

| | |
|--|---|
| B | DC/21/1608/FUL Single storey entrance porch extension, first floor DC extension over existing garage, and single-storey rear extension 41 Westmorland Road |
| <p>Committee recommended REFUSAL on following grounds:</p> <p>The proposal appears to be contrary to SCLP11.1 para. (b) as it does not demonstrate a clear understanding of, or complement, the local character and distinctiveness of this estate.</p> <p>Furthermore, with reference to SCLP para. (c) i iv, the proposal does not relate well to the scale and strong character of its immediate surroundings; will impact the existing neighbourhood layout; and, due to its massing and design, does not relate well to the street scene at Westmorland Road and Wrens Park.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the impact on residential amenity, with reference to SCLP11.2 para. (e) and its physical relationship with other properties.</p> <p>Committee was also concerned that the proposed ensuite bathroom to the south-east corner of the first floor does not appear to be linked to a bedroom, and also noted that the roof structure for the single storey rear extension includes a central support beam marked “Triple posi-joists to support first floor walls.” ESC should seek clarification and carefully monitor this. We are concerned that any later second storey addition would further overlook Wrens Park. ESC should seek clarification and monitor carefully.</p> <p>If ESC is minded to approve the application Committee has noted that the domestic hallway appears to be divided into two; one element being titled “Foyer”, leading to “Gym / Games Room . Committee therefore asks that clarification be sought from the applicant as to any intended business use prior to the determination of this application. Care must be taken to ensure that any business or other use of the property does not impinge on residential amenity.</p> | |

At 10.10am the meeting was adjourned.

The meeting resumed at 10.17am.

| | |
|--|---|
| C | DC/21/3860/FUL Construction of two residential dwellings Land At Brackenbury House Marcus Road |
| <p>Committee recommended APPROVAL. We have considered the revised layout and the amenity to the two proposed houses and the adjacent property at Brackenbury House.</p> | |

| | |
|---|--|
| D | DC/21/3854/FUL Demolition of existing detached dwelling and construction of 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings Riby House 9 Riby Road |
| Committee carefully considered that this application for four modest well-designed dwellings at this location and recommended APPROVAL. However, Committee had concerns about the practicalities of the build in view of the steeply rising ground levels on the site, which are not indicated in the drawings, and which would require significant excavation to achieve a build at street level, as apparently indicated. There are also locally-known subsidence issues in this area and Committee asks that this issue is fully investigated and confirmed as satisfactory prior to determination. | |
| E | DC/21/3989/FUL Retrospective application - two storey front/side extension The Priory 2 Cliff Road |
| Committee carefully considered the recent changes to this property and, in the context of many preceding changes, our view is that there is no significant negative impact to the listed building. Committee therefore recommended APPROVAL. | |
| F | DC/21/3990/LBC - two storey front/side extension (retention of works already undertaken). The Priory 2 Cliff Road |
| Committee carefully considered the recent changes to this property and, in the context of many preceding changes, our view is that there is no significant negative impact to the listed building. Committee therefore recommended APPROVAL. | |
| G | DC/21/3812/ADI Advertisement Consents - Illuminated Fascia Signage 120 Hamilton Road |
| Committee recommended APPROVAL. | |
| H | DC/21/3983/FUL Proposed Alterations and Extensions To Dwelling Including Conversion Of Existing Garage 8 Ennerdale Close |
| Committee recommended APPROVAL. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| I | DC/21/3769/FUL Proposed single storey part rear/part side extension and alterations 1 Kemsley Road |
| <p>Committee considered the height and depth of the extension immediately adjacent to the neighbouring garden and took the view that this would be intrusive to the neighbour’s amenity and cause overshadowing of the garden, in contravention of SCLP 11.2 (b) outlook; (c) access to daylight and sunlight; and, (e) physical relationship to other properties. Committee therefore recommended REFUSAL.</p> | |
| J | DC/21/3386/FUL To change current windows and doors to UPVC. Like for like in style 2 Red Hall Court |
| <p>Committee recommended APPROVAL subject to the detailed design being to a similar level of detail to previous replacement windows in this location.</p> | |
| K | DC/21/3776/TCA Holm Oak (T001) - fell and remove stump. Tree has large areas of decay and significant dead limbs as described in Tree Condition Report attached Harvest Court Cobbold Road |
| <p>Committee had NO OBJECTION to the work proposed subject to the guidance of the East Suffolk Council’s Arboricultural Officer.</p> | |
| L | DC/21/3957/TCA Front garden, immediately to right of double garage 1 x Gleditsia triacanthos (Honey locust) - Fell to ground level Reason: The tree has substantial dieback and is located close to pavement and road. The trunk abuts the wall of the of the existing old pre-cast concrete garages and pressure from the trunk is damaging several wall panels and pushing them out of alignment; owner plans to build new garages on the site of the existing garages, which are old and dilapidated. 11 High Beach |
| <p>Committee had NO OBJECTION to the work proposed subject to the guidance of the East Suffolk Council’s Arboricultural Officer.</p> | |

110. 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 be noted.

111. CORRESPONDENCE

Committee noted the following correspondence received:

- i) Confirmation from ESC that DC/21/2210/FUL, Ranelagh Road, had been considered by the Planning Referral Panel and delegated to officers for determination.
- ii) Notice of an appeal APP/X3540/W/21/3273329 made to the Secretary of State against the decision of ESC to refuse application DC/20/1666/FUL, Former Itron Factory. Committee reviewed its recommendation to refuse the application and made no further comment.
- iii) Notification from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) advising that its final recommendations for electoral arrangements for Suffolk County Council had been published. Members noted that there were no changes relevant to Felixstowe since the draft recommendations. The Clerk advised that the LGBCE intends the Order to make provision for parish elections at the next normal election date in May 2023.
- iv) ESC Design and Conservation advice in respect of DC/21/2318/FUL, White Horse Public House, Church Road, that the building meets six of the ten criteria for Non-Designated Heritage Assets, confirming that it is a heritage asset of moderately high significance. The Clerk advised that this status would therefore need to be taken into account by ESC planning officers when determining the application.
- v) Notification that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised on 20 July 2021, setting out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The Clerk would share a summary of the changes with Members.
- vi) Local highways works. Committee noted a news article highlighting that traffic controls at Candlet Road were set to continue until December, with a two-week total closure during October. Members felt that it was unacceptable for Candlet Road to be fully closed to traffic, particularly with ongoing highways works impacting traffic flow along other main roads. Noting a recent oil spill on the A14 which had caused gridlock, Members also felt that police resources should be immediately available to manage such acute traffic issues. The Clerk would write to the County Council Cabinet Members for Highways to outline Members concerns and ask that consideration be given to a revised plan to mitigate the extent of the impact on traffic.

112. CLOSURE

The meeting was closed at 11.38am. It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 22nd September at 9.15am.

Date: _____

Chairman: _____