

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING  
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING**

A meeting of the Orwell Planning Committee (OPC) was held in the (back room) of the Village Hall on  
Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2019 at 7.00pm (19.00hrs)

**Present:** Cllr G Bunnett – Acting Chairman (**GB**), Cllr J Chuisseu (**CH**), Cllr C Ingrey (**CI**) and Cllr T Morris Lowe (**TML**)

---

- 01/07/19**      **Apologies for absence:** *LGA 1972 sch12 para 40 – Quorate is one third but no less than 3 members LGA 1972 sch12, para 45*  
Apologies were received from Cllrs Szembel and Healy these were for personal reasons and were accepted and agreed by the Planning Committee.
- 02/07/19**      **To sign and approve Planning Minutes of meetings held on 16<sup>th</sup> January and 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019:**  
The minutes were deferred until the next meeting.
- 03/07/19**      **Public Participation:**  
(For up to 15 mins members of the public may contribute their views and comments - 3mins per item)  
There was one member of the public in attendance. Concern was raised regarding item 4.1.
- 04/07/19**      **Councillors to disclose any Pecuniary Interests** (*disclosable pecuniary interests (DPIs) include interests held by a member's spouse, civil partner or similar*) listed on the Agenda:  
There were no interests declared.
- 04/07/19**      **Request for the following:**
- 4.1**      **Land at 35 Town Green Road**      **S/2003/19/FL**  
Mr Green  
Construction of a 3-bedroom bungalow and detached garage  
Following a discussion, it was proposed by Cllr Chuisseu to recommend 'Refusal' with comments (appendix 1) this was seconded by Cllr Morris Lowe and agreed by all.  
There were several reasons it was felt that this application should be refused, however Cllr Ingrey would like it minuted that he did not agree to the point regarding access nor on the point of environmental impact on the environment.  
Vote on Access – recommend to refuse 3, 1 abstention  
Vote on Environmental Impact – recommend to refuse 3, 1 abstention  
Vote on impact of surrounding dwellings – recommend to refuse, all agreed.
- 4.2**      **69 High Street**      **S/2141/19/DC**  
Mr & Mrs Harding  
Discharge of conditions 3 (traffic management plan), 4 (Arboriculture method statement), 5 (details of Materials), 6 (Kerb details) 7 (Boundary treatment plan), 8 (carbon Emissions), 9 (Water use requirement) 10 (Wifi and ducting) of planning permission S/4756/18/FL.  
INFORMATION ONLY this was noted.
- 4.3**      **Land at Hurdleditch Road**      **S/2135/19/DC**  
Mr G Williams, Croudace Homes  
Discharge of condition 8 (arboriculture assessment) of planning permission S/3190/15/OL for outline planning application for up to 49 dwellings, community car park and coach drop off facility, pumping station and associated infrastructure  
INFORMATION ONLY this was noted.
- 05/07/19**      **SCDC Decisions:**  
There were no decisions.
- 06/07/19**      **Other Items:**  
There were no other items discussed.

Ref: 35 Town Green Road, Orwell - S/2003/19/FL

Orwell Planning Committee recommend 'Object' with the comments outlined below  
Orwell Planning Committee request that the application be referred to the SCDC Planning Committee

The Parish Council have many concerns regarding this application.

**5. Overlooking and loss of privacy:**

Several neighbours are concerned that the proposed building will be visible from their properties, and should the proposed bungalow ever have a first-floor accommodation added, (this seems a possibility bearing in mind the floorplate and roof pitch the bungalow/cum house will have line of sight directly into their properties.

**6. Loss of light and overshadowing:**

One neighbouring property in particular will have shadow over it caused by this proposed building, and its garage.

A neighbouring property would lose daylight into kitchen and dining rooms which is approximately 20 metres adjacent to their foundations.

**7. Highway Safety:**

The access road leading to the proposed development is already a busy intersection and is used by both pedestrians and vehicles. Further vehicle movements will only add to an already congested intersection. Of specific note, is the footway/footpath that emerges by the proposed new entrance to the proposed new building. This route is used by children of all ages and hitherto has been regarded by parents as a safe route for children to walk, cycle, scooter and run along. It is also a popular dog walking route. There is no separate footpath to the road; pedestrians and vehicles use the same road surface and pedestrians have to stand to one side when vehicles go through. Additional traffic will make this worse.

There is also a layby, a bus stop, the village shop and post office and the pub at the point where the access to the proposed building emerges on to Town Green Road. This is already a very busy junction which is in effect a blind junction. Families and the elderly and infirm use the bus stop and the village shop and post office, and there have been frequent near misses in an already heavily congested road space.

The proposed parking of another 4 vehicles would increase this risk to pedestrians, and all road users.

Access for emergency vehicles should also be considered here. There is frequently double parking, and even the permitted single parking can make it impossible for emergency vehicles to access the existing properties, and an additional property at this location would simply exacerbate the situation. All three listed building have thatched roofs and are therefore at increased risk should the fire brigade need to reach them and is unable to do so.

**8. Traffic:**

The point at which the proposed new building's access point on Town Green Road is already heavily congested with cars, buses, pedestrians, cyclists and delivery vehicles all converging and seeking to manoeuvre in a very restricted road space. There are frequent near misses. This point sees more road and pedestrian traffic than the rest of the village (except the school) as those using the main village bus stop, the village shop and post office and the village pub all converge.

**9. Parking:**

The proposed development site contains a garage. It should be noted that a previous planning application by the Applicant (S/2924/16/LB) requesting the movement of a drive and garage was in part to improve access and safety to the then one-dwelling plot. That planning application stated that their existing garage conflicts with traffic movements from the driveway of the property opposite. The current application is an intensification of a use the applicant has said causes conflict. Now it is proposed to build a new dwelling with associated parking in a plot that has already been deemed difficult to access. The proposal is for a double garage and 2 external parking spaces, ie parking for 4 cars. The Design and Access Statement implies that one or more of these is for 35 Town Green Road when that property already has a garage and external parking, or is this another case of careless wording

**10. Noise:**

A new building being built so close to neighbouring properties with provision for several cars will create noise where previously there was nothing more than the sound that might be expected from a garden in domestic use, lawnmowers, people talking, children playing. There is concern about the effect upon residents of the properties that are not listed as well as those that are listed.

**11. Design, appearance and materials:**

The Application of the proposed building being of the 'vernacular' style without any description of what that means. The Council is disappointed and concerned that there is insufficient particularity in the application and in particular its description of the building style and character, and of the building materials.

It will be noted by the SCDC Officers, and Members of the Planning Committee, that the Application consistently utilises generic language apparently incorporated in the Application with little regard to the meaning of the words. This creates the impression that the content has been used elsewhere and has been simply reinserted in this application for convenience. Unfortunately, the Design, Access, Sustainability and Planning Statement could mislead by statements such as the village has a medical centre, which it has not and schools, when it has one primary school. The garage is situated on the boundary and has a steeply pitched roof making it more obtrusive than necessary.

The actual materials to be used in the different parts of the building are not identified, but the external design shown on the drawings suggests a confused mixture of brick, render and timber cladding of no design merit. The Design and Access Statement, under the heading 'Appearance', refers to 'The use of local materials'. Bricks, tiles and cement are not made locally and the timber is unlikely to be grown locally so this is misleading.

**12. Effect on listed building and Conservation Areas:**

There are three Grade II listed buildings in the immediate vicinity of the Application. All and each will be impacted by the Application to a greater or lesser extent. Some by increased traffic and general noise, some by lights (presumably there will be security lights as well as general domestic and amenity lighting installed), the loss of natural habitat will also impact the general amenity of the properties each of which had sat in the one remaining part of the village that had never been developed whilst all around them had seen very extensive infill over the last 30 years. These buildings to a large extent, still sit with their landscape unaltered for many years. The proposed bungalow will have an impact on the setting of the three listed buildings close to its proposed location. This application is similar to a previous application S/3972/17/FL with only small changes.

**13. Nature Conservation and/or impact on protected trees or the landscape:**

The trees on the site were also felled prior to an application being put forward and thus no bat, owl or newt survey was able to be carried out. It is well known that Owls nested in one of the recently felled trees.

Some trees were felled a few days after the original application.

It was also felt that the infilling of such areas should be deterred as the heritage aspect of the village should be protected and the impact on the Heritage aspect of the village has not been established.

**General Observations.**

It is felt that the application is very poorly put together and the Design and Access Statement still has important errors. For example, there is no medical centre in Orwell. The statement that the building is to be of the vernacular style has no meaning in the context of the proposed location. This is the third application on this site, each of the last two being slightly smaller than the previous application. We understand that both were withdrawn because they were going to be refused. Two of the concerns about the previous applications S/3972/17/FL and S/3219/18/FL related to being contrary to Policy NH/14 and Policy HQ1 of the Local Plan 32018 and in our opinion, this is still the case