

**Email 1**

Dear all relevant parties,

I'm just writing to voice our strong objections to the 'change-of-use' proposal for 47 London Road South to allow it to become a HMO with potentially 9 bedrooms. REDACTED, we feel that this proposal isn't right for our area and we sincerely hope that this is turned down and that the current property remains a large family home and that it doesn't get approval to become a HMO.

- The house backs onto St. Johns Road which already has major parking issues for homeowners and tenants. Cars regularly double park on pavements and block driveways and businesses. This a real problem for the area that could tip over the edge if No. 47 expands to house at least 9 adult drivers.

Thank you for taking on board my comments. I would appreciate a brief reply of acknowledgment of receipt.

Kind regards,  
REDACTED

**Email 2**

REDACTED

To Lowestoft Town Council Officers and Planning Committee members

**OBJECTION TO DC/24/0580/FUL | Change of use from residential dwelling (C3) to 9 bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy  
47 London Road South Lowestoft Suffolk NR33 0AS**

I have numerous reasons for opposing and objecting to the planning application above but as I have only been made aware of it over the weekend via the online Lowestoft Journal and EDP and am going on holiday tomorrow, I will keep it as short as possible because my time is currently very limited.

For your ease of reference I attach the Design & Access Statement, the Heritage Statements and WLP Extracts referred to in the aforementioned Supporting Documents.

I have been in touch with the property owner over the weekend who told me in writing that his property is for sale and not yet sold and that an agent is dealing with it. I assume from what the owner also stated to me writing that the applicant making this planning application is a potential buyer who wants this to become a 9-bed HMO for up to 18 asylum seekers to be run by SERCO. It does feel like the decision for this property has already been made and the planning process something that has to be dealt with as quickly and quietly as possible.

My home is REDACTED. I also own REDACTED opposite the rear elevation of the application address at 47 London Road South and which I am currently renovating for a young family of four, who will be moving into it in the next few months and who currently live in close proximity at REDACTED.

Firstly, please note the application address is in the Conservation Area and the Heritage Action Zone.

Secondly, no statutory Notices appear to have been posted in the immediate area or letters posted to the stated "Neighbour Consultations" in the Neighbour Notification List on the East Suffolk Council Planning portal for this application. REDACTED.

There are untold inaccuracies and untruths in the supporting documents but to keep it short, I will just focus on the main glaringly obvious misrepresentations and infringements of quoted Waveney Local Plan (WLP) references.

#### Supporting document DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

This document in its "Introduction" on page 2 states "existing property currently being used as an unlawful house in multiple occupancy". This is untrue as it is a residential dwelling and the opposite of what the owner of the property says whom I contacted on Saturday 23 March 2024 and who stated in writing to me "Ludicrous, it's a 6 bed property never been converted and is vacant and has been for a while, we just had the extra kitchen in for when mum and dad were there".

In the next section of the Design & Access Statement entitled "Existing Use" also on page 2, it is stated "The property is currently used as an unlawful 7 bedroom house in multiple occupancy with shared bathroom and kitchen facilities". So again, as the owner of the property states above, "Ludicrous, it's a 6 bed property never been converted and is vacant and has been for a while, we just the extra kitchen in for when mum and dad were there".

In page 3 under the "Planning Policy" section, the Design & Access Statement refers to **Policy WLP8.4** and if you study this policy you will see it states "no longer suited to family occupation or have a long established use (i.e. 10 years or more) as a House in Multiple Occupation or flats". This is another huge misrepresentation as the current owner only bought the property on 2 December 2016 and lived there with his wife and family for several years before moving abroad fairly recently. I recall he lived there at least until around 2022. So it certainly has not been a HMO for over 10 years.

In page 6 under "Design and Heritage" this Design & Access Statement is relying on **Policy WLP8.29**, which if you study this policy relates to Gypsy and Traveller Sites. Firstly, this application seeks to use the property as an HMO for asylum seekers and not a Gypsy and Traveller Site but more importantly, this policy requires that "The site is not located within Flood Zones 2 or 3." I would point out that this site does indeed sit within Flood Zone 3.

There are many more discrepancies but as there are very limited time restraints to raise comments and objections with this application I'll now move on to the next supporting document.

#### Supporting Document HERITAGE DOCUMENT

On the front page of the Heritage Document the words "existing 7 bedroom HMO" are used as the description of the whole document. This is completely untrue because the property is a residential dwelling.

On page 3 in Section 1 Introduction at **1.1 Instruction**, "The building in question is currently occupied as a 7 bedroom C3 dwelling, and the client is applying for a change of use to a HMO". As stated previously, the owner of the property stated in writing to me on Saturday 23 March 2024 "Ludicrous, it's a 6 bed property never been converted and is vacant and has been for a while, we just the extra kitchen in for when mum and dad were there".

On page 4 in Section **1.3 Purpose and Scope** at 1.33 the document refers to HAZ by stating "One of its primary objectives is to bring back into use long-term vacant properties". This is misleading as the current owner only bought the property in December 2016 and has owned it for just over 7 years and lived in it with his family for several of those 7 years.

On page 5 under **1.6 Local Policy**, three different references are made to the Waveney Local Plan. **Policy WLP8.29** relating to provision of Gypsy and Traveller Sites has already been covered earlier in this email and the same applies here. **Policy WLP2.32** does not appear to be relevant to

this application as it concerns “affordable housing in the countryside on the edge of villages” and “rural exception sites”. Likewise, **Policy WLP2.39** also appears irrelevant to this application as it concerns “rural settlements in the countryside”.

There are many, many more points within this application that I could object to but unfortunately, currently, I have very limited time available to me.

Yours sincerely

REDACTED

### **Email 3**

Dear Councillors,

OBJECTION TO DC/24/0580/FUL. Change of use from residential dwelling (C3) to 9 bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy (suis generis) including conversion of existing roof space formation of dormers to rear and insertion of Velux roof windows to front elevation. 47, London Rd. South, Lowestoft Suffolk, NR33 0AS.

My Wife and I own the property REDACTED. We have recently learnt of the proposed changes to the property 47, London Rd. South, NR33 0AS. REDACTED we would like to state our objections to these changes.

We have concerns that the planned four storey rear extension would adversely affect the open space and restrict natural lighting to our property. It would look out of place, being so much larger in relation to the other properties surrounding it. It would greatly affect the car parking of local residents living in St. Johns Rd. which is already very restricted due to parking restriction i.e. yellow lines due to the narrowness of the road requiring access for emergency services. Space is not of a premium in this area and the thought of building materials arriving on lorries, the presence of heavy plant, worker van's / vehicles would not do anything to help the situation. All these components lead to potential gridlock, further preventing emergency vehicles access as this is after all a one way street.

When we first sought to buy REDACTED we were informed that it was a condition that the dwelling was not to be used as a House of Multiple Occupancy, as the area is already saturated with such dwellings. Therefore it seems very unfair that 47, London Rd. South should be allowed to be HMO, to house asylum seekers.

We are actively involved as volunteers within the Kirkley community, and as part of our role is to maintain and enhance the character, appearance and heritage of the village.

We feel that the proposed dwelling changes would not help towards enhancing or benefitting our local community.

#### Email 4

Dear Councillors

**OBJECTION TO DC/24/0580/FUL | Change of use from residential dwelling (C3) to 9 bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy (suis generis) including conversion of existing roof space, formation of dormers to rear and insertion of velux roof windows to front elevation. | 47 London Road South Lowestoft Suffolk NR33 0AS**

My husband and I own REDACTED and despite our being listed as one of the “Neighbour Consultations” in document (DC\_24\_0580\_FUL-INFO\_SHEET-5057950) within this planning application, we have not yet received any information about the application from East Suffolk Council nor has any public notice been attached to a lamp post or other prominent position. However luckily, we found out about it via the online Lowestoft Journal and online Eastern Daily Press today, 23 March 2024, and yet it is on your agenda dated 28 March 2024 in only 5 days’ time for consideration!

Although we have had very limited time to look at the application and no time to take professional advice on it, we would like to object on the following grounds:

- 1. This proposed development of 47 London Road South sits inside the Conservation Area and the Heritage Action Zone should therefore be covered within the Local Plan.**
2. Our property is directly opposite the proposed 4-storey rear extension, which we consider would be overbearing, over-development and overlook our property. The proposed rear extension is pretty vast.
3. We consider it to be overdevelopment of what is a traditional 3-storey, terraced, residential, family home. We know the owners, who although now live abroad, lived there as a family for several years and put in a second kitchen when their parents moved in with them. It is **not** an “illegal 7-bed HMO” as stated in the Design and Access Statement, which we note has been drawn up by a company miles away from Lowestoft in Worcestershire. The owner of the property told me today that it is empty and not illegally occupied as the application would have you believe.
4. If developed, 47 London Road South would become the only 4-storey building in the terrace and in St Johns Road, and would dominate the immediate vicinity. The layout, design and appearance are out of character and are overdevelopment of the house.
5. The proposed development would significantly impact on both our privacy and outlook.
6. The roads to both the front and rear of this property are one-way so a development of this scale would no doubt impact negatively on the traffic system, which is already extremely problematic in this area especially when the Bascule Bridge is up. We think a development of this scale would cause many problems in terms of building materials being delivered, heavy plant required digging out footings etc, parking and offloading of deliveries, workers’ parking and road safety matters.
7. The outside space to the property is tiny for the proposed 9-bedroom HMO and where would all the wheelie bins go? Would there even be enough room for any cycle sheds? And what about parking? There is **no** parking at this property at all and **no** parking on this stretch of London Road South, which is one-way. To the rear of the property in St Johns Road,

parking is already restricted to one side of the road only because of the narrowness of the road, which is also one-way only.

8. We note the application is for SERCO to run this as an HMO specifically for asylum seekers and we are well aware of some of the terrible crimes that have been committed by asylum seekers and not least the “small boat people” crossing the channel a couple of days ago carrying offensive weapons, stabbing each other and being arrested upon landing. We also worry that SERCO doesn't have a great reputation in many areas, appears to get awarded many government contracts regardless of their performance and we are very dubious as to how well they would run this proposed development, which is out of keeping with the character of Kirkley.
9. As a retired couple, we would be fearful of any additional crime living in such close proximity to a large number of asylum seekers, who would almost certainly come from a different culture, with different views on women, religion, politics and our way of life. We believe it would have a negative impact on the amenity of the area as is. ***We would like you to note that we have absolutely no problem with nearby Fyffe Centre, which houses local, homeless people and is very well managed and run.***
10. A large area of Kirkley has already been designated as a Flat Saturation Zone and although this particular property sits just outside this zone, there are already numerous properties in both Marine Parade and London Road South that have been converted into flats and this application just adds and exacerbates an area already saturated and has a knock-on, cumulative impact.

We trust that our local council will take our worries, fears and comments into consideration and reject this proposed change of use from residential to large scale HMO use.

Yours sincerely  
REDACTED

#### **Email 5**

To whom it may concern,

I have recently become aware of the plans to turn a property on London Road South into a house of multiple occupation, used as a dwelling for Asylum seekers. I live in this area and strongly oppose this move. We don't know whose these people are that you plan to let live among us and our children and what crimes they may have committed or their reason for being here. There is already a strain on services for citizens that are paying tax and this is only going to add to it.

There are so many people that live here already that are homeless or in poor accommodation, this would be a much better use of an empty property. In the journal it says that this property will have a negative effect on the area but how will giving it to asylum seekers make it any better? The company Serco have been known to leave properties in a complete state of disrepair and have been fined millions of pounds for this, as reported in the guardian. I have the same opinion of the other property you are applying for in Milton Road East, also for asylum seekers and also planned to be owned by Serco.

This move is strongly opposed by many local people in the town.

REDACTED

**Email 6**

Hello,

As a owner of two businesses and a local I am putting forward my appeal for this planning permission to be made into a hmo.

These houses should be kept as a residential family home to keep up with the local heritage preservation.

Having more hmos in the area only bring a certain type of person (single people) that don't contribute well to the community.

I feel once you allow one type of hmo this area will be taken advantage of, especially housing single asylum seekers.

We need home for local families and charity very much should start with our own local family's first. This seems to be a running theme with the limited company serco destroying local heritage seaside towns and ruining beautiful family homes with history.

Please don't allow Lowestoft to be taken advantage of by fat cats.

Regards.

REDACTED

**Email 7**

To who it may concern,

I am writing to oppose the application for a HMO for asylum seekers on London Road South. I have lived in this area for 20 years and strongly disagree with this move. Firstly, a large part of Kirkley and London Road South is designated as a Flat Saturation Zone and is problematic in terms of parking, wheelie bin provision, amenity space and so forth. When many people have bought houses in the area it is conditional on them never being able to convert into flats or smaller units. This is only going to put more strain on this area but seems to be a different rule for companies like Serco who make plenty of profit in government pay outs for asylum seeker properties and then leave the houses in disrepair which is not what we want for our local area or any part of our town.

Secondly, we don't know who these asylum seekers are, what crimes they have committed and escaped from and whether they have been immunised as it is widely reported that most asylum seekers are not. We are already under strain for dental and NHS services, we have loads of homeless people and families struggling in poor accommodation so why are numerous asylum houses being planned for in this town?

I do not support this plan and will be strongly opposing it throughout the process. This move is not only opposed by local people but also local businesses, I am yet to speak to anyone who sees this as a good idea.

REDACTED

## **Email 8**

### **In respect of DC/24/0580/FUL | Change of use from residential dwelling (C3) to 9 bedroom House of Multiple Occupancy**

I live in Kirkley, and have only recently been made aware of this planning application. Before I put forward my main points of objection, I will make two observations.

1. Normal planning procedure has not been followed in this case. The neighbours have not been informed, there have been no notices posted. If the application had not been reported in the local media, we would not have known about it at all.
2. The Heritage Statement in respect of the application is faulty. It states “property is currently used as an unlawful 7-bedroom house in multiple occupancy with shared bathroom and kitchen.” This is untrue. It is not currently occupied at all, and, for several years before now has been used as a family home. It does not have a shared kitchen—it has two kitchens, in fact. If these statements are untrue, how many other statements in the supporting documents are false or misleading? Based solely on this, the planning permission should be refused, but I will raise further objections below.

The property lies within a Conservation Area: The proposed plan would completely destroy the look of the property and the whole of the terrace, besides having an impact on the historic fabric of the building. To replace windows in a conservation area is a challenge for homeowners, and now the council is going to approve what is effectively a 5-story, intrusive building into the area? It goes wholly against the letter and spirit of the Waveney Local Plan, which states in part, “[by 2036] Waveney's valuable built, historic and natural environment will have been protected . . .” How will adding a huge extension, as well as dormer and Velux windows, destroying a “valuable built, historic” property contribute to the Plan? (See point 3 of the WLP) How will it “significantly improve the quality of urban design across the District?” (Point 9 in the WLP)

The property also lies within a flood area, an area that was to have been protected by the proposed, but now scrapped, flood defences.

Parking in this area is already past saturation point. The streets in front and behind are one-way, and that system is often ignored on St John's Road, with cars travelling in both directions. The road is narrow, making deliveries in large vehicles difficult, if not impossible. Where would the wheelie bins go? Where would bicycles or other means of transport be stored? The supporting documents themselves state “there is no facility at present to store cycles, park cars or store and locate refuse bins.” A very large addition to the property will not make more space.

Thinking about the surrounding roads: how will construction vehicles get in and out of St John's Road, to the rear of the property? Where will the building materials be stored during construction? This will cause huge disruption to the residents and possible damage to the road and even the surrounding properties.

Kirkley already has many HMOs, large homes that have been divided into flats, group houses, etc. Making this property another HMO takes what could be a family out of the frame. For the past few years, Kirkley has made a huge effort to improve the quality of living for its residents. Adding another HMO will be a step backward, discouraging families from moving into the area, and impacting the quality of life for those currently in residence.

Local people are already challenged in finding housing, and this development will exacerbate that situation. This area needs families who are committed to living, working and contributing to the area; this development would be detrimental to that concept.

Up to 18 people could be living in this property, presumably, looking at the demographics of the asylum seekers, young, single men. This area has, historically, had an issue with crime; how will moving 18 young, single, unemployed men into the area help that, or make the local residents feel more secure? The police are already overstretched; where would the policing come from? The safety and security of the residents would be at risk.

Where will these asylum seekers get dental treatment? We live in a dental desert, with no relief in sight. Where will they get medical care? The surgeries in Lowestoft are operating at more than capacity, the James Paget has the second-longest waiting list in the country, according to reports.

I could raise many other objections, but based on those stated here, I strongly urge the rejection of this application.

Thank you for your time.

REDACTED

#### **Email 9**

I wish to object to the proposed change of use of 47 London Road South. The objection is on the grounds that as the proposed development is next to the defined a flat saturation area, it would cause additional pressures on the area from increased parking requirements, bin storage issues, increased disturbance, maintenance issues and environmental decline, leading to an imbalance within the local community. There is no on or off street parking available to this property, so should any of the 9 residents to choose own a car, this will immediately put undue strain and pressure on neighbouring parking facilities.

This property is within the Conservation Area as well as the London Road Heritage Impact zone. The application also includes provision for a flat roof dormer window, which will be visible and will change the roof line, which will not be in keeping with similar properties in the area.

#### **Email 10**

I am writing to strongly object to the change of use planned for the above address.

I'm confident this proposal is not in line with local residents wishes. Personally I have had negative experiences from developments of this type having been aggressively confronted by a group. Regretfully the residents will find it very difficult to integrate into local community leading to tensions and concerns on both sides.

I accept there needs to be a sensible compromise to accommodate however in the middle of a residential area not open to this will be a recipe for certain problems.

I'd urge the council to please consider very carefully local people's wishes.

Kindest regards

REDACTED



**Email 11**

I understand there is a planning application due to be discussed on Thursday 28th.march for a property in London road south to house asylum seekers managed by servo. This is very close to the East Coast cinema, which is very well run usually well attended but sometimes quiet especially if there are no good films being shown. If there were undesirable people living nearby I for one would feel very un-comfortable visiting there at night. This area is also subject to flooding, we have yet to see whether the new floods defences work. Also the people living in the elderly residents accommodation I'm sure would feel rather vulnerable.

It is also quite a busy road bringing traffic into town and also to the promenade. What impression would this send as we are already a deprived area.

There is I gather plans afoot for a similar property to be. developed in Milton road, east, surely one such accommodation is enough!