



**EAST SUFFOLK COUNCIL**

**PLANNING ADVISORY PANEL NORTH – 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/20/0783/FUL

**Application Address:** 45 Pier Avenue, Southwold, IP18 6BU

**Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:**

Whilst recognising the views of the Town Council, Members were of the opinion that the proposal was not out of character with other dwellings in Pier Road and with the majority of the extension being at the rear of the property, car parking space was being retained. As a result, Members were in agreement that the application should be approved.

**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 following informative note added to the planning permission:

- C3 dwelling house use only

**Reason for Decision:**

To inform the Advisory Panel, the Head of Planning and Coastal Management explained that he had met with the Town Council towards the end of 2019 because of its concerns regarding a number of permissions that had been granted to residential properties.

In terms of the recommendation to approve, when making his decision, the Head of Planning and Coastal Management was of the opinion that there were no significant adverse issues; the extension was significantly set back and gave no cause for concern.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management expressed his wider concern over the potential future use of properties becoming holiday homes capable of housing larger

family groups or similar. If the property was to be used as a dwelling house, then there was no material change of use. The informative note recommended was to clarify the dwelling's use.

**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:**

Not applicable.

---

**Application Number: DC/19/5063/VOC**

**Application Address: 243 Long Road, Lowestoft, NR33 9DF**

**Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:**

The Advisory Panel discussed the history of the site and questioned the fact that the two existing properties might not conform to their approval. If this application was deferred because of the history on the site, then the applicant, Ward Members and objector(s) could address the Committee and all be aware of Members' reasoning. It had been considered to be overdevelopment of the plot but following adjustments to the proposal and having regard to the extant 2010 approval, there now appeared to be no good reasoning to refuse the application.

**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 following additional conditions:

- Removal of permitted development rights
- Roof additions
- Slab level height / floor height to be first agreed (including fixing location)

**Reason for Decision:**

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management considered all submissions, including the updates, and the content of the officer's report and then viewed the block plans from 2010 and the 2018 refusal. He had apprised himself of the representations that had been made both by the Ward Members and the significant concerns expressed by the neighbour at No. 245. There were differences between the current application and the 2010 application; that was still live and could be implemented.

The ridge height of the proposal was the same as that approved in 2010, the garage proposed in the 2018 refused scheme (ref. DC/18/3020/VOC) had been removed and the proposed dwelling had been moved forward on the plot. The internal design had been transposed so that on the north elevation, the bedroom was on the opposite side of the dwelling and the bathroom window, which would be obscure

glazed, was on the side of the boundary with No. 245. Although there was a slight increase in bulk due to the approx. 1.7m eaves height increase, the proposed development had been pulled in slightly from both side boundaries resulting in a better relationship with neighbouring properties. There would be no additional impact on sunlight or loss of light. There had been no change to the access and there was good visibility onto the main road.

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management's view was that, whilst appreciating the concerns of the Ward Members and residents over the impact of the development, there were no amenity or other grounds to refuse the application.

**Any Declarations of Interest declared:**

Councillor Ceresa declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest as being County Councillor for the area.

**Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:**

Councillors Ashdown and Ceresa declared that they had been lobbied on the application.

**Any Dispensation Granted:**

None.

---

**Application Number: DC/20/0825/FUL**

**Application Address: 14 Pier Avenue, Southwold, IP18 6BX**

**Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:**

The Advisory Panel noted that the Town Council had concerns over the design but Members had no problem with the design as it was similar to other properties in the street. The dwelling should be for family use and not be maximised for use as a holiday home for housing larger groups. The Advisory Panel noted that the conversion of the existing store would not need planning permission, nor would rear extensions up to 4m. Rear extensions up to 8m could proceed without planning permission but were subject to consultation with neighbours. The proposed extension was only 1m deeper. Members unanimously supported approval of the application.

**Decision Made by the Head of Planning and Coastal Management:**

That the application be APPROVED subject to the conditions as listed in the update report and the following informative note added to the planning permission:

- C3 dwelling house use

**Reason for Decision:**

In his determination, the Head of Planning and Coastal Management considered that the design was acceptable and subject to controlling conditions, the application should be approved with an informative note added to the planning permission clarifying the authorised C3 residential use.

The officers would continue to liaise with the Southwold Town Council and the Council's Planning Policy and Delivery Team regarding the incremental use of properties for groups greater than family groups.

**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/20/0309/FUL**

**Application Address: Agricultural Building Valley Farm, Kings Lane, Henham**

**Advice provided by the Advisory Panel's Elected Members:**

The Members noted that the existing barn conversion, approved under permitted development ref. DC/19/4310/PN3, was five units and this proposal was also for five units but for external alterations that went beyond the scope of the permitted development approval, and works within the wider site area inclusive of parking provision and amenity space. The properties could be lived in all year. The Advisory Panel understood that the proposal was converting an existing building, the design was good and questioned if it was possible for improvements to be made to the track. A Member proposed that permitted development rights be removed to control outbuildings in the units' garden space, as the amenity space was considered to be minimal on three of the proposed units.

**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 following additional conditions:

- A requirement for detailed working drawings for the conversion to be submitted prior to works commencing
- Entrance to ensure safety of residents in the vicinity of the working farm
- Removal of permitted development rights

**Reason for Decision:**

The Head of Planning and Coastal Management noted that visibility onto the highway was good and that County Highways had no objection. The permitted development fallback position would not require improvements to the track leading to the site.

The permitted development approval for the barn conversion had been received at the latter part of 2019 and was a fairly recent approval, with the regulations requiring the conversion to be completed within three years from the approval date. The time remaining to implement the extant approval increased the weight to be

given to the fallback position.

The recommendation for approval could be supported with additional conditions.

**Any Declarations of Interest declared:**

None

**Any Declarations of Lobbying and Responses to Lobbying declared:**

None.

**Any Dispensation Granted:**

None