**DISS TOWN COUNCIL**

MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Sub-Committee** held in the **Council Chamber** at **Diss Corn Hall** on **Wednesday 11th January 2023** at **6.45pm.**

Present: Councillors: K. Murphy

S. Olander

R. Peaty

E. Taylor (Chair / ex-officio)

G. Waterman

J. Welch

In attendance: Sarah Villafuerte Richards, Town Clerk

District Councillor Minshull

**PL0123/01 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received and considered from councillor Gingell due to a last-minute arrangement made by a contractor.

**PL0123/02 NOMINATION OF SUBSTITUTE REPRESENTATIVES**

There were none.

**PL0123/03 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS AND REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATIONS**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minute No.** | **Councillors Name** | **Personal/Other Interest** | **Pecuniary**  **Interest** | **Reason** |
| PL0123/07  2022/0677 | G. Waterman | X |  | This councillor attended the applicant’s AGM recently and was approached about this application. |

**PL0123/04 MINUTES**

It was

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 9th November 2022 were a true record and were duly signed by the Chairman.

**PL0123/05 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Members considered a resolution under Standing Orders 3d to 3h to suspend the meeting to hear comments from members of the public on items to be discussed on the agenda. District councillor Minshull was in attendance for the Full Council meeting which followed the planning committee.

**PL0123/06**  **ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

There were no items.

**PL0123/07 NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL MATTERS**

Councillors received and commented on planning applications and other development control matters.

There were comments regarding insufficient lighting, drainage issues, overlooking/privacy, inadequate parking and lack of private outdoor space. It was agreed that the design of the original application was architecturally better and more in keeping with the surrounding area than the revised application. There was also a view there is a need for this type of housing in the town, that the existing site is in a poor condition, that the applicant has tried to respond to the previous comments to create opportunities for people to better themselves and that parking may be less of an issue as users are less likely to drive. Applicants were reminded that they can attend all meetings of Council to discuss applications and respond to questions. With five votes in favour and one against, it was

RESOLVED: That the Council’s response / recommendation would be softened and re-formatted to encourage the applicant to reconsider their proposals and submit a revised application, which better addresses the planning considerations.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **App. No** | **Type** | **Applicant** | **Address** | **Proposal** | **Response** |
| 2022/0677 | Full | Solo Housing (East Anglia) | Land at 32 to 34 Victoria Road, Diss, Norfolk | Removal of former garage and construction of new affordable flats | Diss Town Council supports the principle of development on this site, applauds the applicant for revisiting their proposals based on previous comments and encourages the applicant to attend future planning committee meetings to discuss future proposals. However, members feel that the original design was architecturally better and more in keeping with the surrounding area than the revised application and for the following additional reasons feels that the application should be REFUSED.  1. Policy DM 3.5 (also policy DM3.8) states additional dwellings on sub-divided plots within development boundaries are permitted, however in this case:  a) Too many flats are being squeezed onto this site giving massing and poor-quality design, which would have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties. The space at the rear and ends of the property are very narrow and may become an area where waste is discarded. We would be happy to consider a single storey extension which although it would likely reduce the number of flats would be more in keeping with area and make efficient use of the area.  b) Whilst the original design with pitched roofs overlooked the neighbouring properties, the walls and the flat roof of the new design give the impression of an industrial building, which would be out of keeping with the character of neighbouring residential properties and does not substantially reduce overshadowing.  c) The shared amenity space is barely adequate for the existing 13 flats on this site and will be inadequate for the addition of 9 further flats (22 in total).  d) The proximity to the boundaries with other properties will lead to overlooking, inadequate levels of reasonable access to light and privacy, free from unacceptable noise. The same will apply to those living in ground floor flats because of the relatively high fence and low windows at the rear of the property.  e) The proposed design in having the first floor 1m below ground level may impose an unnecessary flood / drainage risk. There may also be a security risk due to low rear windows (almost at ground level) and a narrow passageway at the rear of the property masking possible intruders. It is unlikely to meet the Police aim of ‘’designing out crime’’.  2. Policy DM 3.12 - the parking provision is barely adequate for the 13 existing flats and certainly inadequate to cater for an additional 9 new flats especially as this includes parking for staff and service vehicles. There are currently 3 staff parking places and 4 parking spaces to cover the 22 residents plus service vehicles.  3. Policy DM 3.13 - the development will lead to:  a) overlooking and loss of private residential amenity space  b) loss of day light, overshadowing and overbearing impact  c) introduction of incompatible neighbouring uses in terms of noise and artificial light pollution. The policy states that planning permission should be refused where proposed development would lead to an excessive or unreasonable impact on existing neighbouring occupants and the amenity of the area or a poor level of amenity for new occupiers.  4. Policy DM 4.3 - facilities for the collection of recycling and waste are inadequate for the increased number of apartments. |

**PL0123/8 SOUTH NORFOLK PLANNING DECISIONS**

Members noted the planning decisions made by the Planning Authority since the last meeting.

**PL0123/9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Members noted that Planning committee meetings will precede scheduled committee dates should applications require committee consideration.

Meeting closed at 7.15pm.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Councillor E. Taylor

Committee Chairman