

## Stody with Hunworth Parish Council

### Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting, held on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> July at 7pm at Hunworth and Stody Village Hall

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

**25/35. Chair's welcome and to accept apologies for absence** – KC introduced himself as the Chair of the PC and welcomed all to the meeting. He informed the meeting that this meeting was being recorded by a member of the public.

Apologies were accepted by All for Cllrs. Adam Godwin and Alan Suffling NNDC Cllr Andrew Brown also sent his apologies.

**25/36. Declarations of interest and dispensations to speak** – JP said that he is Brother-in-law to CM. It was Approved by All that he had a dispensation to speak and to vote on the Proposals.

**25/37. To receive a presentation from Stody Estate and their expert JB on the revised planning application for the Hunny Bell pub and car park and the adjacent farmyard** – KC informed the meeting that, due to the amount of changes in the Planning Application submitted to the Estate it was being sent out for a full re-consultation.

KC confirmed that the meeting would take the following format:

CM would present the revised application to the meeting; members of the public would have an opportunity to give their views, followed by Cllrs. The Parish Councillors would then vote on their response to the Planning Application.

CM introduced himself as Managing Director and member of the MacNicol family, owners of the Stody Estate. He stated that his objective is to raise the required funds to ensure the long-term viability of the Pub. He described the recent financial history of the Pub and that the feedback he had received is that the Hunny Bell is too large, too expensive to run and lacks accommodation. The impact of the Planning Application would be to build the first new houses in Hunworth for over 70 years and to remove agriculture from the centre of the village.

The new application has considered the views of local residents and been revised accordingly: the number of smaller homes has been increased and larger ones reduced, the walnut tree is saved, biodiversity net gains have been introduced, all vehicles accessing the new houses will do so via a single access road next to Appleton's House. The Pub will have its own access, there will be a footpath allowing access to the Pub and bus stop from the new homes. The number of car parking spaces at the pub has been increased by 30% by converting some of the garden.

The flood risk is still a work in progress: all the requirements resulting from the 2023 flooding are now in place (ditch & bund) and the housing scheme will remove the heavy sugar beet machinery and much of the concrete pad, the new houses will have their own soakaway, and ditching on both the west and north boundaries will be increased.

CM requested residents consider the scheme in its entirety.

KC thanked CM for his summary.

**25/38. 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.**

KC stated that he wanted questions to address each part of the scheme separately so would take questions on the following topics: flooding, changes to the Pub, the housing scheme, any other questions.

Question and comments from members of the public (*in italics*)

**Flood Risk**

*Concerns were expressed that yesterday's rain had shown the mitigation was not enough to prevent current flooding and that building houses would only exacerbate this due to run off from rooves and waste water from the houses. It was not clear where the water from the drains would go and diverting the flow could lead to flooding elsewhere*

Response from CM and JB – hard standing and impermeable surfaces will be reduced by removing the sugar beet pad and agricultural area. The housing will have klargesters and waterbutts, the drives and roads would be made of permeable materials. Oversized pipes would be placed under the roads to capture excess water and release it more slowly

*Once the houses were completed new residents may restore hard standing as patios or additions to the properties. As children grow older they may require additional parking.*

JB – the Parish Council could request covenants and restrictions on Permitted Development Rights (PDR) on the properties to prevent this. The scheme includes visitor parking spaces.

*There are still many unknowns and the plans are not finalised*

KC – Could you get an independent survey by a hydrology expert?

JB – The detailed design is still to be completed. Planning permission won't be granted without flooding mitigation

CM – We are discussing everything with NNDC

Suggestions made:

Put attenuation crates under the field

Planting a tree belt at the base of the field

Developing a reservoir in the field which could be part of the Pub's attractions

Putting reservoirs beneath the houses – ie a flood cellar

**Changes to the Pub**

Reduction to 3 houses (from 4) behind the Pub, reduction in the size of the garden, increase in the number of parking spaces. Conversion of the big barn into 4 en suite double bedrooms with access internally to the Pub.

Concerns were expressed that the Pub required a good sized garden to attract summer visitors and families. Reducing the size would make it less viable long term.

Concern voiced that, taking into account staff and the new accommodation there was still not enough parking to cater for the Pub. The local population is small so most users of the Pub would be driving to it. As a Destination Pub the availability of parking was important.

Suggestion made

Would NNDC allow for some houses to be moved further back onto the field and for an overflow car park also on the field behind the Pub?

CM – this is a good proposal. Is that something that the village would support? We would then take it to NNDC.

AT – this would be taking land out of food production

CM – this area is currently in an environmental scheme so doesn't produce food.

*If this application is refused will the Pub remain closed?*

CM – Yes

*How important are the houses at the top of the Pub to the revised scheme?*

CM - Intrinsic

Clarification of the ACV (Asset of Community Value) – this is attached to the car park, so if the car park is amended, the ACV will follow and be attached to the new reduced car park.

The ACV allows 6 months for the holder to purchase the asset if it is put up for sale, before it is available on the open market.

CM clarified that the order of house building and renovation of the Pub was still under discussion with NNDC. Selling some of the properties would be required to fund the Pub renovation and the Pub could not be re-opened while it formed part of a building site, but NNDC would not allow all the properties to be sold until the Pub was re-opened.

## **Housing Development**

Responding to questions on the construction – JB

Normal construction hours on a building site would be 8am – 4pm: any contractors arriving on site before this would not operate machinery. The expected length of time for a build of this size is approximately 18 months. The PC could request a limit to the hours of work and could request no weekend working – this would have an effect on the duration of construction time.

Highways – the Pub and residences now each have a separate entrance.

Footpath – *Concern that this introduced a suburban element to the village. Current residents liked the quaintness of walking along the quiet village street.* CM clarified that this had been a Highways requirement due to Health & Safety.

*The road surface should not be tarmac as this would add a suburban feel.* JB – the access road will have a porous surface. It will not be tarmac. The final material is yet to be decided.

*Introducing a cul-de-sac with modern houses would be incongruous to the village – a gross over-development.* JB – with drawings it is very difficult to show the brick variations and how they will fit in – the houses have to meet modern design standards and building regulations.

*The Development needs to go ahead for the Community to evolve – new people are needed in the village.*

JB – The PC could request a covenant that the homes should remain as permanent residences.

Social Housing – CM confirmed that Broadland had expressed interest in managing the scheme

*Concern was raised about the location of these properties and the impact they would have on the village.*

The PC could request that the properties only be let to people with a connection to the local area – however JB explained that there was a limit to how long NNDC would allow the properties to remain empty.

Stody Estate are retaining 3 or 4 properties as long-term lets for full-time tenants.

## **Financials**

A discussion took place regarding the different pricing in this application compared to that in the previous one. Questions were asked about the price increases in the new FVA (Financial Viability Assessment).

The NNDC surveyor – who will complete his own assessment - has not yet reviewed the costings supplied with the Planning application.

Support was voiced for the Estate: the Estate is running a business and their commercial activities have to remain viable. The Estate is committed to the Hunny Bell and at the same time aware of an acute shortage of Affordable Homes in rural areas.

## **Councillors' conclusions**

Cllr Suffling – not present – written statement

I regret I am unable to attend the Extraordinary Parish Council meeting on Tuesday as I am committed to go to the Great Yorkshire Show.

The two main issues I wish to raise are the risk of flood and the reduction in the size of the car park and now the reduction in the pub garden.

The farmyard site has flooded on many occasions and seriously in 2023. Climate change will increase the frequency of significant rainfall and just digging ditches that go nowhere will not change the high risk of flood.

The reduction in the pub car parking will have an adverse effect on the viability of the pub and the loss of garden will make the Hunny Bell uncompetitive against the local destination pubs who have large car parks and gardens

Cllr Godwin – not present – written statement

Firstly I would like to declare that I am a tenant of an Estate property. This maybe applicable if I manage to get to the meeting slightly later.

Looking at the new plans submitted for Hunny Bell I'm pleased to see that the car park spaces have been increased by 30% over and above the NNDC/Highways formula. With the access to the houses at the rear of the pub now being redirected via the main entrance next to Appleton House this would appear to create a safer environment not only for the housing scheme but also to the visitors to the pub using the car park. This also creates some extra car parking spaces which can only be a positive!

With the Environment Agency's audit last year and putting the advice into practice by moving the gateway from the rear fields being at the lowest point onto the concrete pad and the removal of the hard standing area by replacing it with green areas such as gardens along

with some strategical drainage the risk of flooding will have been reduced dramatically. This could be bolstered by deepening the ditch or increasing the height of the bund.

All-in-all for me the new scheme appears to address the issues raised at the last meeting.

JP – an improvement in sorting out the flooding issues but more needs to be done and monitored.

The car park issue has been addressed but at the cost of landscaping to the garden  
A valid point has been made about the detail – not all the detail is in the application which throws into doubt what we are voting for.

CC – It is sad to see this intense antipathy to the Estate. They don't get everything right but I prefer to deal with a family rather than a Private Equity firm or a large insurance company. The Estate largely farm the land for food. The Estate have not built a big solar farm or safari park on the land.

People seem completely anti any new building; people have said that this is a cul-de-sac with a suburban feel but Beck Cottages in Stody are a cul-de-sac. We cannot be anti any change and some new houses would be advantageous – we are in fact changing our houses all the time.

BT **Proposed** that the PC should **OBJECT** to the Planning Application in its current form. This was Seconded by AT. 4 Cllrs were in favour of the proposal, 1 against: the Motion is **carried**.

CC **Proposed** that that this scheme, without the houses on the car park, would be supported by the PC. This was Seconded by JP. 3 Cllrs were in favour of the proposal, 2 were against: the Motion is **carried**.

**25/39. To close the meeting.** The meeting closed at 9.55pm

Signed

Date