

SOUTHWOLD TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning and Development Committee held in the Council Chamber. at the Town Hall, Southwold on Tuesday 21st September 2021 at 6pm.

PRESENT:	Councillor
	“ J Jeans - Chairman
	“ S Flunder
	“ P Goldsmith
	“ J Sutton
	“ R Temple (arrived at 6.25pm)
	“ W Windell

Also, present: Cllr Bradbury to speak as a member of the public, and the Town Clerk.

BUSINESS

1. **Apologies:** To receive apologies for absence. There were no apologies for absence.
2. **Declarations of interest:**
 - a) *To receive any declarations of Personal Interest regarding the agenda.*
Noted that the Town Council as owner of the Boating Lake.
 - b) *To receive any declarations of Pecuniary Interest regarding the agenda.*
Nil.
 - c) *To receive any request for dispensations regarding the agenda.* Nil
 - d) *To receive details of any lobbying to members.*
Cllr Jeans advised that 15 Cumberland Road had advised her that a planning application was being submitted for the property.
3. **To receive and approve Minutes of meeting held on Tuesday 7th September 2021.**
On the proposal of Cllr Windell seconded by Cllr Flunder it was RESOLVED by all to approve the Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 7th September 2021.
4. **To receive comments from the public on matters on the agenda** *(each will be allowed a maximum of 3 minutes – to a total maximum of 10 minutes).*

A member of the public spoke on the Boating Lake planning application. It was acknowledged that this is an application submitted by a tenant on a council property. It is a retrospective application and although it is retrospective it should be treated as all other retrospective applications and considered as if in its original form. The following matters were raised; a) Sheds were given previous planning permission for use as picnic areas, not trading areas, and this use should be adhered to, b) it is a Boating Lake – where have boats been this summer? c) Landscaping/environmental impact – all affected with lack of sensitivity to climate change/environmental sympathy. Why has concrete been put down? Need to find some way to mitigate situation and stop further impact on the town.

5. **Planning Matters:**
 - (a) **To determine the Town Council response to the following applications:**
See attached for details of applications.
 - (i) *DC/21/3981/FUL – To clad exterior of property with Hardieplank boarding, to match that of extension which has been granted planning permission DC/20/5296/FUL, 46 Hotson Road.*

46 Hotson Road was the subject of agreed planning application for an extension which preserved its 1930s character. Cllr Jeans explained the application. The fibre board cladding has been installed on a part of the premises already. Within this application, the aim is to clad the whole building to create extra warmth/insulation.

The Chairman advised members that the Neighbourhood Plan Design Policy now has some weight as that Inspector felt that the CAA was exemplary and that the use of the National Design Guide was also exemplary. In the Southwold Neighbourhood Plan CAA there is comment about Hotson Road (see P100). The features and Suffolk Red brick are an important aspect of the character. If the building is clad, will it preserve and enhance? Discussion on this matter. It was agreed that the character would neither be improved or enhanced. This building makes a positive contribution to the area in its present design. Overbearing from visual/design point of view. The rear cladding does not form a precedent for the whole building. Discussion about the detailing around the windows – how can the detailing be retained if cladding is being installed? Reference to N plan to be made in the response.

There is one neighbour comment on the ESC portal, and this is objecting to the application

It was agreed by all to refuse the application as the cladding will affect the character of the property and the street scene and the use of cladding is inappropriate in this area. Also concern about the loss of detailing around the windows once cladding is installed.

(ii) DC/21/4120/FUL – Frontage works and side porch, 15 Cumberland Road.

Cllr Temple arrived 6.25pm.

It was mentioned that some of the works had already started as applicant have moved front boundary wall.

See Design & Access Statement. Discussion – pre-planning has been submitted and this application follows the advice given. The planning application is improvement and alters the property to more how it used to be. It was proposed to approve this application. No objection. All agreed.

(iii) DC/21/4084/FUL – Retrospective Application – New frontage fencing, regrading of ground levels, relocation of buildings, Boating Lakes and Kiosk, North Parade.

Background paper provided to all advising of appropriate planning policies to consider and detailing the planning consents that presently exist on the site. Members were advised of the previous planning consents for this site. Consent exists for 8 beach (picnic) huts following an application for 17 which had previously been refused. Colour of the huts having to be agreed with ESC Planning and the huts to only be used as picnic huts. No subsequent application had been submitted to date.

A small putting area was installed some years ago - no planning application had been put in for this (may not have required planning).

Background to Town Council involvement - 2015 the Town Council took the lease over from WDC – present tenant was in situ. Paddle boat water restored. March 2018 tenant approached Council re improvements to adventure golf and Council advised it would like to wait for feasibility study conclusions. 2018/2019 feasibility study carried out about future improvements to the site to enable appropriate funding grants to be applied for. Study received comments from approx. 165 responses. One of outcomes from the consultations was that an open frontage was needed to make the site more visible to visitors.

Discussion took place regarding the planning application.

Cllr Windell advised that there is no request in the planning application for a golf course. The Design & Access Statement seems to suggest that a golf course already has planning permission, but it was noted there has not been any planning approval registered by the LPA (see comment above). It was noted that the area for golf has been extended.

The Chair explained the relevant planning policies to consider for.

- a) metal fencing - the frontage of Klondyke, putting green is tamarisk hedge
- b) Concrete surfacing - golf – has used concrete surfacing as its base.
- c) Colour of beach huts - Beach huts have been painted black, have been placed together, and are laid on top of concrete. (Members were advised that these used to be various colours to match the beach huts along the prom).

Section 5.4 of the Design Policy wording of the Neighbourhood Plan was referenced- which is aiming to protect the landscape.

Cllr Flunder advised that Southwold is a seaside resort and people are trying to make a living. Cllr Windell advised that unfortunately such considerations are not material planning issues and that the role of planning cttee members is to consider all applications on material planning terms. Cllr Windell advised that as this is a retrospective application the cttee should respond as it would do on other retrospective applications i.e that the cttee do not appreciate applications being retrospective and that retrospective applications are not to be endorsed.

Discussion on application. Comments included; Design & Access statement being misleading about material planning issues, feasibility study gave excellent feedback and good suggestions, the newly extended golf course was started last year, design not in keeping – can the designs be altered to be a better fit for the planning requirements, role of Council as landlord.

A recorded vote was requested.

After full discussion it was agreed on a majority of 3 in favour (Cllrs Sutton, Temple, Windell) and 2 against (Cllrs Flunder and Goldsmith), (- note that the Chair did not vote (Cllr Jeans)) that as the application does not accord to some planning/N plan policies as described above, and is retrospective, it should be refused accordingly, on appropriate material planning grounds. However, it was requested that as the applicant is a tenant of the Town Council, the chair of the landlords cttee should work with the tenant to achieve the best results for both parties.

- (iv) *DC/21/4101/FUL – Retention of conservation rooflight installed in front roof slope, 40 Victoria Street.*

This is a retrospective application. The cttee do not appreciate applications being retrospective and retrospective applications are not to be endorsed.

Discussion about conservatory roof light.

The application will create a change to the street scene and impact on Conservation Area. The area will not be improved or enhanced.

It was agreed by all to refuse this application on these grounds.

- (b) *ESC decisions and applications to ESC Committee.*

The Elms – it was noted that some of the rendering was changed from the original application before it was permitted by LPA.

- (c) Any new Planning Inspectorate Appeals Lodged? Nil

(d) Other planning matters:

Preplanning – 2 Dunwich Road – Cllr Jeans and Cllr Goldsmith have met with the architect about the requests being put forward.

ESC referral panels –ESC Ward Cllr Beavan has asked the ESC Audit and Governance cttee to reconsider ‘call in’.

Conservation Area Appraisal – this is being progressed by ESC. Council will receive an update in November.

Whitepoint – a planning application has now been submitted.

Training update - SPS/SALC – no update.

Housing Needs Survey – Cllr Jeans advised that a survey is going ahead for a scheme in Reydon, and that Southwold can also be involved. Cllr Jeans will review the survey and circulate draft comments to all Councillors to ensure that it can capture the needs of Southwold.

Southwold Methodist Church and Hall –The Town Council has been approached about keeping the Methodist Hall for community use. Churches are exempt from an ACV listing, but church halls might not be exempt. Members were advised that the N plan could also cover this. After discussion it was agreed to let the Neighbourhood Plan take its course and see if the Neighbourhood Plan could have an influence on this.

Trees – Response from Tree Preservation Officer had been circulated to all.

ESC Planning and Building Control update Sept 2021 – had been circulated to all.

13 Station Road – plastic pipe used on frontage altered to cast iron as required.

6. **Date of next Planning and Development Committee Meeting:** Tuesday 5th October 2021.
To note 6.30pm. start.