

**MINUTES of a PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING held  
ONLINE on Wednesday 9 September 2020 at 9.15am**

**PRESENT:** Cllr S Bird (Chairman)                      Cllr M Morris  
                 Cllr A Smith (Vice-Chairman)              Cllr D Savage  
                 Cllr S Bennett                                      Cllr K Williams  
                 Cllr M Jepson

**OFFICERS** Mr A Tadjrishi (Town Clerk)  
                 Mrs S Morrison (Planning Administration Assistant)

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Two members of public.

**188. PUBLIC QUESTION**

None

**189. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from **Cllr S Gallant** and **Cllr S Wiles**

**190. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Member(s)</b>	<b>Minute No.</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Cllr S Bird Cllr M Jepson	All	Local Non-Pecuniary (as Members of East Suffolk Council)
Cllr S Bird	All	Local Non-Pecuniary (as Member of Suffolk County Council)

As no Pecuniary declarations were made, there were no requests for dispensation.

**191. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**It was RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting held on 19 August 2020 be confirmed as a true record.**

**192. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

<b>A</b>	<p><b>DC/20/1002/ARM   Approval of Reserved Matters and Discharge of Condition 18 relating to Outline Planning Consent (PP/J3530/W/15/3138710 - DC/15/1128/OUT) - Phase 1 - Residential (262 Dwellings, open space and supporting services and infrastructure). Land at Candlet Road,</b></p>
	<p><b>The Town Council submits the following comments in relation to this latest application:</b></p> <p><b>1. Boundary treatment</b></p> <p><b>Boundary plans should seek to retain existing hedgerows and vegetation wherever possible, and clarification is sought as to the proposed boundary treatment to allotment site. See also comments under Public Open Space below.</b></p> <p><b>2. Drainage and Sewerage</b></p> <p><b>It is critical that the drainage arrangements are robust enough to mitigate the impact of water being displaced from this development. The site is known to have several watercourses, which are regularly overloaded, as has been borne out by recent local experience. It is therefore imperative that the development can manage its own water runoff. Further assessment does not appear to have been undertaken and moreover it is not an appropriate approach as this is required to be detailed and understood prior to approval of the application.</b></p> <p><b>We note that it is proposed to discharge partly into existing watercourses. However, the landscaping drawings show that the watercourses are to be covered over and seeded with wildflower. This documented contradiction between the drainage strategy and landscaping drawing is unacceptable.</b></p> <p><b>The watercourses are an essential element of the local water management system and should be retained, enhanced and properly maintained.</b></p> <p><b>Further assessment does not appear to have been undertaken and moreover it is not an appropriate approach as this is required to be detailed and understood prior to approval of the application. We note that it is proposed to discharge partly into existing watercourses.</b></p> <p><b>The foul-drainage capacity for this area of Felixstowe has been shown, over many years, to be wholly inadequate. This development, together with others, will feed back into the existing system. Therefore, wider discussions should take place with relevant stakeholders to ensure that a fully integrated and strategic approach to provision of sufficient capacity in the long term can be achieved.</b></p> <p><b>In accordance with The Town Council’s environmental aspirations, the</b></p>

developer should explore the potential for surface water runoff to be collected and made available to the adjacent allotments which would help reduce the use of fresh water.

### **3. Renewable Energy**

Felixstowe Town Council have declared a Climate Emergency; as East Suffolk Council and many other authorities have also done. It is therefore important to consider all development proposals in this context.

The applicant's Design and Access Statement appropriately refers to Policy DM21 (f) which states that *"The District Council will support and strongly encourage the conservation of energy and the use of alternative and renewable sources of energy in the design and layout of proposals for new buildings and conversion of existing buildings, provided it would not seriously detract from the character of the area."*

It is therefore inappropriate that the application is silent on the opportunity to build in well-established technologies for alternative and environmentally friendly energy sources, notably ground source heat pumps. The Town Council notes that locally, organisations such as Flagship Housing have introduced such provision in their own estates, even retrofitting where not originally installed, with a claimed 66% reduction in household energy bills and hence energy usage.

### **4. Highways Issues**

However, we do not find ourselves in agreement with the following comments in their consultation response:

We believe that the proposed vehicular entrance to the school site should be moved southwards, just to the north of the pond, with provision considered within the school site for parent parking/drop off, to avoid congestion to the northern part of the site and deter people from using Gulpher Road as a school drop of point.

We agree that footpath 24 should be upgraded to provide a metalled surface suitable for pedestrians, linking to the central part of The Grove. However the desired interconnectivity for cyclists should be appropriately routed with a view to establishing links to the wider 'Felixstowe Garden Neighbourhood' concept to the north of the Grove so as to avoid encouraging intensive use of the Grove Woodland by cycles and horses, for which it is not an appropriate location .

We believe that the developer's proposals are similar to that of other similar developments over recent decades, notably Faulkner's Way Trimley and we do not believe the issues raised by Highways are evident on those sites.

We ask that the developer explore the possibility of an access point into allotment site, which the Council owns and would be pleased to work with them to achieve.

#### 5. Public Open Space

We have great concern that the landscape drawings show the complete elimination of the existing watercourse to the north west and north of the site, which are to be covered over and seeded. We believe this is unacceptable both from a drainage perspective, as referred to above, and in terms of the loss of the public amenity and ecological assets which they currently represent, and which should be enhanced as part of the wider Green Spaces concept.

We note that equipped play areas are not provided in accordance with the s106 agreement. However, none are proposed in this application, as stated e.g. at para. 3,3: "... Public Open Space ... comprising of ..... 0 Acres of play areas". Accordingly, equipped play areas should be provided.

#### 6. Affordable Housing

We commend the exemplary arrangements in terms of the level of provision and integration of affordable housing, balanced throughout the site which we understand will be 'tenure-blind'.

#### 7. House Design

Committee was disappointed by the uniformity of design which is not in keeping with the local area. The developer should be encouraged to propose a more sympathetic design portfolio, reflecting the local vernacular in accordance with DM21 (a) which states that proposals should relate well to the scale and character of their surroundings particularly in terms of their siting, height, massing and form.

Finally, we would ask that a condition be made that Phase 1 of the development is completed before Phase 2 begins.

The Council therefore recommends **REFUSAL** of the application unless the issues above can be satisfactorily resolved.

<b>B</b>	<b>DC/20/3016/FUL</b>   Provision of new enlarged single storey security cabin in 1 Nicholas Road Container Yard as replacement for existing cabin (size 12.01 x 2.96m) <b>Plot 1 Nicholas Road</b>
<b>Committee recommended APPROVAL</b>	

<b>C</b>	<p><b>DC/20/3298/VOC</b>   Variation of Condition(s) 2, 7, 9 and 15 on planning permission DC/13/3656/FUL (Proposed high bay distribution unit with a footprint of c. 47,000m2, including car parking and associated infrastructure)</p> <p><b>Land At Clickett Hill Road And South Of Railway Line Nicholas Road Trimley St Mary</b></p>
<b>Committee recommended APPROVAL</b>	
<b>D</b>	<p><b>DC/20/3066/FUL</b>   Change of use of ground floor former Grocers (A1) to C3 use and retention of existing dwelling at first floor and second floor</p> <p><b>12 Manning Road</b></p>
<b>Committee recommended APPROVAL.</b>	
<b>E</b>	<p><b>DC/20/3067/FUL</b>   Proposed new welfare hub to include 3No cabins positioned on paving slab base to accommodate storage, wc's and coffee hut. Incl 2.4m high anti climb security fencing to perimeter plus security lighting.</p> <p><b>Seaton Recreation Ground Seaton Road</b></p>
<p><b>Committee acknowledged and understood local concerns, considering those and potential safeguarding issues in respect of the proposed compound partially obscuring visibility of the adjacent play area. However, on balance we believe that the benefits outweigh the issues and recommend APPROVAL.</b></p>	
<b>F</b>	<p><b>DC/20/3301/FUL</b>   Construction of a two storey extension to the side of the existing dwelling and single story garden room to the rear</p> <p><b>14 St Georges Road</b></p>
<b>Committee recommended APPROVAL</b>	
<b>G</b>	<p><b>DC/20/3118/FUL</b>   Single storey side extension to existing nursery provision</p> <p><b>Day Nursery Convent Of Jesus And Mary 61-63 Orwell Road</b></p>
<b>Committee recommended APPROVAL</b>	
<b>H</b>	<p><b>DC/20/3225/FUL</b>   Proposed Two Storey Front Extension with Ground Floor Side Extension</p> <p><b>18 Western Avenue</b></p>
<p><b>Committee recommended REFUSAL. The application is not as described and the drawings propose the subdivision of the property and the creation of two dwellings, rather than an extension to the existing property.</b></p>	

<b>I</b>	<b>DC/20/3303/FUL</b>   Single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling <b>64 Constable Road</b>
<b>Committee recommended REFUSAL. Whilst we have no objection to the principle and plan of this design we were unable to ascertain the height of the extension and were concerned that the parapet height may adversely impact the neighbouring properties in contravention to DM23(c) in relation to access to daylight and sunlight.</b>	
<b>J</b>	<b>DC/20/3153/FUL</b>   Single storey rear extension with flat roof <b>4 Walnut Close</b>
<b>Committee recommended APPROVAL</b>	
<b>K</b>	<b>DC/20/3113/FUL</b>   Side and rear extension (reduced scheme from that approved under DC/18/0760/FUL) <b>2 Looe Road</b>
<b>Committee recommended APPROVAL.</b>	
<b>L</b>	<b>DC/20/3149/TPO</b>   TPO SCDC 00/0140 Part G1 11no. Holm Oak - crown reduce back to previous reduction points, and reduce overhang over No. 14. <b>11 Foxgrove Gardens</b>
<b>Committee had NO OBJECTION to the work proposed subject to the guidance of the East Suffolk Council's Arboricultural Officer.</b>	

### **193. PLANNING DECISIONS**

**RESOLVED** that the decisions received from East Suffolk Council since the date of the previous agenda and up until the date of the agenda for this meeting be noted.

### **194. CONSULTATIONS: REFORM OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM**

Cllr A Smith gave a brief overview of the issues relating to the response to the 35 questions raised by NALC, which originated from MHCLG.

There were four main areas within the paper: Boosting Housing Supply; Delivering First Homes: Extension of Permission in Principle and Enabling the Smaller Developer. Cllr Smith advised the coverage of the changes had not been well represented by the media. Those elements of the changes reported had been largely related to separate business (not retail) sites.

Members reviewed the draft response which had been circulated prior to the meeting and, with a couple of amendments, asked the Clerk to finalise and submit to both NALC and MHCLG on behalf of the Council.

It was also agreed that there should be two workshops for Members to review the 'Planning for the future' and 'Transparency and competition' white papers which required responses in October. The first would be for a few Members to formulate an initial response, with a second workshop to allow for further discussion with all Committee Members. Following these workshops, the matter would be considered and debate at the following Planning & Environment Committee meeting in October.

The Clerk was asked to make the necessary arrangements and circulate any relevant information to all Members.

**It was RESOLVED that:**

- i) the Clerk should finalise and submit the Committee's response to the 'Changes to the current planning system' consultation to both NALC and MHCLG on behalf of the Council; and,**
- ii) the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Cllr K Williams, Town Clerk and Planning Administration Assistant should review the 'Planning for the future' and 'Transparency and competition' white papers prior to a further discussion at a Committee workshop involving all Members, dates for which to be circulated by the Clerk.**

## **195. CORRESPONDENCE**

Members noted the following:

**Suffolk County Council (District of Waveney) (Stopping, Waiting and Loading Prohibitions and Restrictions and On-Street Parking Places) (Map-Based) Order 2018 (School Entrance Markings) (Variation No. 8) Order 2020**  
This notice prohibited stopping in front of school entrances.

## **196. CLOSURE**

The meeting was closed at 12.26pm. The date of the next meeting was noted as being Wednesday 23 September 2020, 9.15am.

---

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_