

CIRCULATED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING

ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS REPORT

13th December 2016

Item 4 – DC/3844/OUT Coal Stacking Ground, Denmark Road, Lowestoft

It will be noted in Paragraph 4.52 of the report that the Environment Agency submitted a holding objection on flood risk grounds. Following the submission of an updated Flood Risk Assessment the Environment Agency have removed their holding objection providing that conditions relating to flood risk are considered. The following additional conditions are therefore recommended:

1. Prior to the occupation of the building hereby approved, details of a flood management plan (including as a minimum: flood warning provision, evacuation procedure, emergency plan, and management of un-secured objects) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to reduce the risk of damage or nuisance as a result of flooding to the proposed development, future occupants and elsewhere.

2. Finished floor levels shall be set not lower than 300mm above the 0.5% annual probability with climate change flood level unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: to reduce the risk of damage or nuisance as a result of flooding to the proposed development.

3. Prior to the commencement of development, details of flood proofing measures including flood resistant and flood resilient techniques to be used shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to reduce the risk of damage or nuisance as a result of flooding to the proposed development.

Further conditions recommended by the Environment Agency:

4. No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water drainage into the ground is permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Infiltration through contaminated land has the potential to impact on groundwater quality.

- 5 Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the local planning authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods can result in risks to potable supplies from, for example, pollution / turbidity, risk of mobilising contamination, drilling through different aquifers and creating preferential pathways. Thus it should be demonstrated that any proposed piling will not result in contamination of groundwater.

Item 6 – DC/16/2550/FUL Waterside Park, The Street, Corton

Since the publication of the Committee Report, a further 9 representations have been received from local residents.

The representations do not raise any new matters that are material to the determination of the application and include:

- Uncertainty over the future of the existing retail operations
- Impact of development on residential amenity
- Lack of car parking and potential highway impact
- Development will undermine cliff stability
- Impact of construction activity
- Increase in activity will erode village character
- Question over need for additional hotel accommodation in this area of Lowestoft.

The potential for some disruption during the construction period is acknowledged, however, any such impacts will be temporary and may be effectively controlled through a Construction Method Statement.

Officers recommend a further condition requiring the applicant to submit and obtain officers written agreement to a Construction Method Statement before development commences.

Item 8 – DC/16/4457/FUL 9 Garden Lane, Worlingham, Beccles

Since the publication of the Committee Report, a tree Survey has been received on 8th December 2016 from the applicant conducted by AT Coombs Ltd. This is not reproduced in full here but is on the Council website. The report has been reviewed by the Arboriculture Officer. The report concludes that the tree does not prevent the construction of the dwellings but that the drive would have to be a no dig construction. This finding repeats the opinion given by the Arboriculture Officer. It is the view of the area planning officer that the resulting drive, based on the survey information provided would be too steep to meet the County Council's standard and that some excavation would be needed to achieve the necessary gradients. The applicant has provided a level survey, but not a detailed design for the drive, that would meet the County Council's comments and including resulting design levels. It is considered that this cannot be left to condition in this instance as the preservation of the tree and access design is fundamental to the question as to whether the site can be developed in the manner proposed.

The Arboriculture Officer comments on the report as follows dated 9th December 2016 (precised): The report correctly states that the most significant tree on site is the Sweet Chestnut covered by TPO No. 016 and it is valued as a grade A tree – which is the highest category tree grading in the BS 5837:2012. The report reiterates the Council's views that the existing drains were found to be in a poor state of repair, and this led to roots infiltrating them and causing further damage. New drains in good order would not be affected or affect roots. The existing bungalow is in the Root Protection Area of the category A Sweet Chestnut. Its foundations and associated hard standing are likely to be inhibiting the roots. Demolition must take place in a manner not harmful to roots and under arboricultural supervision. Plot 1 encroaches into the indicated RPA of the A category tree (T1) – however given the presence of the footprint of the existing building it is unlikely that there are any roots from T1 within the footprint of the dwelling on plot 1. Therefore it can be constructed using regular methods. Plot 2 – foundations will only have minor encroachment into the RPA so pre-emptive root pruning can be carried out to minimise the harms.

The double garage has only minor encroachment into the RPA.

The new entrance and drive is the most important and difficult aspect. The report states that the hard surface is within the RPA of the Sweet Chestnut and will need to be constructed using a No-Dig surface at or above ground level. The surface should be designed by an engineer to ensure it suitable for the traffic and loading that will be experienced when in use and no closer than 0.5m from the stem of any retained tree. It will be necessary to carry out some regrading to provide suitable slope into the site. The extent of this regrading will need to be detailed further, but must avoid excavation within RPA of tree. Additionally pruning to provide clearance would be needed. Details of soakaways and below ground services and trenches are needed. Any above ground apparatus including CCTV cameras and lighting should also be positioned to avoid the need for any regular or detrimental pruning to the tree. Minor facilitative pruning is acceptable – However positions that require repetitive and significant tree works must be avoided.

The proposed replacement mitigation for other removed trees is acceptable.

Whilst the report shows that the two properties could be built close to the Sweet Chestnut tree – it does not wholly address the issue of the access drive, (and significantly this may not be physically able to be addressed). At the time of writing we have no engineer’s report – as requested in the arboricultural impact assessment.

Item 9 – DC/16/4494/FUL 8 The Street, Wissett

A letter has been received from the new owner of The Plough outlining their aspirations for the pub, shop and the caravan park and their comments are below:

“During the period of our purchase, a planning application for a caravan park has gone in, and also during this time the pub has unfortunately had to close because the tenant could not make a financial success of the pub. Upon looking at the books, it is apparent that the pub is not viable in its current form. Therefore it needs to diversify”.

“Our business plan is to diversify the business with another income from the caravan park. We will install top of the range mobile homes with timber effect cladding to soften any visual impact and create a desirable holiday location. We will install a new road (tarred and chipped) and a new car park for the pub, along with new gulley’s and drains to rectify any drainage problems that they currently have. We also plan to refurbish the pub and village shop, which closed several years ago”.

“With the income from the caravan park, which we feel will be a success due to local fishing lakes and amenities, we can then subsidise the pub so that it is on a low rent, which will make it viable for a tenant to come in and build the business to a success and giving back a great local amenity to the village. The village shop will also be reopened”.

“I hope we have set out our business plan clearly, we live locally and have invested in this property with a view to reopening a very important local amenity”.