

Confirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Planning Committee North** held in the Conference Room, Riverside, Lowestoft, on **Tuesday, 8 June 2021** at **2.00pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Norman Brooks, Councillor Jenny Ceresa, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Malcolm Pitchers

Other Members present:

Councillor Peter Byatt

Officers present: Jamie Behling (Trainee Planner), Joe Blackmore (Principal Planner), Sarah Carter (Democratic Services Officer), Sarah Davis (Democratic Services Officer), Mia Glass (Assistant Enforcement Officer), Beth Hughes (Assistant Planner), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Iain Robertson (Senior Planner), Ben Woolnough (Planning Development Manager)

Announcement

The Chairman welcomed Ben Woolnough to his first PCN meeting in his new role as Planning Development Manager.

1 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Bramley-Crawshaw and Rivett.

There were no substitutes.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Ceresa declared a Pecuniary Interest in item 7 - DC/21/1823/FUL - 20 St Georges Road, Beccles, as she was the applicant. She advised that she would leave the room and take no part in discussions or voting on the item.

Councillor Cooper declared a Pecuniary Interest in item 8 - DC/21/1462/FUL - The Alders, Theberton, as he was related to the applicant. He advised that he would leave the room and take no part in discussions or voting on the item.

3 Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying

There were no declarations of lobbying.

4 Enforcement Action - Case Update

The Committee considered report ES/0788 which summarised outstanding enforcement cases sanctioned under delegated powers or through the Committee up to 25 May 2021. There were currently 11 such cases.

The Assistant Enforcement Officer provided an update with regard to:

Top Street Martlesham – a site visit had taken place as required and the matter was now with the Council's Legal Department.

Dam Lane, Kessingland – a site visit had taken place to check on the lake compliance; none had been undertaken and further discussions were taking place with the Council's Legal Department. The Court case on 5 July related to the structures.

White Cottage, Woodbridge – a site visit confirmed compliance and the case was now closed.

Members questioned the timescales on some cases, one of which dated from 2013. At Saxonfields in Snape, there were differing dates of February and June 2021. The Assistant Enforcement Officer advised that whilst the enforcement notice had been served, it would not come into effect until 15 February after the 28 day appeal, with compliance by 15 June.

There being no further debate, it was

RESOLVED

That the report concerning Outstanding Enforcement matters be received and noted.

5 DC/21/1193/FUL - Common Edge, Farnham Road, Snape

The Committee considered report ES/0792 which gave details of the planning application for a single storey Orangery extension on the rear of the property with roof terrace above and two two-storey extensions to the front and side of the dwelling to provide utility, study, dressing room, en-suite and fifth bedroom.

The application was before Members as the minded to decision was contrary to the Ward Members' recommendation to refuse due to concerns relating to design and residential amenity.

Members received a presentation showing the site location plan and aerial photograph, together with a plan giving an indication of the second planning application DS/21/1200/FUL which was to be considered under Agenda item 6. Members viewed the photographs of the existing dwelling and existing extensions

to the front and rear, trees on the boundary, and views looking towards the neighbouring property. Further slides showed the existing and proposed floor plans and elevations including the proposed single storey extension at the rear with roof terrace, and block plan.

The Planner commented on the material planning considerations and key issues and advised that the proposal was not considered to be overdevelopment due to the size of the plot. It was felt that noise would not be an issue due to the distance to the boundary and the fact that the property would remain a residential dwelling. The boundary was well screen by trees and the proposed privacy screen would be in place if the trees were cut back at some future date. Approval was being recommended subject to revised wording for condition 2 as detailed on the update sheet.

The Chairman invited questions.

Members sought clarification as to the height of the screen on the roof terrace. The Planner confirmed it was 1.8m adjoining the building reducing down to waist height towards the front of the terrace. If the trees were removed, then there would be some overlooking into the neighbour's garden. The Chairman proposed that the height of the whole screen should remain at 1.8m and that should be considered to be reasonable.

The Chairman invited the public speakers to address the Committee.

Mr R Rainger spoke as an objector and resident of the neighbouring property. He referred some papers having been amended with a different plan and drew attention to two specific images. Mr Rainger referred to paragraph 2.1 and the historic nature of the site with open outlook prior to the trees being planted. Paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 made reference to the recent planting and dense vegetation which was overhanging the boundary. Such references made it look like the proposed extra development was acceptable because of that. The 7m barricade of conifers blocked light and being only 3m distant from his property would result in root damage. If the trees were removed, there would be no screening whatsoever. He referred to design, materials and finish to ensure a satisfactory appearance and visual amenity; none of that had been undertaken as previously agreed.

As the Applicant's Agent, Mr R Stewart advised that the proposal to extend the property was to provide better living accommodation and to allow the Applicant to work from home. The proposed extensions were in keeping with the existing property and its character and the painted claddings would echo the existing design. The proposal would not result in loss of privacy as the ground floor doors would be some 24m distant from the neighbour. The 1.8m high screen on the balcony would protect the neighbour. The plot extended to some 2,440sqm which was large enough for the proposed development and which was only 7% of the total site area. That was a similar density to the neighbouring plot of Christmas Cottage. Mr Stewart advised there would be no negative impact on current noise levels and the existing planting provided both an acoustic buffer and a privacy screen. The proposals were in keeping with existing dwelling.

Members questioned the fact that the Applicant had submitted two applications for

the extensions and cart lodge and not one. Mr Stewart explained that one was the householder extension and the other required more ground survey. They were to be judged at the same time; the tourist accommodation and it being a new dwelling was a full application not a householder application.

Comment was made that Members should see the second application and compare what they would both look like if both approved. The Planning Development Manager reminded the Committee that the earlier slide had showed the extensions and the location of the cart lodge. Each application should be considered on its own merits. Whilst the design was agreed to look satisfactory, some concern was expressed over the large development and the fact that car parking would be lost if the proposed cart lodge was built.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, subject to the screen on the balcony be 1.8m in height for its full length. This was agreed by the Agent and it was

RESOLVED

That permission be granted, subject to the following 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 drawings P01 and P03 received 11/03/2021, P04a received 27/05/2021 and P05b and P06c received 09/06/2021 for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

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

4. Prior to the hereby roof terrace being first used, a privacy screen shall be erected and retained at a height of 1.8 metres on the western edge of the roof terrace as shown on drawing P-06C and P-05b received 09/06/2021. If glass or plastic is chosen it shall have an obscenity of level 3 on the Pilkington obscured glazing range (or equivalent by an alternative manufacturer). This item shall thereafter be retained in its approved form.

Reason: To avoid the possibility of unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring property.

The Committee considered report ES/0793 which set out details of the planning application proposing one and a half storey three bay cart lodge with tourist accommodation at first floor level. The ground floor included two parking bays and one storage bay and the first floor comprised WC, dining/kitchen/living room, bedroom and en-suite.

Members viewed the aerial photograph, site location plan, proposed block plan, several photographs within the site and a photograph of the proposed siting of the cart lodge with tree screening behind. The proposed floor plans and elevations gave an indication of the parking and storage bays and also the accommodation being provided. The east elevation would have skylights only.

The Planner outlined the material planning considerations and key issues and drew particular attention to the following:

- Unlikely overlooking the neighbour due to the position of the cart lodge.
- Unlikely extra noise from tourism with guests arriving/leaving due to the fact that one double bedroom was being provided and outside space was not being provided.
- No over development; whilst it was a relatively big structure, the site was large.
- No objection from County Highways, with one condition being applied.
- Little visual impact due to vegetation and trees on the site.

The Planner confirmed that approval was being recommended subject to a RAMS payment which had now been received, and an amended condition 4 outlined in the update sheet.

The Chairman invited questions.

Members asked questions relating to:

- An assessment on contaminants.
- What other Highways conditions has been proposed.
- Residential buildings being extended forward of the original building line.
- If the size of the annex met minimum standards of space requirements.
- Provision of amenity space for the residents of the holiday accommodation in the cart lodge.
- Problems that might be created for the neighbours.

The Planner advised that there might be hydrocarbons contaminating the site from the petrol station next door; however, Environmental Health advised that the Applicant could remediate the site before any construction commenced. Highways had commented on providing a connection to recharge electric vehicles and suitable storage for building materials. The trees on site helped reduce any impact that might result from building in front of the main dwelling. He was not aware of any minimum space requirements for tourist accommodation and it was probable that people staying in the accommodation would go elsewhere for the use of outside space.

The Planning Development Manager advised that, whilst there would be dedicated parking, it was reasonable to use outside space in the surrounding area, similar to a bed and breakfast. It was not being conditioned to provide amenity space because part of the site was not being formally separated.

The Chairman invited the public speakers to address the Committee.

Mr R Rainger reminded Members that any development which was in front of the building line was not usually allowed and the emphasis on the trees providing suitable screening was unacceptable. Referring to paragraph 7.2 in the report, the proposed new tourist accommodation would be accessed by stairs only and not disability friendly. There would be impact on the neighbours and the slide showing a person silhouetted at the top of the stairs would give visitors unobstructed views into the neighbouring property. There would be additional noise from some six vehicles parking on the gravel drive being used by residents, employees and now tourists. Whilst the accommodation was proposing one small double bedroom, the elevations showed children and there was no provision of outside space. There should not be reliance on the tree screening to allow what was clearly overdevelopment.

The Applicant's Agent advised that the three-bay cart lodge was being located near the north east corner of the plot with plenty of screening. The proposal was in accordance with policy SCLP6.5 providing tourist accommodation and contributing to the local economy. The design was in keeping with existing. The proposed building would contribute positively towards screening the neighbouring garage. The west facing dormer windows were 30m from the neighbour and the staircase was set back. It was not overdevelopment as it would only increase the development to 9.6% of the entire site. In his opinion, one bedroomed tourist accommodation would only provide a limited increase in noise compared to the busy road and nearby garage. The proposal would offer a positive impact on Common Edge, existing properties and the local economy.

Members noted that all three Ward Councillors had objected to the proposal and so too had the Parish Council. There was uncertainty for the neighbours and it could be seen as over development. Some Members were not comfortable with the outside staircase and suggested that consideration be given to incorporating the staircase on the inside. Refusal was recommended.

An opposing view was that the proposal was located next to a busy garage and, going forward, provided tourist accommodation some distance from the nearest neighbour. The recommendation in the report for approval should be supported.

The Planning Development Manger reminded Members of the location of the staircase on the roadside of the proposed building and there could be the potential for overlooking in all directions. There might be the opportunity to provide the staircase on the dwelling side or enclose it with a 1.8m screen.

The proposal for refusal was then duly seconded and voted on, which was LOST.

A further proposal was made to defer a decision on the application, so that the design

of the staircase could be reviewed and consideration could also be given to the provision of cycle storage and outdoor amenity space. Deferral was duly seconded and it was

RESOLVED

That a decision be deferred to allow further discussions to take place with the Applicant with regard to screening of staircase, provision of outdoor seating area and cycle storage.

***Note:** Having declared a Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item 7, Councillor Ceresa left the meeting at 3.08pm.*

7 DC/21/1823/FUL - 20 St Georges Road, Beccles

The Committee considered report ES/0789 which gave details of the planning application for the removal of an existing garage, provision of a two-storey side extension to the property and provision of an annex in the rear garden. The application was before Committee as the Applicant was an East Suffolk Councillor.

The Senior Planner advised that whilst the site was within the Beccles Conservation Area, the property was not listed or making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area as many of its original features had been replaced with unsympathetic modern alternatives.

Members received a presentation which showed the site location plan, Conservation Area Boundary, photographs of the property and street scene, the size of the rear garden, existing and proposed layout and floor plans, and proposed elevations. The rear and front elevations and floor plan of the proposed annex were also displayed.

The Senior Planner explained the material planning considerations and key issues and drew particular attention to the relevant policies relating to design, which was acceptable, and impact on the Conservation Area which were none. County Highways had no objection; the loss of the garage was considered to be minimal as it was likely to be too small for modern day vehicles, and two parking spaces were being provided in addition to the available parking on the highway. The plot size was suitable for the proposals and it was intended the annex would be ancillary to the main dwelling. Approval was being recommended subject to revised wording for conditions 2 and 4 as detailed on the update sheet.

In response to a Member's question relating to annexes in neighbouring properties, the Senior Planner advised that other properties in the area had small outbuildings but no annexes. There was no separate access to the annex; there would be a pathway between the property and the boundary for access to the rear.

During the ensuing discussion, Members were of the opinion that the proposal would result in improvements to a not very attractive dwelling and the garden could satisfactorily accommodate the annex. Members were of the opinion that using the annexe as ancillary to the dwelling made the proposal acceptable and it was

RESOLVED

That permission be granted, subject to the following 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 plan nos. 2697.20.1F and 3A; received 27 May 2021 and 2697.20.2A received on 14 April 2021, for which permission is hereby granted or which are subsequently submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and in compliance with any conditions imposed by the Local Planning Authority.

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

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

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

4. The use shall not commence until the area(s) within the site on plan no. 2697.20.1F 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 enable vehicles to park within the site reducing the requirement for on-street parking in the interests of highway safety.

5. The residential annex hereby approved shall only be occupied and used as ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling known at the time of this decision as 20 St. Georges Road and shall at no time be subdivided from the curtilage of or used as an independent unit of residential accommodation separate from, 20 St. Georges Road.

Reason: The building is not suitable for use as a separate residential unit due to its location on the site and lack of separate parking and curtilage area.

Note: Councillor Ceresa re-joined the meeting at 3.21pm. At the same time, having declared a Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item 8, Councillor Cooper left the meeting.

8 DC/21/1462/FUL - The Alders, Potters Street, Theberton

The Committee considered report ES/0790 giving details of the planning application for the removal of an existing storage barn and to erect a single storey extension which

would join a proposed two storey extension at The Alders in Therberton. The application was before Committee as the Applicant was a close relative of an East Suffolk Councillor.

Members received a presentation showing the site location plan, the siting of the property in relation to Theberton village and a selection of photographs showing the driveway, existing dwelling and barn to be demolished. The block plan showed the position of the proposed extension and both existing and proposed elevations and existing floor plan and proposed floor plans were displayed.

The Assistant Planner drew attention to the material planning considerations and key issues and confirmed that the proposals were in keeping with the relevant policies SCLP11.1 and SCLP11.2 in the Local Plan. She confirmed no comments had been received from the Environment Agency and due to the isolation of the property, there would be no impact on residential amenity. Approval with conditions was therefore being recommended.

Members raised no specific questions and following a proposal for approval which was duly seconded, it was

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the following 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 not be carried out other than in accordance with Site Plan and Drawings received on 24th March, 2021 ('OS MasterMap 1:1250 scale Site/Location Plan', 'OS MasterMap 1:250 scale Proposed Block/Layout Plan', 'Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations Drg No. Dwg.J2109.pp 1', 'Existing Floor Plans & Elevations Drg No. Dwg. J2109.ep').

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

3. The materials and finishes shall be as indicated within the submitted application and thereafter retained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

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

4. The finished (ground) floor levels of the extension shall be no lower than ground floor levels in the existing dwellinghouse.

Reason: to ensure the extension is no more vulnerable to flooding than the existing dwellinghouse, in accordance with Environment Agency standing advice.

The meeting concluded at 3.26pm.

.....
Chairman