

CIRCULATED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING

ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS REPORT

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th October 2016

Item 4 – DC/16/2868/FUL – Care Home, Manor Farm, Church Road, Kessingland

Suffolk County Council – Flood and Water Management comments:

“The applicant is unable to demonstrate they have a surface water drainage strategy for the site and they have failed to follow the drainage hierarchy. Ground investigations have not been undertaken to ascertain the suitability for infiltration. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that discharge to a surface water body is unsuitable.”

In the light of these comments authority is sought for officers to grant permission subject to the resolution of the surface water drainage system.

Item 5 – DC/16/3475/FUL – agricultural dwelling, Berry Farm, Clarkes Lane, Ilketshall St Andrew

An additional condition is recommended to remove permitted development rights:

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No. 2) (England) Order 2008 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification), no building or structure permitted by Classes A (extensions or alterations), B (changes to the roof), C (any other alterations to the roof) or E (buildings or enclosures within the curtilage of the house) or F (hardstandings) of Schedule 2 Part 1 of the Order shall be erected without the submission of a formal planning application and the granting of planning permission by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure a properly planned development.

Item 7 – DC/16/2940/OUT – 14 holiday cottages, Pakefield Hall, London Road, Gisleham

Suffolk County Council, Flood & Water Management comments:

“Suffolk County Council, Flood & Water Management require a surface water drainage strategy to be submitted in accordance with the Suffolk Flood Risk Management Strategy, appendix A.”

In the light of these comments authority is sought for officers to grant permission subject to the resolution of the surface water drainage system.

Item 9 – DC/16/3806/RG3 – Extension of existing car park area to gain an additional 13 spaces, 2 Canning Road, Lowestoft

Suffolk County Council Highways: Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Highway Authority recommends that any permission which that Planning Authority may give should include the conditions shown below:

3. Condition: The use shall not commence until the area within the site shown on submitted drawing 02 for the purposes of manoeuvring and parking of vehicles has been provided and thereafter that area shall be retained and used for no other purposes.

Reason: To ensure that sufficient space for the on site parking of vehicles is provided and maintained in order to ensure the provision of adequate on-site space for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles where on-street parking and manoeuvring would be detrimental to highway safety to users of the highway.

Item 10 – DC/16/3491/RG3 – erection of beach huts, Jubilee Parade, Lowestoft

The applicant has been asked to consider providing greater separation between the proposed beach huts in light of Member's recent concerns on other beach hut proposals. These concerns related primarily to:

- Conflict between vehicles on the promenade and promenade/hut users (it being envisaged that the larger spacing would provide a 'refuge' between huts);
- The small proposed space being more likely to result in the accretion of sand/rubbish which may be difficult to remove; and
- Potential for spread of fire between huts.

In response the applicant has confirmed:

- The overall width of the promenade at this site is approximately 8.5m, so a 2m deep hut would give a clear promenade depth of approximately 6.5m - even allowing for a 2m depth of 'social' space for hut users a clear depth of 4.5m is left. It seems unlikely that vehicles using the promenade would exceed 3m in width (the minimum width for a local distributor road being 3.35m each way). Vehicular use is highly restricted i.e. service vehicles and emergency vehicles, both groups proceeding at slow speeds on the promenade. It also seems unlikely that all of the 2m 'social' space will be used at any one time, so opportunities should exist in this area for 'refuge' use if required. Long established huts to the north and south of the proposed sites have huts with gaps of approximately 0.5m mean average with a clear promenade depth in front of the hut of approximately 6.8m width, comparable to the proposed situation of 6.5m depth. It is not believed that conflict between vehicles and promenade/hut users has been an issue in these locations.
- Long established huts to the north and south of the proposed site have huts with gaps of approximately 0.5m mean average and inspection does not indicate that these gaps are particularly prone to the accumulation of rubbish and the like.
- If a hut is affected by fire it seems unlikely that the fire 'barrier' provided by a 1m gap would be significantly greater than that provided by a 0.5m gap. As noted long established

huts to the north and south of the proposed site have huts with gaps of approximately 0.5m mean average and whilst it is understood that occasional fires have occurred impacting more than one hut, it is not believed that any particular fire has impacted large numbers of huts.

If the larger spacing is insisted upon the resulting number of huts seems likely to be reduced from approximately 48 to 39 huts. These huts are intended to a large extent to provide alternative day accommodation for visitors to the seafront given that 58 of the existing chalets/beach huts have become unsuitable due to deterioration of the fabric. A reduction to 48 is already a significant drop in numbers, a reduction to 39 huts would be very significant. Core Strategy CS13 does recognise the need to protect existing tourism uses and in the current circumstances the proposal would seem to be the optimum way of doing so.