



**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE - UPDATE SHEET**

**13 October 2020**

**Item 7 – DC/19/3914/FUL – Alterations to and change of use of business units to create 5 no. residential dwellings for over 55s at Miles Ward Court, Halesworth IP16 8AY**

10 The following additional condition is proposed

11 Before the development is brought into use the secure covered cycle storage shall be provided in its entirety and shall be retained thereafter and used for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision and long term maintenance of secure covered cycle storage in accordance with the Suffolk Guidance for Parking (2019) requirement that sites with a relaxation in quantity of car parking provision should be designed to be exceptionally sustainable.

**Item 9 – DC/20/1912/FUL– Change of use and conversion of Wainford House, a class C2 care home, to nine C3 residential flats at 3 Saltgate, Beccles NR34 9AN**

3.1 This will comprise of five no. one bedroom flats, and four no. two bedroom flats.

**Item 11 – DC/20/1352/FUL – Redevelopment and extension of the former Royal Court Hotel to provide a café (A3) at ground level and 16 residential flats at Royal Court Hotel, Lowestoft NR33 0AZ**

5 Additional Consultations

Ward Member, Cllr Peter Byatt:

“I have looked at the above Planning Application and whilst generally in favour of the development of what has become an eye-sore in Kirkley over the years, I make the following comments:

I am pleased to note that Suffolk Highways have included a number of conditions

---

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT  
DX: 41400 Woodbridge

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ  
DX: 41220 Lowestoft

I am concerned that the one-bedroom flats are at the absolute minimum size at 37 metres, which, as far I am aware, is also the figure for single, not double occupancy as stated in the Plans.

Comments have been made by some that this should be returned to being an hotel. This was not the original purpose of this building, and never was particularly successfully as an hotel.

Also I recognise the positive comments about the building being within the South Lowestoft Conservation Area, and sympathetic renovation.

Questions:

Can the first floor be re-configured to reduce the number of flats to increase square-metreage of single-bedroom units?

Will this building definitely be Secure by Design, as advised by Suffolk Police?

Is another Café necessary, as the area is well-served with food outlets.

Will the cycle-store include charging points?

There is no lift as far as I can see in the plans, so will there be adequate access for any Disabled residents on the Ground Floor?

Will consideration be given to solar panels on the roof?

Unless I have missed it, where will waste bins be stored?...

On both Projects I am generally in favour."

Comments from Ward Member, Cllr Louise Gooch:

"I am just writing to concur with Peter's comments below in relations to the application for the former Royal Court Hotel in Kirkley.

Peter and I discussed the application when first submitted. My, and I believe Peter's, main concern was in terms of the density of occupation, the lack of space and the fear that should the project fail in any way, we would be stuck with a building that had been adapted but had very limited appeal in terms of potential for further use.

As Peter says below, if further enlargement of square meterage could be encouraged so that residents have more than adequate personal space, this would make the development more attractive still. As you will know, there is a lot of research at the moment into the damaging psychological effects of living in cramped conditions with little storage, and we don't want to add to the stock here.

I agree with all of Peter's comments below (especially the risk of the saturation of cafes in this area; the importance of solar panel investigation; the access for disabled residents; and the ease of bicycle storage).

Generally, though, I am in favour of the development and look forward to seeing the building being brought back to life in the community, especially given its prominent position on the main street.

I am sorry that day-time work commitment will prevent my attendance at the meeting itself."

## 8 Planning Considerations

In reviewing the published Committee Report, officers consider that further information on Highways/Parking matters may be of benefit to members when considering the proposals.

Suffolk County Highways Authority objected to the initial application submission (for 29 flats) due to the lack of parking provision on-site. The amended proposals now include eight car parking spaces to the rear of the site (a level of 0.5 spaces per residential unit). The proposal includes provision for the secure storage of 22 bicycles; although, further indicative details of cycle storage have been provided to show stacked storage could provide for up to 40 bicycles. The Highways Authority has removed their objection to the application on the basis that conditions be applied to any permission granted, to secure details of the cycle storage facilities, and electric charging infrastructure to the new vehicle parking spaces. Officers agree with this and the recommended condition four covers these matters as a pre-commencement condition.

The site is sustainably located and there are large public car parks in the area that could also be utilised by residents and visitors to the site. With the recommended condition, the proposed development would be acceptable in highways safety and transport terms, in accordance with policy WLP8.21 (Sustainable Transport) of the Local Plan.

### **Item 13 – DC/20/2249/FUL– Extension of existing outbuilding to form dwelling at Orchard Barn, The Street, Somerleyton NR32 5QB**

#### 4.1 Additional representations

Two representations have been received, following publication of the report, raising the following additional points:

- Does not take account of SCC Highways recommendation of refusal.
- The site is not one of the two approved development sites contained in the East Suffolk Council Waveney Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan for Lound, Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton.
- The existing building is for stable use only, not domestic.
- The bulk of the land was retained by the Applicants and Crown House was sold in August 2005. The Stables Building was built according to the Design and Access Statement in 2007. Crown House was again sold in 2008 to the present occupiers.

- No mention of Neighbourhood Plan for Lound, Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton.
- Proposal does not provide safe access for property as its more than 40m from highway
- The gable of the existing building is located approximately 10m from the nearest adjoining property boundary.
- Increase in noise compared to existing use, and proposal will adversely impact on amenity.
- Proposed red line is incorrect.

#### Officer Response to Comments

Somerleyton has two allocated sites in the Local Plan:

- Policy WLP7.5 – Land North of The Street, Somerleyton – Approximately 10 dwellings
- Policy WLP7.6 – Mill Farm Field, Somerleyton – Approximately 35 dwellings

New dwellings can be supported outside of allocated sites if they are compliant with national and local planning policy. In this instance, the proposal is a windfall site, and is considered by officers to be compliant with policy. In addition, the Neighbourhood Plan for Lound, Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton is at an early stage and therefore cannot be given significant weight

Paragraph 7.7 of the committee report sets out that the proposed extension is located approximately 30m from the nearest residential dwelling. For clarification, the proposed extension is located approximately 5m from the nearest neighbouring boundary to the north, and the existing building is located approximately 6m from the nearest boundary to the east, and approximately 18m to the nearest dwelling to the east.

10 The following condition is recommended

- 8 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification), no building, structure or alteration permitted by Classes A (extensions or alterations), B (additions to the roof), C (other alterations to roof) or E (buildings or enclosures within the curtilage of the house) of Schedule 2 Part 1, and Classes A and B (Solar equipment) of Schedule 2 Part 14 of the Order shall be erected without the submission of a formal planning application and the granting of planning permission by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure a properly planned development, protect the setting of the Conservation Area and protect the amenity of neighbouring residents.

#### **Item 15 - DC/20/3084/FUL – Construction of 1 no single storey dwelling and domestic store and rearrangement of parking facilities at 24 St. Marys Street, Bungay NR34 1AX**

The applicant's agent sought (on the 12 October 2020) to provide amended plans by email the day before the committee which seek to address the concerns of Officers and SCC Highways Authority.

These amendments cannot be accepted at this stage and would need to be submitted as part of a fresh application.

**Item 16 – DC/20/3175/FUL – Works include internal strip out/reconfiguration of interiors, insertion of sliding folding doors, infill extensions, new door to PC block, proposed louvres and vents and proposed signage at East Point Pavilion, Lowestoft NR33 0AP**

4 Additional Consultations

Comments from Ward Member, Cllr Peter Byatt:

“The minor renovations will definitely enhance the Pavilion, and will ensure that it has future for a number of years to come as an iconic local building.

I have written separately to Kathryn Hurlock regarding the proposed colour scheme and offered my view on using a more traditional palette ie deck chair stripes.

I am looking forward to the remainder of the works which will hopefully include a Changing Places W.C.

On both Projects I am generally in favour.”