

MINUTES of a PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING held at BROADWAY HOUSE, ORWELL ROAD, on Wednesday 23 June 2021 at 9.15am

PRESENT: Cllr S Bird (Chairman)
Cllr S Bennett
Cllr S Gallant (*up to and including item 25b*)
Cllr M Morris
Cllr D Savage
Cllr K Williams (*up to and including item 25b*)

OFFICERS: Mr A Tadjrishi (Town Clerk)
Mrs S Morrison (Planning Administration Assistant via Zoom)

IN ATTENDANCE: 4 Members of the public (in person)
11 members of the public (via Zoom)
Cllr S Wiles (via Zoom)
Cllr M Deacon (via Zoom)

20. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman advised that he would invite members of the public to make their representations immediately prior to the application being considered.

21. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from **Cllrs A Smith, Cllr M Jepson, and Cllrs S Wiles** due to other business.

Cllr S Gallant and **Cllr K Williams** gave apologies in advance of needing to leave the meeting at 11.45am to attend to other business.

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member(s)	Minute No.	Nature of Interest
Cllr S Bird Cllr M Jepson Cllr S Gallant	All	Local Non-Pecuniary (as Members of East Suffolk Council)
Cllr S Bird	All	Local Non-Pecuniary (as a Member of Suffolk County Council)
Cllr M Morris	25(l)	Pecuniary Interest (as the applicant)

In declaring that the interest was pecuniary in nature, Cllr M Morris, advised that she would leave the meeting prior to and during the consideration of this item.

23. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

It was **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting held on 5 May 2021 be confirmed as a true record.

24. RECOMMENDATIONS MADE TO EAST SUFFOLK COUNCIL UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

Committee **NOTED** the record of recommendations made to the East Suffolk Council under delegated authority to the Town Clerk in accordance with Minute #17 of 2021/22.

25. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Committee considered the following planning applications received since the last meeting and **RESOLVED** to submit the following observations to East Suffolk Council:

At the direction of the Chairman, Committee heard representations from members of the public and Cllr M Deacon on the following application. A wide range of objections about the proposal were heard, referencing many issues experienced from the development of the adjacent site at Laureate Fields, the consultation process and concerns about the timing of development, density and height of housing, impact on service infrastructure and highways.

A	DC/21/2710/OUT Outline Planning Permission With Some Matters Reserved - to create up to 150 new homes, associated infrastructure and open space. Land North Of Conway Close And Swallow Close
Committee recommended REFUSAL. In particular, Committee had concerns about another development commencing whilst development is still ongoing at laureate fields; the foul water and surface drainage capacity and the consequential impact on highways from developing 150 homes on this site. Committee was also concerned that the indicative site illustrations only shows approximately half the homes that are being proposed under this outline approval.	

At the direction of the Chairman, Committee heard representations from members of the public, Cllr M Deacon and Cllr S Wiles, citing the historic and community value of the White Horse Public House as well as concerns about the impact of a convenience store on residential amenity in this location, the Grade 2* listed church opposite and other nearby shops.

B	DC/21/2318/FUL Demolition of the White Horse Public House (Use Suis Generis) and the erection of a convenience store (Use E) on the ground floor and four apartments (Use C3) on the first floor, and the erection of two
----------	--

bungalows (Use C3) with associated parking and landscaping.
The White Horse 33 Church Road

Felixstowe Town Council recommends REFUSAL of this application.

We object to the proposals in the strongest terms.

Firstly, we would request consideration is given to declaring the premises of the White Horse as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. This should include both the main public house building and all of the outbuildings.

We believe that the structures meet 3 of the 4 criteria set out in Section 4 and Appendix 1 of the Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2021) and summarised at SCLP Paragraph 11.37.

Under "Architectural Interest", it demonstrates aesthetic value because of its intrinsic local style and local characteristic, and it exhibits a positive external appearance. It was designed by well-known architect, Thomas Cotman, who was responsible for several important buildings in Felixstowe. Lastly, it contributes to the local scene as a landmark feature.

Under "Artistic Interest", the building has value as a good quality example of the iconic Arts and Crafts style. Under "Historic Interest", it has social and communal value. We recognise that it is part of the local identity (and has been for more than a century) and facilitates social interaction.

We have concluded that the application is contrary to SCLP Policy 8.1. The application fails to comply with any of the three conditions for change of use of a non-registered asset. There is quite demonstrably still a need for the public house as a community facility. Over 200 objections from residents have been submitted. A common theme within these is that the community emphatically value the facility, the only such establishment in that area.

Next, the applicant has failed to provide evidence of 12 months marketing, and we question the assertion that the business is no longer viable. We feel that the public house could be run profitably with different and more imaginative management techniques. Lastly, the Committee have decided that the proposed alternative use of the site for a convenience store does not meet the criterion of an equivalent or better facility, given that there is another convenience store in close proximity.

Regarding the proposed convenience store with four apartments and two bungalows, we consider that the scheme is contrary to several policies. SCLP 4.8 states that new retail facilities at out-of-town centre sites will only be permitted if it does not impact on neighbouring uses

in terms of traffic, parking and amenity issues. The Town Council considers that the amount of vehicle movements associated with the retail store and overflow parking in residential roads due to the inadequate provision of only 12 car spaces for the shop, will have an adverse impact in the vicinity. We do not recognise the applicant's claim that an estimated increase of two-way vehicle trips from 93 to 726 per day represents a minor increase.

The siting of a convenience store in a largely residential and quiet road will negatively affect the amenity of the residents. We further argue that the introduction of a convenience store at this particular location will result in unacceptable impacts on the established convenience store nearby and for other local independent retail outlets.

The Town Council has determined that the proposed building is contrary to SCLP Policy 11.1, specifically paragraph (b) as it fails to demonstrate an understanding of the built and historic environment, most especially the effect on the Grade 2* listed Church opposite. Additionally, we believe the proposal contravenes paragraph (c)i due to the scale and character in relation to its surroundings; (c)iii due to the height and massing in relation to the surroundings, and (c)iv failing to establish a clear relationship between the building and the wider street scene.

It is also contrary to SCLP Policy 11.2. para. (e) - the resulting physical relationship with other properties.

We have reached these conclusions in assessing the potential impact of a utilitarian and architecturally uninteresting building, 21m by 16.5m in size, in an area of traditional and architecturally appealing residential buildings.

Finally, the provision of only five car parking spaces (four plus one visitor space) for the proposed four 2-bedroom apartments does not meet the standards of the Suffolk County Council Advisory Parking Guidance.

Due to the number of items on the agenda, Committee agreed to extend the meeting time beyond 2 hours.

At this point, being 11.45am, Cllrs S Gallant and K Williams left to attend other business.

At the direction of the Chairman, item L below was moved to the next item.

Cllr M Morris left the meeting in accordance with her Pecuniary Interest declaration.

L	<p>DC/21/2808/TCA Rear garden 1 x Holly -Reduce and shape by up to 30%, to reduce shading on neighbour's garden. 1 x Apple - Remove as branches will interfere with neighbour's new fence. To be replaced by two evergreen shrubs. 1 x unknown: Remove, near a pond and there are 2 other trees nearby on either side, and it is too close to the fence to enable maintenance work.</p> <p>79 Ranelagh Road</p>
<p>Committee had NO OBJECTION to the work proposed subject to the guidance of the East Suffolk Council's Arboricultural Officer</p>	

Cllr M Morris returned.

C	<p>DC/21/2594/FUL Change of use of first floor to residential including new windows at first floor and new entrance door at ground floor. No changes to shop front</p> <p>24 Orwell Road</p>
<p>Committee recommended APPROVAL.</p>	

D	<p>DC/21/2481/FUL Single storey side extension to rear of property. New Dormer Window to roof of house fronting Quilter Road. New flat roof dormer to rear of house to form Ensuite Shower Room</p> <p>50 Quilter Road</p>
<p>The Committee recommended APPROVAL. In particular, Committee carefully considered the effect of a dormer window on the front elevation given that the property is within the Felixstowe Conservation Area.</p>	

E	<p>DC/21/2643/FUL Change of Use from Home Office (C3) to a small Barber Shop (A1), and will be operated by applicant as a sole practitioner.</p> <p>10 Reedland Way</p>
<p>Committee recommended APPROVAL. We note that the applicant has requested the wrong use class (A1) where this should be class E under the latest Use Class regulations. Given the other permissible uses within Class E we would ask that it be conditioned to use as a barber shop only.</p>	

F	<p>DC/21/2152/FUL We have recently had a garden room built where we were advised by the builders of the size we could have without needing planning permission. We have since discovered that as one corner of the building (it is at an angle to the house) sits a small way in front of the original front wall of the house that we are in breach of planning.</p> <p>99 Colneis Road</p>
<p>Committee recommended APPROVAL.</p>	

G	DC/21/2711/FUL Single storey rear extension, brick plinth cladding upper section 23 Rogers Close
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	

H	DC/21/2588/FUL Change of use from a commercial therapy room back to residential. 106 Garrison Lane
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	

I	DC/21/2573/ROC Removal of Condition(s) 15 on Planning Permission DC/20/4735/FUL - New Dwelling Condition Number(s): 15 Conditions(s) Removal: Clearance works completed ; report appended n/a The Light House Golf Road
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	

J	DC/21/2701/FUL Provision of new replacement accessible beach access ramp over sea defence wall. Martello Ramp (adjacent New Cafe) Corner Sea Road Orford Road
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	

K	DC/21/2609/FUL Replace the existing White P.v.c.u. Tilt/Turn window in the bedroom with White P.v.c.u. casement type frames. There will be no Colour or, Material change just design in casement handing. The existing window has openers operating inwards, the proposed has the openers operating outwards. Flat 22 Undercliffe Wolsey Gardens
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	

26. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

27. CLOSURE

The meeting was closed at 12.32pm. It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 7th July at 9.15am.

Date: _____

Chairman: _____