

**Meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2015 at 7.30pm held in the Margaret Preston Room, Wreningham Village Hall**

**Present**

Cllrs Michael Hill (Chair), Elizabeth Brake, Paolo Dalmazzo-Aukland, Hilary Gauthier, Jon Moon and Keith Morris.

**In attendance**

None

**699. Apologies.** The Clerk

**700. Declarations of interest.** None.

**701. Open Forum.** Meeting closed at 7.30pm to allow members of the public to speak.

---

None

---

Meeting opened at 7.31pm

**687. Planning**

- 2015/1036: Land West of All Saints Church, Church Road – proposed dwelling using innovative solar based technology and wildlife enhancing landscape proposal.

The Councillors were divided on the merits and demerits of this building. The Parish Plan has guided previous responses to planning applications – e.g. with respect to building size; type and quantity. It was considered that the applicant/owner should be invited to explain their approach and answer Councillor questions.

To help in such a Q&A session the following records aspects of the debate and issues which arose:

- Design – claimed as an “innovative design” might be of benefit/interest to the village; estimated 300 sq meters, four bedroom house would offer the comfortable living space; besides the garage, no other buildings to be allowed on the plot
- Landscaping – a comprehensive proposal which would improve the plot; the home set within / behind the proposed landscaping would be masked (in time) from view; unique intention for flora and fauna environment within the plot; sustainable design to be welcomed; require the site to be landscaped as indicated.
- Drawings “not to scale” and present differing perspectives plus no dimensions; request new drawings with dimensions;
- Proportion – large footprint, appears at least twice the size of any building in the immediate vicinity;
- Appearance – barn conversion look(?); dark mass; blocky, with vertical lines and rectangular shape; PV roof will present black solid over darkened/burnt wood vertical walls; appears to loom; appears quite high; very different compared to buildings nearby, or, the village as a whole;
- Positioning – at the back of the plot; on highest point in the village may draw the eye to it from all directions; several years before planting can soften this view; in some drawings the roof line appears to exceed the application's own stated limit of staying below the tree line;
- Power line re-routing – need evidence of how this will be done (above ground / over ground) and how it might impact neighbouring land owners; route to be taken is unclear (drawing appears to indicate running along the side of the church parking area for the graveyard);
- Passivhaus design and build standards will require Passivhaus certification at end following frequent inspection by Passivhaus inspectors at multiple times during construction – no evidence of this being obtained;

## Wreningham Parish Council – Minutes

- Lighting recommendations in the Ecological Assessment to be explicitly adopted in the application as they meet the Council's own policy on exterior lighting;
- The South West corner of the plot regularly becomes flooded (along with the road adjacent to the plot) in heavy rain. The application will need to ensure that the drainage from this plot addresses this either by improving drainage away from the plot or using the water to supply the proposed ponds;
- Ponds – how are they to be maintained to be healthy and with clean water for flora and fauna anticipated to exist there?
- Environment – application provides a “proposed” planting out scheme. This must be held to. However, use of silver birches may not provide a sufficient screen of the house from the road.
- Hedges – suggestion that those at the north side of the plot will be re-planted; are these owned by this plot owner or the adjacent landowner?
- Plot use – currently not used as the plot owner has left it unused, not because it has no value as agricultural land and for grazing;
- Outside of the village building line – generally no building is allowed in these cases;
- Noted references to other planning applications – not thought relevant to this application.

### Summary

It is suggested that the following paragraphs be sent to SNDC as a first response to this application:

“The Council is presently unable to draw a proper conclusion on this planning application. Many questions posed by councillors during discussion remain unanswered in part because of the novelty of the proposal but also because of insufficient information, inconsistent drawings presenting differing views and a lack of dimensions on any of the plans.

So, the Council cannot support this application without additional and revised information. Hence the Council asks for:

1. an extension to the response deadline to allow for
2. the architect and/or the applicant to meet with the council and explain the application and answer questions about it
3. the drawings to be represented with a consistent scale and all relevant dimensions.”

The Clerk will contact the applicant and their representative to ask for their help in understanding this application

All proposed by MH; seconded by P D-A.

**Date of Future Meetings:** 14<sup>th</sup> July, 8<sup>th</sup> September and 10<sup>th</sup> November, all at 7.30pm in the Margaret Preston Room in the Village Hall, Mill Lane.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 8.30 pm

### POST MEETING NOTE

Extension to comment granted until 12<sup>th</sup> June 2015.