

**MINUTES** of a **MEETING** held on **Wednesday 8 April 2020** at **9.15am** by **VIDEOCONFERENCE** to review Planning Applications under Delegated Authority to the Town Clerk.

**PRESENT (by video):** Cllr A Smith (P&E Committee Chairman)  
 Cllr S Bird (P&E Vice-Chairman)  
 Cllr K Williams  
 Mr A Tadjrishi (Town Clerk)  
 Mrs S Morrison (Planning Administration Assistant)

**524. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Member(s)</b>	<b>Minute No.</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Cllr S Bird	All	Local Non-Pecuniary (as a Member of East Suffolk Council and as a Member of Suffolk County Council)
Cllr K Williams	528(a)	Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (Owner of property mentioned in Visual Impact Assessment Report submitted under DC/15/1128/OUT to which this application refers.)

Cllr Williams advised that although she had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest with regards to item 582(a), she had been granted a dispensation from the Clerk to participate in any discussion, but not vote, on the item.

Members present noted that recommendations being made by the Town Council to East Suffolk Council were to be determined by the Town Clerk, under delegated authority. Therefore, this was a consultation meeting, not a formal meeting of the Planning & Environment Committee.

**525. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**Members present confirmed that the Minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee Meeting were a true record.**

**These Minutes and a record of all recommendations made under Delegated Authority would be presented to the next full Committee meeting for formal approval and adoption.**

**526. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Town Clerk confirmed that all Felixstowe Town Councillors had been emailed a copy of the agenda and invited to submit comments.

**Members present discussed the planning applications below and the following recommendations were made under the Delegated Authority**

given to the Town Clerk in accordance with Extraordinary Council Minute #518 of 201920 and were submitted to East Suffolk Council:

a	<b>DC/20/1002/ARM</b>   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) <b>Candleet Road</b>
<p><b>The Town Council submits the following comments and recommendations in response to this application:</b></p> <p><b>1. Site Layout</b></p> <p><b>In terms of the site layout, there is a lack of clear measurements and detail on the distances between individual houses, the length of gardens and the sense of space provided across the development.</b></p> <p><b>2. 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>3. 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 is able to manage its own water runoff. The appendices referred to in the drainage strategy document are missing. Additionally, the strategy refers to the need for further assessment which does not appear to have been undertaken and moreover 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 para 3.17 of the drainage strategy proposes discharging 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>With Appendix I of the drainage strategy missing, we are unable to understand the maintenance requirements of the system being proposed. Furthermore, the liability for its ongoing maintenance needs</b></p>	

to be agreed.

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.

In accordance with The Town Council's environmental aspirations, the 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.

#### **4. 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.

#### **5. Highways Issues**

We support elements of the holding objection submitted by Suffolk Highways. However, we do not find ourselves in agreement with the following comments in their consultation response:

**Para 1 and 2:** 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.

**Ref. Para 3:** 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 .**

**Ref. Para 4, 5 and 6: 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.**

**Further to these issues, we note that the application does not refer to the junction arrangements with A154 Candlet Road and associated off-site works. However, condition No. 29 of the Outline planning consent prescribes that this is to be provided upon occupation of no more than 99 dwellings in accordance with previously approved details. The Council has highlighted a number of issues with the approved highways scheme with the applicant, which are supported by the Felixstowe Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners (FSALG) and which must be considered prior to discharge of this condition.**

**Specifically, if built as currently drawn, it will not be possible to retain the mature trees and green corridor along the eastbound side of Candlet Road from the junction of the development to the Grove Surgery whilst also providing the shared use footpath and cycleway. Additionally, construction would necessitate a visually intrusive retaining wall with a fence along the allotment boundary which is some 2 metres higher than the road. This would fundamentally and unnecessarily change this green, tree lined approach. The Council believes that this can be mitigated by reviewing the position of the layby to the eastbound side and/or utilising some of the width of the vegetation, mostly scrub, to the westbound side. We therefore ask that serious consideration is given to this issue as soon as appropriate.**

## **6. 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.**

**Page 52(50) of the D & A statement correctly records the requirement in the S106 agreement for, inter alia, "equipped play areas". 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.

**7. 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'.

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>	<p><b>DC/20/1205/LBC</b>   Listed Building Consent - Application to vary Listed Building Consent DC/19/0528/LBC - To demolish defective chimney reference FP4 The existing is defective and has major cracks and failed mortar and has a measurable lean - and rocks unsafely</p> <p><b>The Old Hall 37 High Road East</b></p>
<p><b>Committee recommended REFUSAL.</b></p> <p>We believe that heritage statement provided is incorrect where it states the chimney to be a "20th century addition" as there is photographic evidence that the chimney is an original feature of the building. Evidence will be submitted separately.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst we understand the applicant's predicament and accept the need to remove the existing chimney for reasons of safety, we see no reason why a replacement chimney sympathetic to the original design should not be required.</p> <p>We refer to the relevant sections of the NPPF, notably paragraphs 193 to 196. It is evident that there is no public good resulting from removal of the chimney, which is therefore contrary to national policy.</p>	

**527. PLANNING DECISIONS**

Members present noted 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.

**528. CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

**529. CLOSURE**

It was noted that the next review would take place by videoconference on Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> April at 9.15am.

The meeting was closed at 1.10 am.

---