

MUNDESLEY-ON-SEA PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING Held on WEDNESDAY 25th APRIL 2016 at 7:00pm In the CORONATION HALL, MUNDESLEY

Present: Cllr C West (Chairman)
Committee Members: Cllrs P Gray, J Parke, L Stango, D Revell, Derek Smith, Phillip Keddell

Members of the Public: 35

Assistant Clerk: Mrs D Joy

Prior to the meeting taking place members met to ensure they had all received the up to date information on the proposed development in order to make an informed decision.

01 Apologies for Absence

Cllr: C. Payne.

02 Declarations of Interest and Requests for Dispensations

Cllr: P.Gray declared a possible interest in item 3.1 Planning Applications PF/15/1534.

03 Planning Applications

3.1 To consider and agree the following planning application

PF/15/1534 Erection of 44 dwellings, public open space and associated infrastructure
Land off High Street and Water Lane, Mundesley.

The Chairman noted that that the Extraordinary Meeting that was held on the 13th April 2016 was called by him to discuss the changes to PF/15/1534 and he had the right to do so. This meeting was called due to amendments made to original plans that were submitted. Therefore the council's previous decision needs to be reviewed as there have been significant changes, due to the number of house from 51 to 44. NALC have confirmed this. He has spoken to Mr Steel from the Environment Agency and in his view the revised plans meet the Environment Agencies requirements. MPC are not the experts to interpret planning and policies that is NNDCs role. This will be considered at a meeting on 4th May 2016. To speak at the meeting and have your say contact their clerk on PF/15/1534

The Chairman invited Mr Alan Dunger Jane Ross, David Ross, Mr D AllChurch, Mrs Dunn, Mr Rawlings, , Mr Simon Quilter, and email from Mrs Avril B. Duke-Millar and Mr Sean O' Hara to speak.

Prior to these people speaking The Chairman noted that everyone would have 3 minutes to speak. Cllr Derek Smith kept time.

Mr Dunger: Stated that as the council had already made a decision they cannot overturn it. If they rejected the plans at 18.89 how can they accept it at 18.40(Rossi Long Report) It does not seem logical to approve when the flood risk seems higher. Why? Government flood report 9.2.16 Have new guidelines for Climate change Allowances. MPC has a duty to reject this development.(3 minutes)

- Jane Ross: In some places a new development is appropriate. Water Lane is a green space with an important view, which we were told no-one deserves a view, but we appreciate it. The volume of traffic will increase as will workers, school traffic and bin men. The development will be noisy. And is worried that since the last meeting 2 councillors have resigned

Re-dacted due to
data protection

David Ross: People like our village because it still is a village. Once the development is here it won't be. The development area is for people to enjoy and attracts wildlife. Perhaps turn it into a country park, like Pigneys Wood or allotments which are much needed in the village. There are better sites to build a development on. Do we need more? I object to this development. .(2 minutes)

- Mr Don Allchurch: Following the last meeting I have heard from Mrs Baker at NNDC. The highway will be broadened. She notes 15 points of safety to people. NNDC want revised plans. Conservation dept. has concerns that the development and its concerns need to be addressed. Conservation and Landscape 15.12.15 were dissatisfied with presentation. Asked why the builder did not answer these. Why are MPC making a decision without revised plans? .(2 minutes)
- Mrs Dunn: Parking hasn't been addressed. The access road is on a bend. Feels it is an accident waiting to happen. Extra cars will be too much for the village to cope with. People will use the supermarkets and not local shops. I hope you agree with that. (2 minutes)
- Mr Rawlings: This is scientific and the developers have admitted there is a flood risk and amended. Tank to be used to minimise flooding. NNDC say the tank won't work. Plans from 51 to 44 houses. Makes you wonder why they are staying with it. NNDC say there are better sites. This is just a bad site. 01-04-08 other sites should be reconsidered. NNDC stated there should be no more development and if so no more than 10 houses. The Government looked for land, but nowhere did it mention Mundesley. If land in Mundesley isn't available it should not be forced. Object and find another site. .(3 minutes)
- Simon Quilter: MPC will hopefully stick to their guns. NNDC say the land is a heritage site. We have a duty to keep our assets. Once they are built on they can't be taken back. Access is still an issue and remaining houses are still at risk of flooding. Constricted access and the safety of people and other drivers. The Councillor Guide say to take heed of traffic. NNDC do not understand the flood.

Mr Quilter then objected to the fact that he had 3 minutes. The Chairman asked Mr Quilter to sit down, Mr Quilter continued briefly then sat down. .(5 minutes)

- Mrs Avril B. Duke-Millar. Her email was read out by The Chairman.
- Sean O'Hara (Developer): Noted that the Highways reported dated 8th April 2016 is satisfied with the revised plans. In regards to the flooding, re Mr Dungers document. The Environment is considered the Governments expert on flooding. The development is in Flood Zone 1 and not the areas Zone 2 & 3 which are the areas of flood risk. These are the experts that NNDC will consult with. .(2 minutes)
- The chairman thanked everyone for their input. He commented that the Highways were now in support of the modified development. The Chairman then asked if any other Councillors had anything else they wanted to add. All replied no.
- Peter Gray commented that he had lived there for 16 years and it does flood very very occasionally. The drain gets blocked 10 yards down the road from his house and causes the road to flood. The flooding is caused by rainfall from the road and not from the field.
- The Chairman commented that the over development had been addressed as had the flooding. The Councillors have 3 options when voting. These are, in favour, against or to abstain. The Chairman then noted that the Council would take a vote. A member of the public asked for a discussion and the chairman noted this had already been done at previous meetings. The Chairman then directed the Council to vote by raising their hand.

All councillors voted in favour of the development except Peter Gray who abstained.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their time and closed the n

Redacted due
to data protection

04 **Date of Next Meeting**
TBA

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting to the public at 7.30pm.

Redacted due to
data protection

CH.

16/5/16
DATE