

# SHOTESHAM PARISH COUNCIL to be approved at next meeting

Becmead, Shotesham St Mary, NR15 1UJ. Contact 01508550358.. email [shoteshampc@btinternet.com](mailto:shoteshampc@btinternet.com)

Minutes of the meeting of Shotesham Parish Council held at the Trinity Hall at 7.30pm on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> of November 2015

In attendance were ...,

H Jackson, J Nott, M Dyke, M Riches, H Walker, S Dinsdale, J Guy and K Dyke together with DC Florence Ellis and parishioner Liz Putland.

## 1. Apologies

All members were present. Apologies received from CC A Thomas.

## 2. Recording reason for absence.

The Clerk and The Chair explained the reason why members are asked to 'accept' reason for absence when considered apologies.

## 3. The minutes of the 1<sup>st</sup> of October were agreed and signed.

## 4. Planning Determinations.

### (a). Greenhill 2015/2141 was **rejected**

The following points were made

- The planning application was a retrospective application which despite being seen as irritating would be carefully considered as *if no building had taken place. Naturally the actual development cannot be ignored as this is a retrospective planning application being considered.*
- The sensitivity of this site which lies adjacent to a much prized area of special scientific and scenic value appears not to have been considered. A valuable mature 'cherry' tree which previously helped screen the site had been removed making it a much starker street scene.
- The proposed provision of grey concrete tiles was thought to be sensible as they would blend in and be in keeping with the small group of houses. In practice the tiles are to all intents and purposes **black** and further intrude into the street scene. Members found this unacceptable.
- The site is large yet the proposed extension is to the left rather to the right of the property where there is ample space. An extension to the right would not crowd the site and would prevent it dominating the adjoining property. **Members would have recommended a switch to the right** for the extension if this had come to them before any development had taken place.
- No screening has been suggested. Members would have asked that the tree be retained.[see point above].
- The rear landscaping has not been part of this application 2015/2141. It is unsightly and totally out of keeping with the delights of the valley Greenhill sits in. Member would have asked for a more sensitive treatment of this site to maintain the quality of the environment. They recommend steps are taken to reverse or very much reduce the impact of the current terracing.

(b). *Greenhill Double Garage 2015/1870.*

This application had previously **been rejected on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of September.**

The following points were made.

- No material facts had been added by the amended application.
- Indeed the 'tree' shown as affording a significant measure of screening had already been demolished when this amendment was submitted.
- This incorrect provision of information caused concern as to whether it was deliberate. No conclusion was drawn.

The meeting therefore saw no reason to change their view that the application **be rejected**

(c). *Highfields Hawes Green 2015/2332*

The planning application was considered and **rejected**

The following points were made.....

- The proposed development is quite out of keeping with this unique heritage site as the original Norfolk and Norwich hospital.
- The 'hamlet' quality of *Hawes Green* should be protected.
- It was reported that 4 of the 5 immediate neighbours object to the current plans.
- It is oversized in height.
- The style and finish of the building is unacceptable for the area.
- The proposed balcony is again out of keeping.
- If approved as submitted its proximity to road would materially and detrimentally affect the street scene
- Members felt a property that wished to expand should, in this position, consider a linear extension matching surrounding properties.

(d). *Meadow View Brooke Road 2015/2376*

The following points were made.

- Members were aware the property had been occupied.
- Not firm dates/periods of time were able to be stated.
- Nevertheless an occupancy period of more than 10 years and being aware that it was occupied whilst working nearby some 6-8 years ago were offered by 2 of the longer term residents of Shotesham on the Council.

5. *Glen View.*

The Chairman reported on her meeting with SNDC re the need to enforce the planning restriction with respect to the significant intrusions into the 'paddock' in violation to the Section 106 agreement. The officers listened to the case put particularly the concern that enforcement was not being vigorously pursued. They gave assurances that steps would be taken to review the situation and to formally report back in a week or so..

The meeting asked that the report be acquired by the next meeting and *Glen View* be put on the next Agenda.

## 6. Urgent Issues

### Playing Field.

- The request for informal casual usage by a Brooke group was approved. The group to be asked to liaise with the Stoke Holy Cross team to ensure no double usage.

### Remembrance Day.

- The meeting was reminder of the usual procedure and everyone indicated their keenness to attend.

### The Trinity

- The Chairman outlined the present position at the Trinity. After some discussion it was agreed that a very informal monitoring role of it usage would be appropriate.

### 30 mph Limit

- The report from Highways that both the extension of the 30 mph limit towards Saxlingham and Brooke was not possible. It was agreed to consider what further action can be taken at the Uppgate Farm area after discussion with the concerned residents.

### SAM2.

- Henry updated the meeting. The key form was duly signed. We await news of the machines arrival and installation.

### Poringland Housing Development

- There is growing concern that as more and more of the houses in the development become occupied there will be significant impact of traffic using the village as a through route to the A140 and the A47. It was agreed to actively monitor the situation. More thoughts/details to be agreed at the next meeting.

**The next meeting is a full meeting planned for the 3<sup>rd</sup> of December at 7.30pm at the Trinity. A key part of the meeting will be to set the annual budget for 2016/17 and thus the 'precept'.**