



SOUTHWOLD TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on **Tuesday 3rd December 2024 at 6pm.**

Present; Cllrs; Flunder, Goldsmith (Chair), Hurr and Wells.

Also, the Town Clerk and 7 members of the public.

1 - Apologies:

To receive and approve apologies for absence - Apologies were received from Cllrs Gladwell – noted, and Temple - approved.

2 - Declarations of interest:

- a. To receive any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest regarding the agenda. Cllr Flunder re DC/24/3852/FUL. All Cllrs re DC/24/3922/VOC
- b. To receive any declarations of Other Registerable Interests regarding the agenda. Nil.
- c. To receive any declarations of Non-Registerable Interest. Nil.
- d. To receive any request for dispensations regarding the agenda. Nil.
- e. To receive details of any lobbying to members. Nil.

3 - To approve the Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 26th November 2024.

The minutes of the meeting of 19th November were recommended for approval by all.

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).

Nil.

5 - Planning Matters:

- a. To determine the Town Council response to the following applications:

DC/24/3852/FUL – Manor Garden House, Woodleys Yard.

This property is in the Conservation Area and overlooks Southwold Common. The materials used therefore need to recognise the tradition/ requirements of the CA.

The proposal for the kitchen – no objections

Installation of roof lights – no objection

Replacement of window and French doors – no objection

However, re the brickwork and roof the Town Council would recommend that ESC Refuses these aspects of the application for the following;

Red / White Suffolk bricks align with the CA. These should be retained. The property can be viewed from The Common and its CA design features must therefore be retained. The proposed materials and colours would be out of keeping and should not set a precedent.

The proposal for the roof is not in keeping with the CA – The colour/ material/ design of the existing pantile roof tiles need to be retained as the roof is a prominent feature from the Common. The proposed materials and colours would be out of keeping and should not set a precedent.

DC/24/3798/FUL – Pier Pavilion, North Parade.

1)Reconfiguration of parking to front of building.

The Town Council is aware of the footfall volume in this location and appreciates the need to widen the footpath in front of the pier to improve safety for pedestrians and to make the pavement more accessible for all.

However, the Town Council is aware that this area is not owned by the Pier.

Therefore, any alterations to the pavement and parking layout must be carried out in conjunction with ESC/ SCC/ and the owners of the land to ensure that the proposed layout, widths, disabled spaces, dropped kerbs, number of parking spaces is compliant with the requirements of the owners of this land. (There also is no indication as to whether the parking is to remain non chargeable as at present).

2) Construction of new infill section of decking

The Town Council is not clear as to the ownership of this particular area and the rights / permissions required to infill the area.

It is not clear from the application as to why the increase in decking is required – is it to increase the walkway area to ease congestion/ Is it to provide more tables/ chairs?

More information is required to enable the Town Council to respond on this part of the application.

3) Installation of Carousel and Paybooth on the Promenade

The Town Council is aware that the promenade area detailed in the proposal is not owned by the Pier.

There is no indication whether the owners of the promenade have been consulted on this request.

With reference to the Carousel – The proposed siting of the carousel will reduce accessibility along the promenade in this location, taking up a significant area of the promenade in this heavy footfall location. This is of major concern.

There are no timings mentioned for the use of the Carousel and no mention of whether music will be played whilst the carousel is operating. No mention is made about the security of the installation in this area – and how it will be locked/ protected when not in use. Is it to be a seasonal feature?

The Town Council considers that this is not a suitable location for this amenity – which, it feels, would be better sited on the Pier itself. The Pier is locked at night and the safety of the apparatus would therefore be safeguarded and the amenity of the promenade would not be affected.

With reference to the Paybooth – The design and size of the pay booth is out of character for the area and not in keeping with the surrounding amenities. The surrounding areas reflect beach hut style shape and roof – which is not reflected in the proposed drawings. The materials should reflect those of the surrounds.

The proposed size/ height of the paybooth is too large for the area and is not needed for a paybooth. The proposed location of the paybooth will reduce accessibility at this heavy footfall location along the promenade and causing a safety concern in view of the number of people who use the location (see footfall data).

The siting of the paybooth as detailed in the PROPOSED_ELEVATION_FLOOR_BLOCK-5276265.pdf blocks off one side of the promenade completely as a through route for pedestrians.

The siting/size of the proposed paybooth along with the carousel, will close off access around this part of the prom for the trade waste vans, emergency service vehicles, coastguards, paramedics etc, as well as reducing the available pedestrian width of the promenade in this location.

The Town Council would request that ESC REFUSES this part of the application in view of the concerns above.

DC/24/3922/VOC – Site at Junction of Station Road and Blyth Road – As the applicant, the Town Council will not be responding to this application.

Trees

DC/24/4108/TCA – 52 Pier Avenue

b. ESC decisions – Noted.

c. Applications to ESC Committee.

DC/24/2854/VOC & DC/24/3106/LBC - 17 Market Place – decision awaited.

DC/24/2984/FUL – The Coach House, Park Lane – decision awaited.

d. Any Planning Inspectorate Appeals Lodged. Nil.

e. Any licence applications/decisions to consider; Nil.

f. Any consultations to consider. Nil

6 - Date of next Planning and Development Committee Meeting:

TBC

Signed Dated