SHOTESHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Becmead Shotesham St Mary NR15 1UJ 01508550358. clerk.shotesham@outlook.com

**Minutes of the meeting held at the Trinity at 7.30 pm on Wednesday the 8th of December.**

1. All PC members were present together with the local councillor F Ellis. Also in attendance were …The applicant Mr Mantin and his partner, the architect D Marris, Dr G Porter, Mrs S Webber, Mr P Snell.
2. Apologies for absence

* Apologies received and accepted from CC Alison Thomas.

1. Tree Warden

* Mr Raz Woollacott decision to stand down as Tree Warden was accepted by the meeting. Every member expressed the thanks for his service to the village.
* The meeting was made aware of the offer from Sarah Long to take up the post. It was noted that she was the Tree Warden for Saxlingham prior to moving to Shotesham. There was unanimous agreement to her appointment. The Chairman would speak to her to convey the decision

1. **Planning Applications …**

**A .. 2021/2414 ……Maple Tree House, Priory lane…..Recommend acceptance**

Members reviewed the application. Whilst recognising it was within the conservation area it was felt that the proposal had a minor impact on the street scene and thus unanimously approved it.

**B.. 2021/2510…….Land South of Greenhill……Recommend refusal.**

The applicant and his partner and the architect were invited by the Chairman to introduce their proposal for the site.

The quality of the design of the proposed building was fully explained and broadly accepted by the members. The applicant emphasised that 20 villagers had already posted comments on the SNDC planning website supporting the design.

A number of objections were made to the proposal from members of the village who were in attendance. One speaker suggested that the supportive comments related only to the high quality design and not to the question of building in this location. Another complained of “classic ribbon development

A major and very significant concern the intrusion into an area inside the Shotesham Conservation Area and outside the Development Boundaries for the village. The Conservation Area boundaries were amended as recently as 2018, with the full agreement of SNDC, specifically to to protect this precise area. What has been proposed would result in the loss of the, much valued, open space between the main part of the village and the very much smaller settlement/cluster of homes.

* Whilst some effort has been made to reduce the overall profile as seen from the road it does not appear to be well integrated into the hill. It is imposing and impressive in appearance and would present a strong impression due to a wide, full height, above ground, main elevation set not far back from the road.
* There are been several previous applications to build a house on this site. The most recent (Ref 2018/1059) was rejected by SNDC, and the appeal against this was dismissed by the Inspector (Ref: APP/L2630/W/18/3217160) for a number of reasons many of which are equally relevant to this application. The Inspector identifies substantial environmental harm and only “very limited social and economic benefits”, Paragraph 11 of his decision seems particularly important:

“The significance of the CA in my view relates partly to Shotesham being a

small, historic village nestling in this mainly open river valley landscape. The incursion of further development beyond the village limits would detract from this largely undeveloped landscape setting and harm the significance of the CA. Whilst less than substantial I must attach significant weigh to this harm which would not be outweighed by any discernible public benefit which paragraph 196 of the Framework requires I should consider. Consequently, the proposal further conflicts with JCS Policy 1 and Policy DM 4.8 insofar as these seek to protect the historic environment**.“**

* There was concern that, though the current entrance to the disused ‘stable’ generated little or no traffic flow, should the proposal be approved it would create a serious hazard. Traffic flow along that stretch of road is already being ‘speed’ monitored as a result of village concern about excess speed being experienced.

**The parish councillors believe that the proposed dwelling will do substantial harm to the Conservation Area and be of no public benefit. The councillors unanimously refused the application.**

**C.. 2021/2546…….Glenview…Change of Use from Outbuilding to Office (Class E)**

Councillors noted a number of concerns and possible errors with the application including:

• The application states that the change of use has not started. This contradicts all existing evidence as is inconsistent with the Enforcement Action underway by SNDC and statements elsewhere in the application which state there are already 5 employees.

• The floor plan illustrates a toilet but the answer to Q13 indicates that the method of disposal of foul sewage disposal is unknown. We request SNDC make an inspection to ensure that the toilet is compliant with all Building Regulations and that there is no escape of sewerage into the Tas Valley drainage system.

• The application states that the site cannot be seen from a public road or other public space. This is incorrect as the site is clearly visible from Shotesham Road and from Shotesham Common.

A number of points were made on the proposed change of use:…..

* The building was originally built under permitted development rules for use “ancillary to residential use of the property”. No change of use is required providing that office use continues to be ancillary to residential use of the main property.
* The result, if approved, would appear to create a new property not linked to the main house. The site is inappropriate for an office independent of the main property given its proximity to neighbours and the poor access to the highway. Granting full Class E office may open up opportunities for a future change of use to a separate residential dwelling and/or further permitted development which would be inappropriate on this site in a conservation area.
* The Highways concern in the previous application for development of this site has not been addressed. The Highways Department advised that the exit should be via a ‘splayed drive’.
* This office for five staff members is outside the village development boundary.
* All five ‘office staff’ would need to travel from outside the village. Such traffic flows are always difficult for small villages. Especially where the road is subject to through village travel at start and end of each day. The proposed change of use does not support policyDM3.10 on sustainable transport.

**The parish councillors unanimously recommend refusal of the application for change of use.** Members of the public present concurred with this view.

1. Review of expenditure

Members considered the projections of spend for the 2022/23 budget against the current approved budget. At the moment it is estimated that spend incurred in 2021/22 will exceed the current budget by approximately £500. The carry forward will ensure that expenditure is met. This is also mitigated by a generous donation towards the refurbishment of the 2 X-BT boxes….one is used for the defibrillator and the other is a Book Box.

Future inflation is not known but an estimate of 4% has been agreed as one to use for the roll-forward budget for 2022/2023.

A full estimate of its impact on the level of budget for which the precept will

be circulated. If approved that will allow the council to meet the time limit set by South Norfolk Council Finance Department.

1. *Items for consideration.*

* ***Community Award*** *..received from Lord Dannatt on behalf of the village. The award is to recognise the effort made by the village during the height of the Covid19 epidemic. It will be displayed at the foot of the village sign.*
* ***Footpaths****…..FP21.The clerk reported that no progressed appears to have been made by Norfolk County Council to ‘enforce’ the opening of this foot path. Members asked that a direct approach is made to our county councillor Alison Thomas to bring the stalemate to an end. It first arose nearly 10 years ago*

*FP6…It was agreed to erect the two missing signs that will identify the route f the footpath in the area of Market Lane/Stubbs Green. Both signposts and post holders are available. The chairman will approach a resident who carried out a similar task in earlier years.*

* ***Black and White signposts.*** *It was agreed to approach Highways to remove the present signpost from the hedge opposite Eastell’s Lane with a view to its refurbishment/repainting and the making of a new direction arm. It is hoped it can be re-located on the other side of the road in the wide grassy area. It is hoped to follow this by a ‘one post at a time’ approach to refurbish the other 6/7 posts in similar need.*
* ***Platinum Jubilee*** *The meeting agreed to begin the planning process for the event. The SVA will invited to share ideas and plot the way forward****.*** *The beacon basket will be built at Shotesham Estate with materials provided/funded by the PC.*

*A number of sites were suggested and an approach will be made to site owner as soon as possible.*

* ***Future dates/venue for PC meetings****…It was greed to meet at the Trinity on Jan12th, March 2nd and the 4th of May. The clerk will seek to book the dates with The Mercers as soon as possible.*

J K Gough, The Clerk