**HOLCOMBE ROGUS PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Planning Committee**

**Held on Wednesday 27th May 2020**

**At 6.30pm by video conference**

 **APPROVED**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5.1** | **Present:**Councillors: John Butler (Chairman), Adam Pilgrim, Pete Davies, Mick Mathews, Guy Orchard & Nikki OrchardLeslie Findlay – Parish ClerkThree members of the Public | **Action** |
| **5.2** | **Apologies:** Apologies received from Councillors Cooling & Critchley  |  |
| **5.3** | **Conflicts of Interest:** None declared |  |
| **5.4****5.4.1****5.4.2** | The Council discussed the following application:**20/00701/ARM** Reserved Matters for the erection of dwelling and formation of a vehicular access following outline approval **19/01507/OUT**The Councillors listened to the views of the residents attending and agreed that a strong objection was required. JHB was requested to draft comments and circulate to Councillors for approval. (The photographs and letter are available to view on the website). *The following statement was approved and sent to MDDC:**1. MDDC are referred to its planning officer’s report which was considered by your Planning Committee at the outline stage (19/01507/OUT) . Under paragraph 2 of that report headed “****Impact on character and appearance of the area****” your planning officer states as follows**“ The site is raised above the adjoining road level. Any two storey unit in this location would lead to potential issues with regard to the scale and mass of the proposal on a relatively small site. It will be crucial to ensure that the design and layout respect the character of the area, not only with regard to its overall size but also the height of the building. Therefore it is considered that the site will only accommodate* ***a very small low-level single storey dwelling****.**Most properties in this area front onto the road suitable detailing on the elevations facing the road need to be considered at reserved matters so that it doesn’t detract from the street scene“* *3. Given this clear statement made by MDDC planning officer and accepted by planning committee, our Council is surprised to find that the current application for approval of reserved matters is for the construction of a two storey dwelling house.**4. In view of the complete disregard of the planning officer’s report, our Council should be grateful if MDDC would let us know if there have been any communications, whether or not in writing, between the planning officer or any colleague and the applicant or any of their advisors/consultants/builders since the grant of outline planning permission and if so, our Council would like to have details of those communications.**Our Council would like an opportunity to consider any such details, and make further submissions before any decision is made on the current application.**5. Subject to the above, our Council has the following detailed comments on the current application:*1. *The erection of a two storey dwelling on this very small site will indeed adversely affect the street scene.*

*b. The proposal is not for a bungalow, as incorrectly described by the current application for approval of reserved matters.**c. The footprint of the proposed building is far too large given the small size of this garden area at 48 Twitchen.**d. The application proposes that the dwelling house be moved to a location immediately adjoining Timewells Orchard on the edge of the Conservation Area. It is also proposed to remove the hedge immediately adjoining Timewells Orchard and to replace this with a wooden fence. This hedgerow provides an important soft landscaping buffer on the edge of the Conservation Area as can be seen from the attached photographs. The Applicant’s proposals will adversely affect the Conservation Area and the street scene generally. It will be out of character with the local environment.* *f. Paragraph 3 of the planning officer’s report at outline stage headed ‘Impact* ***on neighbours****’ states as follows:* *“...... It is considered that it is likely that residential development could be accommodated on the site in a fashion that provides sufficient distance and juxtaposition between the possible development and the neighbouring properties so as to not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of those dwellings”**Our Council does not consider that the proposed location of the dwelling will, quite apart the adverse impact on the Conservation Area and the street scene generally, provide “sufficient distance and juxtaposition between the possible development and neighbouring properties so as not to adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers”. Any dwelling (even a single storey dwelling) erected so close to the boundary of the site will overlook the garden and patio area of Timewells Orchard. A two storey dwelling would tower over Timewells Orchard.**Our Council understands that MDDC will have been made aware separately of serious health issues relating to the owners of Timewells Orchard which would be exacerbated by the applicant’s proposals. Additionally, the location of an air source heating unit close to the boundary could have very serious consequences.**g. MDDC you should ensure that appropriate wildlife surveys are carried out before any development commences.**h. A further photo is enclosed which shows that the applicant has sought fit at this stage to demolish part of the wall adjoining Twitchen where there was an overflow pipe from the stream passing through the application site. Whilst the Council recognises that it may be prudent, as part of any approved development, to increase the size of the overflow pipe, it is not considered necessary to remove part of the wall and install a steel railing as suggested by the current application. This work does not have approval and should be re-instated forthwith.**i. Any subsequent approval of a single storey dwelling in accordance with the planning officer’s report should contain a condition to ensure that permitted development rights cannot be exercised so as to alter/extend the single story dwelling and defeat the objective of ensuring that the principles set out in MDDC planning officers report are adhered to.**j. Our Council is not commenting on detailed design issues relating to the submitted application since this is not for a low level single storey dwelling.**This application for approval of reserved matters should be refused by MDDC. The applicant needs to submit a new application for a “very* ***small low-level single storey dwelling”*** *and this needs to be located in a location that does not have the adverse impacts outlined in this letter.**Given our Council’s comments, we trust that MDDC will refuse to approve this application. Our Council sincerely hopes that there will be no question of the MDDC planning officer being minded to approve the current application. If for any reason this expectation on our part is misconceived, we do ask that this matter be referred to planning committee and we are asking our Ward member to do what is necessary.* Discussion of Design Guide - Supplementary Planning Document. Councillors were asked to view the document and send any comments to the Chair of Planning by 30th June. | **JHB** |
|  | There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.10pm |  |

**John H Butler**

**Chair of Planning**

**Holcombe Rogus Parish Council**