

Page 23 (2014/15)

Minutes of a meeting of the '**Planning Committee of Blakeney Parish Council**' which was held on **Tuesday 5th August 2014** in the Parish Office, immediately after the Full Parish Council Meeting which commenced at 7.00pm.

Present:- Tony Faulkner (Chairman), Barry Girling, Margaret Benson, Glenn Aikens & Alban Donohoe.

Clerk:- Tracey Bayfield.

Public:- 8.

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** – Were received and ***accepted*** from Leanne Welch (*prior personal commitment*), Ann Wootten (*family celebration*) & Jenny Girling (*away*).
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** from members – Under the Code of Conduct, Members must declare any Disc losable Pecuniary Interests. If such an interest is declared then the member is not permitted to remain in the meeting when the debate begins and voting takes place. There were none.
3. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that the **MINUTES** dated Tuesday 1st July 2014 are signed as a true record.
4. *Adjourned at 8.23pm for the **OPEN PUBLIC SESSION** and reconvened at 8.28pm.*

Planning applications are as follows:-

PF = Full Planning Permission

PM = Planning Permission – Reserved Matters

LA = Alteration to Listed Building

- i) Application No. **PF/14/0785** – *Proposal; Demolition of dwelling and barns and erection of two and a half storey replacement dwelling at, **Three Owls Farm, Saxlingham Road, Blakeney**. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that we object very strongly to this application for the following reasons:-*

A new house in the countryside

The proposal is to build the new house almost 100 metres away from the site of the existing bungalow, in a very open position in clear view from the Glaven valley. It should therefore properly be considered as a new house in the countryside rather than a replacement dwelling. The NNDC's Local Development Framework Core Strategy makes it clear (Policies HO4 & HO5) that new houses in the countryside can only be allowed when they meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and

Page 24 (2014/15)

people working in agriculture, forestry or other essential workers connected with the land who cannot be housed elsewhere. This clearly does not arise in this case.

A replacement dwelling

If considered to be a replacement dwelling, our previous objections apply to this proposal as before, which were as follows.

1. It is totally contrary to Policy HO8 of the NNDC's Local Development Framework Core Strategy which has been adopted to protect the character of North Norfolk's countryside. The policy states that proposals to extend or replace existing dwellings in the countryside will be permitted provided that the proposal;

- Would not result in a disproportionately large increase in the height or scale of the original dwelling, and
- Would not materially increase the impact of the dwelling on the appearance of the surrounding countryside.

The proposal clearly fails in both respects. The proposed new dwelling is enormously larger than the existing dwelling in plan area, height and scale and will have a substantially increased impact on the appearance of the surrounding countryside. The floor area of the proposal is more than four times the size of the existing dwelling. (The floor area of the barn to be demolished cannot be considered in this respect as it is not part of the existing dwelling.)

2. 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.

3. 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

Page 25 (2014/15)

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.

North Norfolk 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.

Precedents

The precedents quoted by the applicants in order to justify this proposal are not similar in any respect. Although technically in the 'countryside' as not being within the areas of the villages defined for development, they are, nevertheless all either surrounded by, or adjacent to, other existing houses.

The attempted use of these 'precedents' does emphasise the danger of allowing the current proposal to go ahead. It would undoubtedly create a precedent for future large houses in the countryside, completely contrary to the NNDC's carefully considered and clear policies designed to protect the precious quality of the North Norfolk AONB and Glaven Valley Conservation Area. If this proposal is approved it will open the gates to further developments of this type which it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to resist.

We would also request that this application is called in to the NNDC Planning Committee, rather than delegated to a Planning Officer for a decision.

- ii) Application No. **PF/14/0828** - *Proposal; Installation of emergency generator at, **Blakeney Hotel, The Quay, Blakeney**. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that we have no objection to this application.*
- iii) Application No. **PF/14/0825** – *Proposal: Installation of flue to attached garage at, **Westrop, Saxlingham Road, Blakeney**. It was ***proposed & agreed*** that we have no objection to this application.*
- iv) Application No. **PF/14/0810** – *Proposal; Erection of detached garage at **Greensholme, off Wilson's Way, Blakeney**. It was ***proposed &****

agreed that we object to this application as it is not possible to access this proposed garage without driving over other peoples land.

- v) Application No. **PF/14/0783** – *Proposal; Relaxation of Condition 4 of planning permission reference: 12/1162 to allow construction of dwelling without complying with Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes at, **Bliss Blakeney, Morston Road, Blakeney**. It was **proposed & agreed** that we have no comment on this application.*
- vi) Application No. **PO/14/0915** – *Proposal; Conversion of residential dwelling to 3 affordable dwellings and erection of 1 residential dwelling at, **The Rectory, Wiveton Road, Blakeney**. It was **proposed & agreed** (other than 1 against and 1 objection) to support this application, so long as the net gain was affordable housing for local people, determined by the parish, and the new house is limited in use to either The Rectory or Vicarage, either by a condition on the planning approval or via a Section 106 agreement.*

We would also request that this application is called in to the NNDC Planning Committee, rather than delegated to a Planning Officer for a decision.

Meeting closed at 9.12pm.

Chairman _____