

## Page 31 (2016/17)

Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of '**Blakeney Parish Council**' which was held on **Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2016 at 6.00pm** in The Parish Office.

Present:- Tony Faulkner (Chairman), Jenny Girling (Vice-Chairman), Samantha Arlow, Margaret Benson, Alban Donohoe, Barry Girling, Edward Hackford, Roger Hall, Rosemary Thew, Neil Thompson & Iain Wolfe.

Clerk:- Tracey Bayfield.

Public:- 5.

1. **Apologies for Absence** – None, all members present.

2. **Declarations of Interest** from members. Tony Faulkner declared a personal interest in Planning Application number **PF/16/0876** (Stratton Long Marine, Westgate Street) having known the applicant for many years.

3. **Open Public Session** –

- Objections to planning application no. PF/16/0876.
- Vans continuously parked on Morston Road, at the 'Greencroft' development. *(Clerk confirmed that this is a matter for the Police or Parking Operations Team, if they deem it to be a danger, and was reported to both last month.)*
- Upset about loss of view and possible property value due to the 'Greencroft' development. *(Advised that neither are material planning issues, under planning legislation.)*

4. **Planning** Application(s):-

PF = Full Planning Permission

PM = Reserved Matters

LA = Alteration to Listed Building

4.1. Application No. **PF/16/0624** – *Proposal; Change of use of land from residential curtilage to Methodist Church curtilage, erection of timber pergola to front and alterations including creation of first floor and insertion of door at, **Blakeney Methodist Church, 111 High Street, Blakeney**. It was **proposed & agreed** that we **support** this application.*

4.2. Application No. **PF/16/0827** – *Proposal; Raise Midstrey gable by 300mm and lower westerly third of main house ridge by 300mm at, **Three Owls Farm, Saxlingham Road, Blakeney**. It was **proposed & agreed** that we **object** strongly to this application, and our previous objections still stand ie;*

a) The new building is too far from the existing bungalow that it is replacing to be considered as a 'replacement dwelling'. As a new dwelling in the countryside it does not comply with NNDC's Core Strategy Policies HO4 and HO5 as it is not for Travellers or Essential Workers in the countryside.

b) If considered to be a replacement dwelling it is totally contrary to Policy HO8 as it represents a disproportionately large increase in the height and scale of the original dwelling (the dilapidated outbuilding remote from the existing bungalow cannot be considered as part of the existing dwelling as suggested by the applicant), and will materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside, given its scale and position moved to the rear of the site where it will be very visible in the Glaven Valley Conservation Area.

c) It is contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy, which has been adopted in order to protect the Norfolk Coast AONB. The policy states that proposals that have an adverse effect will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that they cannot be located on alternative sites that would cause less harm and the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any adverse impacts. The proposal clearly fails this test as there are no benefits to outweigh the damaging impact the development will have on the appearance of the surrounding countryside, and a house of this size and scale could clearly be accommodated on a less sensitive site.

d) It is contrary to Policy EN2 which has been adopted for the protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character. The policy states that development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance;

- Visually sensitive skylines, hillsides, seascapes, valley sides and geological features,
- The setting of, and views from, Conservation Areas.

This proposal, because of its height, scale and prominent position within the AONB and the Glaven Valley Conservation Area will have a seriously damaging impact on the landscape, standing out obtrusively within this very sensitive landscape and in no way can be considered to enhance it.

This is a highly sensitive site which the above Policies have been designed to protect, and a proposal such as this one cannot be allowed to over-ride them. If approved, it would set a dangerous precedent for further, equally damaging, developments in the North Norfolk

countryside. The Norfolk Coast AONB is an important resource for those living in the area and, equally importantly, for the tourism on which so much employment relies and it should be protected with great care and vision.

The district Council have had the vision to set out, in their LDF, clear policies to protect the special character of the countryside, and proposals for development within the countryside must follow these policies if this character is to be preserved.

As this application is identical to the previous application, refused by the Development Committee, the Parish Council considers that nothing has changed and the proposal is still contrary to Policies HO8, EN1 and EN2 and should be refused on the same grounds as before. It would be inconsistent to do otherwise and would undoubtedly create a dangerous precedent for similar large replacement houses in the countryside, in spite of the strange comments to the contrary by the Inspector.

The Inspector did concede that this proposed dwelling would be similar in scale and massing to the one refused on the earlier Appeal, and it is the Parish Council's view that it would still be disproportionately large in relation to the bungalow it is meant to replace (Policy HO8) and would have a damaging impact on the Glaven Valley Conservation Area and the Norfolk Coast AONB which Policies EN1 and EN2 are there to protect.

Hence our continued objections.

4.3. Application No. **PF/16/0871** – *Proposal; Demolition of dwelling and barns and erection of two and a half storey dwelling at, **Three Owls Farm, Saxlingham Road, Blakeney***. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that we continue to strongly ***object*** to this application for reasons as previously cited, ie;

a) The new building is too far from the existing bungalow that it is replacing to be considered as a 'replacement dwelling'. As a new dwelling in the countryside it does not comply with NNDC's Core Strategy Policies HO4 and HO5 as it is not for Travellers or Essential Workers in the countryside.

b) If considered to be a replacement dwelling it is totally contrary to Policy HO8 as it represents a disproportionately large increase in the height and scale of the original dwelling (the dilapidated outbuilding remote from the existing bungalow cannot be considered as part of the existing dwelling as suggested by the applicant), and will materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside, given its scale and position moved to the rear

of the site where it will be very visible in the Glaven Valley Conservation Area.

c) It is contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy, which has been adopted in order to protect the Norfolk Coast AONB. The policy states that proposals that have an adverse effect will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that they cannot be located on alternative sites that would cause less harm and the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any adverse impacts. The proposal clearly fails this test as there are no benefits to outweigh the damaging impact the development will have on the appearance of the surrounding countryside, and a house of this size and scale could clearly be accommodated on a less sensitive site.

d) It is contrary to Policy EN2 which has been adopted for the protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character. The policy states that development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance;

- Visually sensitive skylines, hillsides, seascapes, valley sides and geological features
- The setting of, and views from, Conservation Areas.

This proposal, because of its height, scale and prominent position within the AONB and the Glaven Valley Conservation Area will have a seriously damaging impact on the landscape, standing out obtrusively within this very sensitive landscape and in no way can be considered to enhance it.

This is a highly sensitive site which the above Policies have been designed to protect, and a proposal such as this one cannot be allowed to over-ride them. If approved, it would set a dangerous precedent for further, equally damaging, developments in the North Norfolk countryside. The Norfolk Coast AONB is an important resource for those living in the area and, equally importantly, for the tourism on which so much employment relies and it should be protected with great care and vision.

The district Council have had the vision to set out, in their LDF, clear policies to protect the special character of the countryside, and proposals for development within the countryside must follow these policies if this character is to be preserved.

This further application to move more into the countryside goes completely against these policies.

## **Page 35 (2016/17)**

The first Planning Inspector dismissed this application and we feel that his decision should stand and would ask that members of the NNDC Development Committee are reminded of his report. There is of course the lack of any Section 106 agreement.

4.4. Application No. **PF/16/0876** – *Proposal; Erection of 2 no. two storey, 3 bed detached houses and detached garage block. Change of use of part of the site to garden land for 5 Westgate Street at, **Stratton Long Marine, Westgate Street, Blakeney**.* It was ***proposed & agreed*** that we ***object*** to this application for the following reasons; i) over development of the site, ii) loss of privacy to neighbours, iii) loss of one of the few historic commercial sites within the village, iv) access for residential use onto the highway at this site is extremely dangerous.

## **5. FINANCE**

5.1. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that **Accounts** totalling £14,261.29 are paid.

5.2. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that we instruct 'Norse' to undertake one additional **Hedge Cut** during this financial year, ie. as soon as possible after the statutory 'no cutting' period, due to the extreme growing season.

6. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that due to the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is advisable in the public interest that the press and **public be temporarily excluded** and they are instructed to withdraw.

Members received an update from the Chairman following the meeting he, Margaret Benson & Roger Hall attended with Nicola Baker and Andrew Wells, re; **The Blakeney Hotel & Parking**, with regard where this application is currently at.

*Knowing that our Chairman, Tony Faulkner will be resigning from the Parish Council after this evening, members thanked him wholeheartedly for his past 10 years as a member and the last 5 as Chairman.'*

*Meeting closed at 6.55pm.*

Chairman \_\_\_\_\_

## **Updates from North Norfolk District Council.**

- Application No. PF/16/0699 – Erection of detached 4 bed chalet bungalow at, **8 Langham Road, Blakeney**, this application has now been withdrawn and no further action will be taken upon it.
- Application No. NMA/15/1655 – Non-material amendment to allow changes to gable width, fenestration and introduction of flue pipes to roof at, **Three Owls Farm, Saxlingham Road, Blakeney**. **NNDC- Approved.**