



# SOUTHWOLD TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on **Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> August 2025 at 6pm.**

Present; Cllrs; Temple, Gladwell, Hurr, Palmer, Wells. Also, the Town Clerk.

## **1 - Apologies:**

To receive and approve apologies for absence. Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Flunder and Goldsmith.

## **2 - Declarations of interest:**

- a. To receive any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest regarding the agenda. Nil.
- 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 minutes of meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> July 2025.** Approved 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).*

**5. Planning Matters:** a. To determine the Town Council response to the following applications: *See below for details of applications.*

**DC/25/3037/FUL – Westholme, Godyll Road** – Members commented that the application does not affect the street view. Some members voiced concerns about the design as it seemed too big and overbearing. Extension seems to be a garden room; the application does not create a vision of a house of that period. Particularly the dormer which does not look right for an Edwardian house, specifically because of the materials chosen.

Members agreed as follows.

***Southwold N Plan SWD6 design applies. It was acknowledged that the alterations required do not affect the street view. However, it was noted that the design for the dormer windows is not in keeping with the age or design of the Edwardian property.***

***As part of the Conservation area, the cttee would request that more traditional materials are used for the dormers, which will improve design, and ‘maximise the opportunities to improve the quality of design’***

**DC/25/2098/FUL – 1 Station Road** – no comment from STC.

**DC/25/3009/FUL – 27 Marlborough Road –**

It was Agreed to respond as follows;

**The property is within the Conservation Area, and as stated in the Southwold Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan Design guidelines, the opportunity should be taken to improve the aspect within the CA setting. The Town Council would therefore suggest that the opportunity be taken to restore original material of timber at this property - especially on the front elevations, to be in accordance with N Plan SWD6 Design.**

#### Trees

**DC/25/3057/TCA – The Boathouse, 4 Ferry Road – Noted.**

**b. ESC decisions – see list.**

**c. Applications to ESC Committee. Nil**

**d. Any Planning Inspectorate Appeals Lodged.** Coach House in progress.

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

**Pavement Licences** – The cttee had been asked to consider its policy requirements for the width of pavements as this apparently is now not as per the ESC policy. ESC will accept applications for widths around 1.5m and sometimes less depending on the business case. However,

*Section 3.2 of [Inclusive Mobility](#) - gives advice on the needs of particular pavement users sets out a range of recommended widths which would be required, depending on the needs of particular pavement users.*

***Section 4.2 of Inclusive Mobility sets out that footways and footpaths should be as wide as practicable, but under normal circumstances a width of 2000mm is the minimum that should be provided, as this allows enough space for two wheelchair users to pass, even if they are using larger electric mobility scooters. Local authorities should take a proportionate approach if this is not feasible due to physical constraints. A minimum width of 1500mm could be regarded as the minimum acceptable distance between two obstacles under most circumstances, as this should enable a wheelchair user and a walker to pass each other.***

After full discussion the cttee recommends that;

The STC policy remains as per Section 4.2 of Inclusive Mobility Guidelines i.e. ***‘Section 4.2 of Inclusive Mobility sets out that footways and footpaths should be as wide as practicable, but under normal circumstances a width of 2000mm is the minimum that should be provided, as this allows enough space for two wheelchair users to pass’***

The STC Policy will reflect that each application will be looked at on its merits and will note that there may be special circumstances when 1.5m might be acceptable, in which case STC will state this in their reply to ESC Licensing.

**f. Any consultations to consider. Nil**

**g. Other Matters:**

**21 Church Street** – ESC to be advised that wooden windows have not been installed as per the recent application.

**6 - Date of next Planning and Development Committee Meeting:** Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> September 2025 at 6pm.

Signed ..... Dated .....

**Recommendation - Pavement Licensing for Tables and Chairs;**

The STC policy to reflect Section 4.2 of Inclusive Mobility Guidelines i.e. *‘Section 4.2 of Inclusive Mobility sets out that footways and footpaths should be as wide as practicable, but under normal circumstances a width of 2000mm is the minimum that should be provided, as this allows enough space for two wheelchair users to pass’*

The STC Policy will reflect that each application will be looked at on its merits and will note that there may be special circumstances when 1.5m might be acceptable, in which case STC will state this in their reply to ESC Licensing.