



# SOUTHWOLD TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held on **Tuesday 4th August 2026 at 6pm.**

Present; Cllrs; Flunder, Goldsmith, Hurr, Redington (6.10pm), Temple (6.45pm) and Wells (sub for Cllr Gladwell). Also present the Town Clerk.

There were also 20 members of the public attending.

## **1. Apologies:**

To receive and approve apologies for absence. Cllr Gladwell provided apologies. Noted.

## **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 receive comments from the public on matters on the agenda.**

A member of the public spoke about the Coach House application. Drainage is a concern and the skylight is also a concern. New roof is to be of slate. There is a local concern re drainage of outbuilding, and the location of the outbuilding is not possible with the restrictive covenant being in place. Wall to be built will damage hedge but there are 2 restrictive covenants to prevent this. Environmental concerns continue – domestic gardens need to be protected. Lack of clarity re access from Skilmans Hill.

Another member of the public spoke re Coach House and the concerns about access to the property at the rear. They advised that this is impossible to do without going onto Common, and the need to drive over a PROW. Planning Inspector seems thinks that there is access as there is a gate there. However it is believed that no access to house exists. Also support other resident re restrictive covenants. Both Highways and PROW have voiced concerns but no response from applicants. What do they intend to do and when? The member of the public advised that they would ask Council and applicant and Common Trust to deal with the concerns.

Coach House applicant spoke. Applicant had application overturned in their favour at appeal.

Applicant has 1 car and it is possible to reverse into their property on Skilmans Hill access.

PROW is a shared PROW footpath. Applicant will put in place all things about drainage etc.

For this VOC the size has been reduced by over 10%.

A member of the public spoke about Centre Cliff – Agent for the applicant spoke. Been in the family 75 years. Always been domestic garden. The applicants sister lives adjacent. Trying to minimise impact. Concealed behind wall and is a low density scheme.

Design = bespoke.

Heritage Consultant submission has been sent in.

A member of the public spoke re 100 High Street. Questions – re ridge height and roof lights. Ridge height and roof lights are a concern. Is it Grade II Listed? Why are steps coming out of there?

**4. Notes of the meeting held on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> July 2026.** Agreed by all.

**5. Planning Matters:**

- a. To determine the Town Council response to the following applications:  
*details of applications;*

**DC/26/2466/VOC – The Coach House, Park Lane**

**Proposal:** Variation of Condition No. 2 of DC/24/2894/FUL (allowed by APP/X3540/D/25/3364844)

*Extensive and holistic renovation to the entire property, including: environmental upgrades to all retained building fabric, a new rear extension, first floor extensions, conversion of loft space, internal layout changes, re-facing of all facades, new dormer windows, alterations to the vehicular entrance, new perimeter wall and additional outbuilding to the garden – Variation to previously approved plans.*

Councillors noted that many comments made tonight were made at first meeting. But feel that there are still issues which go against the N Plan. Overdevelopment still applies.

Overdevelopment and a risk to hedgerow and drainage is still a concern. There are still issues which could be resolved. Council did not like the scheme originally but it was agreed at appeal. There has been change to reduce the height and the applicants have addressed many of the issues from the initial report. But applications must prevent overdevelopment and protect public footpaths and the Common.

The applicant advised that all the works can be done via Park Lane. Will not create access for building works via Skilmans Hill.

Rear Access = Common Trust issue and will be dealt with separately.

It was agreed with one abstain that STC ask ESC to refuse this application with the following comments;

The Town Council has a number of concerns on these proposals as follows;

Drainage - what is the management of the drainage - how will controls be set out?

Environmental controls - what environmental controls will be put in place - including with regards to hedgerows etc.

Construction management plan has not been submitted - what is the proposal for the phasing of the build/ traffic management/access arrangements/construction noise management for neighbouring properties? What mitigations will be put in place?

Access - With the rear access at Skilmans Hill being owned by a local Charity, and a designated Public Right of Way on Skilmans Hill running along the rear wall of the property - what conditions/guarantees are going to be put in place regarding access to the rear of the property, specifically ensuring that construction traffic only uses the front of the property on Park Lane for access.

With these concerns still to be addressed and satisfied, the Town Council would ask that ESC refuse this application at the present time.

**DC/26/2530/LBC – 23 Park Lane**

**Proposal:** *Listed Building Consent – Retention of emergency repairs to back addition roof above existing kitchen and bathroom at rear of property.*

It was agreed by all that Council would comment that it is disappointing to receive this application as emergency repairs. However it has no objection on the application.

**DC/26/2509/FUL – Hill View, 67 North Road**

**Proposal:** *Ornate veranda to rear elevation.*

It was agreed by all that the Town Council has no objections on this application.

**DC/26/2369/FUL – 3 The Old Hospital, Fieldstile Road**

**Proposal:** *Change of Use of two spaces. 1) Business Use Class B1 E(g)(i) to Gym Use Class E(d); Part change of use of the Nursery E(f) to Staff Office E(g)(i) and Gym E(d). Installation of three air conditioning units; Retrospective change to the boundary treatment; and Installation of a cycle rack.*

It was agreed by all that Council would query the retrospective change to the boundary treatment – what impact will this have. Council notes the concerns raised in regards to parking/traffic movements along this busy road. The Town Council has no objections to the application.

**DC/26/2354/FUL – The Inch, 43 Ferry Road**

**Proposal:** *Alterations and extension to No. 43 Ferry Road, erection of 2No. domestic outbuildings and associated landscaping.*

It was agreed by all that the Town Council has no objections to this application.

**DC/26/2412/FUL – Centre Cliff, South Green**

**Proposal:** *Detached self-build dwelling with detached garage/store.*

Members noted that this is presently an open space. There will be a principal resident clause. In the Design & Access Statement impact has been noted and it is a sensitive design. Will not be able to see from Pinkneys Lane. Materials = red plain tiles. Brick and flint. Windows – aluminium. NPlan states wooden windows in a Conservation Area.

A member of the public spoke re Centre Cliff. They advised that they did not receive direct notice of the application and hence has had little time to do a response - however noted that there had been a previous refusal for a seafront property. Would suggest that green space should not be built on. A neighbour also advised that they had not been notified even though online it says they have been notified.

It was agreed by all to ask ESC why they have not notified Centre cliff neighbours and STC to ask for extension to 18<sup>th</sup> August 2026. STC to do a site visit from the roads surrounding the property.

**DC/26/2641/DRC - Woodleys, The Common**

**Proposal:** *Discharge of Condition Nos 4, 7, 8 and 9 of DC/25/1867/FUL – Demolition of an existing chalet bungalow and construction of a 1.5 storey replacement dwelling and associated garage, swimming pool and external works – 4. Construction and Demolition Management Strategy – 7. Lighting Design Strategy – 8. Method statement for Ecology – 9. Detailed specification of materials.*

It was noted that Access issues not addressed via use of the Common to get to the site.

Balcony – situation has been missed by ESC.  
Design Materials – not appropriate for this site.  
There is no highway to the site – there is no viable access.

It was agreed by all that STC ask ESC TO REFUSE these documents as the applicant has still not provided a viable access to the site, and ask them to reconsider their controls.

Response; Southwold Town Council has concerns over the following;

Condition no 4 - Construction & Demolition Management Plan PL752, on the basis that it is incomplete and fails to address a critical matter: the only access to the site is over the charitable land known as Southwold Common.

The document makes no reference whatsoever to how demolition or construction activity will lawfully access, cross, protect, or use this land. This is a significant omission. Access arrangements are plainly fundamental to the deliverability and acceptability of the scheme, yet no detail is provided regarding:

- the lawful basis for using charitable land;
- the extent and duration of any temporary access required;
- the route being requested;
- protection measures for the land during construction and demolition;
- traffic management and safeguarding of the access route across the common;
- safeguarding of pedestrians/ members of the public using the common;
- reinstatement and repair obligations; and
- how unauthorised use or damage will be prevented.

Condition no 8 - Ecological Method statement

This statement does not sufficiently detail the mitigation measures for environmental destruction during the demolition and construction phase of the build in this area of outstanding natural beauty.

Condition no 9 - External materials and architectural details

The proposed architectural design is considered inappropriate for its sensitive setting within the Conservation Area.

The appearance is too industrial and functional, lacking any reference to the traditional architectural forms and materials that define Southwold's historic built environment. The one chimney is also considered out of keeping.

The architectural addition of Haddonstone coping between the ground and first floor lends itself to the creation of a balcony around the property which would not be appropriate in this Conservation area - this is to be controlled by way of a condition.

The materials fail to incorporate adequate stone or brickwork and do not reflect the established chalet-style character previously found on the site.

The application mentions that PPC aluminium is to be used – this is not considered to be acceptable in a conservation area.

The Town Council recommends that ESC REFUSE THIS application at the present time.

**DC/26/2547/AME** – 100 High Street

**Proposal:** *Non-Material Amendment of DC/25/4125/FUL - Minor alterations to create a retained ground floor retail unit, a first and second floor two bedroom maisonette; a single bedroom cottage and an extension at the rear of the site to create a single bedroom coach house - 1. Minor change to the ridge height to the existing outbuilding at the north end of the site. 2. An additional central window to the east elevations of the coach house and an additional rooflight to the west elevation. 3. Relocation of the bin stores and 4. The relocation of a useable trapdoor to the GF retail unit.*

It was agreed by all that the Council would like the roof light to be patterned/obscured glass. The Council understands that materials are being removed from this Listed Building and would expect Building Control to control the movement of items/materials of historic importance.

Note – items coming out of the Listed Building a concern. 9 skips have already been taken out of this building including a pump. Should this have been retained? What are ESC controls?

b. ESC decisions – noted

c. Applications to ESC Committee. Next meeting Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> August 2026. Southwold Pier application - Cllr Beavan will read STC refusal on its behalf.

d. Any Planning Inspectorate Appeals Lodged. 17 Market Place.

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

f. Any consultations to consider.  
[East Suffolk Tree and Hedgerow Strategy](#) – deadline 5<sup>th</sup> August 2026.

g. ESC Enforcement action updates;  
ENF/26/0211/SIGN - 17 Market Place - Flag

6. **Date of next Planning and Development Committee Meeting:**  
Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> August 2026 at 6pm.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.30pm.

Signed .....

Dated .....