

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee North** held in the Conference Room,
Riverside, on **Tuesday, 11 June 2024 at 2:00 PM**

Members of the Committee present:

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

Other Members present:

Officers present: Daniel Bailes (Trainee Planner), Joe Blackmore (Principal Planner (Development Management, North Area Lead)), Katy Cassidy (Democratic Services Officer), Matthew Gee (Senior Planner), Agnes Ogundiran (Conservative Political Group Support Officer), Katherine Rawlins (Planner), Becky Taylor, Ben Woolnough (Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management)

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were no apologies for absence received.

It was noted that Councillor Parker needed to leave the meeting at 4:00pm.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Parker declared an other registerable interest and recused himself from item 9 as he was involved in the funding of the project via Locality Funding.

Councillor Ashton declared an other registerable interest and recused himself from items 8 and 9 as they related to assets owned by East Suffolk Council and he was the Cabinet Member for Assets.

Councillor Gee declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6 as Ward Councillor.

Councillor Ewart declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 as Ward Councillor.

Councillor Pitchers declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 8 and 10 as Ward Councillor.

Councillor Wakeling declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 11 as Ward Councillor.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

There were no Declarations of Lobbying made.

4 Minutes

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitchers, it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

that the minutes of the meeting held on 14 May 2024 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report ES/1994 of the Head of Planning, Building Control 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 24 May 2024. At that time there were 22 such cases.

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

Councillor Ashdown asked for an update on outstanding cases now that the new legal support was in place. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management advised that a detailed Enforcement report was being prepared for the Strategic Management Committee in July which would address these issues and provide an update.

There being no further questions or comments, on the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitchers it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 24 May 2024 be noted.

6 DC/22/4993/FUL - Land North of Union Lane, Oulton, Suffolk

The Committee received report ES/1985 of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/22/4993/FUL.

The application was for a phased hybrid development comprising a full planning application for the erection of 45 residential dwellings and associated works and an outline application for up to 87 residential dwellings (with all matters reserved aside from access) and associated works. The application also included the creation of a footpath along the western side of Parkhill running from the application site to the corner of Parkhill and Union Lane.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planner (Development Management), who was the Case Officer for the application.

The site's location plan, north of Lowestoft within the Parish of Oulton, was shared with the Senior Planner noting that it was an allocated site within the Waveney Local Plan. A context map was displayed which showed the public rights of way within the wider area and the proposed access to the site as well as the local amenities, footpaths and road connections.

An aerial photograph and 3D visualisations from various views showed the site in context to its surrounding areas. The Senior Planner highlighted to members the allocated site to the south of the site which was currently out for public consultation. The Senior Planner described the existing buildings surrounding the site, noting the single and one and a half storey buildings to the southern boundary and the properties within Park Hill, Airey Close, Flixton View and the Care facility.

The Senior Planner pointed out the small grouping of listed buildings to the East which were in close proximity to the site with Park Hill Road running between them.

Various photographs of the site were shared, noting some areas of residential overspill which was on land within the applicant's ownership. The Senior Planner noted that the site was very flat, surrounded by trees with many having to have works done to them as part of the application process.

Views from Park Hill were displayed showing the current road structure and restrictions, and the Senior Planner noted that Oulton Lane would be a pedestrian and cycle lane access only due its narrow nature with the primary access being from Park Hill Road.

Photographs of the outline area were shown which demonstrated the storage buildings which were no longer in use and would be demolished as part of the application process. The TPO trees were pointed out to the Committee.

The Policy Map was shown to the Committee with the Senior Planner pointing out:

- Current application site of WLP 2.14
- Separate application site of WLP 2.16
- Existing settlement boundary
- Ancient burial ground to the North East
- Wildlife corridor (allocated within the Oulton Neighbourhood Plan)

The Committee were apprised of the residential development brief which was part of the application process and provided more context and layout aspirations. The constraints map was referred to, noting that there were no TPO's on site but some

adjacent to it, the ancient burial area, the WW2 defence system and the listed buildings.

The masterplan was displayed, showing the primary access route throughout the site from Park Hill and the pedestrian and cycle route from Oulton Street onto Union Lane. The Senior Planner noted the open space alongside the northern area in both phases.

The proposed block plan was shared showing both the full application of phase 1 (45 dwellings) and the outline area for phase 2 (87 dwellings). The Senior Planner noted the attenuation basin in the north west corner of Phase 1 and the main access point from Park Hill leading to phase 2 and the outline area. The landscaping to the front edge, northern boundaries and surrounding the attenuation basin was highlighted. It was noted that there was a proposed 400 square metres of children's play area as part of the conditions. The Senior Planner pointed out the RAMS condition of proposed pedestrian and cycle access up to the PROW network.

The indicative site plan for phase 2 was shared, with all matters being reserved in phase 2 except for the access, as highlighted previously the burial ground was left as open space.

The proposed pedestrian route in Oulton along Park Hill was shared along with the Ecology Masterplan, which comprised tree planting and conservation and the wildlife corridor running along the northern side of phase 1 and western side of phase 2. A map of the Landscaping Plan was displayed for the Committee.

The Storey Plan was shared, the Senior Planner noted that it was mainly 2 storey on phase 2 and on phase 1 the plan was for single story dwellings on the boundary of site mitigating any overlooking issues and providing good levels of amenity for residents.

The Tenure plan was shown, noting as part of phase 2 there would be some affordable housing and custom build homes. Members were informed that the 20% policy requirement for affordable housing had not been met, however the viability assessment had been undertaken by the applicants and independently reviewed by a third party, which demonstrated that the application was policy compliant in the allowance of under provision.

The housing mix was shared, showing the various house types and demonstrating good quality, contemporary design. The Senior Planner noted that several of the houses fronting onto Park Hill had a unique design to create an attractive frontage along Park Hill Road. Sketch perspectives were shared showing the dwellings in context of the site.

The Material Planning Considerations and Key Issues were summarised as:

- Principle of development
- Design and layout
- Amenity/Local Living Conditions
- Highways, Access and Sustainable Transport
- Trees and Landscape
- Heritage and Archaeology

- Ecology and Biodiversity
- Ecological Enhancements/Biodiversity Net Gain
- Suffolk Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)
- Affordable, Custom and Self-build housing
- Flooding and Drainage
- Contamination
- Play and Open space
- Sustainability
- Early Years Provision
- Other matters

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

The Chair invited questions from the Committee to the Senior Planner.

Councillor Ashdown asked whether the access road would be created in full, to road standard for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 before any development. The Senior Planner confirmed that as part of phase 1 it would be a dead end. In response Councillor Ashdown requested that that road was completed in full before work on Phase 2 commenced. The Head of Planning and Building Control confirmed that this could be picked up as part of the Reserved Matters application for Phase 2, ensuring that the phasing of the work was considered, and the road established at the first phase of construction.

Councillor Gee referred to the maturity and types of trees, asking that as many as possible were retained. The Senior Planner confirmed that it was always the aspiration to retain as many as possible of the mature trees. He added that several of the mature trees would be retained and would be subject to pruning, whilst there would be some level of removal, the number to be retained was viable. The Principal Planner referred to the detailed response from the Tree and Landscape team and the proposal for 25% crown reduction of the proposed retained Oaks and similar for the broadleaf trees. It was noted that several of the Oaks had overextended limbs which needed to be considered alongside adjacent garden spaces, and TPO's had been considered pragmatically. The Principal Planner noted an updated tree report which mentioned the Poplar trees on the western boundary and confirmed there had been a balance struck between sensible retention and additional planting of trees.

In response to a question from Councillor Gee regarding the positioning of the houses near the mature trees, the Head of Planning and Building Control noted that the trees had been considered in the design process, and the development had been influenced by the Arboricultural assessment which had been reviewed with the Design and Landscape Officer to get the correct balance.

The Chair asked what was happening with the trees around the edge of the site and along the green corridor. The Head of Planning and Building Control stated that the Arboricultural Impact Assessment sets out what was required in terms of tree protection, ensuring it is conditioned and enforced where necessary. He added if there

were any trees that had issues, the condition does have control to make sure that they were re-planted and addressed, and confirmed that there would be site checks throughout construction and after to make sure planting was successful and address any shortfalls.

Councillor Ewart asked how Oulton was profiled in terms of the requirements that it may have, noting her concern about the number of affordable homes and that they were only in phase 2. Councillor Ewart expressed a concern that in East Suffolk houses were being built that were not appropriate for the people that needed to live in them.

In response, the Head of Planning and Building Control reassured that the houses being built and consented were in line with the housing needs in the local plan, adding sometimes there was a perception in communities that the housing mix in the local plan was not what the community needed. He noted that there were two local plans that were up to date, having been produced relatively recently and they were informed by significant research into the type of housing mix required across the district, both in terms of open market and affordable housing. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management stated that it was regrettable when there was a viability position put forward by the applicant for reduced or zero affordable housing, but there was a policy position that allows that. He recognised that it was a community that needed affordable housing and that there were two housing allocations in Oulton that had the opportunity to provide affordable housing; in addition, there was also the Woods Meadow development which had affordable housing within it. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management noted that the national planning policy framework and the local plan allow the viability of providing affordable housing to be considered and, in this case, the site did have a brownfield nature to it and the costs to develop the site would be higher than the average greenfield site.

Councillor Ewart noted the length that the planning application had been in development for and noted that the current Administration had been together for a year. She asked for clarification on the consideration that had been given to sustainable construction. In response the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management noted that the local plan policies set out ambitions for sustainable construction and, in some instances, these had now been surpassed by Building Regulations. He added that there were more onerous Building Regulations in place, and they had ambitions as a Council to push even further with that, having had discussions with various developers to be more proactive with what they proposed, whilst recognising that they cannot demand more than the current Building Regulations seek. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management told the Committee that they would be moving into a local plan review in the future which could create opportunities for bolder policies in terms of construction. Councillor Ewart thanked the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management for the response, noting the need to future proof with longer term developments.

In response to Councillor Ewart regarding the response from Anglian Water, the Principal Planner confirmed that they had provided a limited response, raising no concerns.

The Senior Planner confirmed that there was a policy requirement for early years provision on one of the two allocated sites in Oulton, and that the Southern site was

considered a better situation due its closer proximity to the centre of the settlement and better connectivity in terms of footpaths for walking and cycling.

Councillor Wakeling applauded the inclusion of wildlife corridors and asked what provision was in place to safeguard whilst development was underway. In response, the Principal Planner confirmed there would be a series of ecology conditions that would be finalised should the application be approved, one of which was the for the submission of a construction environmental management plan prior to any work taking place on site.

In response to Councillor Ashdown, the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management confirmed this was a Community Infrastructure Levy applicable site with 25% contribution that goes to the Parish council for their neighbourhood plan.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the Objectors, Mr Hawes and Mr Bould to speak.

In objection, Mr Hawes stated that Oulton as a village had been disproportionately affected by at least four new building developments. Park Hill Road, the B1375, had significantly increased traffic which led to increasing safety risks especially at the junction with Union Lane.

He noted there was nothing in the proposals to mitigate against the effects on the two listed buildings which were directly opposite the main access point on Park Hill. Mr Hawes told the Committee that approximately 20 years ago the previous owners had requested permission for two holiday caravans and this was refused due to safety and the access to road, however, now 200 plus cars were expected to go in and out of Park Hill. He told the Committee that the listed buildings were 300 years old and were the only two in Oulton Village, they had Georgian windows which only allow, under listed requirements, single pane glass. They were situated a few yards away from the proposed access point, therefore a significant increase for the occupants would occur in noise, vibration, dirt and a greatly increased volume of traffic.

Mr Hawes suggested the following improvements:

- Number of houses should be reduced.
- Phase 2 should not begin for at least five years after phase 1 and not until there had been a review of the site.
- New entrance to be moved further south.

Mr Bould referred to Paragraph 8.42 of the report where it was recommended that the hedge was retained, yet in Paragraph 1.11 it was not clear if the hedge was going to be preserved and whether it was still the intention as illustrated on published plans to construct a proper footpath behind the hedge for the whole length of the development along Park Hill. He added if the area was going to be extended north to Spinney Farm then maybe a footpath should be constructed as far north as Spinney Farm. This was promised verbally and on official documents and was a significant factor that encouraged them and others to respond positively to the development.

Finally Mr Bould told the Committee it was impossible to leave their houses on foot or bicycle without safety risks, due to speeding traffic on Park Hill, this would continue to be dangerous unless the footpath behind the existing hedgerow from Union Lane to the northern boundary was created adding if this could be considered on the opposite side of the road too it would go along way toward making the development acceptable.

The Chair invited question to the Objectors.

Councillor Ashton referred the point from the objector regarding the footpath to the Senior Planner and asked for his views. Following discussion between the Objector and the Officers it was confirmed that the footpath would be on the inside of the future hedgerow and Councillor Ashton clarified that should the scheme be approved it would be in accordance with the path as shown on the map. This was what the Objector was requesting to happen and in line with their original expectations.

The Committee reviewed a zoomed in plan of the area of the site discussed in Paragraph 8.42 which clarified how the site was expected to be laid out in its final constructed design.

In response to a question from Councillor Ewart, the Senior Planner confirmed that Design and Heritage team had been consulted regarding the listed buildings and there was deemed to be less than substantial harm arising from the planned development that would need to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. The Senior Planner noted that he did not have the full information regarding any previously refused planning applications, adding that the current application had been assessed by the Highways Authority as having an appropriate means of access.

Councillor Ewart asked Mr Hawes to share any further concerns, Mr Hawes replied and noted the concern with the volume of traffic, and suggested mitigations regarding road traffic that could help.

There being no further questions for the Objectors, the Chair invited the Parish Councillors to speak.

Councillors Hinton and Sarbutt made their representation, stating that there had been confusion with the plan as they were working with Andrew Oldman up until the end of December 2022, those were the plans that they were working on at that time. They were promised a presentation to the Parish Council in which the public would have been invited. Both planned meetings were cancelled by Andrew Oldman, with his representative advising that a full presentation would happen at a later date. They told the Committee that this had not yet happened and that was why they didn't have any comments on the current application.

The Parish Council stated that putting the two in together had caused confusion but they had got around it. They stated, firstly they had no problems with the layout of the plan, it was allocated in the local plan and neighbourhood plan that this allocation would have happened anyway, so they have adapted to work with it with the aim to get the best for Oulton out of it, adding if the public meeting had occurred that would have happened.

They agree with the issues raised regarding traffic, and could prove from SID cameras that there are 140,000 vehicles per month, most of which are speeding, they have put gates and speeding restrictions in which have had an impact. They were concerned about site traffic coming through the village and would like a condition put in place that the site traffic serving the north side of union lane, enters via Rackhams Corner.

They noted there were lots of protected adders that needed to be considered and recommended refusal until there was a full meeting.

The Chair invited questions to the Parish Council.

The requirement to be consistent with the three minutes of public speaking was pointed out to the Committee Members.

Councillor Graham asked for further detail surrounding the local habitats that they were concerned about. The Parish Council referred to previous developments where there were issues with the migration of wildlife across the road and suggested that a check of the wildlife that inhabits the area was carried out prior to the construction goes ahead to ensure safety of the creatures.

In response to Councillor Ewart regarding attendance at consultation meetings, the Parish Council confirmed that 140 residents attended the open day for the development on the South side and traffic was raised as a key concern.

There being no further questions for the Parish Councillors, the Chair invited the applicant to speak.

Amy Robinson of Oldman Homes told the Committee that they had worked collaboratively with all statutory consultees via public consultation, their website and site visit with the Parish Council. The proposal was for a high quality sustainable development of 132 homes on land allocated in the local plan.

The development would be for high quality Oldman Homes, with a strong frontage on to Park Hill and single Storey on the southern boundary protecting the amenity. Within the development there would be custom built dwellings and affordable homes, the residential dwellings would be 1 to 4 bed in size.

The proposal would lead to greenfield development, resulting in change, adding wildlife corridors, additional trees and hedgerows. There would be an enhancement of the burial ground with information boards and public seating installed and the reinstating of gravestones.

There would be Vehicle access via Park Hill and improved connectivity with new footpaths. There had been no objections from the Highways Authority or the LLFA. The site would provide a £42,000 contribution to RAMS as well as CIL. PV panels and air sourced heat pumps would be installed as well as one EV charging point per dwelling.

To conclude Amy Robinson told the Committee that this was a high quality development in an allocated site, in line with the local plan.

The Chair invited questions to the applicant.

In response to a question from Councillor Ashdown, the applicant confirmed that the access road would be completed in full for stage 1 prior to stage 2 commencing. They added that Phase 2 was to be dealt with by reserved matters, therefore once secured and approved they would fix access for Phase 2.

Councillor Graham noted the suggested contributions and that due to the timing of the application they were working outside of Biodiversity Net Gain, adding as this wasn't a measurable strategy it was difficult to see how they were contributing. Councillor Graham asked for their reasons for working outside of formal net gain. In response the applicant told the Committee that in December 2022 when the application was submitted, they were outside of the requirements of a mandatory BNG assessment. They added that they had done everything possible to maximise biodiversity with a wildlife plan and Ecology conditions. The applicant stated they had all of the necessary surveys done to date and it was an ambition of theirs to continue to improve this area. Councillor Graham noted the work done but it wasn't measurable and requested that the requirement of a measurable approach was fed back to the applicant.

Councillor Ewart sought clarity on the community input. The applicant referred to a meeting in December 2021 where the main concern raised was the burial ground, following which an archaeological assessment was carried out. The applicant told the Committee that they had listened to feedback and responded to concerns regarding no development or play space, sensitive landscaping, information boards. The second concern was Highways and this was reviewed satisfactorily with the Highways Authorities. In response to Councillor Ewart, the applicant said they had tried to arrange a further meeting but were unable to find a suitable date.

There was a conversation regarding the level of communication between the Parish Council and the applicant, Councillor Gee as Ward Councillor, confirmed that she had attended every meeting of Oulton Parish Council and noted that meetings were arranged and had been cancelled. The applicant confirmed they weren't aware that they were waiting for a meeting and had asked East Suffolk Council for any comments, they added that any comments raised would have been addressed in the application. The Chair noted that the concern was around wider communication moving forward and the applicant confirmed that they were willing to work with the community going forward. The Head of Planning and Building Control told the Committee that pre-application engagement between applicants, communities and Parish Councils is always encouraged by the Council. Moving forward communications are those that are negotiated between the Parish Council and the applicant.

There being no further questions, the Chair asked the Committee to debate the application.

Councillor Pitchers knew the area very well and suggested that condition be added that all construction comes from the north. The Head of Planning and Building Control stated that there would be a recommendation amongst the conditions for a construction traffic management plan, which could be considered and approved subject to a satisfactory response from the Highway Authority.

Councillor Ashdown stated that the application had been on the table for many years, noting the beneficial reduction from 150 to 132 homes. Noting the proposed volume of traffic and knowing Oulton Street, he agreed it was necessary to use the proposed route and not the village. He stated there had been a good representation, noting the disappointment in the number of affordable homes but recognising the justification for that. Councillor Ashdown recommended approval.

Councillor Gee expressed concern about Park Hill, as a long straight road, prone to cars speeding day and night. At Oulton Parish Council meetings there was always a speed check presentation and the community wishes to retain the 20mph restriction. Councillor Gee was very worried about the safety provisions.

The Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management emphasised that this was one of two large housing allocations within the village alongside Woods Meadow. He added the local plan process was conscious of that in terms of traffic and the modelling carried out at local plan stage was accepted by the Highways Authority. This was the same at application stage, with no objections from the Highways Authority. Whilst he recognised there may be speeding issues within the village, it should be considered that this development proposal was safe, with no severe traffic impacts.

Councillor Pitchers stated that he knew the area very well, and was happy having seen the drawings and the location of the footpath behind the hedge along with the Highway's safety assessment. He found the mix of housing to be very attractive with front and rear gardens and was happy to second Councillor Ashdown's recommendation.

Councillor Ashton noted that it was imperative that Parish and Town Councils had the opportunity to respond to planning applications and everyone's comments were taken on board and listened to. He expressed disappointment that this hadn't happened in this case. Councillor Ashton had looked at the technical assessments and noted that the safety issues could be exacerbated by more traffic, however the planned development could mitigate the issues. Although very unhappy with the lack of affordable housing and the viability assessment, he did agree that it should be approved.

Councillor Ewart agreed with Councillor Ashton and noted the difficulties with distilling all of the information at the Committee, especially for an area that she was not familiar with and requested that all background information was available to drill into to support the decision.

Councillor Graham concurred with Councillor Ashton and noted the developer had made positive contributions, urging them, if it was approved, to continue to engage with residents and consider a biodiversity net gain assessment.

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitchers, it was by a majority vote:

RESOLVED

That authority to **approve** be granted, subject to the completion of the S106 Legal Agreement and planning conditions that are summarised in section 11 of this report.

Conditions (summarised):

1. Reserved matters approval submission time frame (87 Outline dwellings)
2. Full permission time limit (45 full planning permission dwellings)
3. Approved drawings compliance
4. Submission of a scheme for the provision of fire hydrants
5. Submission of implementation of a programme of archaeological work
6. Submission of Written Scheme of Investigation
7. Submission of Construction Management Plan
8. Internal noise level standards
9. Implementation of noise mitigation measures/construction methods
10. Submission of noise level and/or noise mitigation works validation report
11. Control of noisy construction activities hours
12. Submission of a Supplementary Ground Gas Report
13. Submission of a Remediation Method Statement
14. Completion of RMS approved under condition 13
15. Submission of Validation report for approved RMS
16. Unexpected contamination (unlikely event action)
17. New access construction
18. Provision of storage and presentation for collection/emptying of refuse and recycling bins
19. Submission of details showing the means to prevent the discharge of surface water
20. Improvement to local bus stops
21. Submission of details of the estate roads and footpaths (including street furniture)
22. Construction of carriageways and footways
23. Submission of further information on off-site highways improvements
24. Submission of details on EV charging points
25. Submission of travel plan details
26. Implementation of the Flood Risk Assessment
27. Submission of surface water drainage verification report
28. Submission of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP)
29. Requirement for development to be served by most viable high-speed broadband connection.
30. Submission of details in respect of Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and/or requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'
31. Water consumption requirement
32. Requirement for dwellings to be built in accordance with approved the report 'Sustainability and Energy Statement for Residential Development'
33. Submission of details for Custom/Self Build Plots
34. Phasing Plan
35. Submission of construction plan for attenuation basin on Phase 2 Burial Site
36. Completion of Landscaping Plan for phase 1
37. Submission of Phase 2 Landscaping Plan

38. Submission of precise details for Childrens Play Area
39. Submission of Surface Water Drainage Scheme for Phase 2
40. Submission of surface water drainage verification report for Phase 2
41. Series of Ecology conditions as required by councils Principal Ecologist.

7 DC/24/1124/FUL - Ingleside, 3 Cloutings Close, Kelsale Cum Carlton, Saxmundham, IP17 2RX

Councillor Parker left the meeting at this point.

The Committee received report ES/1986 of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/24/1124/FUL.

The application was for planning permission for a single storey side extension and self-contained residential annexe.

The application was referred to the Planning Committee by the Referral Panel as the objections from the Parish Council were contrary to the officer's "minded-to" recommendation of approval, and The Panel considered the application required further debate at Committee.

The Committee received a presentation from the Assistant Planner, who was the Case Officer for the application.

An aerial photograph and site location plan was shared with the Committee, it was noted that it was within a residential development of 5 properties that were constructed in 1998 and the main reason for the Parish Council objection was that it would set a precedent for the other properties in the area.

The proposed block plan, floor plan and elevations were displayed along with photographs showing views from the East and West, noting that the site was enclosed by trees which reduced overlooking from the neighbours.

The existing and proposed elevations were shared and the material planning considerations and key issues were summarises as:

- Design
- Residential amenity
- Residential annexes

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

The Chair invited questions from the Committee to the Assistant Planner.

Councillor Gee, noted the objection from the neighbour at number 2, and questioned why the proposed extension was so close the boundary (0.5 metres). The Principal Planner reviewed the photographs and confirmed due to the positioning of the

properties it was that close at one corner point only, and was acceptably separated from neighbouring properties.

In response to Councillor Ewart, the Principal Planner confirmed that there was a restrictive covenant in place in respect of additional extensions and outbuildings, however, restrictive covenants were not a material planning consideration, and this had been reported as background information. Councillor Ewart asked if the two parts of the application, the annexe and the extension, could be considered separately and the Principal Planner confirmed that it had to be considered as one whole application.

There being no further debate, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application.

Councillor Ashdown confirmed he had no issues with the application and was happy to recommend approval.

Councillor Ewart noted that the application was in her ward.

Councillor Ashton was sympathetic with the Parish Council objection, adding it was right on the cusp of what was acceptable, but due to its specific plot it didn't set a precedent and therefore he was prepared to approve it.

Councillor Gee noted the attractive design of the cul-de-sac currently and was concerned that the addition would seriously affect the appearance of what was there. The Chair referred back to the Principal Planner's comments regarding the restrictive covenant and noted the final decision following any approval would rest with that. The Principal Planner agreed that the scheme was in a very attractive cul-de-sac, but noted the Officers felt that the location of the annex and the modest side extension would cause minimal impact to the appearance of the area.

Councillor Pitchers commented that the annexe was hidden by the garage extension and although it would fill a large part of the plot up he was happy to second the proposal.

Councillor Ewart considered there should have been two application and would be voting against.

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitchers it was by a majority vote:

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. AB101 Location Site Plan, Block Plan (received 25.03.2024);
- Drawing No. AB104 Proposed GF Plan of Annex (received 25.03.2024);
- Drawing No. AB103 Proposed GF Plan (received 25.03.2024);
- Drawing No. AB102 Proposed W, E, N, S Elevations on Annex. Proposed E, N, W Elevations on House (received 25.03.2024);

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. 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 hereby permitted annex shall not be occupied or let as a separate dwelling but shall be used only for purposes incidental to the use of the dwellinghouse to which it relates or for occupation by a relative, employee or parent of the householder or his/her spouse.

Reason: The development is not such that the local planning authority would be prepared to approve as a separate dwellinghouse in its own right.

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.

8 DC/24/1111/FUL - Jubilee Parade, The Esplanade, Lowestoft, Suffolk

Councillor Ashton left the Committee room for this item.

The Committee received report ES/1987 of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/24/1111/FUL.

The application was for planning permission for the construction of a single storey timber building for use by the Volunteer Lifeguard Corp.

The application was before the Committee as East Suffolk Council were the applicant.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planner (Development Management), who was the Case Officer for the application.

The Senior Planner told the Committee that the application was for a single storey timber building along the lower promenade of Jubilee Parade and formed part of the Jubilee Parade redevelopments.

The site's location plan along with aerial photographs showing the site in context was shared with the Committee.

Block plans, elevations and floor plans were displayed, showing the timber structure building, the design of which would fit with the general aesthetic of the seaside, with its appearance, colour and scale.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Principle of development
- Design and conservation area
- Amenity
- Flood risk
- Coastal erosion

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

The Chair invited questions from the Committee to the Assistant Planner.

Councillor Ewart noted there were no toilet facilities within the building and the Senior planner confirmed the close proximity to the public toilet facilities along the promenade.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the applicant to speak.

The applicant told the Committee that the Volunteer Lifeguard Corp was established in 1952, and since that time there had been several hundred volunteers giving water safety advice, patrols, first aid, rescue support for events and fund raising. Their aim was to provide a presence on the local beach and prevent drowning. They told the Committee that they had to move quickly to establish their fifth base since formation and they were looking forward to working in the new space with the community. The new premises would provide flexibility, storage, a base for training and first aid and a look out point. In the past three years alone, the Volunteer Lifeguards had provided 1600 to 1800 volunteer hours per year, water safety talks 32 schools per year and to 12260 children per year as well as raising funds for local causes to the value of £12,000. They support the Christmas Day Swim (which raises about £110,000), and were happy to be considered as part of the future of Lowestoft beach, and were looking forward to the fresh start.

There were no questions for the applicant.

The Chair thanked the applicant for all that they do for the town and asked the Committee to debate the application.

Councillor Gee very much supported the extremely worthwhile cause and proposed that the application be accepted, as Ward Councillor, Councillor Pitchers seconded it, and it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That authority to **approve** be granted with conditions subject to no objections being received from the Environment Agency and Costal Management Team, and the conditions set out 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 completed in all respects strictly in accordance with:

- Site Location Plan, 250 P1, received 20/09/2023,
- Proposed Site Plan, 252 P1, received 20/09/2023,
- Proposed Temporary Food Container Elevations, 255 P1, received 20/09/2023,
- Existing and Proposed Temporary Toilet Elevation, 256 P1, received 20/09/2023,
- Existing and Proposed Temporary Toilet Plan, 254 P1, received 20/09/2023,
- Existing and Proposed Temporary Food Container Plan, 253 P1, received 20/09/2023,
- Proposed Temporary Facilities Planning Supporting Statement, P2, received 20/09/2023,
- Flood Risk Assessment Addendum, 218414-MR-00-XX-RP-C-003, received 02/10/2023

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

3. The container on the site will be securely anchored to the ground to ensure that the container will remain in position throughout any flood event.

This anchoring shall be fully implemented prior to first use, and thereafter the building shall remain anchored to the ground as long as it remains in-situ.

Reason: To prevent damage to the surrounding area in the event of a flood.

9 DC/24/1177/FUL - Dip Farm Car Park, Corton Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR32 4PL

Councillor Ashton left the Committee room for this item.

The Committee received report ES/1988 of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/24/1117/FUL.

The application was for planning permission for the siting of a shipping container on Dip Farm car park. The planning permission was sought for a temporary period of 5 years, following which there would be a condition to move the container and restore the land to its current condition.

The application was before the Committee as East Suffolk Council were the land owners.

The Committee received a presentation from the Planner, who was the Case Officer for the application.

The site's location plan and photographs were shared, showing the planned container location and the surrounding site. The planner told the committee that the container was going to be used as workshop and tool storage and a volunteer hut for the friends of Dip Farm. The Committee was informed that Dip Farm was a registered asset of community value, and it was recreational green space that was run entirely by volunteers, the Friends of Dip Farm, and was 8 acres in total.

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

The Chair invited questions from the Committee to the Planner.

There being no questions, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application.

On the proposition of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Pitchers, it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That authority to approve be granted subject to:

Conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be for a maximum period of 5 years from the date of this permission, after which time the shipping container hereby permitted shall be removed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and the land reinstated to its former condition.

Reason: Having regard to the non-permanent nature of the structure. A temporary permission is justified in this particular case, as the site is located in an area of designated countryside, outside a settlement boundary, in which there is a general presumption against development, in a location where the permanent siting of a shipping container would not normally be supported on design grounds.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be completed in all respects strictly in

accordance with Site Plan, Proposed Block Plan and Supporting Statement received by the Local Planning Authority 24 March 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. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application 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.

10 DC/24/0177/FUL - 365 London Road South, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR33 0DY

The Committee received report ES/1991 of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/24/0177/FUL. The application sought planning permission for the installation of a modular access ramp and the associated alterations. The application was before the Committee as East Suffolk Council were the applicants.

The Committee received a presentation from the Trainee Planner, who was the Case Officer for the application.

The site's location plan and photographs were shared along with the proposed block plan, elevations and floor plans.

Photos of four similar modular ramps were shared with the Committee with the Trainee Planner noting that the exact design was to be confirmed, but a condition would be set for it to be in accordance with one of the four designs shown.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Design and conservation area
- Privacy

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

The Chair invited questions from the Committee to the Planner.

In response to a question from Councillor Ashton it was confirmed that the ramp was a temporary structure that could be easily removed should the tenant change.

There being no further questions, the Chair invited the Committee to debate the application.

Councillor Pitchers was the Ward Councillor for the area and recommended approval, Councillor Ashton seconded the proposal and it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

To Approve subject to conditions.

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 completed in all respects strictly in accordance with:

- Site Location Plan; received 17/01/2024,
- Proposed Access Layout; received 12/02/2024,
- Existing Window to Proposed Door Drawing; received 12/02/2024,
- Existing Window and Proposed Window Drawing; received 12/02/2024.

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

11 DC/24/1001/FUL - 32 Mount Pleasant, Halesworth, Suffolk, IP19 8JF

The Committee received report ES/1992 of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Coastal Management which related to planning application DC/24/1001/FUL. The application sought planning permission for a single storey side extension. The application was before the Committee as the property was owned by East Suffolk Council.

The Committee received a presentation from the Trainee Planner, who was the Case Officer for the application. The Trainee Planner told the Committee that the application was for a single storey side extension on the end of a terraced bungalow, and whilst East Suffolk Council were the current owners, the applicant was in the process of purchasing the property from the Council.

The site location plan, proposed block plan and existing and proposed elevations were shared with the Trainee Planner noting that the materials chosen related well to the building and its context.

The new extension was proposed to be used as a kitchen/dining room and the existing building would be knocked through.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Design.
- Impact on light.
- Privacy/overlooking.

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

There being no questions or debate, on the proposition of Councillor Plummer, seconded by Councillor Wakeling it was unanimously

To approve subject to conditions.

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 completed in all respects strictly in accordance with Site and Proposed Block Plan (GDS17233/35), Existing and Proposed Floor Plans (GDS17233/33) and Existing and Proposed Elevations (GDS17233/31); received 18 March 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. 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

12 There are no Exempt or Confidential items for this Agenda.

There are no Exempt or Confidential items for this Agenda.

The meeting concluded at 4:43pm.

.....
Chair