

**MINUTES of a PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING held at
TOWN HALL, Felixstowe, on Wednesday 2 November 2022 at 9.15am**

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

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

IN ATTENDANCE: 4 members of the public (*in person*)
3 members of the public (*via Zoom*)

252. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Chairman advised that he would invite representations from members of the public immediately prior to debate on specific applications.

253. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from **Cllr S Gallant** and **Cllr K Williams**.

254. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member(s)	Minute No.	Nature of Interest
Cllr S Bird Cllr M Jepson Cllr S Wiles	All	Non-Pecuniary (as Members of East Suffolk Council)
Cllr S Bird Cllr S Wiles	All	Non-Pecuniary (as a Member of Suffolk County Council)

255. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

It was RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting held on 19 October 2022 be confirmed as a true record.

256. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

Committee noted concerns raised by three members of the public in respect of item A below about the loss of amenity for nearby residents, insufficient parking, access issues and the impact of commercial units on the locality.

A	DC/22/3980/FUL Commercial and Leisure spaces at ground floor and 14 flats on upper floors Adventure Golf Sea Road
<p>Committee recommended REFUSAL. We believe that this application is contrary to SCLP 12.14 which states “Proposals should consider the whole site for resort related uses to provide a vibrant mix of activities” clearly this application does not fulfil this criterion.</p> <p>In the Planning Statement at paragraph 5.9 the applicant states “The Council has supported proposals elsewhere along this section of Sea Road involving commercial uses at ground floor level with residential accommodation above”.</p> <p>That is a fundamental misuse of the phrase “this part of Sea Rd”. The change of land use and hence urban character at the site boundary is because the area was created some 130 years ago as a resort, and the frontage southwards maintained in that way for many years, supported by planning policies for many decades. The area to the north of this site and Buregate Rd supported the resort by being developed for holiday accommodation. Those two land uses are mutually necessary and supportive and essential for the future of the resort. This is a fundamental flaw in the application, in the context of SCLP12.14 as above.</p> <p>We note that a Flood Risk Assessment has now been submitted, however we would seriously dispute the contentions and claims made within that assessment. This site is subject to a risk of flood and the applicant has not adequately addressed this issue.</p> <p>Access and Parking: Whilst it is not a planning issue, we would dispute the use of the shared alleyway to serve as the access for this site. We further believe that the access - particularly with a height restricted entrance and tight turning circle - will be inadequate for commercial vehicles. Whilst we note the applicant’s comparison with the former North Sea Hotel site, nonetheless we believe that the provision for only 10 parking spaces for both residential and commercial occupiers, is totally inadequate and does not comply with SCC parking guidance. We recognise that parking in this busy seafront location is already at a premium and therefore on-street parking will not be a viable alternative for the residential units in this application and will detract from available visitor parking.</p> <p>We also believe that this application is contrary to SCLP 11.2 a) in that it will cause unacceptable loss of privacy and overlooking for several nearby residential properties in Arwela Road.</p> <p>Affordable units: We dispute the applicant’s claim in paragraphs 9.2 and 9.3 of their viability assessment that it is not financially viable to provide affordable dwellings in this location. We would request that, if the application is approved, the appropriate level of affordable units is provided.</p>	

B	DC/22/4027/FUL Single storey rear extension, loft conversion, and associated works 125 Colneis Road
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	
C	DC/22/3931/FUL Retrospective Application for a previously built ancillary annex adjoined to applicants workshop. Journeys End Marsh Lane
Committee recommended APPROVAL, subject to it being conditioned that this annexe should remain ancillary to the main dwelling.	
D	DC/22/3151/FUL Retrospective Application - Retention of cladding and rear single storey extension and dormer 19 Kemsley Road
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	
E	DC/22/4071/TCA 1no. Silver birch (marked '1' on plan) – Fell Belgrove 3 Ranelagh Road
Committee had NO OBJECTION to the work proposed subject to the guidance of the East Suffolk Council’s Arboricultural Officer.	

257. PLANNING DECISIONS

RESOLVED that the decisions on planning applications by East Suffolk Council notified to the Town Council since the previous meeting be noted.

258. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

259. CLOSURE

The meeting was closed at 10.47am. It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 16 November 2022 at 9.15am.

Date: _____

Chairman: _____