

HOLME -NEXT -THE -SEA PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held in Holme-next-the-Sea Village Hall on Tuesday 11th April 2017 at 7 pm

Present:

Kevin Felgate (Chairman)
Lynn Devereux (Vice Chairwoman)
Martin Crown
Margret Easton

Gillian Morley
Robert Burton
Geoffrey Needham
Murdo Durrant (clerk to Council)

Four members of the public were present. The Chairman welcomed them to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance.

1. **Apologies for Absence and approval of reasons:** Nil.
2. **Declaration of Interest:** Cllr Devereux had a non-prejudicial interest in **item 7(a) Planning.**
3. **Confirmation of Minutes of Meeting on the 14th March 2017:** It was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting be confirmed as a true record with the following amendments:
Page 466: The 16th line from the bottom the word 'objections' changed to 'objectives'.
Page 467: The 4th line from the top the word 'Strumshaw' changed to 'Strumpshaw'.
4. **Matters arising (information only):** Item 8 Enclosure books, the digital copy of the books had been received and passed on to Tony Foster for use in the VIN. The Clerk had been in correspondence with the Norfolk record Office and they confirmed that after searching they had no other documentation from the Parish of Holme-next-the-Sea.
Item 13 Park Piece dog waste bins, the Clerk informed the Council that he had been in contact with Mr Hussey, who had said he would speak to the man who emptied the bins to ascertain which of Holme's was used the least. To date he had not come back with a definitive answer, Clerk to chase up a reply from BCKLWN.
Item 14 scheme of delegation, there had still been no response from Councillor Bower to this request. Clerk to email asking for an answer.
5. **Information Items:** All circulated via email except Cllr Needham who had received hard copies.
6. **Public Participation:**
 - a) **Public Participation:** No members of the public present wished to speak.
 - b) **Borough Councillors Report:** None received.
7. **Planning Applications:**
 - (a) **Any Planning Applications received subsequent to this Agenda.**
 - (b) **Planning Applications submitted:**
 - (i) **17/00602/F** Erection of replacement dwelling with a detached garage and annex over, 42, The Poplars, Main Road Holme-next-the-Sea PE36 6LA. The Parish Council OBJECTS to this application. It contains many inconsistencies and errors which require clarification in order that consultees can be confident of making a full and properly informed response. We assume that the application will be determined on the basis of the substantive material provided for comment and therefore have devoted considerable resources to understanding the proposals. Our interpretation of the submission (relevant to our comments) is as follows:
Full Application Form: This describes proposals for the erection of a Replacement Dwelling with Detached Garage and Annexe Accommodation over. It indicates changes to the existing access arrangements, notably including a new access from Main Road to the countryside behind. The replacement dwelling is described as having four car parking spaces and a natural clay pantile roof above brick walls. The existing use is described as dwelling plus gardens (not vacant). It indicates there are no trees or hedges on adjacent land that might influence development or be part of local landscape character and no impact on protected or priority species. The site area is given as 675sqm. Drawings: None of these show accommodation or velux windows over the garage. The roof of the house is shown as pre-patinated raised seam zinc over walls of random width larch boards above imitation Flemish bond brickwork. It is unclear as to what the quoted 675sq m site covers. The drawings show (i) new development replacing the bungalow but extending beyond the existing residential curtilage (ii) a solid brick boundary wall extending into (and enclosing an area of) open countryside to the south (iii) the site area (red line) extending still further south into the countryside and over the existing agricultural building (nissen hut), leaving a gap between the wall in the countryside and the proposed southern boundary of the site and (iv) a new road leading into the countryside from a new junction on the A149. There is no request for a change of use or demolition of the agricultural building. The new road, to be built to NCC Highways standards (for an unstated purpose) is misleadingly described as a 'relocated driveway'. The street elevation excludes the garage to the front of the house. The topographic survey drawing fails to show the trees on the eastern site boundary which are covered by a Group TPO and form the boundary with the Conservation Area. The remaining drawings also omit the hedge and Conservation Area boundary.
Design & Access Statement: This document acknowledges the importance of the site to the setting of the

Conservation Area and the area covered by a TPO, noting that the trees are integral part of the proposal. It describes the Poplars bungalow as derelict (unlike the Application Form) and (unlike the Drawings or the Form) suggests that the replacement dwelling will have flint facings in order to reinforce local distinctiveness, reflect the character of neighbouring properties and enhance the Conservation Area setting. It refers to the new access serving the land to the rear (noting it has been located to reduce the impact on the TPO trees) but offers no justification for its introduction.

Comments

This is the third application for a replacement dwelling on this site and the Parish Council would like to adopt a positive approach to the redevelopment opportunity. As before we have no objection in principle to the replacement of the bungalow but unfortunately nothing fundamental has changed in the developers approach to the site and so most of the Parish Council's previous objections still apply (Ref 15/02038/F - Replacement Dwelling and 16/00312/F - Terrace of 3no x 2 storey dwellings) and we maintain the view that the loss of The Poplars small-holding would be a missed opportunity. Despite changes to the design, it also appears that the reasons for the Borough's refusal of 15/02038/F have not been overcome.

The proposed development does not satisfy any demonstrated local need and if permitted it would cause harm to the character and form of the area. The Parish Council would like to see a much more modest dwelling, sympathetic to the setting of the Conservation Area which bounds the site on two sides. This includes designs and use of materials which acknowledge local character and distinctiveness and fit with the surrounding street scene, together with proposals which protect the distinctive, tree-lined boundary of the Conservation Area and the surrounding countryside.

We object to the southward extension of the house beyond the existing residential curtilage and the enlargement of the plot into the adjacent countryside which is designated as an AONB. We also object to the construction of solid brick boundary walls extending beyond the edge of the village and to the creation of a new access from Main Road. The introduction of a wall to subdivide the countryside is unnecessary and will impact negatively on landscape quality. The introduction of a separate access restricts the residential site area causing the proposed, substantial house to be shoehorned into the remaining space. Consequently the house is positioned right up to the green boundary of the Conservation Area (risking harm to the mature trees in the associated Group TPO) and the detached garage is forced in front of the house, adding to the negative visual impact of the overall design of the property and impact on neighbouring amenity. The new road has no use or relevance to the replacement dwelling. It clearly impacts negatively on the layout of both the site and the neighbourhood as well as on the countryside and AONB. If accepted for anything other than minimal traffic movements, it will add to existing traffic / pedestrian conflicts on Main Road and raises safety considerations at a site where there was previously a serious road traffic accident involving a pedestrian on the only footpath in the village. Clarification of the use and area this road is intended to serve should be sought prior to seeking highways approval.

Although the house is not as high as in the previous application it has been shifted upslope so this has little bearing on the impact. Moreover, the footprint is approaching 20% bigger, making it around 2.5 times that of the existing bungalow and more than twice the average of the neighbouring properties (despite the Parish Council's previous concerns this increase in footprint is a trend across the applications). The footprint of the garage alone is similar to that of the nearby cottages on the boundary of the Conservation Area (and if intended as a garage it cannot be accessed with doors as shown on the west elevation). Compared to the previous application the number of bedrooms in the house has been reduced from six to four, but these four are easily divisible into six by virtue of the nature and layout of the first floor. In reality, the true, relative impact of the scale, height and mass of the property is obscured by the style and presentation of the drawings which omit important landscape features and take no account of the rises in the underlying topography (both from north to south and from east to west across the site). This property would not sit comfortably in the street scene and represents over-development of the site.

Assuming that the materials indicated on the drawings are those intended to be used ie prepatinated zinc roofing, larch boarding and emulated Norfolk Reds, these do nothing to enhance local character. They certainly do not reflect local distinctiveness as displayed by the surrounding houses which include the listed building opposite known as Old Farm Cottages and several important unlisted buildings, all of which are characterised by locally found materials so important to the feel of the village. The site lies on the boundary of the Conservation Area, on the main A149 approach from the West. The associated visibility, prominence of the development in the street scene and proposed design and use of materials, including solid brick boundary walls would (in the words of the Conservation Area Statement) act as a 'Detractor' in the setting of this important part of the village.

Supporting Planning Policy and Sustainability Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework Although the Application argues that the development is sustainable, none of the three dimensions of sustainable development (NPPF 7) are supported by the application: (i) It will impact negatively on the economic role of the land (loss of smallholding), (ii) It will not support a strong, vibrant community by providing housing to meet present needs in a community where local people can only afford more modest properties, there is already in excess of 55% second homes and the resident population is declining (households declined by 28% from 2001-11). The village is experiencing an ongoing trend in replacement of affordable market homes by very large houses (evidenced by Norfolk Insight and VOA data). This is seriously damaging the balance in the housing stock and threatens the viability of the resident community. A similarly large replacement dwelling developed by the Applicants in the same road has been unsuccessfully marketed for more than 2 years (iii) It will do nothing to enhance the natural or historic environment or to improve biodiversity but threatens to damage the Conservation Area and its boundary, the local countryside and the AONB.

NPPF 114 promotes the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment but no proposals are offered in support of this. NPPF 115 emphasises that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty

in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection. The proposed development has high visibility and at this location, the scale and materials of the planned structure are not in keeping with the AONB setting.

NPPF132 states that the significance of a designated heritage asset can be harmed or lost through development within its setting and NPPF135 notes that in the case of a non-designated asset a balanced judgement is required with regard to the scale of any harm. The proposed incongruous design, coupled with the setting of the proposed development site (on the A149 and the main approaches to the Conservation Area, bounded on two sides by its boundaries and in close proximity to listed and important unlisted buildings) means that it will impact negatively on the value of the surrounding heritage assets delivering more harm than benefit to the area.

Core Strategy CS06 seeks to maintain local character and to sustain rural communities, identifying the need for appropriate housing (the 2013 HMA also highlights the shortage of smaller properties in the countryside). CS08 requires new development to (i) protect and enhance the historic environment (ii) to respond to the context and character of places in West Norfolk by ensuring that the scale, density, layout and access will enhance the quality of the environment and (iii) to enhance community wellbeing by being accessible, inclusive and locally distinctive. CS12 notes that development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance the special qualities and local distinctiveness of the area (including its historical, biodiversity and cultural character). It is clear from the comments above that none of these criteria are met by the proposals.

SADMP DM2 The area of the proposed development and indeed the footprint of the proposed dwelling extend beyond the established residential curtilage of The Poplars (as shown on the OS Map, the Site Notice and previously defined by the boundary of the 1998 Local Plan) into the agricultural land beyond. This would erode the edge of the village and damage the area designated as AONB. This is also contrary to Policy DM3 for Development in Smaller Villages and Hamlets which limits new development to the sensitive infilling of small gaps within an otherwise continuously built up frontage provided that the development is appropriate to the scale and character of the group of

buildings and its surroundings. The extension of the development footprint and site boundaries onto the agricultural land and associated buildings to the south requires a change of land use from agricultural to residential and is therefore also contrary to Policy DM3 (infill).

DM5 specifically covers the Enlargement or Replacement of Dwellings in the Countryside and states that proposals for replacement dwellings or extensions to existing dwellings will be approved where the design will preserve the character or appearance of the street scene or area in which it sits and notes that schemes which fail to reflect the scale and character of their surroundings or which would be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring properties will be refused. The proposed scale, mass, design and materials and associated impact on both street scene and neighbouring amenity are contrary to this policy and also to Policy DM15 (Environment, Design and Amenity). This states that the scale, height, massing, materials and layout of a development should respond sensitively and sympathetically to the local setting and also recognises the importance of protecting and enhancing the wider environment and considering both visual and heritage impacts.

Conservation Area Statement This stresses that Holme is quite different to its coastal neighbours for reasons that include its high hedges and trees. It notes the importance of local building materials including clunch (chalk), flint and brick for the unity they provide to the village and indicates that the special character of the Conservation Area can easily be eroded by poorly proportioned new building and inappropriate building materials. As indicated above, given its prominent position on the A149 and boundaries of the Conservation Area, the proposed development is a "Detractor" in terms of its design, visual appearance and use of materials and associated impact on the setting of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the positioning of the house so close to the high hedge and protected trees on the eastern boundary threatens to undermine one of the very features that make the village locally distinctive.

Emerging Neighbourhood Plan As part of its work on the Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council is trying to address some of the housing issues noted above in an effort to arrest the unwelcome changes to the housing stock that threaten the viability of the resident community and its longer term sustainability (see more at <http://www.holme-next-the-sea-plan.co.uk> – especially Downloads 5 and 6). In the spirit of the Localism Agenda, we have consulted widely, inviting all those connected with the Parish to participate in our consultation events and to share the views of Parishioners about the nature of future development of the village. More than 40% (206 including principal and second home owners and 12 landowners) responded to a survey conducted in 2016. Of these, 80% expressed concern about both 'out of character development' and damage to the attractive appearance of the village environment. 75% saw no need for 'high end, expensive homes' (91% identified the need for homes with less than four bedrooms and 69% for single storey dwellings). 65% find the use of contemporary materials such as sheet glass and zinc unacceptable, whereas 90% identified the importance of local building materials in new homes and 70% favoured traditional design.

The proposals in this Application pay scant regard to the clearly stated preferences of the community and the outcome of these consultations.

Recommendation

In the light of the Parish Council's comments on this and previous applications, and taking account of the recommendations in NPPF Paras 58 and 61, we urge the refusal of this application and the submission of more appropriate proposals reflecting the strongly stated preferences of the local community and our comments for a replacement dwelling on the site of the existing bungalow.

Further to the above objections Cllr Easton pointed out the following: that Natural England therefore advise your authority that this SSSI site does not represent constraint in determining this application.

Signed.....*Kevin Felgate*..... Chairman Dated.....**09.05.17**..... Page 471

We also advise that you consult the relevant AONB partnership or conservation board. Their knowledge of the site and its wider landscape setting, together with aims and objectives of the AONB statutory management plan will be a valuable contribution to the planning decision. A local landscape character assessment (where available) can also be a helpful guide to the landscapes sensitivity to this type of development.

Our statutory purpose is to ensure the Natural environment is conserved enhanced and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Why have they not produced evidence of Natural England's advice being followed.

ENLARGEMENT OR REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS IN THE COUNTRYSIDE.

Sustainable development, Economic development that is conducted without depletion of natural resources meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

THE PLANNING PORTAL OF WEST NORFOLK BOROUGH COUNCIL STRATEGIC HOUSING MARKET ASSESSMENT.

This assessment highlighted the shortage of smaller properties in the countryside thereby helping to ensure a range of housing needs of the population in a sustainable manner.

CONSULTATION PORTAL OF KINGS LYNN & WEST NORFOLK C5.5

Where dwellings are replaced in order to control further extensions that may impact on the landscape and rural character of the area, a condition may be necessary to remove or reduce permitted development rights to extend the resulting dwelling. In line with the presumption against new dwellings in the countryside, proposals to replace a property should not increase the number of units.

(c) Other Planning Matters:

(i) **16/01838/F** It was resolved unanimously that the Clerk should contact BT and request the removal of both of the telephone boxes in the village, on Westgate and Main Road, which were known derelict

(ii) **Thornham Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan.**

(d) **BCKLWN Statement of Community Involvement Consultation - Response.**

8.1. Neighbourhood Development Plan:

(a) Working Party Report.

Several strands of work have been in progress during the course of the past four weeks

8.1.1 The website has been released

8.1.2 The Environment report has been updated and completed and placed on the website

8.1.3 We have finally received the heritage assets data held by the Historic Environment Service at NCC. These have been processed and the spatial data has been input to our GIS (point, link and area data).

8.1.4 We have received sampling kits from the Freshwater Habitats Trust. These will be used to collect some basic background data on the Hun and local ponds before the full water quality tests are carried out by UCL. A trial run in the area close Redwell Marsh Bridge following a dry spell indicates good results for phosphates, but poor results for nitrate pollution. This outcome will influence whether we want to have a "Hun Policy".

8.1.5 We are getting down to some basic policy drafting, starting with some of those that are simpler to tackle. Related to this, we have been in discussions with the BC Planning Policy Team regarding ideas about defining Character Areas for the Parish. The Borough is planning to re-introduce boundaries for all villages in the next version of the Local Plan (currently under review) and have suggested that we should come forward with some proposals as the basis for a policy that which we could agree – and we are now getting some basic ideas onto maps which we reviewed with Bob Bowman last week.

8.1.6 Meanwhile we have asked our town planning consultant to advise us on an appropriate employment / retail policy for Drove and he is drafting something for us to consider.

8.2 Meetings

8.2.1 Meetings with local landowners have continued to discuss their aspirations for their land during the Plan period and to explore the possibilities of support for our NDP policies – including suggestions put forward by consultees, notably the possible extension of the footpath network.

8.2.2 We held a very productive meeting with Andrew Jamieson of Drove Orchards and exchanged suggestions for policies and projects that could be incorporated into the Plan. He has offered to help with contacts and contributed some thinking to some of the suggestions we had from the consultations – notably with an Environment / Visitor Centre.

8.2.3 We have also had a further meeting with the NCP, attended by Gemma Clark an Environmental Planner who has taken over some of the work of Tim Venes (now retired). We hope to continue Margaret's cooperation with NCP, working closely on policy development and they have asked if we would contribute to an NDP event they want to organise

8.3.1 Funding

8.3.1 We have put together the basis for a second application for funding the next stage of work which will be focused on developing the policy options and another round of consultations. This is for just over £4000 and together with the funding received so far will take us up to the maximum of £9000. The funding for the Hun water quality tests is coming from a separate pot via the NRT. Christina will submit the application to Groundwork / DCLG following her return from holiday in early May. Having her help is great!

(b) **Website:** Cllr Devereux informed the meeting that the NDP website was now up and running and available to view.

9. **Highways.**

(a) New Road Name - Eastgate/ Marsh Lane/ Marsh Drove/ Blacksmiths Drove. The Clerk informed Meeting that he had contacted BCKLWN highways department and they had informed him that in all documents from land registry and Ordnance Survey the track was shown as a continuation of Eastgate, as such there was no reason to consult with the Parish Council as BCKLWN were not renaming it merely putting up signs to reflect what the name was. The Parish Council could if they wished, apply to have the track renamed at a cost and inconvenience to the residents. It was resolved after discussion that there was little point in taking this further.

10. **Village Matters.**

(a) Village Information Network (VIN): The Village Information Network (VIN) was working well and the Council thanked Mr Foster for his hard work.

(b) Beach Road Willow Trees: Cllr Felgate stated that he was still awaiting quotes for the pollarding of the willow trees on Beach Road.

(c) Flooding Issue Peddars Way: Cllr Felgate reported that the pipework on Peddars Way had been blown through, he had spoken to Sophie Baxter at the Bird Observatory who had informed him they would not clear the ditch know until after the birds had nested.

(d) Oil contamination Kirkgate/ Peddars Way: Cllr Felgate reported that the oil contamination outside of Saltmarshes appeared to be as a result of a tanker spillage which had got into the land drain. Sophie Baxter had also informed him that there had been a leakage in Busseys Lane several year ago which had got into the water system which had led to a contamination of the ground.

(e) Visitors book for council meetings: Cllr Devereux proposed that a visitor,s book be kept to account for members of the public attending meetings. The Clerk informed the meeting that a record of all people attending meetings should be kept for health and safety purposes in the event of a fire and the building being evacuated. Cllr Felgate seconded the proposal and it was passed unanimously. Clerk was to purchase a suitable visitors book for the next meeting.

(f) Hunstanton Golf Club works: Information from Mr William Coker at Hunstanton Golf Club that the coastal path which formed the boundary between the club and L'Strange Estate could be moved due to coastal erosion. A fence could be put up to ensure the boundary stayed as it was, L'Strange Estate were in favour of the fence. Both Holme-next-the-Sea Parish Council and Old Hunstanton Parish Councils will be kept informed as to what is happening.

(g) Register of electors, paper or electronic format for the future: The clerk explained that he had received a request from BCKLWN as to whether the Parish Council wanted the Electoral Register in paper or electronic form in future. The Council resolved to accept the electoral register in electronic form in the future.

(h) Damage to Holme-next-the-Sea sign: It was reported that the Village sign at the junction of Main Road and Peddars Way was missing the top piece in the form of a Viking long-ship. There was no information as to when or how this had happened. It was unsure if it was caused by wind damage or vandalism. A search would be made to see if it could be found and Mr Forster was asked to put this on the VIN to try and ascertain what had happened.

13. **Finance:**

(a) Fourth Quarter Accounts 2016/2017 - January to March 2017: The fourth quarter accounts were provided to the council, there were no comments made.

(b) Fourth Quarter Budget Monitoring 2016/2017 - January to March 2017: The Clerk explained that the council was on course to be within budget for the financial year.

(c) Parish Partnership Funding 2016/17 - Bus Shelter. Clerk to check with JDS what the hold-up was on finishing the bus shelter, the first cheque of which had been paid.

(d) Bank Authority for Parish Clerk: Had been handed in to Barclays Hunstanton in March nothing heard back as yet.

(e) Laptop, Projector and Hard Drive Costings: Cllr Felgate put forward his proposal for the purchase of a lap top, screen, external hard drive and projector to assist with Council meetings. This was discussed and finally proposed by Cllr Felgate that a budget of £1000be provided to purchase this equipment, seconded by Cllr Burton passed unanimously.

(f) Electronic Accounts Proposal: The Clerk is to contact the internal auditor to obtain suggestions for moving to an electronic method of accounting.

(g) Small accounting error - £2 when calculating total payments re Donations and Subscriptions.
As a result of error in calculating totals in December accounts on Ledger. Will be adjusted at end of year accounts.

(h) Approval of proposed payments and Direct Debits:

- (i) Christina Jones £615.37 pay for March (Temp. Clerk & NDP clerk) Ch no. 101353.
- (ii) Murdo Durrant £366 clerks pay for March Ch. No. 101354.
- (iii) Murdo Durrant Clerks expenses March £27.00 Ch No 101356
- (iv) Cheque no. 101338 Norfolk ALC for £15.35 dated 14.2.17 no invoice.
- (v) Cheque no.101343 Norfolk ALC £70 for Local Council administration book wrong amount, Needs to be paid for by credit/debit card £85+ with pp. Clerk to order and pay for claim back

- (vi) BT quarterly bill £45.46 – direct debit..
- (vii) E-On Electricity bill £57.95 Direct debit.

Signed.....*Kevin Felgate*.....Chairman Dated.....09.05.17..... Page
473

(viii)BCKLWN – Collection and disposal of dog waste £648.96 – direct debit returned.
The above were approved, proposed by Cllr Felgate seconded by Cllr Crown passed unanimously.

14. Correspondence Circulated: All correspondence had been circulated by email or hard copy to Cllr Needham.

15. Parish Meeting - Tuesday 9th May 2017 at 6pm in the Village Hall

16. Date of next Parish Council Meeting - Tuesday 9th May 2017 at 7 pm in the Village Hall.

Signed.....*Kevin Felgate*.....Chairman Dated.....09.05.17..... Page
474