

**Pre-meeting Reports**  
**5<sup>th</sup> May 2015**

- 268. Mr Phillip Rowson.** The Chairman introduced Mr Phillip Rowson, the Development Control Manager for Suffolk Coastal District Council, who answered residents questions regards the recent planning permission given to a new build in Long Row. He immediately pointed out that he could not talk or express an opinion on the current application on the table as that would constitute pre-determination. He then engaged with the audience on matters of fact and planning law which had emerged since permission had been given to the houses opposite No 17. The discussion lasted over an hour with the main points coming out below. Residents hopefully attained the answers they were seeking to those points that are not noted. Mr Rowson explained that the access to Long Row had been considered suitable by the Highways authority for No 17 – he did point out though that each application was looked at separately and is judged on merit with the capacity issue being assessed each time. Cllr Smith reported the reasons behind the initial opinion on the junction from Long Row and Valley Road which, although it wasn't considered good, was no worse than many many others in Suffolk. Highways would however be considering what view to take on any further applications that they received for Long Row. He too felt that they would be seriously considering capacity. Mr Rowson confirmed that highways safety is a material planning consideration if issues are raised – even on a private road/track. With regard to the required Construction Management Schedule for the build at No 17 to progress, Mr Rowson promised to ensure that Leiston TC would get a copy once it was submitted so that any concerns could be raised then. Many of the other issues, rights of access, possible damage to neighbouring properties etc. were discussed with many falling into civil law which the planning authority could not, unfortunately, determine. It would be extremely difficult for instance to effectively write in a condition survey of neighbouring properties as a planning condition. There were discussions on refuse collections and size of vehicles used for building, neither of which would constitute a reason for refusal, but which were obviously pertinent to this application. The Construction Management Schedule would cover the latter and it was up to the District Council to provide a refuse collection service to new properties (and they always get a chance to comment on applications to ensure the best solution is included for this.) Finally, Ron Bailey asked that Mr Rowson take a request to the SCDC Council CEO, the Planning Committee Chairman and the Council Legal team to get the permission for No 17 new build revoked. Mr Rowson pointed out how extremely rare such an action would be but agreed to consider any written request and the reasons, when they were received.
- 269. Public.** A resident from Crown Street, in relation to the Long Row situation and the other applications coming forward in the local area, asked the Council and Planning Authority to look at the whole area and the impact on the community from all of them rather than just the individual applications. Mr Rowson undertook to look at the “In combination” effect if the resident would kindly write and inform the case officer which developments should be considered in that overall review. The resident also requested that the Council facilitate a space as soon as possible for her to organise a residents meeting to bring the community together to discuss actions and options to

tackle the issues currently being encountered. This would inform the “In combination” study and would also bring in Highways at another level once the issues were documented. The Clerk would inform the resident when the Community Centre was free and also undertake to invite the new Councillors to attend should they desire and the date was set. Residents then informed Councillors of their concerns with regard to the proposed application for Valley Terrace. They asked members to consider the issues of parking, aesthetics, density, elevations and flooding when looking at the application later in the Agenda. They were all requested to pass all their comments, and observations on possible anomalies in the documentation, to the case officer, Mr Milligan.

During the above discussions, the time reaching 7.30pm, it was proposed by Cllr Ginger, seconded by Cllr Mr Nunn and agreed that Standing Orders be suspended to allow the public session to reach a conclusion.

**At a Planning meeting of the LEISTON-cum-SIZEWELL TOWN COUNCIL  
held in the COMMUNITY CENTRE, King Georges Avenue, Leiston, on  
TUESDAY, 5<sup>th</sup> May 2015 at 8.55 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

**Councillor A. M. Cooper (in the chair)**  
**Councillor D. Bailey**  
**Councillor R. Bailey**  
**Councillor D. Boast**  
**Councillor R. Geater**  
**Councillor Mrs S. M. Geater**  
**Councillor C. S. Ginger**  
**Councillor T. J. Hawkins**  
**Councillor T. E. Hodgson**  
**Councillor W. H. Howard**  
**Councillor J. N. Last**  
**Councillor A. J. Nunn**  
**Councillor Mrs A.V. Nunn**  
**Councillor N. Parker**  
**Councillor Mrs J. Sparrow**

**270. Minutes.** It was proposed by Cllr Howard, seconded by Cllr Hodgson and agreed that the minutes for the meeting of 7<sup>th</sup> April 2015 be signed as a true record.

**271. Apologies.** All present.

**272. Declarations of Interest.** Cllr Cooper in all planning matters.

**273. Finance and Personnel.**

- a) **Accounts for payment.** It was proposed by Cllr Sparrow, seconded by Cllr Hodgson and agreed that accounts presented in the sum £20,010.42p along with £13,122.76p, paid since the last meeting, be approved for payment.
- b) **Administrative Assistant.** The Clerk informed members that he had received a number of applications from applicants for the post of Deputy

Town Clerk. It was his intention, to reduce the interruption to business as much as possible, to interview on 22<sup>nd</sup> May. This would require canvassing new members for volunteers to sit on the personnel committee before the annual meeting. This would be done with full transparency and, hopefully, ratified at the annual meeting.

**274. Planning.**

- a) **DC/1515/1415/OUT – Erection of two dwellings – Land opposite 21 & 23, Long Row, Leiston.** Members discussed all the issues that had been raised earlier and, citing access, overdevelopment and all the objections that were put forward for the previous application on the adjacent site they strongly recommended refusal. Other issues that were raised included the feasibility of any sort of Construction Management Plan that would not hugely effect the amenity of all the residents of Long Row and for the hours of work to be stipulated in any permissions. Cllr Ron Bailey asked members to consider a letter he proposed be sent to SCDC with regard to the Construction management Plan for the adjacent too. This was seconded by Cllr Ginger and agreed. The Clerk was to mention the request for an “In combination” effect to be studied for this application and the one following.

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

- b) **DC/15/1420/OUT – Outline planning application for four semi-detached houses with primary access off Valley Road (all detailed matters for consideration at Outline stage except landscaping) – 1 Valley Terrace, Leiston, Suffolk.** Members noted three serious problems with this application. One was the detrimental effect this would have on the street scene with different stylings at different elevations, completely out of context with the existing housing, plus the intended use of Valley Terrace for vehicles that, previously, had no rights of access to the existing properties from Valley Terrace. The rear of Number 1 and the adjacent properties have pedestrian access and the intended use for parking would involve an engineering solution for the levels which would exacerbate the main problem which is the flooding risk. The problems we are having with the Badger Homes site just 50m west of this site has emphasised the importance of a proper assessment being done on the flood risk that this development would generate for Valley Road. No surface water whatsoever should be generated by any development at this site. The plan should be taken “In combination” with the Long Row and Badger Homes site to assess the increased vehicle movements they collectively make in the confined area of Valley Road and Crown Street as well as in the confined areas of Valley Terrace and Long Row where Highway Safety needs to be assessed. This development is an overdevelopment and out of context and should be refused.

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

- c) **DC/15/1592/FUL Erection of Single Storey porch on front of 85 Haylings Road, Leiston, Suffolk**

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

- d) **DC/15/1588/FUL Redevelopment of site for 8 bungalows with a maximum gfa of 1000m<sup>2</sup> at Abbey View Lodges, Abbey Road, Leiston.** Members confirmed their continued objection and resistance to losing this

valuable tourist accommodation adjacent to an AONB and opposite an embryo SSSI. The brownfield classification is spurious as this Council objected to the holiday chalets in the first instance and there is a very distinct and compelling case for not altering the visual aspect that tourists and residents have as they enter Leiston from the north. Abbey Road is a ribbon development (on one side of the road) which peters out nicely into countryside which the chalets have sympathetically been incorporated into. The one bus that goes past has no stop and doesn't return the same day and it is a mile into the town centre. This is not a sustainable development, has been disregarded by the Neighbourhood planning team which have identified up to 20 years of land allocation for residences (outside of infill) in Leiston and, although the efforts of the applicant to try and make this development acceptable are commendable members are unable to support it. The other issues of the impact and views on the Abbey will be dealt with by the statutory authority responsible I suspect.

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

**275. County Matters**

- a) **Highways.** New lights in KGA look good. Disappointed that speed awareness signs had not been erected yet. Cllr Last raised the recent problems of lack of co-ordination of roadworks in the Town where the diversions and road closures caused chaos. Members heard that this had been brought up at the highest level in the County Council.

**276. District Matters.**

- a) **Sizewell C Community Engagement event – High Lodge .** Cllr Howard complained that the minutes and presentation material had taken too long to be disseminated.

**277. Questions to the Chairman.**

- a) **ESTA.** The Chairman was asked to request that our future representative on ESTA raises the issue of our students' travelling difficulties from Suffolk One at the Associations forthcoming AGM (The connection at Saxmundham between Rail and Bus.)

There being no more business the meeting finished at 9.37pm.

Chair

-----

Dated

-----