

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRA-ORDINARY MEETING OF INSTOW PARISH  
COUNCIL HELD AT THE PARISH HALL, INSTOW ON  
THURSDAY 29<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2017 AT 7.00pm**

**Present: -** Councillor Moores (Chairman)  
  
Councillors Mrs Clements, Crombie, Green, Mrs Hackett, McCrum and Vandersteen.  
  
Mr M Isaac (Clerk).

**In Attendance:** Approximately 20 parishioners/members of the public.

**46 OPENING OF THE MEETING**

The meeting was declared open by the Clerk.

**47 APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies received

**48 COUNCILLOR DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest announced.

**49 PLANNING APPLICATION 58608 OUTLINE APPLICATION (ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT ACCESS AND LAYOUT) FOR THE ERECTION OF UPTO 5 DWELLINGS, ACCESS, OPEN SPACE & ASSOCIATED WORKS (AMENDED INFORMATION, PLANS & DESCRIPTION), LAND AT BARTON LANE, INSTOW**

The Clerk outlined the format of the meeting. The first part of the meeting would be open to Parishioners to express their views and ask questions on the Planning Application. The second part of the meeting would be a discussion and voting on recommendations by the Councillors only.

The Parishioners raised the following issues:

- a) Unnecessary application, in an environmentally sensitive area of the village. The concerns of the NDC Conservation Officer in her report 2 years ago stated:

The green field comprising the development site marks the clear separation between the development of Instow Town and the seaside development. Development of this site would remove the significance of the existing green space and in my view would cause harm to the setting. This harm would be greater than the harm caused by development of the associated Anstey Way site'.

The Conservation Officer has now submitted a report this month saying ' the reduced scheme is an improvement and there would be beneficial changes by altering the proposed lay out'. Why has the significance of the green field which had been

emphasised earlier marking the clear separation between the Town and the seaside development suddenly lost its importance? What about the harm to the setting she was so concerned about?

b) Historic England also wrote on the first application-

'We trust that the Council will take account of the harmful impact that would result on a grade 1 listed building. In accordance with Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 we advise that considerable weight should be given to the "desirability of preserving the building or its setting" when weighing that in the final balance. We consider that this would be a legitimate reason for refusal unless an over-riding public benefit is demonstrated which cannot be delivered on alternative sites in the area.'

Despite the production of an elaborate report submitted by the applicants in an attempt to overcome these comments and objections it does nothing in our opinion to alleviate the concerns expressed earlier. Should approval be given to this application, it is urged that density be reduced and the properties be of single story and sited only on the South East side of the field. It also appears that two of the marked sites no's 4 & 5 at the lower end of the field to the west/north west are well outside the existing building line of properties along Anstey Way, which if approved, would create an unwelcome precedent.

c) That any dwellings should be affordable for local people

d) The Heritage statement stated that there were no views from the Church of the site. This was untrue

e) That BARTON LANE does not exist in Instow.

f) Regardless of the reduction to 5 properties (2 affordable?!) and changes to layout, it is considered that the revision and resurrection does not negate all the comments and representations previously submitted, in particular the environmental intrusion at this key point in Instow.

g) The Road access remains from the narrow Rectory Lane across the stream and through the existing hedgerow.

h) Why Greenfield not Brownfield site

Councillor Green gave an overview of the amendments and history to the application.

Following discussions by Members it was moved by Councillor Vandersteen and seconded by Councillor Moores that the application be REFUSED for the previous reasons agreed by the Parish Council and to surface water and sewage disposal concerns.

An amendment was moved and seconded that the application be APPROVED subject to surface water and sewage disposal issues being resolved.

The amendment was put to Council and on a show of hands lost by 5 votes to 2

There being no further amendments the motion was put to Council and on a show of hands declared carried by 5 votes to 2.

It was further moved that Councillor Moores be requested to call the application in for consideration and determination by NDC Planning Committee which was carried 4 vote to 2

The Council re-affirmed its previous decision and RECOMMENDED that the amended application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- i) adverse impact on the setting in relation to the historic church an important factor.
- ii) adverse landscape impact;
- iii) flood risk at the north west corner of the site. (addressed by the provision of a swale)
- iv) the views previously expressed by the ND Conservation Officer as the gateway to the village
- v) increased traffic following recent planning permissions in Barton Lane
- vi) concerns were expressed re sewage and surface water disposal

It was also agreed that Councillor Moores be requested to call the application in for consideration/determination by NDC Planning Committee

Chairman

The meeting ended at 7.52 p.m.