

SOUTHWOLD TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Town Council of Southwold, held in the Council Chamber at 6pm on Tuesday 17th September 2024.

PRESENT: Councillor S Flunder – Town Mayor
 “ C Hurr
 “ P Davy
 “ Mrs V Gladwell
 “ Mrs V Redington
 “ M Wells

Also present: The Town Clerk and 11 members of the public.

1. a) **Apologies:**

To note/approve apologies for absence. Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Beavan, Goldsmith, Jarvis, Miller, Palmer and Temple. Noted.

2. **Declarations of interest:**

a) *To receive any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests regarding the agenda.* Nil.

b) *To receive Declarations of Other Registerable Interests / Non registrable interest regarding the agenda.* Nil.

c) *To note the decision of the Town Clerk regarding requests for dispensations relating to this agenda.* N/A.

d) *To note that the Register of Interests of all Members is to be completed within 28 days of the election and updated thereafter with changes as they occur.* Noted.

e) *To note any Lobbying to members.* Nil.

3. **Public Forum** (15 minutes will be allocated overall for this section- subject to Town Mayor discretion).

To receive comments from the public on matters on the agenda.

All members of the public wished to speak about the planning application for the Old Coach House.

A member of the public advised that when the property was sold there were 6 covenants on the land –and that the application does not adhere to some of these. It was mentioned that the covenants are fully embraced at present.

A member of the public advised that the original vendors had set up the covenants in around 1950 to prevent overdevelopment on site. It was suggested that there would be a loss of amenity with a considerable loss of light and concerns about the loss of views. It was mentioned that the proposal goes up to neighbours wall, and would stop light getting into the property. Concerns were expressed that the property would look very overbearing from the street, and that the proposals would have an adverse impact on biodiversity. It was stated that the wall being proposed is 2.2m high and will cause damage to wildlife.

It was suggested that the gardens at 22/24/26 have a uniform feel about them and that this should include the Coach House too. It was stated that there had been no attention to the garden policy contained in the Neighbourhood Plan, that there was a lack of design coherence, and that the application squeezed an extension into the site and that the

property will loom over the cottages in the street. Dormer windows were considered to be overbearing. It was suggested that a better solution could be found.

Another member of the public suggested that there was a sign on Skilmans Hill saying “No Through Road – residents of Skilmans Hill only” and that there should not be vehicular access onto Skilmans Hill. It was suggested that there is not room to drive a car into the gates on Skilmans Hill and that vehicles are wider than the gate. It was also suggested that the outbuilding is shown as not being visible from Skilmans Hill and that plans do not show the footpath /sign/benches/bollards etc.

A member of the public advised that; the Design Policy of the Neighbourhood Plan says that “maximising of opportunities of good design” is key to any re-development. It was mentioned that the dormer is very large and that the plans create a conspicuous unattractive building. Side growth is over domination and is contrary to Neighbourhood Plan. The plans will have a huge impact on Skilmans Hill. The proposed garden room will be conspicuous now, and that there will be noise from the heat pump. All paving in the garden is contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan as it loses sense of space. Wall on Skilmans Hill would have to be widened to get cars in it. The structure of the garden will destroy the ambience of Skilmans Hill and is against Neighbourhood Plan policies.

A member of the public spoke about the issues raised; Those present were advised that 2 pre-apps had been undertaken to ensure compliance with NPPF and Conservation Area. 2 Heritage appraisals have been completed and it was mentioned that the ESC Heritage Officer is supportive. Regarding the mention of overdevelopment – all present were advised that there is no encroachment further onto the Park Lane frontage. There is much of the garden left and there is no height increase. Dormer windows are common on Park Lane. Coach House will be a future full-time home. Studio will not be Airbnb/holiday let and will be ancillary. Outbuilding will replace the 2 existing ones. Garden is ¼ acre. Outbuilding will have green roof and will be sunk so that it is virtually hidden from Skilmans Hill. Other neighbours have outbuildings which are visible. Number of parking spaces will be 4 as existing. Policy from SCC Highways Plan needs 3+ spaces. The wall on Skilmans Hill will be preserved and it was mentioned that there would be no extra use of Skilmans Hill. Solar panels are suggested as they are sustainable. There should not be extra light onto Skilmans Hill. Reduction of light to neighbours has not been evidenced by the light reports. With regards to the covenants mentioned above – this is not a planning issue. Signs on Skilmans Hill say “Residents access only”. The property is structurally sound, and it will not be a party house.

Question from Councillors – a councillor asked whether the Deed of Covenant had been considered. The respondent advised that the covenants are not a planning matter.

4. **Planning Matters**

a) *To consider the following planning applications;*

- *DC/24/2894/FUL – The Coach House Park Lane – Extensive and holistic renovation to the entire property.*

Discussion about the application. It was suggested that; the application should be an opportunity to improve the property and that maybe an extension to the rear rather than the width should be considered. Width of the proposals on the site were considered to be an issue and the impact on neighbour’s light. It was suggested that

ESC should do a site visit, and it was noted that it is the role of ESC to consider all the relevant planning policies. There is a need to recognise STC Neighbourhood Plan and disappointment was expressed that the STC Neighbourhood Plan has not been mentioned. Many implications within the Neighbourhood Plan.

It was noted that one of the objectors had sent in a comparison of the application against the Neighbourhood Plan Policies. Members were reminded that the property is in the Conservation Area and that STC does not encourage solar panels/heat source pumps in a CA.

It was suggested that there would need to be a condition that the outbuildings be ancillary to use of house and that STC would want this to be a planning condition if any application is approved. It was suggested that the design is not appropriate for Park Lane.

Following discussion it was proposed and agreed by all that STC would recommend ESC to refuse the application as it stands, as STC is not in agreement with some of the aspects of the application. Members will formulate a response to ESC and consider the application against all of the policies within the Neighbourhood Plan. STC will consider the comments received. It was mentioned that there will be a need to improve the application including improvements to the external look of the front of the property which presently looks out of character.

All members of the public left the meeting.

- *DC/24/2992/FUL and DC/24/2993/LBC – Cliff House, 2 East Cliff, Southwold – The rebuilding of the existing main central chimney stack.*
No objection but would ask for it to be done in lime mortar.
- *DC/24/3030/FUL – Rodings, Salisbury Road, Southwold – alterations to ground floor windows and doors, rendering to all elevations, refurb of 2 sash windows to include double glazed units.*
No objection.
- *DC/24/3039/ FUL and Dc/24/3040/LBC – Crown Hotel, 90 High Street – removal of two existing rear fire escapes.*
No objection.

Trees

Dc/24/3080/ TCA – The Elms Lorne Road – Reducing height – ongoing management.

Dc/24/3161/TCA – The Inch, 43 Ferry Road – remove low limbs, and reduce.

Dc/24/3206/TCA – Gun Hill Place, Gun Hill – sycamore – repollard and whole crown reduction.

Removal of TPO WDC / 2009 – Windles, Samphire, Victoria Road.

Noted.

- b) *Other Planning/ Licensing/ Matters to consider*
Consultation on ESC Pre-App Advice service – consultation to 4th October 2024
Response will be made that pre-apps should be made available to a council when a planning application is being submitted.

Street Trading – licensing consultation to 20th September 2024.

It was agreed by all that as events take place in the High Street, the High Street will need to be deemed as a Consent Street. STC to pay the annual fee for the consent.

- c) *ESC Quality of Place – Community Design Award – update*
Cllr Hurr explained to members about the judging visit which had taken place regarding the entry of the Klondyke skatepark in the ESC Quality of Place awards. Decision of the judges is now awaited.
- d) Ward councillor will be asked to ‘call in’ the planning application for the Coach House so that it is considered at ESC Planning cttee.

5. **Date of next Town Council Meeting:**

Tuesday 1st October 2024 at 7.30pm.

* *Some items from this agenda might need to be considered within a confidential session as below.*

6. **Exclusion of Public and Press if required during discussions:** *Pursuant to section 1 (2) of the Public Bodied (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 it might need to be resolved, due to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted, for the public and press leave the meeting during consideration of the following.*

To consider Report 1St Pl attached regarding 1 Strickland Place.

- a) *To receive any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests regarding the agenda.*

Cllr Redington and Cllr Gladwell declared an interest in this matter.

- b) *To receive Declarations of Other Registerable Interests / Non registrable interest regarding the agenda.* Nil.

- c) *To note the decision of the Town Clerk regarding requests for dispensations relating to this agenda.*

It was agreed that Cllr Gladwell and Cllr Redington could speak before council discussion but would then leave the meeting and not take part in the vote.

Cllr Redington and Cllr Gladwell advised that they would have supported both recommendations.

Cllrs Gladwell and Redington left the meeting.

Following discussion it was proposed by Cllr Wells, seconded by Cllr Davy and agreed by all to support recommendations a) and b) within the paper provided.

The meeting closed at 8.50pm.

Signed

Dated