# Minutes of a site meeting held on **Tuesday, 8 September 2015** at **11.35am** at Land adjacent to 20 Bourne Road, Lowestoft



### Members Present:

Councillors P Ashdown (Vice-Chairman, acting as Chairman), M Cherry and J Ford.

#### Officers Present:

R Amor (Principal Planner for Development Management), P Vertigen (Area Planning and Enforcement Officer) and S Carter (Democratic Services Officer).

#### Others in attendance:

Mr M Dixon, Agent.

Mr P Pitcher, Applicant, Wellington Construction representing Orwell Housing Association.

#### Apologies:

Councillors N Brooks, G Catchpole, G Elliott and J Groom.

The Chairman welcomed Members to the site meeting and reminded those present that the purpose of the meeting was a 'fact finding' exercise only and to provide Members with an opportunity to view the site and its surroundings.

No decision would be made before the application was considered at the next meeting of the Planning Committee.

Bourne Road was a cul de sac and the application was for the construction of two affordable dwellings on a site which was currently a parking area on a housing development. The proposal was to construct two two-bedroomed affordable houses at the northern end of the site and to provide eight parking spaces between the proposed dwellings and the existing electricity sub-station. That would allow two spaces for each dwelling and four visitor parking spaces. The Committee report stated that the proposed materials would be red bricks and dark red pantiles.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer explained that the development was 2.6m from the corner of the pedestrian way to the front of the proposed properties. One issue for consideration was any overlooking that might be created by the first floor windows and the impact on 20 Bourne Road. It was proposed that the lower two thirds of the first floor windows would be obscure glazed. There should be no issues with the rear and sides of the dwellings as these were considered acceptable and the proposed orientation of the dwellings should mitigate any overlooking. However, there were issues relating to aspects of the general amenity. The use of obscure glazing within the windows serving the front bedrooms of the new properties would result in a sub-standard form of development; that would fail to protect the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development.

During the site visit, Members viewed the location of the site and the context of its general setting and, in particular, the Applicant's marked out lines showing the location of the proposed properties, the position of their front windows and their rear gardens.

### **Questions from Committee Members**

Members raised questions on the following issues:

- The type of obscure glass to be used.
- Landscaping across the rear fencing.
- Loss of neighbours' privacy.
- The provision of single storey dwellings on the site.
- Damage to the boundary trees.
- The number of parking spaces.

- Possible provision of a parallel parking area.
- Distance from other properties.
- People's perception of being overlooked.

## Comments from Agent/Applicant

Mr Pitcher confirmed that the obscured window glass would allow maximum light but it would not allow anyone to see any level of detail, either in or out. The intention was not to use frosted glass but a film would be applied to the glass. The style of these windows would allow restricted opening with views towards the open land and the water tower. Bungalows had not been considered as the footprint would take up too much land to make the development viable.

Mr Dixon confirmed that there should be no damage to the tree line; the trees were not actually in the Applicant's ownership. The existing hedging would be trimmed. A survey of the car park had shown it to be under-used and there would be a loss of only five spaces.

The Area Planning and Enforcement officer confirmed that the need for a hardstanding for a nearby owner/occupier had been addressed.

Note: Councillor J Ford arrived at 11.50am.

The Area Planning and Enforcement Officer provided a summary and then explained that the distance between the proposed dwellings and the closest existing property, 20 Bourne Road, was below 21m and that was considered to be unacceptable. However, there were adequate separation distances between the existing properties to the side and the rear of the proposal. Any approval could be subject to conditions to require obscure glazing on side windows at first floor level and appropriate landscape planting within the rear of the proposed gardens.

There being no further questions, the Chairman thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

The site visit concluded at 11.55am.