

the proposed fence and its consequential impact on light amenity for the neighbours at Brinkley Way and Estuary Drive; and the unadopted footpath that is shown to potentially provide access through to Rushmeadow Way.

A	DC/22/2295/FUL Construction of a pair of three bedroom houses South East Corner Laureate Fields Land West Of The Ferry Road Residential Centre Ferry Road
<p>Committee recommended REFUSAL.</p> <p>We have considered this application carefully, but Committee remain of the view that we took in 2019 on an almost identical application for this site. In addition to the comments that we made on that occasion (included below) we further stress that we believe that there is a flood risk at this site and we question whether there are adequate measures to deal with surface water in extreme weather events. We recognise that since development on this site commenced there have been two significant flooding issues affecting neighbouring properties in Brinkley Way from this site. Whilst we recognise that the applicant has permission for 197 dwellings under the Reserved Matters approval on this site, we believe that the two proposed dwellings in this particular location are unsatisfactory for a number of reasons.</p> <p>We believe that the proposed first floor rear window of the left-hand semi-detached property will cause unacceptable overlooking at the properties at 10 Estuary Drive and 25 Brinkley Way, the proposed 2.4m boundary fence will cause unacceptable loss of light at the windows at 25 Brinkley Way and create an intrusive affect.</p> <p>We also believe that development of this land will result in the loss of potential informal public open space, now that the proposed drainage basin is said to be no longer required in this location. Also this area provides a valuable open vista in this very built-up development. We also support the Arboricultural Officer's comments concerning the loss of vegetation, habitat and planting at this location.</p> <p>We therefore conclude that this application is contrary to SCLP 11.1 para. (c) i and ii, and SCLP 11.2 para. (a) (c) (e).</p> <p><i>FTC Comment to previous application DC/19/4079/FUL</i></p> <p>Committee recommended REFUSAL. <i>The Committee were very concerned by the application overall, and also wider issues of flooding in this area. Whilst we accept that DC/17/5394/DRC removed the specific need for the infiltration basin and soakaway in the area in regard to highways, we question the reality that:</i></p> <p><i>i) the permeable surface will be an effective mechanism in the case of severe storms, which is commonly accepted are becoming more</i></p>	

frequent; and,

ii) recent experience following a relatively modest rain storm flooded adjacent land with flows partially from the site in question.

We would suggest therefore, that it is highly likely that the proposal could at the least seriously exacerbate this problem in the future. Committee also believes that the proposal would result in a loss of amenity to adjacent properties, primarily by overlooking 25 Brinkley Way and 10 Estuary Drive, in contravention to DM23(a).

On a wider view, we greatly regret the intensification of use of the overall site as represented by this application, particularly in reference to DM21(f) in this respect. The space in question, even if not technically required for highway drainage purposes, represents a welcome provision of a small open public space to the benefit of future residents. We would request that this be considered by the developer. Furthermore, we remain concerned at the ongoing discovery of changes to this site from the original planning application which have occurred without significant public consultation.

B	DC/22/1983/FUL Placement of a beach hut on The Triangle to be used as a tourist information centre to promote Felixstowe The Triangle Hamilton Road
Committee recommended APPROVAL. We strongly support this initiative and in our view it enhances the Conservation Area.	

C	DC/22/2149/FUL Erection of part single/part two storey rear extension (conservatory to be removed) 7 Queens Road
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	

D	DC/22/2127/FUL Construction of a ground floor extension to rear of property and provide first floor ensuite to bedroom 39 Beatrice Avenue
Committee recommended APPROVAL.	

E	DC/22/2489/TCA 1no. American linden tree (marked on plan) Crown reduction by up to 2 metres 1 College Green
Committee had NO OBJECTION to the work proposed subject to the guidance of the East Suffolk Council’s Arboricultural Officer.	

F	DC/22/1892/FUL Construction of an annexe. Guitar lodge 165 Grange Road
Committee had NO OBJECTION to the work proposed subject to the guidance of the East Suffolk Council's Arboricultural Officer.	

94. PLANNING DECISIONS

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

95. HOUSING IN CLUSTERS AND SMALL-SCALE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE – DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT CONSULTATION

Committee considered Draft Housing in Clusters and Small Scale Residential Development in the Countryside Supplementary Planning Document.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Committee would respond as follows:

Having considered the draft document, Members welcome this SPD. We feel that it provides a succinct but valuable interpretation of policy SCLP 5.4 which has proved difficult to interpret in the past.

96. CORRESPONDENCE

Committee **NOTED** the following correspondence:

- i. Invitation received from Persimmons for a site visit to Trelawney Place.**

It was agreed that the Clerk would respond to advise that Members would welcome a site visit at midday on Wednesday 20th July.

97. CLOSURE

The meeting was closed at 11.20am. It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled to take place on Wednesday 20th July 2022 at 9.15am.

Date: _____

Chairman: _____