# Minutes of the Garvestone, Reymerston and Thuxton Parish Council Extraordinary Meeting

Councillors Present: Edward Stanford, James Smerdon (Chair), Graham Smith and Amanda Ward.

Members of the Public Present: 65 and District Councillor Paul Claussen.

Clerk: Samantha Bromley

## 1. Apologies.

Apologies were received and accepted by Cllr L. Sandford (alternative commitment).

#### 2. Minutes.

To approve the minutes of the Parish Council meeting dated Monday 16<sup>th</sup> June 2025. DEFERRED.

#### 3. Declaration of Interest.

- 3.1. Councillors are invited to declare a pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests on any subject on the agenda.
- 3.2. No dispensation requests were received.

### 4. Correspondence.

- 4.1. Resident: Wyvern Farm Traffic 19-6-25. Noted.
- 4.2. Resident: Wyvern Farm. Noted.
- 4.3. Resident: HGV Traffic from Wyvern Farm. Noted.
- 4.4. Resident: Update on Proposed Wyvern Farm Application. Noted.
- 4.5. Resident: Wyvern Farm, Mattishall Road. Noted.
- 4.6. Resident: Wyvern Farm, Town Lane Garvestone. Noted.

## 5. Public Participation and Reports.

- 5.1. County Cllr Edward Connolly was not present.
- 5.2. District Cllr Paul Plummer was not present. District Cllr Paul Claussen was present.
- 5.3. The police were not present.
- 5.4. Open forum for members of the public:
  - 5.4.1. A total of 27 residents spoke in objection to planning application PL/2025/0829/FMIN. Concerns raised included:
    - 5.4.1.1. Highway safety and the unsuitability of surrounding roads for HGV traffic.
    - 5.4.1.2. Impact on pedestrian safety, especially children walking to school.
    - 5.4.1.3. Loss of rural character and visual harm to the landscape.
    - 5.4.1.4. Negative effects on local biodiversity, including protected species.
    - 5.4.1.5. Environmental risks including increased flooding and water pollution.
    - 5.4.1.6. Noise, light and general disruption to the tranquillity of the village.
    - 5.4.1.7. Doubts over the sustainability and scale of the proposal in a rural setting.
    - 5.4.1.8. Fears of future expansion through incremental development.
    - 5.4.1.9. Inadequate infrastructure to support the proposed use.
    - 5.4.1.10. The potential impact on the wellbeing of residents, including mental health and quality of life
  - 5.4.2. The applicant for PL/2025/0829/FMIN, addressed the Council to clarify aspects of the proposed development. He stated that his employees leave the site in their work vehicles by 7:10am and do not return until after 4:00pm, and that no work takes place on weekends. He noted that there is a train line nearby but believes the development would not affect any underground pipes. With regards to concerns about lighting and

security, he explained that the security lights operate on a 30-second timer and that while there are two guard dogs on site, he believes concerns about their behaviour have been overstated. He concluded by saying he has tried to be reasonable throughout the process.

## 6. Planning Matters.

- 6.1. To consider consultee response to applications received from Breckland District Council:
  - 6.1.1. PL/2025/0869/HOU Erection of laundry room under existing veranda Walnut Tree House Reymerston Road, Garvestone. NO OBJECTION.
  - 6.1.2. PL/2025/0829/FMIN Change in the use of agricultural land and buildings to run a civil engineering business and storage of associated vehicles and equipment, including alterations to buildings and introduction of a new surfaced area (part retrospective) Wyvern Farm, Mattishall Road, Garvestone. OBJECT on the following grounds:
    - 6.1.2.1. Policy GEN 01 Councillors unanimously agreed the development does not meet the aims of GEN 01. It is not sustainably located, provides no additional local employment, and does not serve the needs of the rural community. It was noted that the proposal moves an existing business to a new site without creating wider benefits and introduces safety concerns for schoolchildren and vulnerable road users. Members also felt approval could set an unsustainable precedent for further inappropriate countryside development.
    - 6.1.2.2. Policy GEN 02 Councillors considered that the design and layout of the development does not contribute positively to the character of the area. Industrial surfacing and alterations to the site's entrance have already harmed the rural setting, contrary to this policy.
    - 6.1.2.3. Policy EC 04 Members noted that the business is not agricultural or land based and provides no economic enhancement to the local farming community. It was highlighted that suitable, serviced industrial sites exist nearby, including at Norwich Airport and elsewhere. The relocation appears to be driven by convenience rather than planning merit. Councillors strongly agreed that this is not an appropriate location for such a business.
    - 6.1.2.4. Policy HOU 05 The Council agreed the scale and nature of the proposed use is not appropriate to the rural setting. The road network is unsuitable for commercial traffic and the Council does not support widening Town Lane to accommodate HGV movements, which would permanently alter its rural character.
    - 6.1.2.5. Policy HOU 12 Members noted that the proposal does not represent the reuse of rural buildings for agricultural benefit. The equipment and activity proposed are not compatible with local agricultural needs, and machinery is not capable of being shared in a way that benefits the local farming community.
    - 6.1.2.6. Additional Consideration The development would result in the loss of rural amenity and tranquillity, pose increased highway safety risks to pedestrians, cyclists and school children, negatively affect the mental wellbeing of residents and set a damaging precedent for the industrialisation of rural land without agricultural justification.

The Chair noted that comments on the application could be submitted to the Breckland Council Planning Portal until the 9th of the month. Given the level of public interest, the application would likely be considered by the Planning Committee. The Chair also briefly explained the planning process and the potential for an appeal, should the application be refused.

- 6.2. To consider consultee response to any other applications received from Breckland District Council after the publication of the agenda: None. (<a href="http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningSearch">http://planning.breckland.gov.uk/OcellaWeb/planningSearch</a>).
- 6.3. To receive notifications of decisions made by Breckland District Council: None.

Meeting closed: 8:37pm