

PARISH COUNCIL

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL 13/4/'20

to discuss CROWN/CRANSWICK Amended Outline Planning Permission Ref. DC/17/6326

Present: GG, RC, SM, CJ, SH, GT, AP, MN, JB – who Declared an Interest (can comment but not vote)

GG commenced by saying the PA closing date has been extended but the PC is required to comment by 14th April and would like to go round the table to hear comments:

JB queried this because of the extension date

GG replied that the Planning Portal still states a closing date at end of March – Vincent Pearce confirmed the PC has until 14th April

MN agreed the extension until 28th April but GG reiterated this is not for the PC- PC needs to reply by tomorrow (14th)

DC asked all - considering the responses from residents and comments from Councillors tonight, what is likely to change between the 14th and 28th?

JB thought the financial information of estimated CIL monies which MN had requested from VP might change the decision

RC thinks we should stay with the Portal date (end March now extended to 14th April) or we might be left out

CJ said he sees no need to change the dates

GT said he agrees with Dawn

MN said he had seen comments on the Portal tonight – we should reach a decision tonight

SM agrees with the consensus

SH wants to get a decision out of the way

AP not sure she is ready to make a decision tonight – can we have more time

GG said he is disappointed with VP – seems to be giving confusing and contradictory information which makes it difficult to know whether information from other sources is factual or not. He then asked if everybody had a site plan and voting results sheet/comments pages /GG and MN list of Conditions

JB and SH loaded Site Plan information from the Portal

GT not sure he has all the documents GG assisted GT to recognise the documents

AP asked if GG and MN have another conference call with Crown and Planners as previously advised

GG and MN advised nothing confirmed

GG asked if all could now go through voting and confirmed MN had produced some statistics:

- 93 residents had voted in the poll-they voted 5:1 in favour of a lower density development of 80 houses.
- 73 residents voted YES to the OPP (78.49%)
- 11 residents voted YES to Chicken factory use (11.83)
- 8 residents voted NO to the OPP and NO to a Chicken factory/Industrial use (8.60%)
- 1 resident voted 'cannot make up my mind' (1.075)

Of the 73 residents voting YES

- 41 of these residents voted YES and ticked no further boxes
- 32 of these residents voted YES and NO to Chicken factory/Industrial Use

Of these 73 residents

- 60 residents made no comments about number of 80 houses
- 7 wanted fewer than 80
- 5 residents preferred 60 houses
- 1 preferred 50 houses

GG advised that none of his household had voted (12 adults) as he did not want to be seen to be influencing the votes.

AP asked how these figures compared to the Scott Vincent document (2018 document) where the results had preferred houses to a factory

GT felt that some residents thought that the OPP was more complicated than the Parish Council was suggesting.

GG again asked for round table comments then a vote:

CJ said it was good that not all Councillors were of the same opinion. Voted YES

SM said she wanted a factory as this is what she had always known since living here –if less houses maybe she would have agreed. Voted NO

JB (Comment only) Would prefer houses hopefully with young people to give some life to the village

GT Too many houses and sees no benefit for the village assets - the green area will probably not be used. Voted Definitely NO

MN would support a development of 80 houses but only with the conditions as formulated – not quite right at the moment - No community infrastructure – we are not asking for enough. Voted YES

AP will support the application on the conditions mentioned by MN. Cranswick are changing the design statement – Cranswick feel they have gone a long way – layout is not fixed, we should comment. Objection to development on greenfield land. Voted YES

SH in favour of housing in principle but still doesn't feel Cranswick has gone far enough. 80 houses too many – we need to do more work on what is asked for – need to be stronger on conditions. Voted NO

RC in favour of housing rather than a factory. Should go with the majority of people who responded. Voted YES

GG Need to get as much out of the OPP as possible for the village. Struggling to get a community spirit and a development would create a new centre to the village – residents need to be encouraged to integrate. Voted YES

DC confirmed Councillor vote as : 5 For and 3 Against – with JB declaring an interest.

AP then said she may vote NO. DC pointed out this was a Parish Council vote and any reservations she may have could be lodged direct to Planning as a resident.

GT asked if we (Councillors?) have to accept this result

JB said we should go with the majority decision of the village responses

AP said 80 houses too many – 50 houses better as on OPA

SM approved with conditions

SH said we must say we are not happy but PC approval is subject to conditions

AP said can we say that the other way round?

MN said we should show the village statistics

GG Ditto

RC said we must go with the result of the Statement poll – no point in doing it if we are not going to follow residents wishes

GG referring to the list of conditions – has anyone anything to add or delete?

All Councillors agreed the list is ok

SH requested a Dog Waste Bin be added to the picnic /seating area

GG read out the list of conditions including the addition of a Dog Waste Bin

Finally, GG asked if there were any questions or comments:

All Councillors said they were happy with all that had been said, with the exception of;

GT – he said he was marginally satisfied

SH asked re Affordable Housing – could ‘if the need was identified’ be deleted? – GG advised Affordable Housing may not be considered as Weybread is seen as a Countryside village.

It was agreed the Clerk will type the notes and pass to Councillors for their approval - a response, which will include the list of conditions ([see below](#)), to the OPP will be prepared for presentation by close of business Tuesday 14th April.

The telephone conference call closed at 19.36 hours.