

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee North** held in the Conference Room, Riverside, on **Tuesday, 20 January 2026 at 2pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Paul Ashton, Councillor David Beavan, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Toby Hammond, Councillor Graham Parker, Councillor Sarah Plummer, Councillor Geoff Wakeling

Other Members present:

Councillor Peter Byatt

Officers present: Pip Alder (Democratic Services Officer), Joe Blackmore (Planning Manager (Development Management)), Hannah Lence (Assistant Planning Officer/Planner (Career Grade)), Steve Milligan (Principal Planner (Development Management)), Agnes Ogundiran (Conservative Political Group Support Officer), Katherine Rawlins (Planner), Ben Woolnough (Head of Planning and Building Control)

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Pitchers who was substituted by Councillor Byatt.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Beavan declared an interest in item 7 as he had consistently opposed the application and was speaking as Ward Member. He also had an interest in item 8 as Cabinet Member for Housing.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

There were none.

4 Minutes - November 2025

On the proposition of Councillor Plummer seconded by Councillor Gee, it was

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5 Minutes - December 2025

On the proposition of Councillor Plummer seconded by Councillor Hammond, it was

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2025 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

6 East Suffolk Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee received report **ES/2675** of the Head of Planning and Building Control which provided a summary of the status of all outstanding enforcement cases for East Suffolk Council where enforcement action had been sanctioned under delegated confirmed powers up until 18 December 2025. The Planning Manager explained the Enforcement Officer was unwell so he would answer any questions in their absence. There were a couple of updates to the report. Case C.3 - 11 Wharton Street, Bungay had been complied with so the case was now closed. A.5 - 175 London Road North, Lowestoft had been granted an extension on the compliance period as the works require a specialist contractor who has been appointed. Enforcement will check in at the end of the compliance period.

Councillor Ashdown asked if there was any update on item F.1 and G.1. The Planning Manager agreed to pick this up with the Enforcement Officer but believed there was nothing additional to what was contained in the report.

Councillor Gee asked about the Hinton case (F.1) as the last information was from 2019. The Planning Manager said it was going through the legal process and was with the legal team. A lot of time has been spent on this and it was frustratingly slow but he would see if there was any further update.

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

RESOLVED

That the outstanding enforcement matters up to 18th December 2025 be noted.

7 DC/25/3322/FUL - Land to the rear of Larks Rising, Easton Lane IP18 6SS and The Warren, Easton Lane, Easton Bavents, Reydon IP18 6SU

Councillor Beavan moved to the public gallery.

The Committee received report **ES/2670** which related to application DC/25/3322/FUL. The application sought planning permission for four (4no.) dwellings, proposed as replacement dwellings in regard to existing (1no.: The Warren) and previously demolished (3no.: The Cottages) dwellings on the applicant's wider landholding. The application followed a dismissed appeal (found in Appendix A) and this amended scheme addressed the Inspector's reasons for dismissing the appeal. The application was recommended for approval and was before Committee for determination due to the objections from the Parish Council and Ward Member.

The Planning Manager gave Members a presentation and drew Members to paragraph 3.2 of the report which contained the appeal decision detail. He showed a map of the Reydon area. He then showed a map of the application site and photos of the area from 1998 to 2020 demonstrating how the coastline has eroded and buildings that have had to be demolished as a result. He explained that the application sought to replace the demolished buildings. He showed an aerial photo and map of the site and the red line area of the application site together with photos of the application site. He explained that the application site falls within the National Landscape (AONB). He pointed out how the Warren is included in the red line application and its demolition is part of the application.

The replacement of property is only supported where the property to be demolished is within the Coastal Change Management Area (CCMA). Data updated in 2025 from the Environment Agency showed that the Warren would require demolition in the next 20 years. When the previous application was refused the Warren was outside of the CCMA.

The Planning Manager read out the key conclusions of the appeal decision. When the previous application was considered by the Planning Committee there were concerns about the scale of the proposed development. However the Planning Inspector did not agree that they were excessively bulky and thought they were a modern interpretation of a farmstead.

There was a technical procedural error where the Warren wasn't included in the original application. Leaving the Warren and building 4 new dwellings would mean there was landscape harm. This application includes demolition of the Warren controlled by a condition.

There is a proposed condition on the development area that prevents gardens stretching out beyond that. The woodland blocks identified as 6 on the diagram were considered appropriate and would screen the development. There was a condition to secure the full details as this is a very sensitive site.

The Planning Manager showed diagrams and floorplans of the proposed houses which would be 9m at the tallest point. These are large properties in contrast to the cottages being replaced and the replacement for the Warren, which was currently a 4 bedroom detached dwelling, was a 6 bedroom property.

With regards to the Landscape Visual Impact Statement the Inspector said it was

permissible to replace properties with something of a size that had been extended to include permitted development rights. This means that the new properties are larger than the ones being replaced as the permitted development rights had not been utilised on those original properties. The Planning Manager showed various viewpoints of the site. He explained that the development will be pushed into the countryside more than the existing site but there was a backdrop of development on the lane.

The Planning Manager ran through the material considerations and key issues. Significant weight was given to the appeal decision, but Members were asked to review the scale and design of the dwellings. The Reydon Neighbourhood Plan has a restriction that any new dwellings are just for use as a main residence. However this does not apply as these properties are replacements for properties that were not restricted. The Planning Manager referred to the Copperwheat Avenue development in Reydon that has 7 relocation plots which apply to this application. The applicant could purchase plots for £1 each but this is just an option and the applicant does not have to take this up.

The Planning Manager concluded by noting the contents on the update sheet and said that the application was recommended for approval subject to the conditions contained in the update sheet.

Councillor Ashdown asked how the height of 9m sat with the surrounding farm buildings. The Planning Manager said the poultry sheds were low in height but had a large footprint. There were low height bungalows on Eastern Lane and it was a modest terrace of cottages that are being replaced. The replacement for the Warren is more of an equivalent size.

Councillor Gee asked if there were photographs of the original cottages. The Planning Manager shared a photo.

Councillor Hammond asked for clarity on the replacement of dwellings. He asked if they were residential rather than holiday lets if these properties would not be permitted. The Planning Manager said they are open market dwellings for full time occupation. The cottages were long term lets to tenants. The Warren is a C3 dwelling house that is currently used as tourist accommodation so it is a C3 replacement for a C3.

Councillor Byatt asked to see the planned planting image. He had concerns that by the time the deciduous trees were of screening height the 20 year line of the coast will have come in. He also questioned the point of the screening if the dwellings were demountable and moved in 20 years time.

The Planning Manager said there was no reference to the houses being demountable/moveable in the report and these should be treated as fixed buildings. The application site is well outside of the CCMA even accounting for the erosion rate. Therefore the development is in a location that has a long-term future and plenty of opportunity for the planting to develop. He was not convinced that the landscape plan has the correct choice of planting and this was covered by conditions 15 and 16 which requires that more complete detail is provided to ensure the scheme integrates with the sensitive landscape.

Councillor Ashton noted that the ecology report had 3 conditions, 2 of which were included in the update sheet as conditions 8 and 9 but the removal of hedgerow timing was not in there. The Planning Manager explained that was normally an informative but it should have been included as a note.

The Objector was invited to speak. He explained that landscape preservation and enhancement to protect birds and wildlife had taken place here and the tenant farmer had entered into a higher level stewardship scheme. He said the area was vital for birds and the land was too valuable to be taken over for development of 4 large houses. He said that last year a ten acre field was part of a sustainable farming initiative scheme of planting wildflowers and feeding to attract birds and insects and they had seen spectacular results with 17 red listed species spotted on the farm, with several breeding in the area. He said the wildlife value of the farm was invaluable and granting this planning permission would undo 11 years of valuable work for the environment by the tenant farmer. The development would bring unwanted adverse impacts. He asked Members to refuse the application.

Councillor Ashton asked what the impact will be on the farmer if these 4 houses were built. The Objector said the 4 houses was just an initial phase. The use of a 14 acre farm for a development of 4 houses is a prelude for developing further. It would prevent the tenant farmer from extending his stewardship schemes which he wanted to do across the entire farm. It was a unique landscape and the broad is the second largest reedbed in the country.

The Chair noted the Objector's passion and enthusiasm for the local area.

Councillor Friend from Reydon Parish Council was invited to speak. He urged Members to reject the application. He said it failed the fundamental test and this was unjustified intensification of use in the open countryside. He said they were defending the integrity of the statutory development plan and the landscape protections of their neighbourhood plan. Policy RNP5 was clear about maintaining protection of the countryside. The report failed to explain why this must happen on open productive land when there are viable and less harmful alternative exist. The applicant has refused plots on the Copperwheat site. The poultry sheds are a suitable brownfield alternative. Locating the buildings on this site violated the spirit of policy RNP5. The replacement buildings are not true replacements noting that the Inspector's report said the buildings were larger in scale and bulk. He said that policy WLP8.26 should not be used as a loophole for commercial intensification. The replacements should be comparable in scale and impact. He pointed out that the site sits within a National Landscape and the National Landscape team objects to the proposal. This is significant intensification of use and the report admits this. The site is car dependent and unsustainable. Approving this sets a dangerous precedent telling every land owner on the coast that they can move houses deep into the open protected countryside. The damage and harm far outweighs the benefits. He asked Members to uphold the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan and refuse the application.

The Chair noted the passion of the speaker. There were no questions from Members.

The Applicant was invited to speak.

She explained that she was representing Easton Bavents Ltd, the applicant, who have owned land and property at Easton Bavents for over 100 years. She explained they were here because of coastal erosion. This was not new development but a replacement scheme for 3 properties that were demolished 6 years ago and a fourth due to be lost to the sea within 20 years. She said coastal erosion was devastating referencing Hemsby and Thorpeness in recent weeks. There was no insurance, no compensation and they were not even permitted to defend their own property. She explained that they are told to adapt and there are planning policies to support adaptation. She said they have worked hard to adapt our business responsibly, engaging extensively with the Local Planning Authority, with Coastal Partnership East, producing a masterplan for our land and attending coastal conferences to share and learn. She explained they have delivered genuinely adaptive development on the site, including moveable holiday accommodation that responds to erosion risk, supports the local economy, and has been recognised through an East Suffolk Quality of Place Award and referenced recently in the national press as a positive example of coastal adaptation.

She explained that the application sought to replace long-established residential properties lost or soon to be lost to the sea and they had spent 10 years trying to secure a suitable relocation. She thanked the officers for their professionalism and support throughout.

She continued stating that the Planning Inspector supported this scheme in principle, and that the only change since the appeal is the inclusion of the Warren within the red-line boundary. There were no other material changes so it was a policy-compliant replacement proposal, not additional development. She firmly believed this represents a positive and responsible adaptation response with well-designed homes, with low embodied carbon construction and sustainable to provide homes. She concluded by asking Members to support the officer recommendation to approve the application.

Councillor Byatt asked why they were choosing to build on new land rather than existing sites such as the poultry sheds or the Copperwheat development. She explained they had considered lots of sites over 10 years and this site was recommended to them by the local planning authority and it is referenced in the appeal report. She pointed out that the Planning Inspector thought the site was compliant. She said there was talk of the Copperwheat site but that hadn't even been offered to us.

Councillor Hammond asked about the scale of development. When it came to committee previously the scale was considered inappropriately large but the Inspector disagreed. He asked if she could comment on the difference between the scale of the houses that are being replaced versus what you are building. The applicant explained that the houses are within permitted development rights of the properties they are replacing. They aren't that big although they are bigger than what was there but the Supplementary Planning Document says this is ok and the Inspector supported this conclusion. She felt some of the previous speakers selectively quoted the Planning Inspector. She found the scale to be acceptable.

Councillor Beavan was invited to speak as Ward Member. He stated that rollback

replacements are important and he agreed with the Inspector that plans should be made for the Warren. However he objected to this being in an open field. He pointed out that the arable land provides sand at the beach at Southwold, which would be lost. The Council had supported 6 portable homes and the growth of the business. Two holiday lets provide more rent than the cottages did. He also pointed out that the website says there is a private beach which is not correct. He noted that his presentation slide was not displaying properly. The beach is just inaccessible as the applicant refused to allow public safe access from the southern end. The northern end is often blocked by the sea as they have also refused access to the Environment Agency to maintain the outfall allowing the sea to flood the broad and destroy the largest freshwater reedbed in East Anglia. As a result cars are damaged as it floods at Potter's Bridge every winter. He explained the barn conversion had been supported by them accepting it didn't have to comply with the NP residency clause as it was replacing lost homes. They also agreed to reserve 4 plots on Copperwheat, close to other homes they rent out, for £1 each. With all the applications that have been supported they were surprised to get this application for another four houses.

He asked why they were in the middle of an open field and not on the poultry shed site, which has a condition as part of the barn conversion that they will no longer keep poultry there. He acknowledged that the land was not owned by the applicant but by their brother, the tenant. The family disputes about land are not our problem. We should be able to decide on the best location regardless of the ownership split. Everyone agrees there is harm to the landscape and the AONB. The Council needs to be careful about setting a precedent as a lot of coastal houses are falling into the sea. Property speculators are offering cash to homeowners in Hemsby. The Inspector refused the first application as it didn't include the Warren but it does not mean they agreed with this amended proposal. The Inspector said it needed further representations on impact to the environment and a few trees do not mitigate the damage to the landscape. We know the land better than the Inspector. The work being done by the tenant farmer is more valuable than these four houses which will contribute nothing to the affordable housing crisis. The tenant has lost land, his poultry sheds, his wildlife and his best remaining field. It is neither fair nor just.

Councillor Ashdown asked for clarity about Copperwheat as the applicant said they weren't offered any plots there. The Planning Manager said he had conversations with the applicant about Copperwheat. The reserved matters for the Copperwheat site was only recently approved and the applicant has been looking for alternatives for a number of years before this. The applicant has not been offered the plots specifically but it is open to the applicant to pursue development on this land.

Councillor Hammond noted that one of the three reasons stated for refusal on the original application was due to scale. He asked if there was anything to be done to address the mismatch of scale because of the additional size allowed under permitted development rights and if that was a valid reason for objection last time. The Planning Manager said it was in the report and read the section of the report. He said that although the Inspector disagreed with the Council's position Members were being asked to draw a balance on and the interpretation of that point.

Councillor Wakeling asked if permitted development rights would be removed as a condition if this application was approved. The Planning Manager confirmed that

condition 18 removed permitted development rights, which was clear in the Supplementary Planning Document.

Councillor Gee said she had read the Inspector's report and was confused as it reads like the Inspector was giving the green light but the Inspector found harm in the loss of farmland and that the new development would harm the area and was contrary to the development plan. She said the development plan must be adhered to. The benefits of housing are outweighed by the damage the development would have on the environment.

The Planning Manager explained it was not easy to understand the Inspector's report. The Inspector said that the scale and impact was acceptable. He said the key point was at paragraph 26. If the Warren was left then the development wasn't acceptable. By including the Warren's demolition it made the development acceptable.

Councillor Hammond felt landowners up and down the coast would be happy if we approved this application. He asked if it would set a precedent if it was approved. The Planning Manager said there was no precedent. The policy only supported instances where properties were at risk of loss within 20 years. As the application stands it is just for 4 dwellings and not open to further development.

Councillor Byatt asked if the rest of the field could be developed beyond the curtilage. The Planning Manager explained that condition 19 on the Update Sheet controlled any further development. The green line on the diagram indicated the curtilage of the dwellings but there was a much larger area marked by the red line but part of the reason that was required was because Biodiversity Net Gain was applicable here. The land needs to be included to deliver the Biodiversity Net Gain. There is a specific condition to control the extent of the curtilages and also the removal of permitted development rights. The Chair asked for clarity that the curtilage of the properties was the green line. The Planning Manager explained that each property will have its own individual curtilage and then there is the larger development area. Through the landscape scheme we would see the details of the layout, surfacing, how the gardens are arranged and all the other detail.

The Planning Manager showed Councillor Beavan's presentation image that had not displayed properly.

He showed a plan which included the poultry sheds. He had spoken to the applicant about developing that site as it would be preferable. However whatever the situation, this is not land in the applicant's control. He understands it looks like a good opportunity, but it is not feasible.

Members moved to debate.

Councillor Byatt stated that he didn't like building on green land. He thought the buildings would be intrusive as they are so tall. This was a piece of land that does not need to be built on. We would be going against the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan and we should be avoiding building on fresh land if there are alternatives nearby. He was minded to vote against the recommendation.

The Chair asked if the Reydon Neighbourhood Plan was made when it went to appeal. The Planning Manager confirmed it was.

Councillor Ashdown thanked everyone for their presentations and inputs. He said it was a very difficult situation. He was not happy with the height of the buildings and they do look bulky. The tree planting will help to mitigate. He was disappointed that the Copperwheat opportunity had not been taken up. The Inspector's report does give an indication that if it went to appeal again it would likely be upheld.

Councillor Hammond agreed. We have to support the principle of replacement for this awful situation of losing properties to the sea. The Copperwheat and poultry sheds sites are red herrings. We cannot get involved in family land ownership. But we do set a precedent if we do allow these replacements that really push the definition of replacements. Should consider writing into the policy that it is a 'like for like' replacement. Were it a scheme that was a like for like replacement on a similar square footage then he would support it. This application was really pushing the boundaries. He felt Members were being asked to judge on finer points and he would be voting against the recommendation.

Councillor Gee supported Councillor Hammond's comments. She said the cottages were typical Suffolk houses but the new proposals are totally brutalistic in their concept and one of the most ugly designs she had ever seen. She felt they are intrusive and ugly on the coastline and they are in the AONB/National Landscape. She said the Warren replacement has ballooned and this was trying to get the maximum profit and was not in the spirit of what we should be supporting.

Councillor Ashton said we have two things here. There are policies we would like to have to judge against and the policies we actually have. We should have policies that don't permit this but we don't. The Planning Inspector said the issue was the lack of the inclusion of the Warren, which has now been addressed. When the Inspector carried out the appeal we didn't have the ecology report but we do now and the conditions have been incorporated. He agreed with the sentiment but if we don't approve he felt we will face an appeal that we will lose. He said we have no choice but to accept this as our policies have already been interrogated by the Planning Inspectorate.

Councillor Hammond noted that Councillor Ashton made good points but it was our role to tease out the meaning of policy and set a precedent for policy to be improved. He questioned the purpose of the committee if the policies are just black and white.

Councillor Ashton said the Planning Inspector has already looked at this and said what is being proposed is acceptable. But Members could vote to reject and see what the Planning Inspectorate says.

The Planning Manager said the committee was a quasi-judicial forum but this was not the place to consider policy shortcomings. That was part of the Local Plan group. He stressed that Members needed to look at the policies in front of them today.

Councillor Gee said if it were not for the size, appearance and bulk and the application was more modest we would have approved it much sooner. She asked if it could be refused on the grounds of bad design and ask them to come back with a more modest

proposal that was more like for like.

The Chair said we cannot tell someone what they should do but we have to say yes or no to what is in front of us.

Councillor Gee asked if the applicant could be made aware that if a more acceptable proposal was submitted it would be more likely to be approved. The Planning Manager said with the Planning Inspector decision the applicant would feel they have no need to change the design. The Planning Inspector's decision was a key material consideration which must be given regard to, but Members shouldn't worry about the fear of the cost of an appeal preventing making their own decision. The issue is whether we accept this design and the impact on the location.

Councillor Byatt wanted to come back to alternative sites and asked if the Planning Inspector considered this in their appeal. He felt this will be an overbearing development on this part of the coast.

The Planning Manager said the applicants were aware of the broad outline of Copperwheat and the Planning Inspector was aware of the Local Plan. The lack of reference to it speaks for itself. They were just looking at what was before them at appeal.

Councillor Ashdown said he was in a mind to approve because of our policies and what is included in the Planning Inspector's report. He doesn't like it but he was prepared to recommend approval.

Councillor Ashton was in the same position as Councillor Ashdown. Refusing was futile as it would go to appeal and we will lose. We would be expecting a new Inspector to take a different view to the previous one. He said the Council needs to change the policies going forward.

On the proposal of Councillor Ashdown, seconded by Councillor Ashton, the recommendation to approve the application failed.

An alternative recommendation was sought. The Planning Manager referred Members to relevant policies including WLP8.26 which related to relocation and roll back of dwellings, WLP8.35 - Landscape Character, Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act. He advised against the non-demolition of the Warren. He said they could look at the impact of the design.

Councillor Byatt asked if there was anything in the relocation and rollback policy that says you can replace with something 20% larger. The Chair said our policy as it stands is not specific enough.

Councillor Hammond argued that this was not a replacement. It should be like for like. If it wasn't a replacement this would be refused as it was not compliant. This was completely different so not a replacement and therefore does not fit with the policy.

The Planning Manager explained that WLP8.26 and para 5.18 of the SPD states that if the existing development hasn't used its permitted development allowances the new

development can use those. His advice to Members was that being forensic about the permitted development rights and relating it to the footprint was too academic. He suggested that they could focus on the position of the buildings and the formal appearance as a reason for refusal. These have to be treated as replacement dwellings. It was whether the placement and design are acceptable so policies WLP8.29 – design generally and WLP8.35 – landscape should be considered.

Councillor Hammond said policy WLP8.29 was relevant as this application does not fit with the overall scale and clarity.

Councillor Gee said this was an exposed viewpoint from the road which was flat. This will be very intrusive on the National Landscape. The Chair said this was policy WLP8.35. Councillor Gee said to take the opening paragraph as all of that was applicable.

The Planning Manager asked if they had any comments on the landscape strategy and the planting strategy. The Chair said there was a strong feeling that it would take at least 20 years before the trees provided any screening.

The Planning Manager summarised that they were refusing due to the overall conflict with policy WLP8.26, that they are tall buildings that do not respond to the scale of the surrounding context and as a consequence will cause harm to the National Landscape contrary to WLP8.35. It was also contrary to the Countryside Rights of Way Act and the NPPF. The landscape scheme proposed is unacceptable in terms of mitigating the impact. Councillor Hammond agreed.

On the proposal of Councillor Hammond, seconded by Councillor Byatt it was by majority

RESOLVED

That the application be refused on the grounds that it was contrary to policies WLP8.26, WLP8.29 and WLP8.35 and relevant parts of the NPPF.

Councillor Ashton abstained as he was not convinced by the arguments given but not enough to vote against it.

Members took a short break and reconvened at 4.16pm

8 DC/25/3663/RG3 - 33-41 Puddingmoor, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 9PJ

The Committee received report **ES/2671** which related to application DC/25/3663/RG3 and the Planner gave a presentation. Permission was sought for the installation of replacement windows to the front and rear elevations at no 33-41 Puddingmoor, Beccles, in which there is an Article 4 Direction in force in the Beccles Conservation Area. The application was before the Planning Committee (North) as the building and land is within the ownership of East Suffolk Council. No third-party representations have been received and the Town Council raised no objection.

The Planner showed the site location plan and a selection of photographs of the properties. She explained that the properties have no particular architectural merit and the original windows would probably have been made from timber. The proposed replacement windows were shown and explained that they would be largely like for like replacements. No other alterations were proposed.

It was recommended for approval subject to the conditions in the report.

Councillor Byatt asked if there will there be the same design throughout with top openings. The Planner confirmed they would all have top openings and trickle vents.

Councillor Hammond was concerned that the previous windows were put in 10-15 years ago which didn't seem very long. He asked about the quality of the replacement windows. The Planner explained that the replacements would be better quality in terms of thermal efficiency. Councillor Hammond wanted it noted that he objected to short use uPVC windows and hoped these ones have a long life.

Councillor Ashton argued that this was another example of buildings in a conservation area that shouldn't be included. It was a waste of time and money for these sort of homes to have to put in planning applications for these sort of changes. He was concerned that there are inappropriate properties in conservation areas. The Chair said part of the listing was due to the serpentine wall at the front of the properties, but clearly this needed to be approved as it was like for like replacements.

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

RESOLVED

That planning permission is granted subject to planning conditions listed 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 drawing no. Site Location Plan, Casement Style Windows (Asset Finline), Photos to show Existing Windows received 24 September 2025, and the Design and Access Statement / Heritage Impact Statement received 6 November 2025, 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.

9 DC/25/3775/LBC - 5 St Marys Flats, Ballygate, Beccles, Suffolk, NR34 9NF

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

10 DC/25/4557/FUL - 70-72 High Street, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR32 1XN

The Committee received report **ES/2673** which related to application DC/25/4557/FUL and the Assistant Planning Officer/Planner gave a presentation. The application sought permission for the replacement of modern shopfronts at Nos. 70-71 High Street with traditionally detailed timber designs and repairs to the existing Edwardian shopfront at No. 72 High Street.

The application was presented to Planning Committee because the agent is a member of staff at East Suffolk Council and the project is funded through the East Suffolk Partnership Scheme in a Conservation Area (PSiCA) programme.

The site lies within the North Lowestoft Conservation Area and comprises Positive Unlisted Buildings that contribute to the historic character of the High Street. The proposals aim to reinstate traditional detailing and improve the architectural quality of the shopfronts, consistent with heritage-led regeneration objectives. The proposals will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the North Lowestoft Conservation Area and the significance of Positive Unlisted Buildings.

The Assistant Planning Officer/Planner showed proposed elevations and pointed out that it was deemed compliant with all relevant local and national planning policies so was recommended for approval.

The Chair said it was great that work like this was happening on the Lowestoft High Street.

On the proposal of Councillor Plummer, seconded by Councillor Byatt it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That planning permission is granted subject to the full outcome of the consultation period being presented to committee.

Conditions:

1. 3 Year Time Limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials as detailed on approved drawings

11 DC/25/4438/FUL - 99-99A High Street, Lowestoft, Suffolk, NR32 1XW

The Committee received report **ES/2674** which related to application DC/25/4438/FUL and the Assistant Planning Officer/Planner gave a presentation. The application sought permission for the replacement of modern aluminium windows at first and second floor level with traditional timber sash windows and alterations to the shopfronts at ground floor level.

The application was presented to Planning Committee because the agent is a member of staff at East Suffolk Council and the project is funded through the East Suffolk Partnership Scheme in a Conservation Area (PSiCA) programme.

The site lies within the North Lowestoft Conservation Area and comprises a Positive Unlisted Building that contributes to the historic character of the High Street. The proposals aim to reinstate traditional detailing and improve the architectural quality of the principal elevation, consistent with heritage-led regeneration objectives. The proposals will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the North Lowestoft Conservation Area and the significance of Positive Unlisted Buildings.

The Assistant Planning Officer/Planner showed photographs and existing and proposed elevations of the building. It was deemed compliant with all relevant local and national planning policies and was recommended for approval.

Councillor Ashdown declared that he was acquainted with the leaseholder of the building.

On the proposal of Councillor Gee, seconded by Councillor Hammond it was unanimously

RESOLVED

That planning permission is granted subject to the full outcome of the consultation period being presented to committee.

Conditions:

1. 3 Year Time Limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials as detailed on approved drawings

The meeting concluded at 4.33pm

.....
Chair