

Grundisburgh & Culpho Parish Council
Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Council held on Thursday 14th June, 2018
in the Parish Rooms, Grundisburgh

NOTICES had been posted according with regulations.

Present: - Messrs. S Barnett (in the Chair), G.Caryer, J.Dunnett, P.Kendall, R.Youngman, Mrs.M.Bean, Mrs.S.Grahn, Mrs.A.Willetts and 11 members of the public.

1. Apologies for absence Messrs.D.Higgins, J.Lapsley, Mrs.J.Bignell, Mrs.J.Whittaker

2. To receive members declarations of interest. No interests were declared.

3. Public Open Forum – relating to item 4 It was proposed by Mr.Barnett seconded by Mrs.Willetts, to unanimous approval, that the formal meeting be temporarily suspended, and members of the public invited to address the meeting.

The following issues were raised:

- Two storey houses in an area dominated by bungalows would be intrusive in the street scene and would overlook adjacent properties
- Insufficient off-road parking was proposed which would lead to more on road parking
- Three bed houses could generate more than one car per dwelling which would exacerbate an existing traffic problem especially with school traffic.
- Sewage, water and electricity supplies are already overstretched.

Mr.Barnett declared an interest in Electricity Supply matters.

4. To discuss the following Planning Application

DC/18/2286/FUL Builders Yard, Charles Avenue, Grundisburgh. Erection of 4 dwellings

On return to the formal meeting councillors made the following observations;

- Will the replacement of the builder's yard with four houses cause an increase in traffic ? It was pointed out that at present there is access in and out. The houses would provide four.
- Parking spaces, shown on the plans, are inadequate and do not meeting the County Council's parking requirements of 6m. Plans show 5m. This will inevitably lead to vehicles overhanging into the path or road way or parking in the road.
- There is good visibility for vehicles leaving Charles Avenue this will be considerably reduced if this application is granted.

Mrs.Willetts said that basically nothing had changed since a previous application to develop the site had been refused at Officer level by Suffolk Coastal District Council, giving seven grounds for refusal. .

5. To formulate the Parish Council's response to Suffolk Coastal District Council

Mrs.Willetts read her proposed response which included references to the points made by councillors and members of the public..

DC/18/2286/FUL Builders Yard, Charles Avenue, Grundisburgh. Erection of 4 dwellings

Grundisburgh & Culpho Parish Council objects to the proposal for this site in a very prominent position on rising land close to the centre of the village.

Charles Avenue is a private cul-de-sac of some 17 bungalows and a single storey Doctors Surgery. The latter building does have a car park adjacent but does generates overflow onto this narrow road.

The proposed site has single storey dwellings to the south, east and west. The proposal would result in a cramped form of development out of character with the area and street scene. The proposed 4 two storey houses would cause overlooking particularly to the 4 bungalows fronting Rose Hill and loss of amenity to the properties surrounding the site.

A similar application DC/17/1583/FUL was refused at officer level in June 2017.

There were 7 reasons included in that refusal many of those reasons for refusal apply to the current application.

1) *The proposed change of use to residential would result in the loss of a current, operational employment site in a sustainable location within a key service centre. No evidence has been supplied to demonstrate that there is no current or long-term demand for all or part of the site for employment purposes. Furthermore, the proposal would not deliver any substantial planning benefit which would overcome the harm resulting from the loss of employment space. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM10 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies). There have been no formal complaints made to either the Planning Department or the Environmental Health in terms of the operations at the site and any impact on the neighbouring residents. Whilst new housing would be delivered as a result of the development, this should not be at the expense of local employment opportunities. There is no overriding need for housing in the village or district as the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of housing and has an up to date suite of policy documents including allocations for new housing. Likewise, the proposal would not deliver either affordable housing or small market housing to meet an identified need in the village. Accordingly, the proposal fails to meet Policy DM10 and would result in the loss of an employment site in a sustainable location.*

The 4 dwellings as proposed would be more intrusive in the street scene than the existing commercial use which has 2 small single storey buildings and is set well back from the road. The corner of the site is completely open giving excellent site lines on the road which is the access to the school. To have a 2-storey dwelling in this position would cause severe loss of amenity to residents and road users alike. The applicants claim that *the site used as their operating base amongst the many houses that they built in the immediate locality, indeed this extensive building operation which includes the houses in Charles Avenue and nearby are now completed.* These areas in the village, Charles Avenue and Jaqueline Close were built by Chas Clarke and Son Ltd to house American personnel at Bentwaters wishing to live off site many years ago. Most of the properties built at that time in Charles Avenue are still owned and rented out by the Clarke family

2) By the provision of only three-bedroom dwellings the proposal is contrary to Policy SP3 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies).

3) The site is not able to provide for 4 dwellings in a manner which does not give rise to a cramped form of development out of character with the locality. Although the properties would be detached, they are built close to boundaries and therefore offer limited views through the gaps. Plot 1, as a result of the layout, has what is considered to be a very small garden given that the dwelling has 3 bedrooms and the parking area is alongside the garage and there is no drive long enough to fit even the smallest car in front of the garage access. Whilst government guidance talks of the need to secure efficient use of land, this should not be at the expense of poor design and poor relationship to the character of the area. The proposed plot sizes differ considerably to those in the vicinity and this results in a poor layout, out of character with the area. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF deals with this matter as does Policy DM21 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies)

5) Although occupying a corner location and noting that Alice Driver Road does contain two storey dwellings, the form and scale of the development of the site should take its steer from Charles Avenue as that's where the site's main frontage lays. Charles Avenue contains single storey not two storey dwellings. The site is a prominent entrance to Charles Avenue and the result of four two storey dwellings in this location would be prominent, overbearing and out of context with the locality. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to paragraph 64 of the NPPF and Policies DM21 and DM23 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy and Development Management Policies)

7) It appears that the frontage parking areas are around 5metres in length, which cannot accommodate many modern vehicles. Garages should be set back at least 6 metres from the footway as recommended in Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2015). Where these areas are below the required dimensions, the plots will not have adequate parking provision. Plot 1 is 2metres at the corner of Alice Driver to 3 metres on the Charles Avenue side, inadequate and on this cul-de-sac which contains the Doctor's Surgery where there is often overspill on-road parking any increase in parking would cause severe loss of amenity to all residents and visitors alike.

Mr Caryer encouraged members of the public to write to Suffolk Coastal District Council with their comments.

In response to a question from Mr.Dunnett the chairman said that any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contribution to the Parish Council from this application was unknown.

Mrs.Willetts proposed seconded by Mr.Barnett that her response to this application be approved. It would be reordered before being circulated to councillors for final approval before being submitted to Suffolk Coastal District Council.

Approved: 6 members voting for 1 against 1 member abstained.