

SOUTHWOLD TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held in the Committee Room at the Town Hall, Southwold, at 5.00pm on Tuesday 17th July 2019

PRESENT:	Councillor	D Beavan
	“	J Jeans - Chair
	“	M Ladd
	“	S Flunder
	“	W Windell

Also present: The High Steward, 6 members of the public. Ruth Summers former Design and Conservation Officer at WDC had been invited to assist members understanding of Design and Conservation considerations.

BUSINESS

1. **Apologies:** Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bradbury.
2. **Declarations of interest:**
 - a) *To receive any declarations of Personal Interest regarding the agenda.*
Nil.
 - 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.*
Nil.
3. **To receive and approve Minutes of meeting held on 2nd July 2019.**
It was RESOLVED by all to approve the minutes of Tuesday 2nd July 2019.
4. **To receive comments from Southwold electors on matters on the agenda** (*each elector will be allowed a maximum of 3 minutes – to a total maximum of 10 minutes*).
A public member associated with the Guide Hut expressed concerns as the guide hut is next to the potential new build on Cautley Road and is concerned re access availability, room to undertake repairs, and loss of light and the loss of amenity space. Another public member commented on the design re the internal garage which was considered not to be in keeping with the amenity of the area. Public members advised that the application seemed to have features that were contrary to the Suffolk Design guide and were concerned about the loss/harm to the neighbouring property of the guide hut and that the application would form overdevelopment.

On Design and Conservation;

With regards to the application for 11 Cautley Road the meeting was advised; that the present street scene had rhythm amongst the houses and that the houses work well together i.e. the verticality of the windows and the similarity of the narrow/ thin and tall appearance of the houses which gives rhythm with the gables. Features of the windows presently align horizontally, and this is a critical common feature. The block plan provides the urban grain of the site and its surrounds and may suggest that 9A was built in the garden on no 11. The

new property will be set at an angle to the road. The present gap between the house and the community facility is important to the street scene. The balcony being applied for will be different to others across the street scene.

With regards to application for 59 Pier Ave the meeting was advised that the urban grain can be established from the block plan. An extension should be respectful of its setting. The AONB has different rules relating to permitted development.

With regards to 37 St Edmunds Road the request for the dormer should be justified in the application.

5. **Planning Matters:**

(a) To determine the Town Council response to the following applications:

1) **DC/19/2578/FUL – Three storey extension to north of property with second floor balcony; New single storey rear extension; Internal alterations; Construction of new 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling, 11 Cautley Road.**

Discussion re this application. There were concerns that the block plan does not show 9A correctly. It was considered that as the intention is for the new property to be built at an angle to the road this could look incongruous to the street scene as it is not in keeping with the rest of the road. It was considered that the site could not take both the extension to the existing property and the new house build – this would create over development. The new houses is out of keeping with the street scene. There is significant impact on neighbours and the density of the new build is a concern. Garages will be directly onto the pavement and the 3 storey build will create overlooking. The balcony is different to the existing balconies along the road.

It was agreed by all to request that ESC seek to refuse this application. Town Council response to be refusal.

2) **DC/19/2746/FUL – Construction of a single storey rear extension and alterations to dwelling, 59 Pier Avenue.**

Discussion re this application. There were concerns about the effect on the urban grain as seen by the block plan. The present property is an Arts and Crafts House and the changes being proposed will alter the character to such an extent that this will alter the street scene. Parking provision has been improved but will see the loss of the front garden and is questionable whether sufficient parking spaces have been provided for in this application. An extension should be respectful of its setting but this one is not. Discussion re the request for UPVC windows – the windows there at present are not originals – it was considered that these would have been crittle or sub divided, and that the application may not be permitted development as it is within the AONB. It was considered that the front of the property should remain as at present and that the proposed porch would ruin the look of the front of the property. It was considered that the application would be overdevelopment.

It was agreed by all to request that ESC seek to refuse this application. Town Council response to be refusal.

3) **DC/19/2626/FUL – Construction of a small 2.89m², extension at the rear, 23 Station Road.**

There were no adverse comments on this application – It was agreed by all that the Town Council response to ESC would be to approve.

4) **DC/19/2657/FUL – Construction of a single storey extension, 37 St Edmunds Road.**

There were no adverse comments on this application – It was agreed by all that the Town Council response to ESC would be to approve.

- 5) **DC/19/2689/FUL – Addition of pitched dormer to rear facing roof. Removal of two sash windows, addition of sliding patio doors to internal court yard side/rear, 58 Stradbroke Road.**

Discussion re this application. See Conservation Area Plan re dormers. There would appear to be no justification for the dormer – it is not hidden and will be visible from Stradbroke Road. The incremental changes re roof light, patio door, dormer will cause cumulative harm. The request re windows on the ground floor was considered appropriate to approve but the dormer/ skylight is contrary to policy.

It was agreed by all to request that ESC seek to refuse the request for a dormer within the overall application.

To be noted:

- 6) **DC/19/2665/TCA – 1 x self-set Sycamore – reduce both the height and overhang by approx. 2ft as tree very close to listed wall. 2 Market Place.**

Noted

NOTE - planning applications 1/ 2 and 5 - See attached responses to ESC which detail the comments from the meeting and the decision of the Planning Committee.

- (b) **ESC decisions and matters considered by referral panel.**

See details attached.

6. **Urgent Business:** to act upon any matter of a planning urgency, within the meaning of the Standing Orders, which may be brought to the attention of the Committee with the consent of the Chairman previously obtained.

5 Victoria Street – there was concern regarding the response from the D and CO which does not seem to take into account the effect on Southwold Museum.

Meeting with senior officers/ planning officers at ESC – It was agreed that a meeting be requested with Philip Ridley, Andy Jarvis and Nick Khan – together with Cllr David Ritchie to discuss the present planning system, implementation at ESC and its inadequacies.

7. **Date of next Planning and Development Committee Meeting:**

To be confirmed.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 6.40pm.

Chair

Date