



PLANNING COMMITTEE SOUTH - UPDATE SHEET

28 NOVEMBER 2023

Item 6 – DC/22/1351/FUL – Continuation of use of property as a wedding & events venue with accommodation on a permanent basis at Butley Priory, Butley

- 4.1 Since the report was written, an additional 7 letters of support have been received noting the economic benefits of the proposal.

Item 7 – DC/20/5260/FUL – Phased redevelopment of Redundant Agricultural Buildings to 3no. Holiday Lets, Events Centre, Manager's Accommodation & Office Accommodation. Includes erection of 1no. Holiday Let & erection of Cartlodge & Store infill. Repairs and alterations to existing buildings. Construction of ancillary car parking for all uses & footpath connections to Butley Priory at Butley Abbey Farm, Butley

- 4.1 Since the report was written, an additional 3 letters of support have been received noting the economic and heritage benefits of the proposal.

Item 9 – DC/23/1138/OUT - Erection of 18 x No. Dwellings (including 6 affordables) with garaging, parking, accesses and landscaping at Red House Farm, Levington

Since the publication of the Committee Report online, a further letter of objection has been received raising concerns with regards to:

- Highway matters (highway safety; access; parking etc)
- Design
- Ecology
- Flood risk
- Residential amenity
- Number of homes
- Proposed footpath shown on a blind bend
- Inadequate water and sewerage systems
- Disturbance during construction period

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT
DX: 41400 Woodbridge

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ
DX: 41220 Lowestoft

Item 10 – DC/23/3492/FUL - Construction of 1 dwelling at Hungarian Lodge, High Street Ufford

4.1 Since the report was written, an additional 4 letters of objection have been received (these are additional comments from third parties who have previously commented). The letters re-iterate previous objections (summarised in the main report) and also raise:

- Procedural errors with regards to the consultation period.
- Mental pressure on local people is not considered over and above profiteering of an individual.
- Increase flood risk locally.
- Cumulative impact of development should be considered.

Parish Council Comments

“With reference to the above application, and following your letter of 8th November 2023, advising of a re-consultation due to additional plans being placed on to the Portal, Ufford Parish Council would like to reiterate their objection to this proposed development. Our reasons for objecting to this proposed development remain the same as our letter of 4th October 2023 and are listed below, with one additional point at 4. However, we would also like to raise a more important procedural point.

Your letter of 8th November clearly stated that we had until 22nd November to reply. Furthermore, when viewing the ‘Important Dates’ section of the Portal this morning (6.57am on Wednesday 22nd November) the Expiry Date has been put further back to 27th November – see image here:

Expiry Date	Mon 27 Nov 2023
Actual Committee Date	Tue 28 Nov 2023

However, it has already been determined that this application will be heard by the ESC Planning Committee (South) at their meeting on 28th November. The agenda for that meeting has already been published and the papers include a full report from yourself with a recommendation that this application be approved.

Our concern is, how can comments be accepted up until 27th November, when the Committee report has already been written and distributed to the Committee members? Any comments being received between now and 27th November will not be taken in to consideration and many will not even make it on to the Portal for the Committee to view, as this often takes 48 hours.

We can only imagine that the inclusion of this application on the Agenda for the ESC Planning Committee (South) meeting on 28th November 2023 is an error and request that it be removed and placed on to the agenda for the next meeting, in order that the Officer’s Report can contain ALL comments received up until 27th November 2023 and, more importantly, the Committee have chance to read them, prior to their consideration at Committee.

Reasons for objecting to this proposed development:

Below, I have listed the key objections from Ufford Parish Council included in the earlier letter. You will note that an additional issue regarding the requirement for a RAMS scheme contribution to be made “prior to determination” has been raised by your Ecology colleague and we are concerned that this has not taken place.

1. Residential Amenity – The current Local Plan clearly states the importance of the Planning System playing an “important role in safeguarding the quality of life of residents of the area [of any development]”. Policy SCLP11.2 lists the individual areas of ‘residential amenity’ which should be considered and we believe this development will have a detrimental effect on local residents with regard to:

- Privacy/overlooking
- Outlook
- Access to daylight and sunlight and
- The resulting physical relationship with other properties

Policy SCLP11.2 also states that “Development will provide for adequate living conditions for future occupiers and will not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity for existing or future occupiers of development in the vicinity.” In this context the issues highlighted above apply not only to the occupants of the adjacent No 11 Lodge Road and Forge Cottages opposite but also to the occupants of property proposed by the applicant. As was discussed at Planning Committee South in their Refusal of DC/22/4895/FUL, consideration must be given to the proximity to and impact on both existing and planned properties.

2. Design Quality and inaccurate plans – Despite numerous pieces of correspondence on this subject with reference to the previous application, the new application is still lacking vital information. There is no information on the heating source; will this be a heat pump? If so, where will the pump be located and what will be the impact on neighbours? The chimney appears to be in two different locations on the plans.

Contrary to Policy SCLP11.1 we do not consider this contributes to “high quality design that clearly demonstrates an understanding of the key features of local character”. The application design does not take into consideration the neighbouring listed buildings, or the architecture of the centuries old neighbouring properties.

In addition, we are still very surprised to see reference to a ‘four bedroom house’ in at least one of the documents accompanying the application.

3. Loss of Habitat and heritage wall– Should this application be permitted it will result in the loss of an important wildlife habitat, which was previously referenced by the applicants of the Business Hub (application DC/21/3237/FUL) and acknowledged by ESC in their permission of this application. In addition although two trees are shown on the plans at the front of the bungalow, these will almost certainly require removal, due to their proximity to the dwelling. Furthermore, this site is currently frequented by our large local bat population.

Located on this site is also an old flint wall, potentially part of the previous farm buildings that once occupied the site. This development will almost certainly see the destruction of this wall and would not be in accord with SLCP 11.3 that seeks to preserve historic environments where they exist close to listed and heritage buildings.

4. Financial Contribution to Suffolk Cost RAMS Zone of Influence– The response from Rachel Hall (ESC Ecology Team) to this application, details that a ‘financial contribution’ to the appropriate RAMS scheme is required “...prior to the application being determined”. There is no record on the Portal of this contribution being received and therefore we suggest that this application cannot be determined until there is evidence of the payment being made. For the above reasons we urge the ESC Planning Committee (South) to refuse this application; and defer the Committee hearing until they have had chance to view all comments.”

Statutory Consultee

Natural England's comments include:

“Designated Sites (European) – No objection subject to securing appropriate mitigation for recreational pressure impacts on habitat sites (European Sites)...

Sites of Special Scientific Interest Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have likely significant effects on other statutorily protected sites and has no objection to the proposed development.”

6. Planning Considerations

Ecology

- 6.18 Natural England were consulted given the site lies within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone on Magic Map (www.defra.gov.uk). Their comments include the need for the local planning authority to carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment which has been done and it can be concluded that, with mitigation, the project will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the European sites included within the Suffolk Coast RAMS.