SHOTESHAM PARISH COUNCIL

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

A virtual meeting of Shotesham Parish Council was held via ‘**Zoom’ on 29th of April at 7.30** pm.

1. **Minutes** of the meetings of the 4th March and the 8th of April were approved
2. **Planning Applications**.

i). Skeets Hill Farmhouse …. 2021/0712

* **The application was agreed by all councillors.**

And….

ii) Glenview … 2021/0651

* **The application was rejected/refused by all councillors.**

**This application is an unusual one.**

* When this application was received no one could remember seeing an earlier application for the current building and no application was found on line. All the PC had was a 'retrospective' application for a satellite dish only ..nothing specifically for it to consider with respect to the building it was attached to.
* When that application**...2014/1866..** was looked at the following concerns emerged....

a). No planning permission could be found for the initial building. This was queried with South Norfolk Planners. A helpful officer advised it was 'permitted development' for a shed/store and no formal application was required.

 b). Looking at the application **2014/1866,** which dealt with the original creation of the existing building, many anomalies appear ...

• The 20+ documents associated show a quite different building now to what is shown in the current plans **re 2021/0651**

• The building was a 'shed/store' with no facilities. It currently has a toilet and associated items

• No-one had approved of where/how the foul water from this facility is to be/being currently disposed of.

• The windows were to be covered by shutters and a stable-type door.....as would befit a store. The current building has been altered since those plans were passed/submitted and thus have been ignored. A different building was erected.

• In 2014 the applicant indicated on the Householder Application Form section 10 that it could be seen from the highways etc etc....and that was/is correct. This is not accepted in the current application. An oversight???

*Given the extensive changes from the original plans for this building, the Parish Council consider that it is probable that the applicant should be requesting retrospective permission for planning and for change of use*

**Re the current resubmitted application 2021/0651**

The following points of information/concern were shared by councillors at their meeting on 29th of April and led to their rejection of the application.

• Glenview is now in the 'Shotesham Conservation Area'. We were assured this would be of great significance when considering any planning application.

• The new application form says, quite clearly, that it cannot be seen from the highway, a footpath or from public space**…. this is incorrect.**

• This needs to be corrected within the application, or the application be re-submitted, before any formal decision is made. This will avoid anything that may affect the final decision ...and set a precedent for building in the Shotesham Conservation Area.

* The existing building is an inappropriate and unacceptable intrusion into the landscape of a very sensitive, well valued, part of the Shotesham Conservation Area.
* The **proposed 70% increase** in the footprint would further and unacceptably damage the much-valued landscape from both across the valley and locally from the highway/footpaths and the open space of Shotesham Common. The building is ‘black’ and stands out from all vantage points.
* The plan shows that it is very close to the neighbour’s boundary to the point of being of being too close/unneighbourly. "The building extension is far too close to the neighbour's boundary; while a figure of 80cm is quoted on the plan, the 1:50 scale drawing suggests even greater proximity." This is confusing and should be formally corrected by the applicant before any decisions are made by SNDC. The height of proposal and its link to the proximity to neighbours’ fence/boundary plus the existing satellite dish simply aggravate the situation
* The original permitted development was signed off by an enforcement officer, Mr A Baines, in January 2015, who confirms in his report that it was for a store. The plans did not show the presence of a toilet thus no steps were taken, quite understandably, to approve the foul water disposal. This should now be examined by ‘Building Control’ to be assured its waste disposal system is in keeping with all regulations. Again, very important, for the Health and Safety considerations of users.
* The second amended submission for 2021/0651 indicates it is to become an ‘office’ presumably for business purposes. Councillors are concerned that the 70% increase in size would mean a very large office, the approximate size of the footprint of a small house, that could accommodate a large number of office staff**. This is rather more than a simple ancillary building to the main house.** If it is to accommodate only one person it is already of adequate size.
* If the ‘office’ is to have regular use by an unknown number of employees it should be noted that access to the highway is from an un-splayed drive. There could be a dangerous situation created on departure on to that highway. Villagers have already expressed concern about the speed of the traffic at this area.
* Finally, from public records, Glenview is a registered office with a website for customers to make contact … [www.cncproperties.co.uk](http://www.cncproperties.co.uk)... of a significant number of a major building company offering new build, renovation and commercial building services. None of the owners/directors of the many companies live in Glenview itself.
* The change to the original application 2021/0651 recognises it will be used as a commercial premises which, though they may generate business rates for SNDC, **it remains quite inappropriate in a conservation area ..and a ‘special’ site within that area.**
1. **Footpath coordinator**….and footpath related matters.
* The members all expressed their grateful thanks to Mrs Polly Gould for the excellent way she has coordinated the gathering of information from the ‘Shotesham footpath walkers’. The information is vital to the village’s wish to keep all its well-used and much-loved footpaths in good order.
* Mr Tom Higgin has agreed to take over this responsibility.
* A meeting is being arranged with him and key parish councillors to allow the latest information to be shared/discussed and an action plan be agreed to ensure and weaknesses/failings in the paths and the signage is brought up to standard.

 4 **Anonymous letters**.

* The current draft policy was discussed. Slim Dinsdale offered/agreed to revue the policy and adjust it to meet the need of our village.
1. **Covid 19 …end of regulations re Zoom meetings**
* The meeting looked forward to the time when a face-to-face meeting can be held. Notwithstanding this it was agreed that Zoom meeting have be a positive success Thanks were given to Kim and Heather for coordinating them.
* The only meeting place currently available is at the ‘cleared space’ at the back of All Saints. It is hoped the Mercers/Trinity Hall will also become available as ‘lock-down’ eases/ceases.
1. **Roadside parking and the impact on verges/footpaths**
* The heavy use of Shotesham’s footpaths continues together with the inconvenient and sometimes very inappropriate ‘roadside’ parking. The use of leafletting and other ideas were shared but no decision was taken.
* CC Alison Thomas suggested that we monitor the ongoing impact and, if it persists after ‘lock down’ is ended, we contact her to see if the new County Council can help. NB Full elections on May 6th.
1. **Other matters**.
* A request was made for the speed monitor to be placed at the Glenview end of the village to help combat a rise in the perceived speeding of vehicles in and out of the village.

**Also** ….

A). Alison Thomas confirmed she was standing again to represent Shotesham within the County Council. If successful she would want to continue her good relations with Shotesham.

B). i) Florence Ellis quietly mentioned she has assumed the role of Chairman of South Norfolk Council. The whole meeting expressed the good wishes for her term in office.

 ii) Florence asked if the Bowls Club had approached the parish council for financial support with the necessary maintenance of the ‘club-house’ roof. No approach has/had been made. How funding could be raised within the village was briefly discussed with the aim to see what may be possible. It was noted that the Bowls Club is now registered as a ‘community asset’.

**The meeting closed**.

J K Gough, The Clerk