

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee North** held in the Conference Room,
Riverside, on **Tuesday, 09 April 2024** at **2:00 PM**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Paul Ashton, Councillor Julia Ewart, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Graham Parker, Councillor Malcolm Pitchers, Councillor Sarah Plummer, Councillor Geoff Wakeling

Other Members present:

Councillor Katie Graham

Officers present: Katy Cassidy (Democratic Services Officer), Fabian Danielsson (Assistant Planner), Mia Glass (Enforcement Planner), Agnes Ogundiran (Conservative Political Group Support Officer), Rachel Smith (Principal Planner (Development Management, Central Area Lead)), Becky Taylor (Assistant Planner), Ben Woolnough (Interim Joint Head of Planning)

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hammond. Councillor Graham attended as Councillor Hammond's substitute.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Graham declared an other registerable interest and recused themselves from agenda item 6 as they were ward member and had been in discussion with the Parish Council regarding the item and visited the neighbouring property.

Councillor Ewart declared a non registerable interest in agenda item 7.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

There were no declarations of Lobbying received.

4 Minutes

Councillor Gee raised a point of order regarding P13 of the minutes, paragraph 8 should state "The Chair confirmed the angle test demonstrated that the adjacent property would be losing some light".

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitcher

It was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2024 be agreed as a correct record subject to the above amendment and signed by the Chair

5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report ES/1919 of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management which provided 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 Enforcement Planner to comment on the report.

The Enforcement Planner advised that there was one update, which was for a new notice served on 19 March 2024 on 88 Bridge Road, Oulton Broad for the change of a single residential dwelling to the use of two holiday lets which would come into effect on 19 April with a 4 month compliance period if no appeal was lodged within the month.

The Enforcement Planner advised that there were no further updates to the report and the Chair invited questions from the members.

Councillor Ashdown noted that 2 The Street, Lound was due for compliance on 17 April but there was also a Certificate of Lawful Development (CLD) application that had still not been decided, questioning whether this would delay the rest of the buildings being taken off the site. The Enforcement Officer advised that this would be reviewed after the compliance period to take into account where the CLD was at, they were hoping that the CLD was issued before the review visit. The Principal Planner agreed to find out the details and update.

Councillor Ewart noted that the volume of enforcement cases and the resources available was discussed at the April Strategic Planning Committee.

On the proposition of Councillor Gee, seconded by Councillor Pitcher, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

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

6 DC/24/0178/FUL - 12 Aldringham Park, Aldringham Cum Thorpe, Leiston, IP16 4QZ

The Committee received report ES/1916 of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/24/0178/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the retention of a partly built structure and its completion into a sunroom.

The application was before the Committee at the request of the referral panel as it was considered that the views of the Parish Council should be discussed.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site's location plan and an aerial photograph were shared with the Committee, noting that the site was located in a largely residential area, although not within a settlement boundary and therefore for planning purposes it was deemed to be in the Countryside. The property was situated in the corner of a cul-de-sac with a sizeable garden to the front and rear of the property. The Assistant Planner pointed out the proposed rear extension alongside the partly built blockwork structure. The Committee was shown the plans from the previously approved planning application in 2022 as concerns had been raised regarding overdevelopment of the plot although the garden was considered large. The block plans, existing elevations and floor plans were shared with the Committee, showing the partly built structure and highlighting the dimensions. The Assistant Planner noted that the extension would be clad with grey cladding to match the existing property. Referring to the concerns regarding the scale of the development and the possible overbearing impact, the Assistant Planner showed photos demonstrating the view from the neighbouring property. It was noted that the extension would be set back to mitigate this and a condition had been added for the blockwork to be rendered and painted. The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as design and residential amenity.

The recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management to approve the application for planning permission was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the Assistant Planner.

In response to a question from Councillor Ashdown, noting the comments in the report regarding the lanterns, the Assistant Planner confirmed that the three lanterns would not contribute to light pollution any more than that of the existing residential dwellings.

Councillor Gee sought clarification for the partially constructed part of the building and whether that was started with planning permission. The Assistant Planner confirmed that it was started without Planning Permission and there was an enforcement case on it leading to the applicant seeking permission. The Assistant Planner confirmed that the sunroom was in addition to the original garden room, and on a site visit the applicant had said that there were not plans to replace the garden room, however both still needed to be accounted for.

In response to a question from Councillor Ewart, the Principal Planner clarified the rules around permitted development and confirmed that this extension required planning permission for various reasons.

The Assistant Planner confirmed to Councillor Pitchers that the neighbouring property was just over 16 metres from the sunroom.

There being no further questions for the Assistant Planner, the Chair invited Councillor Wheeler from Aldringham Cum Thorpe Parish Council to speak.

Councillor Wheeler told the Committee that Aldringham Park was a development of 21 detached houses which were built in the 1970s with generous gardens providing an open aspect of each property. He noted that number 12 had been the subject of several alterations and additions which had resulted in a significant increase to the property's footprint. He added that the latest proposal would extend the normal flank wall of the property which was adjacent to the rear garden boundaries of its neighbouring properties – in particular number 4 where the development would dominate the entirety of their rear boundary. Councillor Wheeler asked the Committee to consider that number 12 sat above the level of number 4 and therefore the extension visibility was exaggerated due to the difference in level. Councillor Wheeler referred to the planning permission granted in August 2022 for the opposite side and stated that the present proposal would almost double the footprint of the property and would be disproportionate in scale, adding the Committee could see the concern from the photos that were shown. Finally Councillor Wheeler expressed concern regarding the light spill from the lanterns and asked should the Committee be minded to approve, that consideration be given to the removal of the lanterns or to incorporate suitable glazing to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.

There being no questions for Councillor Wheeler, the Chair invited Stephen Skinner, the applicant, to speak.

Mr Skinner told the Committee that they never intended to mislead the Planning Committee and genuinely believed that what they had started was covered by permitted development rules, adding they had subsequently learned that it would have been more appropriate to apply to the larger house extension scheme and that would have avoided the need for this current retrospective application. Mr Skinner advised that the intention was to not use the sunroom as living space but instead it would be an unheated enclosed area accessible from the house to be used for overwintering plants and in the summertime easily accessible and linked to the garden. There would be no need for significant internal lighting within the sunroom, and therefore negligible threat of light spill, the purpose of the lanterns was to let in natural light and not to let electric light escape. He noted that the supporting wall was unfinished and looked unappealing at the moment and was more than happy to lighten the colour to benefit the impression to the neighbours. Mr Skinner told the Committee that the previous planning application approved 2 years ago could not be withdrawn, however they had no intention to build it as it would not be a practical addition to the house and was in the wrong place. Mr Skinner noted that the wall that they intended to build the sunroom off of was about 0.6 metres lower than the wall of the extension that had already been granted. Mr Skinner thanked the Committee for their time.

The Chair invited questions to the applicant, Mr Skinner.

In response to a question from Councillor Ewart, Mr Skinner confirmed that they had lived in the property since the summer of 2021. Regarding the options for light, Mr Skinner told Councillor Ewart that they were proposing to have three wall lights installed instead of ceiling lighting.

There being no further questions for the applicant, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before them.

Councillor Graham addressed the Committee as Ward Member, stating they disagreed with the interpretation that the extension would not have an adverse effect on the neighbouring property, noting that the property was not consulted at any point regarding the extension. Councillor Graham made a site visit prior to the Planning Committee and witnessed the construction in its current state from the neighbour's garden. Following that visit they felt that the photos shown did not convey the overbearing nature of the construction fully. Councillor Graham reiterated the comments from Councillor Wheeler that the housing estate was a development of detached homes and referred to the Suffolk Coastal Plan and Policy Point 11.1 which stated that the council will support proposed development that demonstrates a clear understanding of the local character of the built environment – the overall scale and development of house alterations and extensions should demonstrate consideration of the component parts of the buildings and the development as a whole in relation to its surroundings. Councillor Graham did not feel this was the case with this development and that the neighbours at number 4 were compromised and recommended refusal.

The Chair advised the Committee that Councillor Graham should have been invited to speak as an official speaker prior to the commencement of debate and this was noted as their speech and as such they would not be participating in the vote for this item.

Councillor Pitchers had particular concerns regarding the neighbouring properties, however having been reassured with the distance and having had the light issue explained, they were happy to accept the recommendation. Councillor Ashdown agreed and was happy to second the application.

Councillor Ewart stated that if the applicant had planning permission in 2022 they would have known in 2023/24 that they needed further planning permission, adding without being able to close the original approval the risk was that both buildings could be built and therefore they were against the application being approved.

Councillor Ashton expressed frustration at retrospective planning permission, however this application conformed with planning policy and therefore would follow the recommendation given and support it.

In response to a question from Councillor Gee, it was confirmed that the neighbours at number 4 were listed as consultees of the planning application.

In response to a question from Councillor Ewart regarding the possibility of the original 2022 planning being delivered along with the current planning application, the Principal Planner confirmed that the recommendation was made taking both

extensions into account and it all could be constructed. Given the size of the plot and the distance between the neighbours, they were satisfied that this would be acceptable.

The Chair moved the proposal to a vote. On the recommendation of Councillor Pitchers, seconded by Councillor Ashdown, it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

To approve, subject to the conditions below.

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is imposed in accordance with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with:

Drawing No. 23172 1 (Site Plan)

Drawing No. 23172 2 (Existing Floor Plans and Elevations)

Drawing No. 23172 3 (Block Plan(s)/Site Layout - Existing)

Drawing No. 23172 4 (Proposed Floor and Elevations)

received 17th January 2024 ;, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. With the exception of the northern elevation as referred to in Condition 4, the materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity

4. Within 6 months of the date of this permission, the rear (northern) elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be finished in render and painted in Tinge of Silver (Armstead Trade). Thereafter, the render and colour shall be retained in this form.

Reason: In the interests of amenity.

Informatives:

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/23/4513/FUL - 23 Park Lane, Southwold, IP18 6HL

The Committee received report ES/1917 of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/23/4513/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the removal of a flint and brick boundary wall and the construction of a new flint and brick wall and access gate in order to create an additional parking space. The application was before the Committee at the request of the referral panel as it was considered that the views of the Town Council should be discussed.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site's location plan and an aerial photograph were shared with the Committee showing the wall and site in context, noting that 23 Park Lane was listed and the garage and wall was built in the 1990s. The Assistant Planner told the Committee that given the likely historic nature of the rear wall and the listing of the main building, it was considered that the wall was curtilage listed and therefore a listed building consent application had been submitted alongside. Photos were shared showing the section of the wall to be removed the Committee was advised that the replacement wall would be constructed with materials reclaimed from the removal of the wall.

The existing block plan and existing and proposed elevations were shared, highlighting that the replacement wall was intended to be in a similar character to that being removed. The material planning consideration and key issues were summarised as visual impact, heritage, residential amenity and highways/parking.

The recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management to approve the application for planning permission was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the Assistant Planner.

Councillor Pitchers returned to the photo of the wall proposed to be knocked down and referred to the substantial hedge and whether that was going to be replaced as that would reduce the visual impact. In response the Assistant Planner noted it was a domestic garden and there wasn't any protection of the planting inside although the block plan showed a large shrub to be retained, this wasn't able to be conditioned.

There being no further questions the Chair invited the objector to speak.

The objector told the committee that they objected as they could not see the justification for another car parking space. The Grade 2 listed building was in a conservation area and already had a large garage and parking bay as well as parking in

front of the property and access to a carpark at the end of road. The objector stated if the open frontage was allowed to accommodate another car then the street scene would be changed forever, noting no other properties in Lorne Road had open frontage, this would be out of character and would spoil the views from the opposite properties. The objector stated that adding another car parking space at number 23 would take away space in Lorne Road which was currently available to all users, including disability badge holders. The objector told the committee that the road was extremely narrow with busy daily two-way traffic flow including heavy delivery vehicles and on one side of the road there was a large stretch with little or no pavement. The objector felt that the short distance available to reverse from number 23 would mean that they would be reversing within inches of their front fence and on to the pavement and pedestrian and traffic problems could occur. Finally, the objector felt that the original old wall could be affected during the removal as part of it was in number 23 and part was in the neighbour's garden.

The Chair invited questions to the objector.

In response to a question from Councillor Pitchers regarding the potential open frontage increase, the objector explained that part of the historic wall was within the property at number 23 and the rest was in the garden, adding if they were to remove the pier then the historical wall would be affected, and if they added another pier, two cars wouldn't access easily, they felt it was unnecessary.

In response to a question from Councillor Ewart regarding use of the garage, the objector commented that currently there was nobody residing in the property and the garage wasn't being used, adding at certain times parking was available on Lorne Road, however this development would affect the availability of that parking.

The Chair requested that the Assistant Planner shared the proposed block plan showing the historic wall and the line of the existing modern wall to be removed, this confirmed that the width at street scene level wouldn't change.

There being no further questions the Chair invited Councillor Wells of Southwold Town Council to speak.

Councillor Wells outlined Southwold Town Council's main objection which was that there was no net gain to the parking, although the plans appeared to show two car parking spaces, they were encroaching on to the garage. They added there was no need for extra parking at the property as it already had the garage and a parking space at the front of the property. Councillor Wells mentioned the issues from the County Council regarding traffic and noted that the plans shown did not truly represent the width of the road and the space needed to manoeuvre in and outside of the spaces there despite the fact that the frontage was not actually being widened.

There being no questions for Councillor Wells the Chair invited the applicant's agent, Mr Bennett to speak.

Mr Bennett noted that the Officer had covered everything and wished to reinforce that the street-scape along Lorne Road was not going to be altered, with the opening remaining essentially the same and the pier would maintain the structure of the wall

and finish it nicely on the edge. It was proposed to reuse materials and retain the planting that was there as part of the conservation area. They added that in Southwold it was always a good idea to take cars off the road and into sites, as mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan, and this proposal allowed for it to be done sensibly.

The Chair invited questions to the applicant's agent.

In response to a question from Councillor Ewart, Mr Bennett confirmed that the proposal aimed to create two parking spaces instead of one in front of the garage.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before them.

Cllr Ashdown stated that the Committee had received a good description of the proposal and parking in Southwold was of a high premium. The application created off-road parking at the property and by retaining the wall material and the wall line there would be no effect on the street scene and was happy to recommend approval.

The Chair noted that two cars navigating in and out on a small road presented some concern. Councillor Wakelin agreed that navigating in and out could be difficult and clarified that at the front of the property it was on street parking with no driveway.

Cllr Pitchers seconded the proposal.

Councillor Ewart discussed the proposed parking arrangements alongside the potential parking space in the garage, the Chair clarified that the proposal was for two parking spaces.

Councillor Graham referred to the report and the number of residents that were displeased with the proposal adding that developments in a conservation area should seek to conserve or enhance heritage assets, which didn't appear to be happening here and therefore was minded to refuse it.

In response to a question from Councillor Wakelin regarding the historic wall, the Assistant Planner referred to photographs and noted that the pier was built to join the newer wall to the historic wall adding it was expected that the new pier and removal of the wall would affect the same parts of the wall and should not cause further damage to rear wall.

Councillor Ashton stated that the opening would remain exactly the same and the pier would be replaced with the same, the parking was restricted on one side completely and between 08:00 and 18:00 every day on the other side of the road, the Committee was here to make decisions based on planning policy and therefore completely supported the proposal.

Councillor Ewart questioned if there should be a proportional value between the size of the house and the number of parking spaces.

The Chair moved the proposal to a vote. On the recommendation of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitchers, it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

To approve, subject to the conditions below.

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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the following approved plans and documents for which permission is hereby granted:

- Drawing nos. Drwg.No. 162102 A received on 21 November 2023.

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

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity

4. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site shown on Drawing No. 162/02A for the purposes of manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that area(s) shall be retained and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient space for the on-site parking of vehicles is provided and maintained to ensure the provision of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety to users of the highway.

Informatives:

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.

The Committee received report ES/1918 of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/24/0163/LBC.

The application sought listed building consent for the removal of a flint and brick boundary wall and the construction of a new flint and brick wall and access gate in order to create an additional parking space. The application was before the Committee at the request of the referral panel as it was considered that the views of the Town Council should be discussed.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The slides were the same as those shown in the associated planning permission (agenda item 7) and the Assistant Planner notified the Committee that the associated listed Building Consent application was necessary as the historic wall at the rear of the building was old enough to be considered as curtilage listed and the removal and rebuilding of the pier would have an effect on the wall. The heritage team were consulted and did not consider there to be any impact on the listed building as the garden would be maintained and the construction would be of a size and in materials that would be appropriate for the listed building approval.

The recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management to approve the application for planning permission was outlined to the Committee.

The Chair invited questions to the Assistant Planner.

In response to a question from Councillor Gee regarding protection of the original wall, the Principal Planner confirmed that the consent was for the limit of the works within the proposal only and should any further alterations to the wall be planned there would need to be a further listed building application.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application that was before them.

Councillor Ashdown recommended approval and Councillor Ashton seconded, adding the Design and Heritage Officers report made it clear there were no objections. It was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

to approve subject to conditions.

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is imposed in accordance with Section 18 of the Act (as

amended).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects strictly in accordance with the following approved plans and documents for which permission is hereby granted:

- Drawing nos. 162102A received on 21 November 2023.

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

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development in the interests of visual amenity

Informatives:

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.

The meeting concluded at TBC

.....
Chair