

## Stody with Hunworth Parish Council

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting, held on Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> November at 7pm at Hunworth and Stody Village Hall to consider PA/24/2458 – revised PA for alterations to the Hunny Bell Pub, and building six houses on the adjacent sugar beet pad.**

**PRESENT:** Karl Carter (Chair) (KC). Charlotte Crawley (Vice Chair) (CC). Adam Godwin (AG), Jeremy Philippi (JP), Alan Suffling (AS), Andrew Taylor (AT), Beverley Tiller (BT), Kerry Harris - Clerk. (KH)  
 NNDC Cllr Andrew Brown  
 2 members of the Stody Estate Team: Charlie MacNicol (CM), Jamieson Bird (JB) MD of Bayfield Homes  
 22 Members of the Public

**25/57. Chair's welcome and to accept apologies for absence** – KC introduced himself as the Chair of the PC and welcomed all to the meeting. There were no apologies. He welcomed CM and JB to the meeting. He informed all that this meeting had been called to discuss the single subject of the revised Pub Planning Application submitted to NNDC by the Stody Estate.

**25/58. Declarations of interest and dispensations to speak** – JP said that he is a brother-in-law to CM. AG said that he is a tenant of the Stody Estate.

**25/59. To receive a presentation from Stody Estate and their expert JB on the revised planning application PF/24/2458 –**

KC noted that the meeting this evening was to discuss the new application and any questions must relate to this scheme. The Cllrs will Propose and Second their response to the District Council at the end of the meeting. He then summarised the Planning Application revisions and responses of the Parish Council during the earlier meetings after which he handed over to CM and JB to present the revised application.

CM introduced himself and informed the meeting that all plans were now available on the NNDC portal. He stated that the aim of Stody Estate with this proposal was to secure the long term future of the Hunny Bell pub. He stated that he had listened to the concerns expressed in the previous PC meetings and there would now be no development on the pub site. The pub will offer 4 internal bedrooms as accommodation. There will be a large new drainage system designed by Rossi & Long. There will be 6 houses on the Sugar Beet Pad which will be built of Norfolk red brick and flint, in keeping with other properties in the village: 2 x 2-bed, 2 x 3-bed and 2 x 4-bed – two of which will be affordable and two will be retained by the Stody Estate for rental. The remaining two will be sold. CM explained the biodiversity and public space gain, the work to prevent flooding which has recently taken place and the drainage scheme for the new properties

**25/60. To consider the views of the parishioners of Stody with Hunworth Parish and other local residents on the Proposals for the Hunny Bell by the Stody Estate and to Approve what action to take.**

*Can you explain what reducing the aspect of the houses at the back of the development means?*

CM – These two houses are still 4-bed, but part of each building is now single storey rather than double.

*Will the drainage be shared.*

CM – the pub will have its own klargesters.

*What will be the monthly rental on the finished Hunny Bell?*

CM – We will look at market rates at that time, but have not charged market rates in the past.

*Will the public space just be available to residents of the new houses?*

CM – It will be available for the whole village to use.

*How soon will you start working on the pub?*

CM – First we need to get planning approval and building regs agreed; after that the sequence is still being agreed with NNDC. Stody Estate is also interested in getting the pub up and running.

*The pub has now been closed with no heating for 18 months.*

CM – The pub is checked each week and there are no leaks

*Can the pub be opened again now?*

CM – it is not viable. The bedrooms and further investment are necessary.

*If the new people can't make it work, will you offer the pub to the village?*

CM – This revised scheme has been led by all the support for the pub shown by the village. Professional advice has stated that the best chance for the village is to have the added value from the bedrooms but it is not possible to predict the future.

CC – The pub is now designated as an Asset of Community Value so the community would have some protection if the pub was put up for sale

*The layout is good and doesn't affect anyone too much. There was no run off through the village on Friday 14/11 after the large amount of rainfall.*

AT – this is all 1 application. Could it be divided into 2 separate applications?

CM – It is 1 application

*Is there work to be done underneath the pub?*

CM – Hopefully not.

AS requested information about the sewerage system for the pub.

CM – there will be a new system

*The proposed system is insufficient. £120K will be required, if not the village will suffer again from leaked sewerage.*

KC – the proposed klargesters has not changed from when a smaller pub was proposed.

*The key issue is the commercial kitchen.*

CC to AB – when will the Planning Committee consider this?

AB introduced himself and explained the NNDC Planning approach:

He had spoken to the Planning Officer dealing with this application this morning. There is still some updating required before the application can be taken to the NNDC Planning Committee: the viability surveyor wants further information; the housing team are happy; the drainage system proposed by Rossi Long has been checked. The Application has been called in by the Head of Planning so it can't be decided by Officers. The scheme cannot be 2 applications – 1 is dependent on the other. NNDC will require a S106 Planning Agreement tying the phases of building and releasing the dwellings to the phases of renovating the pub.

The S106 is drawn up by lawyers and this will take time. It will hopefully be on the January Planning Committee agenda, but if not, then the February meeting. AB confirmed that concerns listed at the previous PC meeting had been addressed.

He noted that the application was contrary to planning policy in allowing housing development in open countryside, but the pub was the material consideration as the advantages to the community could supercede that and there was also the 2 affordable properties and the improvement in drainage.

*Can it be conditional that a particular company has to undertake the work?*

AB – No – NNDC cannot influence any applicant in their choice of contractor

AB – the resident can submit his drainage specification to the planning officer

AT – if it differs from the Specification

AB – NNDC would issue an enforcement notice requiring the applicant to put right any deficiencies in the agreement and would pursue this to prosecution if necessary

AT – could end up with 5 properties released and no pub and NNDC powerless to make the pub open

AB – a brave investor who would invest £330k in a pub and then not open it.

AT – being forced to accept the houses as they are only being built due to the proposals for the pub

BT – where is the septic tank [for the pub] currently

CM – all over the place and the location for the new drainage system has not yet been confirmed

BT – the new footpath: what will it be made of? And will it have a kerb?

JB – it will need to be a proper metal footpath. It will need a kerb, but as this will not be an adopted road, it can be a private kerb, just enough to distinguish between the road and the footpath.

BT – could it be railings as in Heydon?

BT – will there be streetlights?

CM/JB – No, but there may be downlights on the properties

The pub doesn't yet have full plans

CM – they will follow, with building regulations.

*We are being hoodwinked. We do not want 6 houses to save the pub. Sell some land. Get money from the bank..*

*If the pub was still open we wouldn't be sitting here*

A resident who has worked in the field of running public houses was asked for his opinion. *He stated that he believes this proposal will work subject to a competent operator*

KC – The pub needs significant investment

## **25/61 To Approve the Parish Council Response to the Planning Application**

Proposed CC: That Stody with Hunworth Parish Council supports the revised Planning Application PF/24/2458 (HUN1-14e) for the refurbishment of the Hunny Bell pub, in parallel with the building of 6 houses next door on the sugar beet pad, subject to a S106 enabling agreement with North Norfolk District Council.

Seconded BT. 6 for the motion, 1 abstention. Motion carried.

AB – The PC and the applicant will each have 3 minutes to present their representations to the NNDC Planning Committee. AB will have 5 minutes The PC are an official consultee.

The applicant needs to be aware that the S106 agreement needs to be agreed within a reasonable timescale or the approval for the planning application can be withdrawn.

CC – when the PC response goes into NNDC other items discussed at the meeting can be included in the response.

KC – we will encourage the Estate to get the pub open as soon as possible.

**25/62. To close the meeting.** The meeting closed at 8.24pm

Signed

Date