

Public Comments - DC/24/2147/FUL

The following public comments have been received by officers with regards to application DC/24/2147/FUL and the Committee are asked to consider these comments when deliberating on the application.

Please could you raise my objections to the application DC/24/2147/FUL47.

A few months ago an application DC/24/0580/FUL47 was submitted and my wife and I strongly protested against its implementation. We listed many reasons why we felt the proposal was not acceptable and on reading this most recent proposal see nothing that would persuade us to change our opinions. In fact to re-apply for application and the only difference with it is to have one less room to 8 from the original proposal of 9 sounds to me like desperation.

Sadly as I was only made aware of this meeting a few hours ago this e-mail to you is to inform you of our strong objections in a shortened form and should you require a more in depth written statement please do not hesitate to get in contact with me, as we can assure you our views on this matter have not changed.

Yours Sincerely, REDACTED

Please see the objection below, filed on the Planning Portal yesterday. Among other things, I am very concerned about the impact on the mental health of the residents in this area, some of whom are vulnerable. Thank you.

Comments for Planning Application DC/24/2147/FUL

Application Summary

Application Number: DC/24/2147/FUL

Address: 47 London Road South Lowestoft Suffolk NR33 0AS

Proposal: Change of use from residential dwelling use class C3 to House of Multiple Occupancy use class C4 (8 Bedrooms)

Case Officer: Katherine Rawlins

Customer Details

Name: REDACTED

Address: REDACTED

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Access/traffic (parking and road safety)*
- Economic benefits or impacts*
- Flood risk/drainage*
- Historic environment*
- Planning history/previous decisions*

Comment: I wish to object to the proposed conversion of 47 London Road South into an 8-bedroom HMO for the following reasons:

- 1. This property is next to a flat saturation zone; it also lies within a conservation area and the*

London Road Heritage Action Zone. An HMO is entirely inappropriate. Historically, in this area, the decision has been made to restore multiple-occupancy residences back to single-family homes. This proposal contravenes that policy.

2. The area is already highly populated. An HMO, with a possibility of 16 additional residents, would put more stress on an area that already has very little room for bins, parking, bicycle parking, medical and dental facilities, and other public services. On paper, it does seem as if these services are within walking distance. In fact, although they do exist, they are not easily accessible, not even to current residents.

3. As far as I am aware, this property still lies within a Flood Zone 3. Since the flood defences have now been scrapped, placing residents in this area puts them at risk.

4. St Johns road is already a challenge for the emergency services. The proposed construction would seriously affect this. When construction is finished, addition of 16 residents would exacerbate the emergency response situation.

5. HMOs have a history of anti-social behaviour. This particular area also has a history of criminal activity. Our police force is already stretched, so the local residents, who are working very hard to improve their neighbourhood, would be at risk. At the very least, they will be feeling unsafe, vulnerable, and helpless.

The first responsibility of government is to care for their constituents. If this HMO is approved, these constituents will be at risk. They will feel betrayed and vulnerable. I strongly urge the Council to live up to their responsibilities and put Kirkley first.

Thank you for your attention.

Dear All

Please could you raise my comments at today's Planning Committee meeting when the item DC/24/2147/FUL47 47 London Road South, Lowestoft, is discussed.

The application has been resubmitted from one previously refused only a couple of months ago. Nothing much has changed other than the application has been trimmed down from a 9-bed HMO (2 persons per room) to an 8-bed HMO so 16 occupants instead of the previous 18 occupants. The accommodation proposed is again for asylum seekers to be managed by SERCO.

My main objections to the application are:

- 1. It is stated that the property is currently an unlawful HMO, which is completely untrue. The property is currently empty.*
- 2. It is stated that the property would be managed by SERCO, which has a dubious record of running government contracts in the justice sector already and more recently has become involved with immigration services provision too. It seems like these huge companies get paid a lot of government money for often very poor services in return.*
- 3. It is stated the property is in poor condition but that's untrue as well because up until recently it was lived in by an affluent family, who are still the owners of the property but now living abroad.*
- 4. The property is in Flood Zone 3, which as determined in the Waveney Local Plan, is not deemed suitable for HMOs.*
- 5. The property is in the Conservation Zone and Heritage Action Zone as well as being next to the Flat Saturation Zone.*

6. *This part of Kirkley is particularly deprived and an HMO of this magnitude with 16 occupants will only further degrade an area, which is trying hard to pull itself up.*
7. *This development would cause additional pressures on the area in terms of parking, bin storage issues, increased disturbance, maintenance issues and environmental decline, leading to an imbalance within the local community.*
8. *There is no on or off street parking available to this property and St Johns road already is parking on one-side of the road only and is a one-way street with several issues already.*
9. *The property sits within the Conservation Area and Heritage Impact Zone and does not demonstrate how this 8-bedroom HMO represents an "exceptional case" as is required.*
10. *The application does not demonstrate either how the property would be managed on a day-to-day basis in terms of antisocial behaviour, safeguarding, emergencies and there is no detail as to the numbers or duration of tenants or length of occupancy.*