



EAST SUFFOLK COUNCIL

PLANNING ADVISORY PANEL SOUTH – 14 APRIL 2020

DECISIONS BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT

The following decisions have been taken by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management under his delegated authority set out in Appendix 1 of Section E of Part 2 of the East Suffolk Council Constitution:

Application Number: DC/20/0452/VOC

Application Address: Land to the rear of Old Post Office, The Street, Bredfield, IP13 6AX

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

The Advisory Panel noted that the application would have normally been considered by Committee as the applicant worked for East Suffolk Council. Members could see no problem with the scheme and unanimously agreed that permission should be granted.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management accepted the Advisory Panel's view and agreed that the scheme was acceptable.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

Councillor Fryatt declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest as being Ward Member.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/19/5062/FUL

Application Address: Hillbrook, Common Lane, Bromeswell, IP12 2PQ

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

The Advisory Panel noted that the application was for a new outbuilding for commercial use to allow the applicants to work from home. The officer's concerns related to the size and scale of the building and possible impact due to the number of visitors, even though the Parish Council supported the proposal. The Economic Development Team had not objected.

The Advisory Panel unanimously supported the proposed refusal as it considered the building to be too large and would be a use in an inappropriate location. An issue was also raised as to whether the building was against planning policy. The internal layout was not a good use of space to support two businesses and it was difficult to understand the purpose of the front patio area separated from the building by folding doors.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report.

An informative note should be included in the decision for the applicant to contact the Economic Development Team to discuss alternatives.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management noted Members concerns about the possible adverse impact a large number of visitors might have on the area and neighbours. Whilst an appropriate condition could control the opening hours, the number of visitors could not be regulated. The single track roads were also a consideration. The site was near to Melton and Rendlesham where business units were available for this type of use.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management believed the proposal could be supported in the right location; this was an inappropriate location.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/19/3497/FUL

Application Address: Clopton Commercial Park, Debach Airfield, Clopton, IP13 6QT

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Members noted that the proposal was contrary to the site allocation policy but considered the scheme was acceptable as it complied with economic development policies and strategies. A right of way would need to be diverted but that would be dealt with outside the planning process. The proposed B8 use class was for storage and distribution. The local Ward Member explained that the village supported the proposal as beneficial but just not that particular B8 use. He made reference to the previous problems with HGVs.

The Advisory Panel was of the opinion that planning permission should be granted.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions listed in the report.

An informative note should be included on the planning permission to ensure compliance with other regulations including Rights of Way.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management referred to the objection made by Clopton Parish Council to the B8 use and pointed out that the area could currently be used for open storage. The building for B8 use would result in a well-designed building that would tidy the site and could be appropriately controlled with restrictions on operating hours.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management explained that the owner was investing in the site and that would improve the area and provide needed employment opportunities. The proposal could provide the addition of up to 60 full-time jobs. Suffolk County Highways was content with the application. Any new building would need to comply with Building Regulation legislation and that would address any issues that might arise for the less able-bodied including spaces for blue badge holders. In his opinion, the application should be approved.

Should any future issues arise, they would be followed up by the relevant Development Management Team Leader and Enforcement Team.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

Councillor Fryatt declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest as being a Clopton Parish Councillor.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

Councillor Fryatt declared that he had been lobbied as a parish council representative.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/20/0040/FUL

Application Address: 4 Hackney Terrace, Melton, IP12 1NN

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Having considered the report and viewed the officer's presentation, the Advisory Panel Members were of the opinion that the proposed dwelling was overdevelopment of the site on back land. The cramped development was out of character and appeared to create an adverse effect on both road users and parking. Although the new dwelling was being provided with one parking space, No. 4 itself was being left with no off-road parking. The recommendation for refusal was unanimously supported.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be REFUSED for the reasons set out in the report, amended to also refer to the annexe.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management concurred with the views of the Panel. The proposed dwelling would result in an adverse impact on No. 4 and the annexe, if the annexe was retained, and that needed to be reflected in the reasons for refusal.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

Councillor Elliott declared that he had been lobbied by the Ward Member.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/19/4657/FUL

Application Address: 1 Blue Farm Barn, High House Road, Otley, IP6 9PF

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Members noted that the application was to agree change of use from agricultural barn to a residential dwelling with minor alterations including fenestration changes and the installation of a flue. The design was considered acceptable and probably enhanced the appearance. The Advisory Panel unanimously supported the granting of planning permission.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management understood that the Parish Council had no objection to the application. Although the conversion of an agricultural building to C3 dwelling house was contrary to the development plan, the principle had been established through Class Q. The design was acceptable and the proposal was acceptable in planning terms.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/19/4197/FUL

Application Address: Pinetrees, Purdis Farm Lane, Purdis Farm, IP3 8UF

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Members were reminded that a site visit had been undertaken in early March and the report now being considered was for the demolition of the existing building and erection of four dwellings in the form of two pairs of semi-detached three storey properties. The Advisory Panel noted the Corsica pine trees were not in good condition; therefore, there were no significant issues about their loss. The proposed garages could take a vehicle and the Highway Authority had not objected to the car parking arrangements.

The Advisory Panel was of the opinion that the proposal constituted an overdevelopment of the site and was not in keeping with the street scene. Consideration needed to be given to the impact on the adjoining property and the loss of trees which were a very important part of the setting. The whole site looked too cramped. The proposal to have partially obscured glass on the first floor windows to reduce any overlooking was not considered to be acceptable in a property's main living rooms.

The Advisory Panel agreed unanimously that planning permission should not be granted.

Decision Made by the Planning Development Manager:

That the application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- Cramped, overdevelopment of the site and detrimental impact upon street scene/character of the area
- Overlooking and loss of amenity to the neighbour
- Contrived design requiring obscure glazing on rear windows.

Reason for Decision:

The Planning Development Manger agreed that the footprint was too big for the site, such overdevelopment would result in loss of amenity to the immediate neighbour. She supported the views of the Advisory Panel.

The Planning Development Manager believed the site could be developed but with a more suitable scheme which could address the benefits of providing smaller units in the locality. The officers would work with the applicant to review the proposal with a view to finding a more suitable scheme for the site.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management declared a personal/private interest as the site was located near to his residence. He took no part in the discussion or decision on this item which he had delegated to the Planning Development Manager.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Note:

Councillor D McCallum joined the meeting at 11.55am during discussion of this item.

Application Number: DC/20/0745/FUL

Application Address: 14 Carford Close, Martlesham Heath, Martlesham, IP5 3TB

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Members noted that the Parish Council had objected to the proposal and that five representations of objection had also been received. The Advisory Panel was of the opinion that the elevations and design enhanced the appearance and unanimously supported the granting of planning permission.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions listed in the report and the removal of permitted development rights.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management concurred with the view of the Advisory Panel and was of the opinion that the design added to the street scene. The officer had proposed the removal of permitted development rights and that should be supported.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/19/3623/VOC

Application Address: Land West of Ferry Road Residential Centre, Ferry Road, Felixstowe

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Members noted the application was to vary the approved outline plans to make some minimal changes and to ensure the houses for the registered social providers were of a suitable standard.

The Ward Member gave specific details relating to the comments on non-compliance, the harm to neighbours' amenity and the views of Felixstowe Town Council. It was alarming that some windows were being removed in the apartments and that the footprint of some properties needed to be re-sized. The boundary line of some properties was also being moved and that would impact on existing residents. The site was contentious locally; it was felt that the developers were pleasing themselves and consideration should be given to taking the application to Committee.

The Advisory Panel agreed the development seemed to be badly managed and questioned the need to remove windows. The moving of the rear boundary by less than 1m for plots 137 to 148 was acceptable and ensured there was no ransom strip.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management explained to the Advisory Panel that the windows to be removed on the side elevation of the apartments were secondary windows in kitchens. In his opinion, moving the fence onto the common boundary was not unacceptable. The minor relocation/re-siting of affordable units was acceptable having carefully noted the plans in the presentation.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised that, as the planning authority, the Council had to determine the application on its planning merits whilst still being sympathetic to the Town Council and residents. He noted the demand for affordable units was such that concerns would be raised if the provision was delayed. It was disappointing that the developer had not been previously aware of the size

and amenity requirements and the registered social provider had not realised earlier of the need for minor changes nor communicated that with the Council.

Looking at the application on planning grounds and any material harm that might arise, there was nothing substantive to warrant refusal. The Head of Planning and Coastal Management advised that he had no alternative but to support the recommendation for approval.

It was agreed to learn from this application, in that developers and affordable housing providers should look at what was actually needed before putting in applications.

As and when reasonably possible, the Head of Planning and Coastal Management agreed to convene a meeting with the developer, Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee South, and Councillor Deacon as Ward Member, to discuss the development.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

Councillor Deacon declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest as being a member of Felixstowe Town Council.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/20/0432/VOC

Application Address: Mickey's Field, School Road, Waldringham

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Members noted the proposed variation to conditions covered various changes which the Parish Council had objected to. They noted that the changes were to the rear only and the extension on the rear of the property would be acceptable under permitted development if the house had already been built. Having considered the officer's presentation, and the inclusion of a privacy screen for the ground floor, the Advisory Panel unanimously supported the recommendation to grant planning permission.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions listed in the report and the inclusion and retention of the privacy screen.

Reason for Decision:

Having considered the details in the report and presentation, the Head of Planning and

Coastal Management concurred with the Advisory Panel that the variation application should be approved.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.

Application Number: DC/18/4196/FUL

Application Address: Bawdsey Radar Trust Transmitter Block, Bawdsey Manor Estate, Bawdsey, IP12 3BA

Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:

Members noted the purpose of the 24m mast was to improve internet connectivity, the height of which would maintain line of sight so that signals could transmit. The positioning and design of the mast had been fully discussed and the Advisory Panel welcomed the proposal for a lattice tower mast as it was less obtrusive on the landscape. It was appreciated that there would be some impact on the houses in the vicinity but, overall, the mast would be beneficial for the residents and the local community in general. The benefits of the internet had been proven and were a necessity in the current Covid 19 lockdown.

The Advisory Panel agreed planning permission should be granted.

Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Reason for Decision:

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management agreed with the Advisory Panel's unanimous view to support the recommendation in the report. Whilst mindful of the objection from Historic England, the wider public benefits justified approval and outweighed the limited harm to the nearby listed building.

Any Declarations of Interest declared:

None.

Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:

None.

Any Dispensation Granted:

None.