris replied that the council wrote the letter and all the officer said was why should he look in the files to try and give this answer. Mr Hill stated that the officer said that the council was not asked to consider that.

Mr Harris asked if the Council was going to reflect the interests of the parishioners. Dr Bacon asked again for a decision.

Mr Edwards stated that it would appear the response from NNDC has not met the approval of a number of people and some councillors. Mr Edwards declared a dis-interest, as he has no knowledge of the matter. Mr Edwards stated that it was agreed at the last meeting a letter would be sent requesting the information, NNDC have not responded it would not take long to find the information. Mr Edwards thought the letter asked a perfectly reasonable question, more importantly he was taking guidance from the floor as there are a lot of concerned parishioners who are wondering what is going on down there and they know far more about it than Mr Edwards does. The Parish Council is representing them, if they are not happy with the answer from NNDC we should write a strongly worded letter saying our parishioners and our councillors are not entirely happy with your response, we need the details we have asked for. It would appear from what has been said that the man who

owns the site has a bit of form hence the suspicions from the floor of what his real plans are. Mr Edwards stated that he would abstain from a vote because he has no knowledge that would satisfy his conscious either way. If the farmer has a valid case justice will prevail and he will get permission.

Mr Edwards proposed that the Council sends a far stronger worded letter to NNDC saying they would like this information we are not fussed if it takes a bit of time to find, it is what they are paid to do. Mr Read seconded the proposal. There were four votes in favour, four vote against. Mr Jordan abstained. Mr Edwards asked the Chairman to consider the views of the parishioners before taking the casting vote. Mrs Gardiner stated that although people think she is a farmer, she has nothing to do with the farm but she spoke to her son said they do have to cover all the muck heaps and they have cows so that is a concern but she thought the main concern that in fact it is the over-use that is concerning and that can be included on the reply on planning and the roads are not suitable. Mr Hill stated that the Council had been reminded at the previous night's meeting and tonight that we live in an environmentally sensitive area and there is an opportunity to take some responsible action to protect that area, which is what this request is about. Mr Hill could not see why the Council could not approve that request and then if the parishioners want questions asked about the numbers of use and the road use that is a separate issue and Mr Hill would be quite happy to discuss that issue separately to this issue. The Chairman stated that he sees this as two separate issues and he asked if Mr Edwards' proposal included any comment on the muck heap or was it just a proposal. Mr Edwards replied that he wanted the questions answered. Dr Bacon clarified that Mr Edwards' proposal did not include the cover of the muck heap. Mr Edwards confirmed that.

Dr Bacon stated that if the proposal is not linking the two but asking questions about the use then he was sure the issue would come back again if it is refused so he voted in favour of requesting the information simply because he thought if the council turns it down now the issue would come back again and would be raised again. The Parish Council might as well face it now rather than have it come back again next meeting, on that basis the Parish Council is adjourning the decision on the muck heap itself until we get an answer. Mr Hill questioned why the Chairman cast his vote differently from his original vote. The chairman explained that the first vote had been his personal vote, but the casting vote was how he thought the meeting should come to its final decision. That is the case here he personally did not think the council should be enquiring into the use of the site but he thought for practical pragmatic reasons the council might as well face the issue because it will come back again so his casting vote was that the council do write the letter asking for further information which would get it done now rather than delaying the issue until next meeting.

Action Point clerk to write to NNDC requesting further information.

7.3 Planning application PF/21/1740 Chapel House. This had been circulated. Mr Edwards stated that he had been monitoring the portal and there were no local objections. He noted that permission is sought to build a sensory room which he did not have a problem with. If the nearby neighbours are not objecting he thought it could be approved or supported but with the proviso that it is not converted into a holiday let. Mr Edwards proposed approval with the proviso it has to be used for the purposes it stated, this was seconded by Mr Harris and all in agreement.

Action Point clerk to respond.

7.4 Response from the Planning Department regarding the Greenoaks site. This had been circulated. Mr Harris stated that he had been unable to use the links.

Action point the clerk will try to download what was sent.

8. Environmental Matters

8.1 Update on Johnny Crowe's Staithe. Dr Bacon reported that he had not been to have a look yet to talk to the person concerned, he appears to be there some of the time and not there some of the time. Dr Bacon stated that he needs to be persuaded to move on permanently. Mr Hill and Mr Read will try to go with Dr Bacon. Mr Read stated that he and Mr Filgate had agreed to go with Dr Bacon last time. Dr Bacon stated that if anybody else wanted to go rather than him he did not mind. Mrs

Gardiner stated that it was important to get on with this because another month has gone and he has got away with it.

8.2 Update on dog bins. The order had been placed for the new bins and repair of the broken dog bin. Mr Edwards stated that the bin opposite the Old Chapel had been repaired, so that part had been done. The ranger inspected the sites and did the repair. There is a formality that Highways have to approve the positioning which does not take too long and once this is given then the ranger comes back out.

8.3 Highways issues. Mr Read reports that problem regarding the overgrown brambles it is nearly impossible to see when turning into Ludham Road even in a car. It is dangerous for the children and mothers to walk to school. It is beyond belief it is not possible to see round the corner. Dr Bacon clarified this is on the junction of Long Lane and Ludham Road. Mr Edwards stated interestingly part of the site plans for the Lea Road project indicate there is a hedge there which needs to be trimmed right back to allow vision for road safety, hedges do grow back again. Mr Read said this needs to be done before the children go back to school, a couple of years ago the brambles had been cut to the ground.

Action Point, clerk will follow this up again and include Cllr Price.

Mr Read also reported the hedge on the corner opposite the Post Office the hedge on top of the brick wall. It was trimmed the other day; it is not quite down to the foot but he would accept that. The hedge is now sticking out into the road, visibility to turn into Church Road is restricted.

Action Point clerk to contact the property owner.

A member of the public asked if there would be any addressing of the flooding in Lea Road, Dale Lane, Hall Road, Wood Street. Dr Bacon replied that the Parish Council does occasionally report those flooding items to the Highways, they don't do any major works to alleviate the flooding and there are lots of places where it happens. Sometime such issues can be dealt for instance about twenty years ago there used to be bad flooding in Back Lane, near to the junction with Dale Lane that was partly alleviated by putting a soakaway into the neighbour properties. Most of the floods have been like it for years, they are regularly reported to Highways and the Highways do nothing about it general. Again, pressure on the County councillor to put pressure on the Highways department might be what is needed.

Mrs Harris reported some potholes in Hall Road and Lodge Road.

Mrs Gardiner reported that Dale Lane is very narrow because the hedges and vegetation have not been trimmed at all. This is the responsibility of the landowner who was present at the meeting and will look into it. Mrs Harris stated that it is forbidden to cut the hedges now until September. Mr Hill replied that hedge can be cut for highway reasons at any time.

8.4 Emails from Norfolk County Council Records & Register Office., circulated. Dr Bacon explained that this relates to the Highways Act 1980 where farmers and landowners can put in maps showing the land that they own or farm and what registered paths are on there but basically it is a disclaimer saying that they deny there are any other rights of way on there. Dr Bacon noticed that from Mr Alston's fields some of the public rights of way are not marked on the map but then the text says they do not have to mark them. Mr Harris asked shouldn't they be marked, does the Council need to do anything about it. Dr Bacon replied they do not need to do anything, it is more if the Parish Council sees there is something which they think should be a right of way that is not registered that is on that particular piece of land. If it is registered whether it is shown on the map or not it is a right of way but it is the landowner then saying he does not recognise any other rights of way on his land. It is a follow on to the 1932 Highways Act. Dr Bacon could not see that any have been missed out, there is nothing the Parish Council needs to do on this at the moment. Registered rights of way whether they are marked on the map or not are registered rights of way and it is optional whether they are marked on the map.

9. Finance

The current account stands at £5910.92, the number account £629.52 and the BPA £18180.76 making a total of £24721.20.

Four cheques were presented for payment:

101376 for £100 payable to AR Beales for strimming in the Sandholes

101377 for £327.60 payable to NNDC for emptying the dog bin

101378 for £2239.27 payable to NNDC for the 6th May election

101379 for £106 payable to HMRC for tax.

The clerk's salary will be paid by standing order

A breakdown in costs for the 6th May election had been circulated. There is another invoice to follow for 20th May election.

Mr Harris asked if they recognised the mess up of the elections with regard to the sending the poll cards out twice. Dr Bacon explained the invoices, the charges for this election because it coincided with County Council elections they are not charging for some of the items and they will charge a third of the charge and the other two thirds for the County Council election.

Mr Harris asked if the Parish Council was being charged twice for the polling cards. The clerk replied that the officer at NNDC could not see a charge on any of the invoices for the poll cards for 6th May.

Dr Bacon stated that the second election would be dearer because the costs would not be shared with the County Council election. Mr Harris stated that it was a pity they could not put the two together. Dr Bacon stated that there were not allowed to put the two together even though they were a fortnight apart they had to be two separate elections. Mr Harris and Dr Bacon agreed that when Mr Beckley resigned it was his intention that both elections would be on the same day.

Mrs Gardiner stated that this sum of money is an awful lot of money to put someone on the Parish Council and we have another bill and that money, to her, could have been spent in some other way, youth need it and we will have to try and find it sometime because it is a waste of money. The Parish Council perhaps needs to look at co-opting again.

A member of the public commented that parishioners should be able to vote who they want. That is democracy. Mrs Gardiner replied that was fine so long as they did not object to this amount of money, some people would say at the end of the year that £5,000 going on an election is a lot of money. She could not see why NNDC charge that much.

Mr Harris stated that the council needs to have the 360 they have been dysfunctional and that is why they have had the elections because co-option lost its credibility. Mr Harris went on the council could resolve the lack of credibility and the lack of responsiveness to the parishioners they could probably get over that but there have been a whole number of incidences like on the Poores Trust which were not edifying.

Mr Edwards stated that there was an election and the Council got him! If there had not been an election the council would not have got him, there would have been two different outcomes.

Mr Harris proposed that the payments be paid, this was seconded by Mrs Wickens will all in agreement.

10. Progress Reports

- 10.1 Village Hall. Mrs Gardiner reported that they are continuing slowly and cleaning regime is continuing after every meeting. Dr Bacon cut the grass beside the village hall and trimmed

back the visibility splay either way but the neighbour adjoining did say that there are people in Neaves Close the hedge does stick out one way it makes it difficult to come out looking to the right. Mrs Gardiner stated that the builders said they would cut the hedge down. Dr Bacon thought it was the builders and said that as far as the Parish Council is concerned they would not object if the residents want to cut it back even further than he had cut it to make a better visibility splay.

Mr Read stated that the three neighbours that surround the playground asked if the hedge could be cut. If quotes are asked for now a decision can be made at the next meeting. Mr Read stated that they all want it done at different heights, some only want a light trim, their greenhouses need to be protected. The side also need cutting back. Mr Hill said that the council spent quite a lot getting it cut last time and thought it should be cut at the height it was done before. Mr Read would meet with the contractors.

Action point – clerk to obtain quotes.

10.2 All Saints Church. Dr Bacon reported that there is still no Rector and the gras cutting continues to be done by volunteers. Mrs Gardiner reported that there would be two fund raising events in the next month: 15th August open gardens and a quilting weekend on 11th and 12th September.

10.3 Poors Trust. Dr Bacon stated that they had a tree surgeon in to do some surgery on some of the trees along the roadside of Catfield Staithe and actually on Catfield Staithe for safety reasons.

Mrs Wickens' term as a Trustee has expired, Dr Bacon said if this was advertised, at the next meeting the Parish Council could appoint or reappoint a Trustee. Also, Mr Jordan's term is nearly up. It was decided to do the two vacancies at once.

Mrs Harris asked how long the terms are usually, Dr Bacon replied three years. Mrs Harris stated that Mrs Wickens' term is longer she had been there longer, she thought it should have come up in March, it should have come up because last time Dr Bacon and Mr Beckley also overran for six months, it is quite a loose concept. Mrs Harris asked in future the Poors Trust should look at that in future. Mr Harris asked if it would be advertised in Catfield News because Dr Harris tried to stand last time and Dr Bacon voted for himself, there might be others interested. Dr Bacon replied that he was perfectly entitled to.

Ms Johnson stated that if the term was extended for three people for a term of three years that every year one person's term comes up. Dr Bacon replied ideally but then if somebody resigns out of sequence like Mr Read did, who was a Trustee for a few months and then resigned and that meant the was a different timing.

Action Point – clerk to put something in the magazine for anyone interested to contact her.

11. **Date of next meeting.** The date of the next meeting was set for Wednesday 1st September at 7pm in the village hall.

12. **Any Other Business.** There was none.

The meeting closed at 9.40pm.

.....
Chairman

.....
Date