

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a meeting of the **Planning Committee South** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton, on **Tuesday, 23 April 2024 at 2.00pm.**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Seamus Bennett, Councillor Tom Daly, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor John Fisher, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Mike Ninnmey, Councillor Mark Packard, Councillor Rosie Smithson

Other Members present:

Councillor Deborah Dean

Officers present:

Katy Cassidy (Democratic Services Officer (Regulatory)), Danny Clarke (Senior Development Officer), Martin Clarke (Licensing Manager and Housing Lead Lawyer), Elliott Dawes (Development Programme Manager), Heather Fisk (Head of Housing), Marianna Hall (Principal Planner (Development Management, South Area Lead)), Phil Harris (Strategic Communications and Marketing Manager), Andy Jarvis (Strategic Director), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer (Regulatory)), Danielle Miller (Principal Planner (Major Sites)), Bethany Rance (Senior Planner - Energy Projects), Dominic Starkey (Assistant Enforcement Officer (Development Management)), Isabella Taylor (Assistant Planner), Ben Woolnough (Interim Joint Head of Planning)

Announcement

When opening the meeting, the Chair announced that he had reordered the agenda and that item 9 would now be heard after item 6 and before items 7 and 8.

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Debbie McCallum. Councillor Deborah Dean attended the meeting as Councillor McCallum's substitute.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Seamus Bennett declared an Other Registerable Interest in the planning application being considered at item 9 of the agenda, as a member of Felixstowe Town Council.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

No declarations of lobbying were made.

4 Minutes

On the proposition of Councillor Hedgley, seconded by Councillor Dean, it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2024 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair, subject to the following amendment:

Page 4, paragraph 3, first sentence to read “The Committee was advised that four trees on the site's frontage were subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and the Council's **Landscape and Arboriculture** team had not objected to their removal.”

5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report **ES/1928** of the Interim Joint Head of Planning, which was a summary of the status of all outstanding enforcement cases for East Suffolk Council where enforcement action had been sanctioned under delegated powers up until 20 March 2024. At that time there were 17 such cases.

The Chair invited the Assistant Enforcement Officer (Development Management) to comment on the report. The Committee was advised that an appeal had been lodged in respect of case A.4 (88 Bridge Road, Lowestoft) and that since the report had been written, an enforcement notice had been served on the Queen public house in Brandeston, relating to unlawful use.

There being no questions to the officers, on the proposition of Councillor Deacon, seconded by Councillor Hedgley, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 20 March 2024 be noted.

6 DC/23/4469/VOC - 32 Thoroughfare, Woodbridge, IP12 1AQ

The Committee received report **ES/1929** of the Interim Joint Head of Planning, which related to planning application DC/23/4469/VOC. The application sought retrospective planning permission to retain the dwelling as constructed and rectify the breaches of conditions 2, 8 and 12 where the approved building had not been built in accordance with the approved plans.

As the case officer's minded-to recommendation to approve the application was contrary to Woodbridge Town Council's recommendation to refuse the application the application was presented to the Planning Referral Panel on 23 January 2024,

in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, where it was referred to the Committee for determination.

The application was initially considered by the Committee at its meeting on 27 February 2024, where the Committee resolved to defer the application in order to carry out a site visit to view the situation as built. The site visit was undertaken on 23 April 2024 at 10.30am, prior to the meeting.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner (Major Sites), who was the case officer for the application. The Principal Planner provided updates in responses to queries raised during the site visit; the planning history on the site was outlined and it was confirmed that the parcel of land to the rear of the site was owned by 8 Doric Place.

The Committee was shown photographs taken during the site visit demonstrating the following views:

- Looking towards 6 Doric Place from the flat roof area of 32 Thoroughfare.
- Planting to the rear of the garden of 32 Thoroughfare.
- Looking out from the downstairs cloakroom window at 6 Doric Place.
- Looking out from the first floor bedroom window at 6 Doric Place.
- Looking out from the first floor bathroom window at 6 Doric Place.
- Looking towards 32 Thoroughfare from the rear garden of 6 Doric Place.

The site's location was outlined and the Committee was shown an aerial photograph of the site which demonstrated its proximity to residential properties in Doric Place, Brook Street, and Jacobs Way.

The Committee was shown photographs of the site demonstrating the following views and noting the changes to the approved scheme:

- Changes to the wall at the north-east elevation.
- The north-west and south-east elevations, showing window changes.
- The rear garden as view from within the dwelling.
- Views from the flat roof.
- Zoomed in view taken from the nearest corner of the roof terrace.
- The side elevation of 6 Doric Place taken from within the site.
- The view from the objector's bathroom window.

The Committee was shown drawings of the approved block plan and both the approved and proposed elevations. The Committee was also shown a photograph from the supporting statement demonstrating views from the flat roof and photographs provided by a third party objector showing the garden design of 6 Doric Place. The Principal Planner displayed the approved landscape plan.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as visual amenity and the impact on the conservation area, and the impact on residential amenity. The recommendation to approve the application, as detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. In response to a question on setting a precedent and undermining previous decisions of the Committee, the Interim Joint Head of Planning said he understood the concerns of members but advised that the Committee was required to determine the application before it in a fair and open way.

The Interim Joint Head of Planning appreciated the Committee's frustration with the retrospective nature of the application but was clear that it must judge the application before it on its merits and noted that there was an opportunity to assess what overlooking has been caused.

In response to further concerns from another member of the Committee regarding the retrospective nature of the application and the precedent approving it may cause, the Interim Joint Head of Planning highlighted there had been a number of planning enforcement cases in the district following the refusal of retrospective planning permission where the refusal had been upheld on appeal, and that these sites had been required to be restored. The Committee was advised that applications cannot be penalised for being retrospective and this was an option available to applicants, albeit a high risk one.

A member of the Committee asked if there had been any scope for enforcement action to have been taken on the site during development. The Principal Planner noted that the development not being in accordance with the approved plans had been highlighted by Planning Enforcement and that an application to make a non-material amendment had been made and refused. The Principal Planner said that as with all enforcement cases, the applicants had the right to submit an application to rectify breaches of planning permission.

A member of the Committee referred to the changes being made as a result of Building Control issues and questioned if the breaches should have been identified at this point. The Principal Planner explained that although the Council provided Building Control services, developers were entitled to use an approved inspector and this had been the case with this development.

The Committee was informed that although changes could be recommended by Building Control as part of a separate regime, any such changes must be approved as part of the planning process. The Interim Joint Head of Planning added that the Council's Building Control team was proactive and constructive working with the Planning team to identify any planning breaches, and that in this instance had no input on the site.

The Chair invited Ms Sue Key-Burr, who objected to the application, to address the Committee. Ms Key-Burr thanked the Committee for visiting the site and hoped it had seen how oppressive the development was for her home, and how much worse it would be if the applicant was able to use the flat roof as a balcony terrace.

Ms Key-Burr said that the vegetation screening installed by the applicant was not permanent and suggested it could be removed in the future. Ms Key-Burr highlighted that the applicant had breached the approved planning permission, noting the planning history on the site and said that the development had not been halted when ordered to do so. Ms Key-Burr stated that the applicant had sought to rectify the breaches with

a non-material amendment which was refused, but this was not included in the officer's report.

Ms Key-Burr said she was being continually reported to the Police by the applicant but had been told she had done nothing wrong, and highlighted the applicant's behaviour at the Committee's meeting on 27 February 2024. Ms Key-Burr was of the view that the use of the flat roof as an amenity space would be detrimental to her home's residential amenity and pointed out that Woodbridge Town Council maintained its objection to the application.

Ms Key-Burr considered that the removal of condition 8 of the extant planning permission did not accord with policy SCLP11.2 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan and said that users of the public car parks adjacent to the site would also object to the overlooking from the flat roof. Ms Key-Burr urged the Committee to refuse the application.

The Chair invited questions to Ms Key-Burr. A member of the Committee asked if the development resulted in a loss of light to her cloakroom window. Ms Key-Burr confirmed that it did and noted that the utility room and kitchen window were also affected.

In response to a query regarding the first-floor bathroom window, Ms Key-Burr said that the glass was not frosted, having not been replaced due to the historic nature of the window, but that a film had been applied to reduce the window's transparency. Ms Key-Burr advised that when the bathroom light was on, the room's interior was visible through this film.

The Chair invited Ms April Groen, the applicant, to address the Committee. Ms Groen was accompanied by Ms Liz Beighton, her agent. Ms Groen thanked the Committee for visiting the site and observing the relationship between her property and 6 Doric Place. Ms Groen said that she had never intended to make a retrospective application and reiterated that the changes to the scheme had been a result of issues raised by Building Control during the development.

Ms Groen pointed out that the report recommended approval of the application; she noted the planning history on the site but said that none of these applications had benefitted from a site visit as the dwelling had not been constructed at that point. Ms Groen considered that the Committee would have observed there is no significant overlooking of 6 Doric Place and the two dwellings could co-exist harmoniously. Ms Groen advised that the windows of 6 Doric Place affected by the development were not primary windows and gave examples of a similar scheme being allowed in Felixstowe.

Ms Groen said that she had engaged with her neighbours at 4, 5 and 6 Doric Place and had made changes to the initial design of the property in response to feedback from Ms Key-Burr; the house had been designed to provide a six-metre gap from the bathroom window of 6 Doric Place and Ms Groen said that the Committee would have observed this, which challenged Ms Key-Burr's comment that there was only a one-metre gap.

Ms Groen highlighted that the dwelling had a high energy rating and that she and her husband were quiet neighbours. Mrs Groen considered that she had created a high quality home that did not adversely impact on their neighbours and hoped that tensions would dissipate after the application was determined.

A member of the Committee referred to Ms Groen's comments at the Committee's meeting on 27 February 2024 about having experience of developing properties, and queried why she had chosen to disregard the conditions of the extant planning permission. Ms Groen said that although she had experience with self-build properties, she was not a housing developer and reiterated that it had not been her intention to mislead anyone.

Ms Groen explained that the change to include bifold doors onto the flat roof was required as part of the heat release system and this in turn required the balustrade for safety reasons. Ms Groen said that she had attempted to resolve this as a minor amendment initially, noting the significant opposition to the scheme from neighbours and reiterating the circumstances that had led to the retrospective application.

Another member of the Committee sought clarity from Ms Groen on the comments relating to the distance between properties. Ms Groen explained that the initial design of the dwelling had been amended to curve the building away from 6 Doric Place in response to concerns raised about the impact, and was now six metres away at its nearest point.

Ms Groen confirmed that if approved, the flat roof terrace would be used for minimal leisure activity, such as sitting out and having a drink in the evening. Ms Groen said there was no great intention to use the terrace area but she wanted to be confident to be allowed to get onto it and water any plants.

A member of the Committee questioned at what point Ms Groen had identified the planning breaches to the Council. Ms Beighton, speaking for Ms Groen, confirmed that a certain level of access had always been intended and that the breaches would have first been brought to the Council's attention when the non-material amendment application was made.

Another member of the Committee asked if Ms Groen and Ms Beighton concurred that the development had created overlooking of 6 Doric Place. Ms Beighton reminded the Committee that it was not considering the principle of development, including the impact of windows, as this position had been endorsed by the Council when it granted the extant planning permission. Ms Beighton said that the Committee was specifically considering the impact of the use of the flat roof terrace and if it caused significant overlooking and a significant loss of amenity. Ms Beighton noted that the site was located in a built up urban area where overlooking already existed.

In response to a query on if a transparent balustrade had been required, Ms Groen said there had been no specification on this element and what had been chosen was based on similar balustrades in the area. When asked by a member of the Committee if she had considered that an alternative balustrade would have reduced overlooking, Ms Groen commented that she had not and highlighted that her property was overlooked by the bathroom window of 6 Doric Place.

A member of the Committee questioned the need to go outside to close the bifold doors. Ms Groen explained that this due to the design of the doors.

In response to queries from a member of the Committee on any recent consultation with neighbours and if the balustrades could be made opaque, Ms Groen said she had recently discussed the application with neighbours and advised that the balustrade could be made opaque where it faced 6 Doric Place, and was willing to do so if this addressed Ms Key-Burr's issues.

A member of the Committee sought clarity from officers on the intent of the flat roof in the approved application. The Interim Joint Head of Planning clarified that there was no indication on the approved plans that there would be access onto the flat roof and confirmed that the introduction of the bifold doors and balustrade was in conflict with the extant planning permission.

Another member of the Committee asked what conditions, if any, could be applied to the balustrade. The Interim Joint Head of Planning advised the Committee that it was required to determine the application that was before it and did not have the power to redesign the scheme. The Interim Joint Head of Planning explained that although it was possible to impose conditions on balconies in respect of privacy, it was more difficult to achieve this on a retrospective application; the Committee was advised that a time-limited condition could be added by way of recommendation.

In response to a further question from the Committee about restricting the use of part of the flat roof, the Interim Joint Head of Planning was hesitant to advise this course of action as it would be a material change to the proposed scheme.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. A member of the Committee expressed his concern about the use of the flat roof terrace; he acknowledged the applicant's assurance that it would be used for low-level amenity activities but cautioned this could change in the future. The Member considered that the site visit demonstrated there was overlooking from the flat roof terrace to the amenity space of 6 Doric Place and was of the view it was therefore difficult to approve the application. The Member stated his frustration with the retrospective nature of the application and said he was unable to support it.

Another member of the Committee referenced the site visit and considered that although there was overlooking, there would not cause a significant impact and this would lessen as the screening planting established itself. The Member was more concerned about the impact of any noise emanating from the use of the flat roof terrace and suggested that should the application be granted, noise levels be restricted by condition.

Other members of the Committee spoke on the application, citing the issue of overlooking and how this could be solved by making part of the balustrade opaque and/or higher. One member of the Committee queried the applicant's choice of a transparent balustrade.

During debate, it became apparent that the majority of the Committee were minded to refuse the application and no proposal for the officer's recommendation was forthcoming; the Chair indicated an intention to propose a motion to refuse the application. The Interim Joint Head of Planning advised that, based on the issues raised by the Committee by debate, it could resolve to refuse the application on the grounds it was contrary to policies SCLP11.2(a) (privacy/overlooking) and SCLP11.1(e) (impact on the amenity of the wider environment) of the Local Plan, along with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in respect of the impact of the amenity of existing users.

Following further debate to formulate a recommendation to refuse the application, it was on the proposition of Councillor Packard, seconded by Councillor Smithson, and by a majority vote

RESOLVED

That the application be **REFUSED** on the grounds that it is contrary to policy SCLP11.2(a) of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, in that the development causes overlooking between both the proposed development and the neighbouring development at 6 Doric Place.

NOTE: following the conclusion of this item the Chair adjourned the meeting for a short break. The meeting was adjourned at 3.23pm and was reconvened at 3.35pm.

9 DC/24/0773/VOC - Former Deben High School, Garrison Lane, Felixstowe

The Committee received report **ES/1932** of the Interim Joint Head of Planning, which related to planning application DC/24/0773/VOC. The application sought a range of design changes to the residential development at the former Deben High School site on Garrison Lane in Felixstowe through the variation of Conditions 4 and 9a of permission DC/23/0539/VOC, granted on 10 August 2023. These variations sought to change some of the materials for the dwellings and amend the approved plans to reflect changes to the elevations of the apartment buildings and houses and revisions to the site layout and parking.

The application was before the Committee for determination, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution, as the Council was both the applicant and the landowner.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner (Development Management, South Area Lead), who was the case officer for the application. The Committee was apprised of the planning history on the site and was shown the approved site layout plan.

The Principal Planner displayed aerial photographs of the site showing views from prior to the demolition of the former Deben High School, after the demolition, street views of the site from Garrison Lane, and a drone photograph of the development as of 8 April 2024; the Principal Planner noted that development had commenced under the extant planning permission.

The Committee was shown examples of the proposed elevation changes across the development, including drawings showing changes to Block A (south-west and north-east elevations), Block B (north-east elevation), and house type 02. The Principal Planner also displayed drawings of the proposed amendments to house type 01 and identified the location of these units on the site. The Committee was informed that a root protection area had been discovered to be larger than anticipated and to mitigate any impact two of the house type 01 blocks had been relocated and some parking allocation had been redesigned.

The Committee was shown comparisons of the approved and proposed amendments to the elevations of house type 01 and details of the amendments to building heights, showing the table of changes contained within the report. The Committee was advised that the height increases were not considered to raise significant amenity issues relative to the approved scheme.

The Committee was also shown a site section (north-east to south-east) demonstrating the amendments to the building heights. The Principal Planner explained that the approved plans had assumed a flat, level site and noted that the illustration displayed demonstrated that the finished levels of Block D were lower relative to Block C.

The Principal Planner detailed other layout changes across the site to accommodate increasing parking space sizes, which resulted in some reduction in soft landscaping. The Committee was informed that the changes to the parking provision resulted in reduced parking along the access road and would provide two drop-off spaces and a blue badge visitor space. The Principal Planner added that minor changes were also proposed for the siting of the substation, ball court, bin stores, and cycle stores.

The Committee was provided with computer-generated images comparing images of what the site would look like when completed as approved and as proposed, demonstrating views of house type 01 and Block B, house type 02 and the existing Assembly Hall, house type 03 (as seen from Garrison Lane), Blocks A-D (as seen from the cricket field), and an image of Blocks B and C (as seen from the courtyard) as proposed.

The recommendation to approve the application, as detailed in the report, was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the officers. The Vice-Chair noted that one of the computer-generated images suggested that a roof terrace had not been removed and sought clarity on this issue. The Principal Planner detailed that this was a balcony for one of the apartments and it was proposed to remove the roof terraces from house type 01.

A member of the Committee highlighted the loss of roof terraces and soft landscaping and in particular the apparent loss of amenity space demonstrated by the comparison of the two computer-generated images showing house type 02 and the Assembly Hall; the member sought clarity on the parking standards that required the reconfiguration of the parking provision and why green space was being lost to accommodate it.

The Principal Planner explained that in the case of the computer-generated images of house type 02 and the Assembly Hall, the image showing the site as proposed was developed from a different viewpoint than the one showing the site as approved, and that the proposed amenity space in that area was unchanged by the new proposals.

The Interim Joint Head of Planning added that the new computer-generated images showed more realistic planting and highlighted the examples on the images of house type 03. The Interim Joint Head of Planning explained that the size of car parking spaces were dictated by the Highways Authority's guidance for parking standards, which sets a minimum standard size to accommodate modern vehicles.

Another member of the Committee queried how much green space was being lost as a result of the changes. The Principal Planner said she did not have a figure to hand but highlighted on the plans where green space was being lost.

It was confirmed to a member of the Committee that the relocation of the two dwellings and the reconfiguration of parking had not created additional parking spaces. In response to another member of the Committee, who queried if the changes related to cost savings, the Interim Joint Head of Planning advised that significant work had been undertaken on the amendments to balance quality design with the changes required for the development to meet the passivhaus standards for energy efficiency and that a compromise had been met between the two factors.

The Chair invited Lord Charles Banner KC, representing the applicant, to address the Committee. Lord Banner was accompanied by Mr Chris Coultas and Mr Mike Durrant of Kier, and Mr Simon Pask of HBS, who were present to answer any questions the Committee had.

Lord Banner advised he would be brief as the Committee had the benefit of a comprehensive report, which provided a legal and sound rationale for the approval of the application. Lord Banner drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 8.3 and 8.5 of the report, which stated that the proposed scheme would ensure the development remained of high quality and in accordance with the Council's development plan.

Lord Banner said that Planning was not a beauty contest and that the Committee needed to determine if the proposed changes were in accordance with the Council's development plan. Lord Banner advised that the proposed changes were not cost driven but were changes to the design to create a workable scheme that would meet the passivhaus standard.

Lord Banner referred to paragraph 7.5 of the report and confirmed that the application was not retrospective in nature; he said that as soon as the developer had identified that changes were required all work on the site stopped and the application was made.

The Chair invited questions to Lord Banner and his colleagues. A member of the Committee sought assurance that the proposed changes were not a result of needing to reduce the cost of the development and would not alter the overall look and feel of the site. Lord Banner reiterated the points at paragraphs 8.3 and 8.5 of the report, acknowledging that despite some minor architectural downgrades the development,

overall, would be a high quality scheme. Lord Banner said the changes were not driven by costs but by a need to meet the passivhaus standards.

Another member of the Committee considered the parking standards as recommendations and asked why green space was being lost to make room for larger car parking spaces. Lord Banner advised that the number of car parking spaces being provided would not change but said that cars were getting bigger and the spaces needed to be changed to meet the current parking standards set by the Highways Authority.

Lord Banner said that the parking standards were a material planning consideration and that there needed to be a good justification to depart from them; he said the parking on the site needed to be fit for purpose and that it appeared this was not the case as approved. Mr Durrant confirmed that the parking space size would increase for 2.4 x 4.8 metres to 2.5 x 5 metres.

A member of the Committee asked if something like a living wall could be created to counter the loss of the roof terraces. Mr Durrant advised that there would be a 30% biodiversity net gain on the site and that rooftop planting would be retained and enhanced.

In response to a query regarding plans for a management company for the development once completed, Mr Pask explained that until this application had been determined any planning for this element could not be addressed, but noted that discussions had taken place with East Suffolk Services regarding taking on the management of the site. When asked by a member of the Committee how residents would have a voice in respect of site management, Mr Pask explained that a residents committee would be formed and this would be done in a tenure blind way to ensure fair representation.

Following a question on how the properties would be sold, Mr Pask advised that there would be a mix of open market properties, both leasehold and freehold, and social housing. At the invitation of the Chair, the Licensing Manager and Housing Lead Lawyer confirmed that the social housing would be added to the Council's housing stock.

The Interim Joint Head of Planning, at the Chair's invitation, advised that there was a need to achieve the right balance of parking provision on the site and said that what was proposed by the application was consistent with the provision in the approved scheme. The Committee was advised that there had been concerns in the community that parking would spill out from the site into adjacent roads and this had informed the provision proposed for the site.

The Interim Joint Head of Planning said that whilst minimising parking at sustainable locations should be pursued where possible, what the Committee was being asked to determine was not an opportunity to redesign the whole site but the application that was before it. The Interim Joint Head of Planning noted that car sizes were increasing and that there was an aging population in the area that would need spaces that could safely accommodate larger vehicles.

The Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it. Several members of the Committee spoke in support of the application and considered it positive that the proposed changes were not being applied retrospectively and were being made to meet the high standards required for Passivhaus certification.

A member of the Committee, who was also ward member for Western Felixstowe, considered that the housing the site would provide was much needed in particular the Council housing stock that would be created. The Member expressed some disappointment with the visual changes to the development, being of the view that the development would now be less attractive than what was approved, but stressed it was important that a much-needed site be delivered. The Member also reiterated earlier comments about concerns regarding on-street parking and the need for sufficient provision on-site.

Another member of the Committee, who had queried the changes to meet parking standards, expressed his support for the application but held some reservation about the enlargement of the parking spaces. The Member agreed with the number of spaces provided but was concerned at the loss of green space to increase their size.

A member of the Committee expressed some concern about leasehold sales on the site and management company charges, and the impact these elements would have on future residents.

There being no further debate, the Chair sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report. On the proposition of Councillor Hedgley, seconded by Councillor Dean, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to conditions to address the following matters:

- Time limit for commencement of residential development (with full planning permission).
- Time limit for the commencement of development (with outline permission).
- Time limit for the submission of reserved matters (for development with outline permission).
- Dwellings to be constructed in accordance with approved materials.
- Removal of permitted development rights for extensions and alterations, roof alterations and outbuildings in respect of the residential development.
- Removal of permitted development rights for walls and fences.
- Removal of permitted development rights for additional windows above ground floor level.
- Requirement for windows above ground floor level serving bathrooms to be fitted with obscure glazing.
- Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents.
- Provision of storage areas for bins.

- Development to be carried out in accordance with approved scheme for provision of affordable housing.
- Details of external lighting to be agreed.
- Construction hours to be limited to 7.30am to 6pm Mondays-Fridays, 8am to 1pm on Saturdays and no construction work to take place on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- Protective fencing for existing trees to be implemented as approved.
- Noise assessment to be submitted.
- Requirement for a minimum of 5% of car parking spaces for staff/visitor use to be provided with EV charging points (development with outline permission).
- Requirement for all dwellings with off-street parking and a minimum of 10% of spaces in private communal parking areas to be provided with EV charging points.
- Site investigation in respect of land contamination to be carried out (development with outline permission).
- Remediation method statement (RMS) in respect of land contamination to be submitted.
- RMS to be completed prior to occupation of the development.
- Validation report in respect of land contamination to be submitted.
- Landscaping scheme to be submitted for approval.
- Management plan for maintenance of communal areas to be submitted for approval.
- Residential development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drainage strategy including construction surface water management plan.
- Strategy for disposal of surface water to be submitted for approval (development with outline permission).
- Details of implementation, maintenance and management of the strategy for the disposal of surface water to be submitted for approval (development with outline permission).
- Surface water drainage verification report to be submitted for approval.
- Construction Surface Water Management Plan detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction to be submitted for approval (development with outline permission).
- Southern-most balconies at first and second floor levels on apartment Block D to be fitted with an obscured glazed privacy panel on their southwest elevation to a height of 1.7m from balcony floor.

Informative:

1. The Local Planning Authority has assessed the proposal against all material considerations including planning policies and any comments that may have been received. The planning application has been approved in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and local plan to promote the delivery of sustainable development and to approach decision taking in a positive way.

7 DC/24/0456/FUL - Stones Throw Cottage, 19 Station Road, Woodbridge, IP12 4AU

The Committee received report **ES/1930** of the Interim Joint Head of Planning, which related to planning application DC/24/0456/FUL. The application sought planning permission for the construction of a single storey extension at Stones Throw Cottage, 19 Station Road, Woodbridge. The application had been submitted in tandem with an

application for Listed Building Consent (DC/24/0457/LBC) as the property was a Grade II listed building, which was on the meeting agenda for determination later in the meeting.

The application was before the Committee for determination as the applicant was an elected member of the Council, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the case officer for the application, on both this and the linked application DC/24/0457/LBC. The site's location was outlined and the Committee was shown the existing and proposed elevations, existing and proposed floor plan, proposed block plan, and drawings comparing the proposed scheme to the one which was approved in October 2023.

The Committee was shown several photographs looking into the site from a range of vantage points on the boundary, and several images from within the site.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as residential amenity, heritage, and design. The recommendations to approve each application, as detailed in the report, were outlined to the Committee.

There being no questions, public speaking or debate on the item, the Chair sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report. On the proposition of Councillor Packard, seconded by Councillor Hedgley, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within a period of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

2. The works hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

- The proposed plans and location plan- 631-03- received 06.02.24

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been considered and approved

3. Prior to commencement of any works, details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(i) Details of the external materials to be used for the extensions.

(ii) Details of roof/wall junctions of the extensions with the existing building to show method of attachment and flashings.

(iii) Details of all new windows to include: appearance; position within opening; method of opening; materials and finish; heads and cills; type of glazing; glazing bar profiles; and ironmongery.

(iv) Details of all new external and internal doors to include: appearance; materials and finish; frame and architrave; type of glazing; panel profiles; and ironmongery.

(v) Details of proposed services, including new openings. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(vi) Details of the exact size and specification of the roof light.

Development must then be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

8 DC/24/0457/LBC - Stones Throw Cottage, 19 Station Road, Woodbridge, IP12 4AU

The Committee received report **ES/1931** of the Interim Joint Head of Planning, which related to planning application DC/24/0457/LBC. The application sought listed building consent for the construction of a single storey extension at Stones Throw Cottage, 19 Station Road, Woodbridge, and had been made in conjunction with an application for planning permission (DC/24/0456/FUL), which had been determined earlier in the meeting.

The application was before the Committee for determination as the applicant was an elected member of the Council, in accordance with the scheme of delegation set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution.

The Committee had received a presentation on both this and a linked application DC/24/0456/FUL determined earlier in the meeting, and is recorded at item 7 of these minutes.

There being no questions, public speaking or debate on the item, the Chair sought a proposer and seconder for the recommendation to approve the application, as set out in the report. On the proposition of Councillor Packard, seconded by Councillor Hedgley, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. The works to which this consent relates must be begun not later than three years from the date of this notice.

Reason: In accordance with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. The works hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

- The proposed plans and location plan- 631-03- received 06.02.24

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what has been considered and approved

3. Prior to commencement of any works, details in respect of the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(i) Details of the external materials to be used for the extensions.

(ii) Details of roof/wall junctions of the extensions with the existing building to show method of attachment and flashings.

(iii) Details of all new windows to include: appearance; position within opening; method of opening; materials and finish; heads and cills; type of glazing; glazing bar profiles; and ironmongery.

(iv) Details of all new external and internal doors to include: appearance; materials and finish; frame and architrave; type of glazing; panel profiles; and ironmongery.

(v) Details of proposed services, including new openings. The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

(vi) Details of the exact size and specification of the roof light.

Development must then be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

The meeting concluded at 4.42pm.

.....
Chair