

HOLME-NEXT-THE-SEA PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the Parish Council held in the Village Hall,
Kirkgate, on Monday, 10th September 2018 at 7pm.**

Present: Lynn Devereux (Chair), Kevin Felgate (Vice Chair), Margaret Easton, Robbie Burton, Gillian Morley, Martin Crown, Geoff Needham

In Attendance: Five members of the public.

1. Apologies for Absence and approval of reasons

Apologies had been received from County Councillor Andrew Jamieson (clash with Ringstead PC Meeting); Mr M. Longley (Parish Clerk and RFO – annual leave); Mr & Mrs G. Jackson had asked for their apologies to be recorded and had sent a letter seeking support from the Parish Council in responding to the Planning Application and related Enforcement Issues (circulated by the Clerk in advance of the meeting and attached).

2. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Devereux recorded a non-pecuniary interest as a neighbour in Agenda Item 3

3. Planning Application 17/02194/F: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of one and a half/two storey dwelling and detached garage at **The Poplars, 42 Main Road, Holme-next-The-Sea, Norfolk PE36 6LA.** Consultation on amendments to the Application.

- One Councillor complained that he had not received copies of the drawings in advance of the meeting. The Chair explained that amended drawings had not been posted on the Borough Council's website as expected but clarification of the relevant plans had been received shortly before this meeting – but too late to circulate in advance. The drawings had now been downloaded and would be displayed on the big screen for consideration by the meeting
- The amended plans (Block Plan, Elevations, Floor Plans and Garage Plans) were displayed on the screen for review.
- The Chair summarised the key points of the PC's response to the original application and the pre-application comments provided to the Applicants by a Senior Planning Officer at the Borough Council. Key concerns (and reasons for refusal of previous applications) were scale, bulk and design of buildings; overdevelopment of the plot; extension of curtilage into the adjacent countryside, negative impact of these on the street scene and failure to respond to local context etc.
- The amended drawings were then compared to the previous set that had been commented on by the PC.
 - Following the Jackson's letter the amended Block Plan was compared to a standard, OS-based map of the type widely used and accepted for planning applications. This suggested that the House plus the road would not fit on the Poplars plot (as drawn) and would intrude on neighbours' land. It also showed the area of countryside that would be lost in order to accommodate the proposed development and further, that the bin presentation area would be on the public footpath outside the proposed brick wall.

Signed..... *L S Devereux*.....Chairman

Date...*9/10/2018*.....

- Comparing the front elevation with that of the previous, refused application indicated that amended proposals would result in a house that would be significantly higher and only fractionally narrower. Furthermore, the Officer's request for a reduced size garage had been ignored and resulted in a garage that was slightly larger.
 - Other neighbour's concerns regarding inaccurate presentation of trees in the Conservation Area were also noted.
 - It was noted that very little had changed as a result of the amended drawings. Concerns were expressed that the Officer appeared to have signalled a decision to recommend approval before receiving consultation responses. It was also acknowledged (as suggested in the Jackson's letter) that the proposed, new road into the countryside had taken on new significance due to unauthorised works/change of current use on the site behind.
 - As a result of recent research into the history of the village, one Cllr had also raised the issue of the historic value of the Poplars Bungalow, a part of which was believed to be a section of the 'Hippisley Hut' which is of considerable Heritage significance due to the role it played in the development and application of radio technology to track zeppelin airships in WW1.
4. **Reports:** There were no reports available from County or District Councillors but it was noted that Cllr Jamieson was assisting with Highways matters.
5. **Public participation:** It was agreed to adjourn the meeting for Public Participation.
- The Chair suggested that the Jackson's letter should be read to the meeting but Cllrs agreed that it had been considered adequately in advance and in view of the points already discussed in the meeting this was not necessary.
 - The following points were raised in discussion:
 - Failure to identify the relevant drawings had undermined effective consultation.
 - Previous refusal reasons still have not been addressed. Officer's requests have been ignored as have community concerns. The amendments have made things worse – e.g. proposal to use slate roofing tiles and red brick walling, height of the house and size of the garage. One Cllr pointed out that the Garage was wrong at the front of the house and should be relocated to the rear.
 - There was general concern about unauthorised development of the site behind the Poplars and Seaton House. One Councillor pointed out that the local community was being bullied by the developer's behaviour. It was suggested that this was a form of corporate bullying and that it was unacceptable that residents should have to spend their savings on expensive legal advice to protect their property.
 - There was a discussion of the significance of the Hippisley Hut and how this related to the buildings standing on the cliffs at Old Hunstanton. One Cllr said the hut at the Poplars was of no historic significance. Another disagreed and had submitted a request for a temporary listing. She read from an article published in the local press some years earlier which described how the

listening hut had been relocated to the Poplars by the family of the previous owners. This was verified by another Cllr who is related to the family. The Chair said it was important that if the building was of such significance it should be protected and there was support for the Vice Chairman's suggestion that if necessary it could be relocated again.

- Cllr Needham said that although he was opposed to the development in the Countryside, he was not opposed to the re-development of the Poplars and he felt that much of the discussion was irrelevant. The Vice Chair explained that the PC had never opposed the redevelopment of the Poplars in principle – it was the nature of the proposed development that it found unacceptable. It was further noted that the enforcement issues had a direct bearing on the planning application because they raised issues about the proposed additional access in relation to the ongoing unauthorised uses to the rear.

(Cllr Needham left the meeting at 7.55pm)

- A Cllr reiterated concerns about the dangers of having an additional access at this location when the site is already served by an existing access that was approved as part of the Seaton House development. This is already being used to access the area behind the Poplars.
- Another Cllr noted that a number of properties on Main Road have shared accesses so why was a new access needed at this property.
- It was agreed to object to the amended proposals highlighting in particular, the excessive size of the house; overdevelopment of the plot; the garage is inappropriate at the front of the house, the proposed road doesn't fit and is dangerous – and links to the enforcement issues.
- A Cllr suggested that in view of the large number of concerns relating to the way in which the application had been handled by the BC, the inaccuracies in the Applicant's drawings and the enforcement issues, a complaint should be made to the Borough Council. This was agreed. It was also agreed that it was important to identify a Borough Councillor who could meet/assist the PC in resolving these problems.

The meeting closed at 8.15pm.