

# HOLME-NEXT-THE-SEA PARISH COUNCIL

## Draft Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council in the Village Hall, Kirkgate, on Monday 28th November 2016 at 7 pm

Present: Kevin Felgate (Chairman) Martin Crown  
Gillian Morley Lynn Devereux  
Robert Burton Margaret Easton  
In Attendance: Christina Jones (Clerk)

There were two members of the public present. Councillor Felgate welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance.

**1. Apologies for Absence and approval of reasons for absence.**

Apologies had been received from Councillor Needham (family illness).

**2. Declarations of Interest.**

There were no Declarations of Interest.

**3. Public Participation.**

It was **RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the meeting be adjourned for 15 minutes for public participation.

**(a) Public Participation.**

There were no issues raised by the public present.

**(b) Borough Councillor Report.**

There was no Borough Councillor report.

**4. Planning.**

**(a) 16/01918/F** Variation of Condition 1 attached to Planning Consent 15/00657/F to allow the landscaping plan to be amended at Inglenook, 32 Main Road, Holme-next-the-Sea PE36 6LA. Discussion of the suggested response that had been circulated by Councillor Devereux when the following points were made:

- The Landscaping Plan had been submitted as a result of the non-compliance issue relating to the wall.
- Concerns were raised that Norfolk County Council (NCC) Highways Department had not commented on the safety issues.
- The Site Notice had been posted on the opposite side of the road where it was difficult to view.
- The plan submitted is inaccurate as it indicated the wall stops at the gatepost but it continues to the footpath edge.
- The footpath width on the plan is greater than in reality.

The Application had been discussed on the telephone with both the Compliance Officer (Heidi Wedge) and the Case Officer (Chris Fry). The Case Officer acknowledged that the plan was incorrect but nevertheless proposed approval and was awaiting a new plan although its receipt and consideration were apparently not required before approval was to be recommended.

After further discussion it was **RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the suggested response be submitted as an objection, that comment be made regarding the Case Officer's comments in the accompanying email and that both be copied to Borough Councillor Bower who had taken the concerns regarding non-compliance to the Planning Department.

**(b) 16/01983/F** Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission 16/00094/F to vary previously approved drawings at Brook House, 32 Beach Road, Holme-next-the-Sea PE36 6LG.

This Application relates to the replacement of shingles on elevations on the original plans with slates. Councillor Morley had spoken to the builder and brought samples of the suggested replacements. There are other properties in the village that have used slates. There was some confusion as to where the slates would be used as the Applications refer to 'elevations' which were understood to be walls whereas the drawings indicated the change from shingles to slates referred to the roofs. After discussion it was **RESOLVED** (unanimously) that no objection be raised to the replacement of shingles with slates on the roofs but that objections would be raised if this related to the re-cladding of the walls.

**(c) 15/02053/F** Condition 8 compliance issues relating to The Tractor Barn, Main Road, Holme-next-the-Sea.

Concerns had been raised by a parishioner regarding the safety of vehicles leaving the parking area to join the A149. Changes to the original plans had resulted in there being no turning area and cars would have to reverse onto the main road. The property is being used as a holiday let and will therefore have multiple, different, occupants. The Parish Council's response to the original application had included a request that Highways be consulted. After discussion it was **RESOLVED** (unanimously) that the Parish Council contact the Planning Department stating that concerns had been raised and asking for confirmation that both Planning and Highways were content that access / egress, visibility and safety issues had all been considered and had been addressed satisfactorily.

