

HIGH KELLING PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of High Kelling Parish Council held on Tuesday 5th November 2024 at 2pm at High Kelling Village Hall.

Attendees: Cllr Peter Rutherford (Chairman), Cllr Maureen Pearman (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Sally Monkman, Cllr David Carter, Cllr Philip Fejer, Cllr Jan Kemp, Cllr Duncan Henderson and Locum Clerk Gemma Harrison.

Members of Public Present - 47

1. Administrative:

- a. Cllr Peter Rutherford welcomed everyone to the meeting. Apologies have been received from Cllr Susan Rutherford and County Cllr Eric Vardy and District Cllr Martin Batey.
- b. It was AGREED by all to suspend the Standing Orders to allow for a lengthier public participation given the importance and interest from local residents on PF/24/1892.
- c. There were no declarations of Interest or requests for dispensations by councillors in any of the agenda items listed.
- d. Cllr Rutherford introduced the Pineheath Care Home planning application which has been received for consideration by the Parish Council. The Parish Council have asked Savills (The agent) some questions about the proposed scheme, Cllr Rutherford shared the feedback with everyone present. A list of the questions and answers can be seen at Appendix A.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(Maximum 15 minutes)

- Mr Cole stated that he would prefer to see the building remain as a Care Home, traffic is a huge concern. The member of the public disagreed with the number of vehicle movements stated in the application. There was concern raised about the bus stop which will cause a blind turning space. Vehicles turning right from Holt would hold up traffic.
- Concerns raised about the gated community, leading to segregation within the community.
- Mr Fish raised concerns that houses will be marketed as private residential homes with no affordable homes being offered.
- Mr Morgan stated that two vehicles will struggle to pass along the proposed access road, as such access is not appropriate. He stated that pedestrians are not catered for. There would be limited lighting making the road and nearby path, dangerous for pedestrians at night.

- Mrs White stated that a traffic report carried out on a nearby property being developed would only approve one vehicle from one house going out onto the main road, whereas this development proposed considerably more.
- Mr Houchell stated it was difficult to make a comparison between the vehicle counts on the road at the time the Care Home was granted permission and today as traffic has significantly increased.
- A member of the public raised concerns about an additional access by the substation. It was confirmed that that the second exit was for pedestrian use only. The member of the public raised concerns about the width of the access road, stating it was not fit for purpose as two vehicles cannot pass. There was disappointment that the properties were only going to be available on the open market, it is anticipated a lot of the properties will become second homes, which won't give any value to the village.
- Mr Bullman stated his primary concern is pedestrians. Older people in one-bedroom properties and will rely on public transport. The road is not suitable for safe crossing. There is no footpath on that side of the road.
- A member of the public asked the question whether NCC had a policy restricting crossings on the A148. Cllr Pearman stated that there are policies in place which only allow crossings in certain Circumstances.
- A member of the public stated they had concerns about future management of green areas. Cllr Rutherford stated that it was anticipated to be managed by an external management company.
- Mrs Holmes raised concerns about the sewage works not having enough capacity to cope with the additional homes. References were made to gardens flooding with sewage in the past.
- Mr Kelly stated that he supported everything everyone has said. In addition to the concerns already raised he stated that the newly added Public Footpath alongside the Care Home site, is not shown on any of the plans, it is not marked on the footpath map which is included within the application.
- Cllr David Carter stated it would be difficult to get out into the traffic flow and feels it will be detrimental to traffic flow.
- A member of the public mentioned the previous fatality at the end of Avenue Road and was concerned the proposal would cause more accidents along this stretch of the A148.
- Mr Mangan asked whether the data for the traffic movements (from when the care home was first in operation), can be verified. He felt the data was inaccurate and seemed very high.

- A member of the public stated that there are already a number of safety concerns on the A148, with a recent accident occurring when a car attempted to turn off the A148 and was hit from behind. Problems exist already and will be made worse by the proposals.

To help steer the Parish Council, Cllr Peter Rutherford asked for a show of hands from members of the public in favour and against the proposal at Pineheath Care Home,

In Favour – 0

Against– 47 (all members of the public present).

2. Planning

a. To consider planning applications

- PF/24/1892 Pineheath Care Home, Cromer Road, High Kelling.
Cllr David Carter PROPOSED to OBJECT, and this was SECONDED by Cllr Jan Kemp and AGREED by all. Clerk to respond summarising the above concerns raised. GH
- PF/24/2157 Bramble Wood, Selbrigg Road, High Kelling - No objection was PROPOSED by Cllr David Carter and SECONDED by Cllr Jan Kemp and AGREED by all. GH
- PF/24/1997 High Kelling Pharmacy at Holt Medical Practice, Kelling Hospital, Cromer Road – Cllr David Carter stated he SUPPORTED the application, this was SECONDED Cllr Jan Kemp and AGREED BY ALL. GH
- PF/24/1771 – High Kelling Holt Railway Station, Cromer Road – it was noted this has now been APPROVED by NNDC.

The Meeting ended 14.44

Next scheduled Full Council Meeting

Tuesday 19th November at 7pm at High Kelling Village Hall

APPENDIX A

Correspondence Q&A with Savills (Pineheath Care Home)

1. How are you going to achieve the width on the private access way to allow vehicles to pass?

The access road measures >4.1m in width. In accordance with Manual for Streets this is more than enough space for 2 vehicles to pass each other. The road is an existing formal access which successfully served the care home which generated 79 more vehicle trips per day than the proposed scheme. During the busiest peak am hour of the day the residential scheme would generate less movements than the existing consented use. Some recent width restriction has been caused by growth of the hedge of Pineheath Cottage on the east of the access. If this is cut back and maintained (as is standard practice) as it is on the west then there is sufficient space for two vehicles to pass each other. The land is in the applicant's ownership so there is no impediment to doing this.

2. Are there any plans to show how the visibility splays will be achieved on the A148?

It appears that a considerable amount of vegetation and hedgerow will need to be removed. Visibility splays are shown at page 30 of the Transport Statement attached here for ease of reference. This is an existing access point and visibility will need to be maintained (i.e. cutting back vegetation) no matter what the land use is. Any vegetation on the client's land will be maintained to ensure full visibility can be achieved. I concluded the same in conversation with Nick Hume, the owner of Pineheath Cottage, who pointed out the vegetation is relatively new growth. I have encountered a similar issue at a site in Surrey where the County Council were satisfied with a condition requiring the applicant to maintain the visibility splays. In other locations a s106 legal agreement has been drawn up to achieve the same. In short, there are good examples of where this has been achieved before.

3. It is noted that there are proposals for pedestrian crossing points on the A148. The Parish Council had previously asked for a pedestrian refuge but were told that the A148 was too narrow to create a safe crossing point.

The road is 7m wide and already contains a central hatched area. There is also a considerable amount of Highway Land either side which could be used to facilitate a crossing point, the width which will be determined by the type of crossing used to be agreed with Norfolk County Council. In pre-application consultation NCC advised "This proposal includes areas needed to improve emerging visibility and includes a proposed tandem pedestrian crossing is generally welcomed in principle, but would need a full safety audit to consider all design aspects and may need land dedication for the new footpath provision". We remain in consultation with NCC to reach agreement about the safe inclusion of the crossing.

4. The number of units considerably exceeds the number of new dwellings allocated for High Kelling in the local plan. What is the justification for this?

Policy HO 9 allows for the re-use of existing buildings in the countryside. The Policy HO 1 states that all new housing developments, including conversions shall provide at least 40% of dwellings as having two bedrooms or fewer, with internal floor spaces below 70sqm. As set out in North Norfolk's 2019 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the region is seeing a steady decline in household size

which is project to continue. 35 dwellings are proposed on site. 21no. x one-bed (60%), 12no. x two-bed (34%) and 2no. x three-bed (6%) dwellings. All units meet the nationally described space standards. The proposed housing mix exceeds the local policy minimum standard set out in Policy HO 1 whilst re-using an existing building.

We also note that the Examination of the Local Plan has identified a significant shortfall in housing provision across the district and the Inspector has recommended increasing provision within small growth villages such as High Kelling.

5. Some village residents have already expressed their concerns about the size of the development and the effect on traffic movements and safety on the A148. Is this something you wish to address?

The existing lawful use of the site would, if in use, generate 167 vehicle movements a day through staff, visitors and servicing whereas the proposed use would only generate 88 vehicle movements. In addition we have proposed a number of measures to improve highways safety and connectivity to and from the village and the existing bus stops. We would like to think that local residents would welcome this highway benefit with reduced traffic and enhanced pedestrian facilities.