

CIRCULATED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING

ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS REPORT

PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 August 2016

AGENDA ITEM 8: Former water company offices Rectory Road, Lowestoft: partial demolition, conversion, and new construction to create 20 dwellings

9/8/16 Local Objection

I am an owner at Kingswear Court and previously objected to the proposed development of St Marys convent building. In order to illustrate the effect of the proposed development, particularly block B projecting 8.6 metres beyond an historical and well established building line within a conservation area, I have attached a visual mock up.

I've attached views with the proposed building included in the photos - the view looking east from Kirkley Cliff only just includes the "lodge" bungalow alongside the main entrance.

On the view from the opposite side of Rectory Road there are three photos - the original (it was difficult to stitch the two photographs together because of the distortion at this close distance), the second view is with the proposed building shown.

On this view the roof position of the existing building to remain has been used to anchor the drawing so it is a very good representation. The third view shows the tower of the existing building, so it can be readily seen how far forward the new building projects beyond the existing building line.

The third view point is from a point down Kirkley Cliff near the hotel Victoria. This view does suffer from lacking perspective on Block B to the rear of Block A, but this gives a good general indication of the blank gable ends of Block A with Block B to the rear projecting beyond the building line.

Please will you include these representations in your deliberations and consider the implications of this, in my view, unwanted development.

Further letter received 10/8/16 following a message that paste up views cannot be relied upon:

Dear Mr Green, thank you for your prompt response. I am but a private individual without the means or resources to commission 3d modelling.

By providing the image, my intention was merely to illustrate the mass of additional build (block B) proposed, when viewed from a southerly aspect.

A further image is attached which may hold greater merit by overlaying the proposed (block B) extended building onto an existing view.

As you will be aware, traffic is one way (north to south) along Kirkley Cliff Road and when viewed from a northerly direction block B will likely be no less intrusive than viewed from the south by virtue that the extension (block B) will 'stick out' 8.6 m beyond the existing building line which applies almost uniformly to all property east of Kirkley Cliff Rd.

While my image may not be technically accurate, it will serve to represent substantially the effect of the development which, in my opinion, overwhelmingly consumes what little of the buildings existing facade it is proposed to leave remaining intact.

The development would, in my view, be greatly enhanced should the applicant remove Block B from their proposal and undertake to restrict all works to within the footprint of the existing building.

Please will you bring this latest image, and points made above, to the attention of members of the planning committee in order that they may take into consideration my concerns, prior to determination of the application.

(Note: the images referred to are part of the presentation)

12/08/16 Further letter received from the Victorian Society

RE: Former Convent, Rectory Road, Lowestoft (c. 1900, South Lowestoft Conservation Area); application for the partial demolition of the existing building and the erection of new dwellings

Our ref: 2015/09/005

Thank you for your letter informing the Society of the revised proposals. Despite the evident improvements in the scheme, we remain concerned at the extent of demolition still proposed, which has not been justified and which would be harmful to the locally significant building and the significance of the Conservation Area. The turret on the south-west corner is a particularly important and prominent feature of the building: at the very least it and the block of which it forms part must be retained. Views of the turret from both the north and south along Kirkley Cliff Road must also be preserved.

We remain concerned also by the quality of the design and detailing of the proposed new build elements, which is not commensurate with that of the historic structure. While it is modest in appearance – and appropriately so – the former convent is well-built and pleasingly proportioned. Any new build must be of a comparable quality. As proposed the new buildings suffer from an evident desire to squeeze as much accommodation into the new blocks as possible; the meanness of the three-storey structures (and the spaces within them) is clearly apparent, resulting in a stockiness of window proportion that appears incongruous in the context of the historic building. The retention and adaptation of the existing two-storey buildings (which we suggest above) would not only maintain the building's interest and the positive contribution it makes to the surrounding area, it would almost certainly lend itself to far more commodious, comfortable and desirable dwellings.

The erection of two 'lodges' would be a far more appropriate means of providing additional accommodation in the grounds than that previously proposed, and it is one that reduces pressure on the historic structure. Their gardens would require careful landscaping to ensure that the openness of the site is maintained. Visually jarring, intrusive and potentially cluttering elements – such as fences, walls and large expanses of tarmac – should not be permitted.

On this basis we maintain our objection and recommend that you refuse this application consent.

Yours sincerely

James Hughes

15/8/16 Letter from SCC Development Contributions Manager

Lowestoft: Rectory Road – developer contributions

Whilst most infrastructure requirements will be covered under Waveney District Council's Regulation 123 list of the Community Infrastructure Levy charging schedule it is nonetheless the Government's intention that all development must be sustainable as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). On this basis the County Council sets out below the infrastructure implications with costs if planning permission is granted and implemented.

The adopted 'Section 106 Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk' sets out how contributions are assessed and calculated.

1. Education. Paragraph 72 of the NPPF states that 'The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education'.

The NPPF at paragraph 38 states 'For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.'

SCC would anticipate the following minimum pupil yields from a development of 20 dwellings, namely:

- a. Primary school age range, 5-11: 5 pupils. Cost per place is £12,181 (2016/17 costs).
- b. Secondary school age range, 11-16: 4 pupils. Cost per place is £18,355 (2016/17 costs).
- c. Secondary school age range, 16+: 1 pupil. Costs per place is £19,907 (2016/17 costs).

The local catchment schools are Red Oak Primary School, St Mary's Roman Catholic Academy and East Point Academy. At the primary and secondary school level current SCC forecasts show that there will be surplus places available to accommodate all of the pupils arising from this development.

2. Pre-school provision. Refer to the NPPF 'Section 8 Promoting healthy communities'. It is the responsibility of SCC to ensure that there is sufficient local provision under the Childcare Act 2006. Section 7 of the Childcare Act sets out a duty to secure free early years provision for pre-school children of a prescribed age. The current requirement is to ensure 15 hours per week of free provision over 38 weeks of the year for all 3 and 4 year-olds. The Education Bill 2011 amended Section 7, introducing the statutory requirement for 15 hours free early years education for all disadvantaged 2 year olds.

From these development proposals we anticipate up to 2 pre-school pupils arising at a cost of £12,182 (2016/17 costs).

This development falls in the Carlton Colville Ward where there is a deficit of 267 Early Education places from September 2017. In The Carlton Colville ward there are the following providers: Carlton Colville Pre School, Grove Primary and 4 Childminders.

Please note that the early years pupil yield ratio of 10 children per hundred dwellings is expected to change and increase substantially in the near future. The Government announced, through the 2015 Queen's Speech, an intention to double the amount of free provision made available to 3 and 4 year olds, from 15 hours a week to 30.

3. Play space provision. Consideration will need to be given to adequate play space provision. A key document is the 'Play Matters: A Strategy for Suffolk', which sets out the vision for providing more open space where children and young people can play.

4. Transport issues. Refer to the NPPF 'Section 4 Promoting sustainable transport'. A comprehensive assessment of highways and transport issues will be required as part of the planning application. This will include travel plan, pedestrian & cycle provision, public transport, rights of way, air quality and highway provision (both on-site and off-site). Requirements will be dealt with via planning conditions and Section 106 as appropriate, and infrastructure delivered to adoptable standards via Section 38 and Section 278. Please refer to Luke Barber.

Suffolk County Council, in its role as local Highway Authority, has worked with the local planning authorities to develop county-wide technical guidance on parking which replaces the preceding Suffolk Advisory Parking Standards (2002) in light of new national policy and local research. It has been subject to public consultation and was adopted by Suffolk County Council in November 2014.

5. Libraries. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Chapter 8 talks about the importance of 'Promoting healthy communities', particularly paragraphs 69 & 70. Paragraph 69 states that "the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities". Local communities regard the library service as an important and valued community facility. Paragraph 70 talks about the need to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities the community needs by planning positively for community facilities such as cultural buildings to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; and to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs. There is also the need to ensure that facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community.

The adopted 'Section 106 Developers Guide to Infrastructure Contributions in Suffolk' and the supporting 'Libraries and Archive Infrastructure Provision' topic paper sets out the general approach to securing library developer contributions. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) previously published national standards for library provision and used to monitor Library Authorities' performance against the standards. Whilst these national standards are no longer a statutory requirement they form the basis for Suffolk County Council's in-house standards, which form the basis of the contract with Suffolk Libraries. The standard recommends a figure of 30 square metres per 1,000 population as a benchmark for local authorities; which for Suffolk represents a cost of £90 per person or £216 per dwelling based on an average occupancy of 2.4 persons per dwelling.

The capital contribution towards libraries arising from this scheme is £4,320, which would be spent on enhancing library facilities & services in the vicinity of the development.

6. Waste. All local planning authorities should have regard to both the Waste Management Plan for England and the National Planning Policy for Waste when discharging their responsibilities to the extent that they are appropriate to waste management. The Waste Management Plan for England sets out the Government's ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management.

Paragraph 8 of the National Planning Policy for Waste states that when determining planning applications for non-waste development, local planning authorities should, to the extent appropriate to their responsibilities, ensure that:

- New, non-waste development makes sufficient provision for waste management and promotes good design to secure the integration of waste management facilities with the rest of the development and, in less developed areas, with the local landscape. This includes providing adequate storage facilities

at residential premises, for example by ensuring that there is sufficient and discrete provision for bins, to facilitate a high quality, comprehensive and frequent household collection service.

SCC requests that waste bins and garden composting bins should be provided before occupation of each dwelling and this will be secured by way of a planning condition. SCC would also encourage the installation of water butts connected to gutter down-pipes to harvest rainwater for use by occupants in their gardens.

The waste disposal facilities topic paper sets out the detailed approach to how contributions are calculated i.e. a contribution of £51 per dwelling giving a total of £1,020.

7. Supported Housing. In line with Sections 6 and 8 of the NPPF, homes should be designed to meet the health needs of a changing demographic population. Following the replacement of the Lifetime Homes standard, designing homes to the new 'Category M4(2)' standard offers a useful way of fulfilling this objective, with a proportion of dwellings being built to 'Category M4(3)' standard. In addition we would expect a proportion of the housing and/or land use to be allocated for housing with care for older people e.g. Care Home and/or specialised housing needs, based on further discussion with the local planning authority's housing team to identify local housing needs.

8. Sustainable Drainage Systems. Refer to the NPPF 'Section 10 Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change'. On 18 December 2014 there was a Ministerial Written Statement made by The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Mr Eric Pickles). The changes took effect from 06 April 2015.

"To this effect, we expect local planning policies and decisions on planning applications relating to major development - developments of 10 dwellings or more; or equivalent non-residential or mixed development (as set out in Article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010) - to ensure that sustainable drainage systems for the management of run-off are put in place, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.

Under these arrangements, in considering planning applications, local planning authorities should consult the relevant lead local flood authority on the management of surface water; satisfy themselves that the proposed minimum standards of operation are appropriate and ensure through the use of planning conditions or planning obligations that there are clear arrangements in place for ongoing maintenance over the lifetime of the development. The sustainable drainage system should be designed to ensure that the maintenance and operation requirements are economically proportionate."

9. Fire Service. Any fire hydrant issues will need to be covered by appropriate planning conditions. SCC would strongly recommend the installation of automatic fire sprinklers. The Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service requests that early consideration is given during the design stage of the development for both access for fire vehicles and the provisions of water for fire-fighting which will allow us to make final consultations at the planning stage.

10. Super-fast broadband. Refer to the NPPF paragraphs 42 – 43. SCC would recommend that all development is equipped with high speed broadband (fibre optic). This facilitates home working which has associated benefits for the transport network and also contributes to social inclusion; it also impacts educational attainment and social wellbeing, as well as improving property prices and saleability.

As a minimum, access line speeds should be greater than 30Mbps, using a fibre based broadband solution, rather than exchange based ADSL, ADSL2+ or exchange only connections. The strong recommendation from SCC is that a full fibre provision should be made, bringing fibre cables to each premise within the development (FTTP/FTTH). This will provide a network infrastructure which is fit for the future and will enable faster broadband.

11. Legal costs. SCC will require an undertaking for the reimbursement of its own legal costs in connection with work on a S106A, whether or not the matter proceeds to completion.

12. The above information is time-limited for 6 months only from the date of this letter.

The above will form the basis of a future bid to Waveney District Council for CIL funds if planning permission is granted and implemented.

Additional recommended conditions:

Add to condition 11: Materials samples and brick sample panel showing mortar mix and finish.

Add extra condition 12: Prior to the commencement of development (other than demolition), a sustainable drainage scheme for the management of surface water, including details of methods for the treatment of car park run off and the maintenance of the system, shall be submitted to and agreed in written with the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be constructed prior to the occupation of the development and maintained thereafter in the approved form.

Reason: To ensure the benefits of sustainable drainage.

AGENDA ITEM 9: Land south of Southwold Road, Stoven; Erection of agricultural (pig finishing) building

3/8/16 SCC Highways

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority make the following comments:

This proposal is unlikely to have any significant impact on the local highway network.

AGENDA ITEM 10: 92 Dukes Drive, Halesworth, Construction of House

12/8/16 – additional near neighbour (Theresa Nichols at 10 Dakings Drift) comment relating to 92 Dukes Drive

The correspondence reiterates previous concerns, and confirms that the author is unable to attend to speak at the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 11: The Bungalow, The Avenue, Kessingland, Lowestoft; Construction of a detached bungalow and detached

12/8/16 – Revised Public Rights of Way Response

Government guidance considers that the effect of development on a public right of way is a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission and local planning authorities should ensure that the potential consequences are taken into account whenever such applications are considered (Rights of Way Circular 1/09 – Defra October 2009, para 7.2) and that public rights of way should be protected.

Public Footpath 2 is recorded off The Avenue, providing access to the development area. The Rights of Way and Access Team therefore objects to the proposal as submitted on the basis that:

- In the interest of safety there is insufficient width for walkers and vehicles to pass safely and there are no passing places or places to escape to in the event of a large vehicle using the footpath.
- In the interest of the amenity for the public it is not an acceptable route for any construction traffic due to the lack of width and the likely damage to the largely unmade path surface.

Given the late revision of advice from SCC PROW team the item has been withdrawn from the agenda to allow the applicant an opportunity to redesign the scheme to alleviate the alleged conflict between users of the PROW.