

Confirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee North** held in the Conference Room,
Riverside, on **Tuesday, 08 August 2023 at 2:00 PM**

Members of the Committee present:

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

Other Members present:

Councillor David Beavan, Councillor Peter Byatt, Councillor Alan Green

Officers present:

Joe Blackmore (Principal Planner), Sarah Davis (Democratic Services Officer), Matthew Gee (Senior Planner), Mia Glass (Enforcement Planner), Nick Khan (Strategic Director), Iain Robertson (Senior Planner), Alli Stone (Democratic Services Manager), Ben Woolnough (Development Management - Major Sites and Infrastructure)

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were no Apologies for Absence.

2 Declarations of Interest

There were no Declarations of Interest.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

Councillors Ashdown, Pitchers, Ashton, Gee, Ewart, Wakeling, Plummer and Ewart declared they had been lobbied regarding item 6 but had not responded.

4 Minutes

On the proposal of Councillor Hammond, seconded by Councillor Ashdown it was

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2023 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report ES/1618 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 13 July 2023. At that time there were 19 such cases.

The Chair invited the Enforcement Planner to comment on the report. The Enforcement Planner noted that in respect of case D.1 this was heard in court on the 31 July and the defendant had been ordered to pay £5,134.78. The case remained open until the land was returned to its former state. Regarding case E.1 this was largely resolved, some small areas of planting were still required.

There being no questions it was

RESOLVED

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 13 July 2023 be noted.

6 DC/22/2520/FUL - Pakefield Caravan Park, Arbor Lane, Lowestoft, NR33 7BE

The Committee received report **ES/1619** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/22/2520/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the extension of Pakefield Holiday Park to provide for the following development on land to the west of the park:

1. A new and improved access and main site entrance off the A12
2. New entrance buildings and clubhouse facility
3. The siting of additional static holiday caravans, involving the rollback of existing static caravans away from the coast
4. Environmental improvements and landscaping throughout

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planner, who was the case officer for the application.

The site location was outlined in relation to the current holiday park. The Senior Planner also shared aerial photographs and 3D models of the site and photographs through the site showing the existing agricultural buildings, which would be removed, and the site boundaries.

The Senior Planner shared photographs showing the current entrance to the site and the proposed entrance to the site. The proposed access arrangements including new signage were displayed. The Senior Planner explained that the new entrance and exit

would be left turn only, and displayed the proposed block plan showing access barriers on the site.

The proposed elevations, floor plans and models of the new club house were displayed. The Senior Planner stated that this had been designed to be a similar size to the existing agricultural buildings on the site. Indicative drawings of the new caravans which would be used on the site were displayed, the Senior Planner stated that a limited colour palette would be used for the new caravans. The proposed landscaping and an illustrative masterplan were also displayed.

The Senior Planner shared aerial photographs showing coastal erosion on the site since 1999 and a plan of the coastal change management area. It was estimated that twenty three pitches had been lost on the site due to coastal erosion. The extension of the site would allow for rollback of the coast in this area.

The proposed links to public footpaths in the area were shared.

The Senior Planner summarised the material planning considerations and key issues as:

- Policy and Legislative Background
- Principle of Development
- Holiday Occupation and Restrictions
- Landscape and Visual Impact
- Highways and Transport
- Economic Considerations
- Amenity Impacts
- Ecology and Biodiversity
- Coastal Change Management and Re-location of Development Affected by Coastal Erosion
- Sustainability
- Heritage Assets
- Other Matters

The recommendation to approve the application, subject to the conditions set out in the report was outlined to the Committee.

Members raised questions relating to;

- Planting and landscaping
- The rate of coastal erosion
- The proposed site entrance and options for physical barriers preventing right turns
- Mitigation measures for neighbours during construction
- Site density
- Noise from the clubhouse

Regarding planting, officers confirmed that a detailed planting plan including species had not yet been confirmed. Landscaping was generally required to be made up of native species and so it was likely planting would be more deciduous. Officers confirmed the Council's ecologist considered impact to be suitable.

Officers confirmed this part of the coast was managed by Coastal Partnership East with support from East Suffolk Council and others in the area. Officers shared photographs

of the site showing coastal erosion since 1999 to demonstrate the rate of erosion in the area.

Officers stated that the proposed entrance system had been considered by Suffolk County Council Highways Department and was considered a good option for entrance and exit from the site. Officers explained that highways did not dictate the solution and road layout, but that they ensured the solution that had been put forward was safe and sensible. As they had no objected, it was reasonable to assume that there was no issue with this proposal. The Planning Development Manager reminded the Committee that a proposal had been put forward and they were to judge this on its own merits not against any alternatives.

Regarding mitigation measures for neighbouring properties, officers confirmed there was no requirement to protect views. There was a construction management plan in place which included measures to protect against interruption from the construction of the site.

Officers confirmed a noise assessment had been completed and noise levels were considered appropriate. The clubhouse was approximately 32 metres from the rear boundary of properties on Jubilee Road. The outside area of the clubhouse was designated for dining, and the existing clubhouse on the old site would be removed.

Regarding caravan density, officers confirmed that this was set by a licence and there was a standard model setting the density of sites and so it was reasonable to assume the density would be similar to the existing site.

The Chair invited Mrs Batley, representing objectors to address the Committee.

Mrs Batley summarised the main objections of the neighbours on Jubilee Road. This area was rich in wildlife and protected species, crossed by the national coastal footpath and had the potential to be a great asset to the area as a nature reserve. Traffic on the A12 was already heavy, the area was an accident blackspot and a child had been killed here. Large caravans, transporters and holiday traffic negotiating the two roundabouts would only add to the danger and congestion, and previous applications had been refused. Noise across the site would be considerable from entertainment, holiday makers and traffic around the site, and noise from the nearby Pontins site could clearly be heard.

Mrs Batley stated that drainage and flooding was also a great concerns. Flash storm flooding caused by runoff from rooves was an issue due to the clay soil in the area which was no easily permeable. Subsidence was also a risk on this type of soil, and Mrs Batley stated that having a large amount of heavy machinery moving around the site was a great concern and neighbours needed reassurance about the stability of the site. Adding further accommodation would also stretch the areas emergency services even further.

Mr Batley stated that residents would face loss of light, security and privacy. Some properties were at a lower ground level than the site, and so the loss of light would be even worse in these properties. Security was also a concern due to recent crimes in the area, and the turnover of strangers at the site could increase crime levels.

Property values would also decrease. A clubhouse, swimming pool and caravans were planned against properties with no buffer zone between properties and the site, and Mrs Batley encouraged the Committee to view the site to understand this.

Mrs Batley stated that approving this site would create a precedent and allow for development all the way along the A12 to Kessingland, ruining an area of high landscape value which was an asset to residents and visitors.

There were no questions from members. The Chair invited Mr Jones, representing the applicant, to address the Committee.

Mr Jones stated that the planning application covered two aspects, the extension of the park and a new entrance on to the A12. Coastal erosion had resulted in the loss of twenty three pitches in the last three years and it was estimated that an additional twenty five to thirty would be lost over the next three years. This application would secure the future of the park and the employment of thirty five staff.

Mr Jones stated that the current access arrangements brought traffic through a residential area which was a regular cause on conflict with residents, particularly in busy periods when caravans were being delivered. All traffic would instead be directed to a dedicated entrance, removing traffic through a residential area.

Mr Jones stated that the additional pitches would replace the pitches that had been lost and as the applicant had improved the park following their purchase in 2019, and reduced the number of pitches on the older area of the park, the number of pitches would stay the same and within the park licence. It was anticipated that an additional eighteen people would be employed when the park was completed, and the park would contribute over £1.5million to the local area each year. A pre application and public consultation had been held and was well attended.

Mr Jones stated that the application represented a significant investment of over £10million into Pakefield by Park Holidays, and that they were committed to improving the site and facilities.

Members raised questions around

- Control of the entry and exit
- The location of the clubhouse on the site
- Terms of licences for caravan owners
- The boundary with Jubilee Way
- Coastal erosion

Regarding options for the entrance to the site, Mr Jones stated that clear signage would be put in place. Options for a hard barrier had been discussed but were not considered appropriate.

Mr Jones stated that the clubhouse was located reasonably central on the new site as it was replacing a facility that was centrally located. Different options had been considered but this location was felt to be most appropriate and no issues with the

position had been raised during public consultation. Officers added that there was an existing feature on the south of the site that was being retained and limited options.

Regarding terms and licences for caravans, Mr Jones stated that the maximum age for a caravan on the site was twenty years. Holiday makers were not allowed to live on the site permanently, and there were conditions in leases which prevented this. Mr Jones confirmed that residents owned their caravans and occupied a plot which was leased to them. For those that had lost their plot to erosion, they would be offered a plot on the new site depending on their lease.

Regarding the sites boundary with properties on Jubilee Way, Mr Jones stated that mitigation measures were felt to be sufficient. The ditch on this boundary would be cleared and reinstated. Any concerns about ownership of this boundary would be resolved separately, although the ownership of the land had been confirmed as part of the planning application.

Mr Jones stated that Park Holidays were a stakeholder with the Coastal Steering Group and were contributing to discussions about erosion in this area. At present they had not been asked to contribute to any defences but they were working with the group for solutions. Mr Jones also confirmed there was access to the beach from the site.

The Chair invited Councillor Byatt to address the Committee as ward member.

Councillor Byatt stated that he lived near the caravan park. He was pleased to see the thoroughness with which the Committee were considering this application. Councillor Byatt stated that he welcomed the new entrance to the site and asked if this would be installed first so the rest of the construction traffic could use it to access the new part of the site. The removal of large vehicles and holiday traffic from a residential area was welcome, as was the investment in the site, the improvement in infrastructure, and the increase in jobs which would come with the expansion of the site. Councillor Byatt in particular noted the provision of air source heat pumps and asked if these would replace the use of bottled gas on the site.

Councillor Byatt noted that there had been twenty four expressions of support for the site, and sixty objectors. It was difficult as ward Councillor to balance these opinions within one community.

Councillor Byatt summarised his objections to the site, namely the closeness of the new caravan plots to existing residents, and Councillor Byatt demonstrated the closeness of the plots to the boundary. Although screening planting was planned this would take time to mature and for privacy to be restored. Properties on Jubilee Road, which was closest to the site, were south facing and it was reasonable to assume that there would be a loss of light. Multiple new sources of noise would also be introduced to the area, and again it would take time for planting to mature to dampen this sound.

Councillor Byatt stated that the greatest visual impact would be felt by residents on Jubilee Road. The build phase would take place in the closed winter season, however Councillor Byatt noted that there was no defined closed season for the site. The site also had a different ground level to properties on Jubilee Road and the topography varied across the site, meaning some caravans would look over and into

the gardens of neighbours and little consideration had been given to fencing to provide further privacy. Councillor Byatt noted that the exact location of caravans was not dictated by planning and stated that the caravans could be moved around to provide more privacy.

Councillor Byatt summarised that this was a large application that would benefit some residents and not others, and asked that the Committee view the site in person to ensure they fully understood the impact it would have. Councillor Byatt stated he believed there was more that could be done to mitigate the impact of the development for neighbouring properties regarding noise and loss of privacy.

Members raised questions regarding traffic management on the site. Councillor Byatt stated that he would like to see a physical barrier to prevent right hand turns rather than just signage. However removing traffic from the residential parts of Pakefield would be incredibly beneficial, and that there was no merit to keeping the existing entrance even for limited access. Movement around the site certainly needed to be looked at, as did the entrance, but his main concern was mitigation for noise and loss of privacy.

Councillor Ashdown stated that having heard the presentation and representation from residents, it was clear that the new access seemed sensible but there were still concerns regarding mitigation measures. Councillor Ashdown proposed that a site visit take place and the application be deferred.

This proposal was seconded by Councillor Pitchers.

Councillor Ashton stated he agreed with comments from Councillor Byatt. Jobs and the protection of the site from coastal erosion in the shorter term was welcome, as was the moving of the access road which would improve the movement of traffic through a residential area. Councillor Ashton stated he was concerned about the mitigation against noise and he did not feel this was currently sufficient to approve the application.

Councillor Ewart commented that she would like the site owners to consider moving the clubhouse to and that she would welcome being able to visit the site to understand concerns. Officers stated that moving the clubhouse could be considered as a comment for the applicant and it would be up to them to consider this.

Councillor Pitchers asked if Suffolk County Council Highways could engage with the applicant on a physical barrier to the site. Officers confirmed this was not up to highways to enforce, but that it could be passed on as a comment. Suffolk Highways were the experts in this area and might have considered a barrier detrimental to road safety in other respects.

Councillor Hammond commented that he would like to see a bigger buffer strip between the site and Jubilee Road and he encouraged the applicant to consider this.

Clerks note: the meeting was adjourned at 15.37pm to allow members of the public to leave the meeting.

Following the adjournment the Planning Development Manager summarised the process for a site visit and stated that members of the public would be allowed to observe this but not engage. Committee members would use this as an opportunity to understand the facts of the site and no discussion or deliberation would take place.

The Democratic Services Officer confirmed the process for registering to speak at a Planning Committee Meeting and stated that three minutes was allocated for objectors, town councillors and applicants regardless of how many people had registered to speak in these roles to ensure a fair hearing.

By a unanimous vote it was

RESOLVED

That the application be **DEFERRED** to enable the Committee to visit the application site.

Officers advised that a site visit would be arranged and that details would be circulated to members of the Committee in due course.

7 DC/23/0701/FUL - Holly House, 80 Pier Avenue, Southwold, IP18 6BL

Clerks note: the meeting was adjourned from 3.45 to 3.55pm

The Committee considered report ES/1620 of Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/23/0701/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the demolition of the existing single storey side and rear extensions and the erection of new single storey side and rear extensions, and a new dormer window to the attic storey on the north elevation. The proposal also involved the provision of a raised veranda to rear of the lounge and dining room. The proposal had been amended since the original submission following officer feedback. The referral panel had referred the application to the Committee as the Officer recommendation to approve was contrary to the objection received from Southwold Town Council.

The Committee received a presentation from the Principal Planner. The Committee viewed the proposed site and block plan, contemporary photographs showing the current single story side and rear extensions, the property and its surrounds. Existing and proposed elevations and floorplans were shared along with plans showing the current elevations compared to the proposed elevations.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Design
- Residential Amenity

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

Members raised questions relating to:

- the age of the structures that would be demolished
- views from the new rear dormer window and options for screening

The Principal Planner stated that the existing structures that would be demolished were likely part of the original building, and that the concerns from Southwold Town Council did relate to these structures being part of the fabric of the building. Regarding the rear dormer and views to neighbouring properties officers stated that any conditions relating to obscured glass or protection/retention of existing screening plants would not be considered reasonable as the window was thirty five metres from the building it overlooked - which was over the twenty one metres minimum distance in planning guidance. Officers stated it was within the Committee's gift to add conditions, but they had to be satisfied they were reasonable and met all the tests.

The Chair invited Mrs Thompson Hart to speak in objection to the proposal. Mrs Thompson Hart stated she was speaking on behalf of her parents whose home neighboured the application site to the rear. They strongly objected to the proposed dormer window and veranda which would overlook their property and encroach on their privacy.

Mrs Thompson Hart stated that although their property had a reasonable size garden to the rear, any activity in outside areas would now be overlooked. Regarding the dormer window there would be no particular view from this apart from of neighbours, and so a Velux window would be more appropriate and still provide natural light. All the neighbours at the rear of the property, who lived in the area permanently, had objected because they felt they would be overlooked and lose their privacy. Those who had not objected lived at the front of the property and would not be impacted by any development at the rear. This issue was made worse as trees in the applicants garden which provided screening had been removed.

Mrs Thompson Hart also stated that her parents had only been informed of the Planning Committee meeting by Southwold Town Council and otherwise their objections would not have been heard.

There were no questions to Mrs Thompson Hart. The Chair invited Councillor Goldsmith to address the Committee on behalf of Southwold Town Council.

Councillor Goldsmith stated that this was outside of the conservation area as it currently existed but that there was now a consultation to include it in the area. The houses in this area had been built in the Arts and Crafts style and the single storey extension was an essential part of the style of the property.

Councillor Goldsmith stated that in relation to privacy concerns, an outdoor fitness studio had been constructed in the back garden which already interrupted the privacy of the neighbours. The applicants statement that the trees to the rear of the property would provide screening was incorrect as these trees were deciduous and so did not provide screening for a large part of the year. The applicants could see into the houses of neighbours and so it was logical to assume that the building of a veranda this would be exacerbated.

Councillor Goldsmith stated that Southwold Town Council stood by their objections under policy SWD6 of the Southwold Neighbourhood Plan.

Following a question from the committee Councillor Goldsmith confirmed that the Southwold Neighbourhood Plan was called upon frequently, and that many properties in the area had similar structures and gardens.

The Chair invited Mr Vaughan, representing the applicant, to address the committee. Mr Vaughan stated he wished to respond to some of the issues raised by previous speakers. Regarding the fitness studio this had been granted permission previously, and was not included on the plans as it was a temporary structure that had been built after this application had been submitted.

Mr Vaughan noted there was an existing terrace at the rear of the property which would be replaced in the proposed design. It was common for modern extensions such as this to work so that people could move directly from their homes to a terrace without going down stairs, and as the rear of the house was raised so was the terrace. Southwold Town Council referred to the side extension as a modern structure, and plans had been amended following comments from the conservation officer so that this extension was more fitting with the Arts and Crafts design of the building.

The Committee asked questions regarding the style and materials of the veranda and the decision to construct a dormer window.

Mr Vaughan stated that the veranda would be constructed from glass, the option for obscured glass would only obscure views of the property's own garden. It had been designed to look modern to fit in with other modern extensions to the rear of the house and in contrast with the Arts and Crafts style at the front.

Regarding the window, Mr Vaughan stated that a similar property on the same road had a dormer window which had been granted planning permission without any objections. The first floor windows had the same view and overlooked other properties, as this was a built up area all properties were overlooked in some way.

The Chair invited Councillor Beavan to speak as the ward member.

Councillor Beavan stated that the height of the platform at the rear of the property was 1.2 metres and the fact that this was being extended further into the garden meant neighbours would be overlooked. This was quite an important historic building for the town and therefore the application was of interest to the town council.

Although the amended plan was welcome, Councillor Beavan stated the main concern was the overdevelopment of the garden which was still an issue. This was an issue across the area and houses were no longer residential in nature but being planned to fit as many people as possible. Councillor Beavan stated he would like to see this limited and towns preserved for residents.

Responding to a question, Councillor Beavan stated that the application should be rejected and the applicants asked to adjust their plans following discussion with neighbours.

Councillor Gee stated that this was an unsympathetic construction on an important building. The construction would increase the bulk of the building from the original, and buildings should be protected in their original form as much as possible. It was clear that it was planned that this should be part of the conservation area, and if this was already in place this would not be appropriate development.

Councillor Ewart stated that contemporary work on older buildings could be appropriate, but that in this case the whole area had a certain look and this work would disrupt this.

Councillor Ashdown stated that the change in design would change the look of the building but not necessarily make the building overpowering. It was noted that the building sloped down at the rear which was the reason for the height of the veranda.

Officers stated that non-designated heritage assets were identified, and this property had not been identified as such and was not within a conservation area although it was in an arts and crafts style of some historic value. The Principal Planner shared comments from the Conservation Officer stating that the use of modern materials was considered appropriate in this situation as it created a contemporary contrast to the front of the building as the whole of the rear was modern. The front elevation and height of the roof ensured that the extension remained subservient to the main building.

Councillor Hammond stated he had sympathy with trying to unify the modern rear extensions to make them practical for living. However he recognised the comments from neighbours on the prospect of being overlooked.

Councillor Ashton noted the same dormer window on the rear of another house, and therefore saw no reason to object. In terms of the revised design to the side and rear, the Conservation Officer was content and this had to be taken into account. Building and extending houses did have an impact but he saw no reason not to approve this application.

Officers shared plans of the neighbouring house with a similar dormer window which had been referred to by Councillor Ashton.

Councillor Ewart asked officers to confirm what options there were should this be refused. Officers confirmed that the committee had received a scheme and were asked to determine it based on this scheme, rather than an idea of an alternative design. When members came to a different view to officers they had to ensure they had a sound reason based on policy for this.

Councillor Plummer asked if it was reasonable for a condition be put in to protect the trees to prevent views being further opened up. Officers stated that planning conditions should not be used to retain existing planting, but conditions on planting

could be considered. If the area did end up falling in a conservation area then the council would need to be notified of any work to trees.

On the proposal of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Wakeling it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

Approve.

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 accordance with the following approved plans/drawings: Site Plan, Block Plan received 22 February 2023 and drawing nos. 013, 014, 015 and 016 received 23/5/2023.

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 approved plans unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

8 DC/22/3700/FUL - The Old School, Toad Row, Henstead, Beccles, NR34 7LG

The Committee considered report **ES/1621** of Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/22/3700/FUL.

The application sought full planning permission for the construction of a new dwelling adjacent to Old School House, accessed from Toad Row, Henstead. The proposal had been amended during the application process from the original proposal which proposed access from Benacre Road; the proposed dwelling had also been reduced in scale.

The application had been referred to the committee as the applicant is a member of East Suffolk Council Staff.

The Committee received a presentation from the Senior Planner, who was the case officer for the application. The site location was outlined, an aerial photograph was displayed along with photographs showing views through the property. The original and revised site plans and elevations were shown. The application was recommended for approval of planning permission.

The material planning considerations and key issues were summarised as:

- Principle of Development

- Highway safety
- Design/Character and appearance of the area
- Neighbour Amenity

The committee asked officers to confirm whether there had been any objections to the application. The Senior Planner confirmed there had been two objections relating to the previous entry onto Benacre Road. This had now been moved to Toad Row but objections had still been raised about conflict with the entrance to the village school on the same road. It was felt that this entrance onto Toad Row was the safer option.

Councillor Ashton stated that he supported the amended application and proposed that it be approved. Councillor Ashdown seconded the proposal.

By a unanimous vote it was

RESOLVED

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 Drawing Nos. AB100a, AB103d; Received 14 March 2023 and Drawing No. AB102g; Received 30 March 2023 and AB101s; Received 19 June 2023, 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. Details of all external facing and roofing materials shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before development commences on the dwelling. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory external appearance of the development.

4. Before the access is first used visibility splays shall be provided as shown on Drawing No. AB101r with an X dimension of 2 metres and a Y dimension of 21 metres in the West direction and 32 metres in the East direction to the nearside edge of the carriageway and thereafter retained in the specified form. Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 2 Class A of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no obstruction to visibility shall be erected, constructed, planted or permitted to grow over 0.6 metres high within the areas of the visibility splays.

Reason: To ensure drivers of vehicles entering the highway have sufficient visibility to manoeuvre safely including giving way to approaching users of the highway without them having to take avoiding action and to ensure drivers of vehicles on the public highway have sufficient warning of a vehicle emerging in order to take avoiding action, if necessary.

5. No other part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until the new access has been laid out and completed in all respects in accordance with Suffolk County Council's standard access drawing DM01 with an entrance width of 4.5 metres for a shared access. Thereafter it shall be retained in its approved form.

Reason: To ensure the access is laid out and completed to an acceptable design in the interests of the safety of persons using the access and users of the highway. This needs to be a pre-commencement condition because access for general construction traffic is not otherwise achievable safely.

6. The use shall not commence until the infrastructure within the site shown on Drawing No. AB101s for the purposes of preventing surface water falling onto the highway and it being discharged appropriately within the site has been provided and thereafter the infrastructure shall be retained, maintained, and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To prevent hazards caused by flowing water or ice on the highway.

7. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site shown on Drawing No. AB101s 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.

8. Before the development is commenced, details of secure, lit and covered cycle storage and electric vehicle charging infrastructure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision of cycle storage and charging infrastructure for electric vehicles in accordance with Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019).

Note: As per Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019), ducting and a suitable consumer unit to allow for the installation of one EV charging unit should be provided per Class C3 dwelling.

9. Before the development is occupied details of the areas to be provided for the storage and presentation for collection/emptying of refuse and recycling bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved

scheme shall be carried out in its entirety before the development is brought into use and shall be retained thereafter for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that space is provided for refuse and recycling bins to be stored and presented for emptying and left by operatives after emptying clear of the highway and access to avoid causing obstruction and dangers for the public using the highway.

10. No development shall take place until the existing trees on site, agreed with the Local Planning Authority for inclusion in the scheme of landscaping, have been protected by the erection of temporary protective fences of a height, size and in positions which shall previously have been agreed, in writing, with the Local Planning Authority. The protective fences shall be retained throughout the duration of building and engineering works in the vicinity of the tree to be protected. Any trees dying or becoming severely damaged as a result of any failure to comply with these requirements shall be replaced with trees of appropriate size and species during the first planting season, or in accordance with such other arrangement as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, following the death of, or severe damage to the trees.

Reason: For the avoidance of damage to protected trees included within the landscaping scheme in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

11. No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs, brambles, ivy and other climbing plants shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation should be submitted to the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that nesting birds are protected.

12. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

13. Prior to occupation, evidence of how the required water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day will be achieved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason To ensure that the finished dwelling(s) comply with Policy WLP8.28 of the East Suffolk Council - Waveney Local Plan (2019) (delete as appropriate), and to ensure Building Control Officers and Independent Building Inspectors are aware of the water efficiency standard for the dwelling(s).

14 Prior to first occupation the bathroom window on the eastern elevation at first floor level shall be glazed with obscure glass, and shall be retained in that condition, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To preserve the amenity of adjacent property.

Informatives:

1. It is an OFFENCE to carry out works within the public highway, which includes a Public Right of Way, without the permission of the Highway Authority.

Any conditions which involve work within the limits of the public highway do not give the applicant permission to carry them out. Unless otherwise agreed in writing all works within the public highway shall be carried out by Suffolk County Council or its agents at the applicant's expense.

Suffolk County Council must be contacted on Tel: 0345 606 6171.

For further information, go to: <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/parking/apply-and-pay-for-a-dropped-kerb/>

or;

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/application-for-works-licence/>

Suffolk County Council drawings DM01 - DM14 are available from:

<https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/planning-waste-and-environment/planning-and-development-advice/standarddrawings/>

A fee is payable to the Highway Authority for the assessment and inspection of both new vehicular crossing access works and improvements deemed necessary to existing vehicular crossings due to proposed development.

2. 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.

3. The applicant is advised that the proposed development may require the naming of new street(s) and numbering of properties/businesses within those streets and/or the numbering of new properties/businesses within an existing street. This is only required with the creation of a new dwelling or business premises. For details of the address charges please see our website www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/planning/street-naming-and-numbering or email llpg@eastsuffolk.gov.uk

The meeting concluded at 5.07pm.

.....
Chair