

## Question 6 - Is there anything missing from this vision and, if so, what should be included?

The flood issue has not been included anywhere despite flooding predictions. There is no mention or genuine consideration of the caravan community.

22/05/2024 23:32

Sustainable details for caravan site plans. What you will do when it is flooded. How a holiday let business is viable when flooding regular and insurance invalid. Whether town can sustain a constantly full/let caravan site.

22/05/2024 21:11

The static caravan site does require considerable investment, as does the harbour but it has to be done sympathetically to the community within them. There is very little practical information given for any of the four models ie. costings, how they would be implemented etc. The model that I thought had been voiced all these years does not seem to have been included which is: 5. Continue as is - annual license but invest the revenue in the site with plumbing throughout for all caravans & the option for electric hookups for all sites. Given everyone's high focus on all things ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance), I would have thought it would be an ESC consideration to develop the site as a minimally as possible. Running water for all would be a great addition & grants for caravan owners to set up their caravans with solar panels so that the site was a flagship site for green energy. There is also no mention of the flood risk - given the vision is 2035, but the government flood predictions show the site under water due to rising sea levels somewhere between 2030 & 2040 this seems like a huge omission. Caravan owners are no longer able to insure against flood risk. This poses two questions - how can you ask caravan owners to have caravans under 10 years old which are uninsurable & also if ESC move to one of the renting models how are you able to sign off the liabilities of investing in new caravans but not being able to insure them? There was also years gone by discussions of proper drainage for the site - last year in August, the heavy rain alone caused major flooding which was sufficient enough for my children to be paddle boarding out the front of our vans... There is no reference in the vision to the existing caravan community, a lot of whom have decades of memories in Southwold & on the site. For example, I have been going to the touring site since i was 9 & my mother got a static caravan in 2008, which was passed onto me last year. I had my name on the waiting list since i was 15! In the planning timelines, there is no mention that caravan owners are stakeholders. Surely an omission? Or are we deemed local residents? I think most of us feel like we are locals so perhaps we fall under that but it is unclear. Either way, actual local residents do not seem to have been properly informed of this consultation process. How do ESC intend to go about 'enhancing traditional fishing activities and fostering artisan entrepreneurship', does this mean there will be investment into local businesses along the harbour? Where will the money come from for this? Is the extent of the work needed to the harbour known? Is there an indication of investment or time required? Is the income from the static caravan site going to be funding this & therefore really impacts which model is chosen? ie. the most lucrative for ESC?

22/05/2024 20:29

Flood. There is no protection for businesses, and caravan owners from the predicted flood level rise. Improving the environment for the many bird species and other wildlife that make this area so special.

22/05/2024 18:50

It should include an environmental plan for the area. It should include plans for managing flood risk.

22/05/2024 18:07

The understanding that the caravan and campsite sit on a level 3 flood plain. There is no consideration of this at all. Putting new caravans and infrastructure, spending public money on this site, needs proper consideration of this major risk. There is also no proper consideration of environmental impact or enhancement, its a missed opportunity to do something actually visionary in an ANOB and conservation area. No reference to the existing caravan community, which has been in Southwold for 50 years and many for 5 generations, very fearful of being priced out in order to support the financing of repair to the harbour.

22/05/2024 17:29

Green solutions!

22/05/2024 16:54

There should be much more emphasis on sustainability and eco solutions

22/05/2024 16:42

It is light on detail, particularly on the caravan site; some more tangible goals for the harbour area might have been more useful than a vision.

22/05/2024 15:52

The vision does not take into account the unique character of Southwold and its surrounds. It seems to wish to create a commercial hub out of keeping with the area and its traditional feel, which is what makes it so attractive to visitors and boosts its economy.

22/05/2024 15:21

Green solutions!

22/05/2024 16:54

There should be much more emphasis on sustainability and eco solutions

22/05/2024 16:42

It is light on detail, particularly on the caravan site; some more tangible goals for the harbour area might have been more useful than a vision.

22/05/2024 15:52

The vision does not take into account the unique character of Southwold and its surrounds. It seems to wish to create a commercial hub out of keeping with the area and its traditional feel, which is what makes it so attractive to visitors and boosts its economy.

22/05/2024 15:21

The Society feels that more detail is required before it can assess the objectives and core vision elements properly. We consider that more detail on what needs to be done to protect the area should be included.

22/05/2024 14:49

No mention of real flood threat to the entire area over the next few years. ESC should make it clear that they would indemnify caravan owners as currently there is a total lack of insurance cover for caravan owners.

22/05/2024 14:38

There is no detail on the overall impact for existing caravan owners. I am very supportive of upgrading the site and the need to protect the harbour (and the town) from the threat of rising sea levels. I like the look of designs 1 & 2, but without more detail it is very hard to make an informed decision.

22/05/2024 13:53

Missing? Heart. Included? Fisherman should be included.

22/05/2024 08:30

It doesn't mention any details of how it will impact the caravan community or anything about the very likelihood of flooding and how this will impact the vision.

21/05/2024 21:49

The 'charm' of the harbour area is the unexpected range of existing businesses that organically developed over a very extended period. I am worried that having a relatively rapid development (10 years) of commercial and other facilities will lead to an overly planned Disneyfication of a tourist attraction style harbour. I see that walking along the top of the concrete flood protection dyke opposite the The Voyager hut is now considered too dangerous. Is this the start of removing the character of the place. Playing that forwards, will the harbour road be Tarmacked in the future as it is a trip hazard. Is the heavy machinery used to move boats around compatible with more tourists?

21/05/2024 21:20

Costs are missing. Issue of flood risk insurance is missing. The possibility of making money from the whole harbour is missing eg. why not create businesses along the harbour? why is all the profit having to come from the caravan site? Given that staycations are declining and Southwold holiday lets in town are decreasing, this is not the best economic strategy either. Build on what you have - a strong community committed to staying and caring for the caravan site. how about developing community, arts, leisure and eco spaces at the site and harbour as a way to build community at the same time as making money? I have seen the Vision document produced by Helen Renshaw and Archie Bashford and I think it has brilliant alternative ideas that could also enable the caravan community to afford to stay on the site.

21/05/2024 21:14

I think consideration for the people who will be visiting and staying there is missing. The vision will inevitably involve hugely increasing costs for caravan owners. This will mean having a caravan is unaffordable, for my family and many others. This will diminish the sense of community there as it will drive out the people already there and reduce the site to a profit driven business. I think full transparency on these costs is hidden and it doesn't provide any sense of security to the people on the site or on the waiting list. It leaves me feeling as if the costs will continue to increase and increase with no limit. The suggested 'improvements' are unnecessary and not based on the people's desires. The waiting list is already long (I've been on it 17 years), there is clearly no need for changes to be made to attract more people. So why are they being proposed?

21/05/2024 21:06

The harbour and campsite consultation does not talk about the threat of flooding and the impact this will have in the future. No reference to the existing caravan community, which has been in

Southwold for 50 years and many for 5 generations. The contribution they have made to the community and environment is not discussed. The caravan owners /occupiers are presented as a problem that needs to be fixed in order for 'progress' to be made. Which is then conflated with the funding for improvements to the harbour. There is no indication of income requirements for the works to the harbour or costs of works, nor timescale. It feels like plan that is ill thought through and nonviable.

21/05/2024 19:54

i.FLOOD RISK: In the paper 'Harbour Vision 2035' the stated aim is for the caravan site to be a 'premier coastal holiday destination'. The word FLOOD does not appear at all in the document, yet government flood predictions show the caravan site under water and Southwold surrounded by floods between 2030 to 2040. So this is a proposal to invest substantial public money on a flood plain where currently caravans cannot be insured against flooding. ii.Options for the harbour: Why aren't there also options for the harbour? This is supposed to be a vision paper for both. iii.Community: The Harbour Vision paper does not mention the current long standing caravan community, many families there for 20, 30, 40 or in some cases 50 years, who fear being priced out by the proposed development. Is there a special vision to maintain the existing community, or is this all about commercialisation? (see the stories section at the end of this link (see the stories section at the end of this link <http://www.southwoldcaravanowners.co.uk/index.php/ct-menu1-item2/caravan-park-redevelopment> iv.Climate change: It is shocking that a Green Party led council can put out a vision with no attempt to address climate change in structural ways, through up to date installation of green electricity, water and green sewage, nor to address the potential adverse impact, through the proposed rental fleet, of hugely increasing footfall and traffic and pollution in this quiet part of Southwold

21/05/2024 19:03

The Vision is not represented in the proposal coming forward. The points set out in the vision itself are good, but the result being a modernised caravan site falls way short.

21/05/2024 18:24

Understand caravan site options 1 & 4 are non-starters. Options 2 & 3 include main requirement of caravan owners e.g. mains water electricity etc. but not enough financial detail to see if is viable for us to remain on site.

21/05/2024 16:57

The effect of climate change may cause an enhanced risk of flooding

21/05/2024 16:27

Any mention of flood plain projections.

21/05/2024 15:26

Flood insurance

21/05/2024 15:23

Insurance against flooding

21/05/2024 15:10

No mention of Flood risk - and we can't get insurance for flood damage for our caravans. There is no costings for the works to the harbour works, nor any timescale, therefore expressing an

opinion is extremely difficult. Commercial plan seems to ignore any acknowledgement of 'community' of caravan owners who have been resident through family generation's for 50 years.  
21/05/2024 13:05

The existing flood risk and likelihood of it increasing as sea levels rise have not been factored into consideration of future options. Insurance against flood risk is not possible. Greater emphasis should be placed on the obvious conflict between retaining the attractive, uniquely chaotic character of the boats and huts etc. and introducing 'modern functionality'.

21/05/2024 12:56

It ignores the existing caravan owners & by introducing renting would lose totally the appeal of Southwold & create serious problems controlling the site with strangers constantly arriving & leaving. The introduction of longer leasing is ageism as far as many of the existing caravan owners are concerned. Additionally the rising sea levels & flood risk do not make it viable.

21/05/2024 11:32

The options and vision include things such as 20 year leases, but no mention is made about the flood risk to the site. Caravan owners cannot obtain any insurance, so this suggestion is not feasible. No mention of amount of money invested on a flood plain. The proposals do not include any clear figures, so it is hard to vote on them. Caravan community has also not been considered - the site has 5 generations of families who have loved and contributed to the local community and businesses.

21/05/2024 11:20

There is a lack of detail and costings throughout. No mention of the flood threat (2030 to 2040) to the site. A lack of clarity about plans for the Harbour and relationship of caravan site to Harbour. I understand whilst SCOA has representation on the HMC they do not have a vote on decisions taken. This in principle does not suggest a co operative relationship.

20/05/2024 21:52

Securing the long term viability of the harbour is very desirable. But it needs to be seen in the context of the development of Southwold as a whole. The harbour vision seems to be a stand alone document and does not acknowledge this need.

20/05/2024 14:28

Costings. You mention that the harbour 'requires considerable improvement' but do not say what needs doing, what that is going to cost or where you hope to get the money from.

20/05/2024 10:23

I am extremely concerned about the plans for the caravan site and the harbour area, both of which are unique and will be spoiled if the wrong actions are taken

19/05/2024 13:06

There are no costings and no detail. Nothing is said about the flood risk and about not being able to ensure any caravans - old or new against flood risk. Government flood predictions show the caravan site and Southwold surrounded by floods around 2030/2040. But a large financial investment is still planned in a flood plain. There is no mention of the AONB surrounding the caravan site and how to maintain/increase biodiversity, beauty and the tranquillity which is currently a huge attraction. There is no mention of the current caravan community, many of whom have had caravans here for several generations. Caravan owners are not listed amongst stake holders in the consultation documents. There is no description of income requirements for the

works to the harbour or costs of works, nor timescale, so expressing an opinion is extremely difficult.

19/05/2024 11:27

Proposed high density caravan park is unsightly and will attract a different mix of people who may not be as interested in the community aspects of the site as present today. Particularly when seeing some options to buy/sell leases, which will lead to financial driven leaseholder decisions, not community related. The concept of the council owing 30% of the site will undoubtedly lead to more financial exploitation of leasehold caravan owner as is common practice in social housing with a mixed ownership. Finally, on the plus side is the brutal honesty of the council to use the caravan site as the sole/primary cash cow for funding the harbour improvements. My question is - what is the harbour operation itself contributing to the site improvements?

19/05/2024 10:23

On the environmental side, the omission of any mention of the word flood and any flood-related provision or discussion is concerning. The Southwold caravan park is in a high-risk flood area and the issue of flood mitigation and insurance is a major concern. The long-established community of caravan owners is not listed as a stakeholder group, which is unreasonable given how they would potentially be impacted by the proposals. The caravan owner community has collectively paid a substantial amount in site fees in the caravan site over a long period of time and have a vested interest in what happens to the caravan site location. This oversight seems intentional, given the council is aware of the concerns of the site owners but does not want to engage with the group in an authentic way. The vision and proposals seem focused on maintaining the tranquillity and historical preservation of the harbour, but only in the collections of monies from the caravan site.

18/05/2024 19:05

Question 6 omits 'strategic direction' as per top title. I hope to include my thoughts about strategy here. Acknowledge the significant risk from global warming and rising sea levels and increased flooding as jeopardy to doing nothing AND to any development plans. To have goals which are measurable rather than woolly meaningless statements such as 'a cornerstone for economic growth'. To include the south side of the river ie Warbleswick harbourside and businesses. To include changes to sailing fraternity.

16/05/2024 15:48

The vision makes no mention of maintaining the community of caravan owners, which is important to me and many others. There is no mention, or allowance for the likelihood of flooding which needs to be factored into the planning. There is no indication of how much money is required and therefore it is difficult to make an informed decision on options.

16/05/2024 14:04

Road use and traffic control.

15/05/2024 17:32

Clear text with specific deliverables rather than management/planning conceptual statements.

15/05/2024 14:13

THE VISION DOES NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FACT THAT THE CURRENT CARAVAN OWNERS BRING A LOT OF TRADE INTO THE AREA AND ARE NOT BEING CONSIDERED AT ALL DURING THIS PROCESS. AT PRESENT THE SITE IS VERY SUSTAINABLE WITH MOST CARAVANS RUNNING ON SOLAR POWER. 140 UNITS CONNECTED TO THE MAINS IS NOT SUSTAINABLE  
14/05/2024 22:18

I'm surprised that the vision does not reflect the fact that the caravan site is at high risk of flooding. This means caravans can't be insured, so it seems strange to focus on a plan that involves investing lots of money - both for infrastructure etc and for upgrading caravan on a project that may only be short term, and puts both the council and the caravan owners at risk of losing money due to lack of insurance cover. It's also hard to form a view on the vision as it contains no information about how much it will cost. There are lots of gaps in the information.  
14/05/2024 20:09

Inclusion of new holiday caravans and infrastructure which could bring in lots of income for the site  
14/05/2024 20:08

I agree with the vision but would like more detail about how the Harbour can be enhanced to achieve the optimistic objectives.  
14/05/2024 17:23

I understand the need for attention to the harbour infrastructure, but I do not think the strategic direction, so far as it relates to the caravan site has been sufficiently scoped. I fear that some of the potential options could have exactly the opposite effect to that which is intended. Namely, that potential leaseholders or renters will stay away due to unfavourable terms and conditions and uninsurable assets and rendering an economy from the site negligible or nil.  
14/05/2024 14:36

The Vision does not deal with details, nor consider the impact of climate change and change in sea levels.  
14/05/2024 12:26

No  
14/05/2024 11:02

The Vision document is all words and no substance. It provides no details or examples of what it wants to do. It also provides no definite link to what is proposed for the caravan site, e.g. what would the changes at the caravan site allow to happen within the harbour. Would it finance the repair of South Pier?  
13/05/2024 23:25

Recognition of the damage caused by over-enthusiastic "vision" and commercialisation when self-interest entrepreneurs are let loose  
13/05/2024 09:49

The vision seem to focus on changing the caravan site to maximise income to spend on the harbour? That's how it reads. I'd like to know how we as caravan owners will benefit? It seems we have the upheaval for the benefit of others  
12/05/2024 07:52

The provision of some chalets on the caravan site  
11/05/2024 20:23

The inclusion of green alternatives. The consultation with organisations or bodies that have successfully achieved something similar to what the vision plans to achieve. Learning lessons from successful schemes  
10/05/2024 17:09

There is too much reliance on the Caravan site subsidising the harbour at great expense.  
07/05/2024 11:09

The quiet traditional fishing-related and maritime uses are what I would like to see continued. I don't think new artisans and food markets would enhance this. My vision is that people will walk along Blackshore Harbour as they do now.

The vision does not clarify what needs to change to fulfil the ambition  
03/05/2024 13:13

Local opinion. Opinions of users of the caravan site over many years. There seems to be no design concept for the Harbour or costings/ management plan, just vague reference to development and business.

There is nothing about Flooding or generations of caravan owners . There is no indication of income requirements or timescale of the foreseeable costs.  
30/04/2024 22:37

More thoughts about children and their needs, play equipment, sports equipment for youth  
30/04/2024 09:21  
Why change it.. lack of money.. from caravan & camping site? Floods anyway

There is no mention of Walberswick within the vision, yet Walberswick shares the harbour with Southwold. This is a very concerning omission as the plans would have severe negative effects on Walberswick's unique character.  
29/04/2024 09:44

The caravan owners who have been there for 50 years are not included as stakeholders; we are a vital part of the community and many of us have been visiting for generations  
28/04/2024 20:13

Flood mitigation does not appear to have been considered. The caravan owner community are not mentioned as stakeholders in the redevelopment plans of the consultation. Caravan owners should be listed as stakeholders, given some of the pitches have been in many generations of families for over 50 years, contributing each year in site fees. There have been no detailed or reasonable redevelopment plans for the caravan site, no flood prevention measures have been put forward just very vague proposals for the redevelopment. East Suffolk Council have engaged very poorly with caravan owners. Please can ESC have clear, open, dialogue, and work with the local community who have been on site for many generations to create a positive outcome for all. The lack of willingness of ESC to engage the caravan owners' community, the caravan community has had to initiate engagement with ESC to obtain future proposals for the caravan site. ESC has

alienated the caravan owners by not keeping caravan owners (who should be listed as stakeholders) informed. ESC should engage with those caravan owners and their families who have invested financially and emotionally in the caravan site for many years. Tranquillity, biodiversity, and affordability are all factors to be considered in such a fragile environment.

no mention of flood risk, no mention of any costs either to caravan owners nor ESC. no mention of existing site community. difficult to express an opinion.

28/04/2024 17:10

I strongly believe that the importance of preserving the unique, timeless uniqueness of the Blackshore, Both Southwold and Walberswicks' side Should be stated as a priority.

26/04/2024 11:24

With improved harbour facilities how will the increased car traffic be dealt with. What are the planned logistical changes for the area to cope with additional traffic and parking.

25/04/2024 17:26

What does this mean >>."a beacon of heritage-rich, economically vibrant, and community-focused development."

Should include Southwold supporting a healthy local natural environment integrated within the wider natural environment of the Suffolk Coast

25/04/2024 11:17

Flood risk on the site impacting any investment and security of income, cost of the harbour works and timeline, anticipated timeline to upgrade the caravan site, sustaining caravan community and support for southwold, response to climate change

25/04/2024 07:16

Need to avoid turning it into a Disney like toy town pastiche

24/04/2024 18:15

Clarity on how important the caravan site is to funding the redevelopment

24/04/2024 14:03

Would prefer to see the simplicity of Southwold harbour maintained

23/04/2024 20:00

As a caravan owner who is already unable to insure my caravan against flood risk on the site, it is an extraordinary omission that the word FLOOD does not appear on the vision paper for 2035. Government flood predictions show that the caravan site will be under water and Southwold surrounded by floods by 2030 - 2040. Any proposal to invest substantial public funds on a level 3 flood plain seems like a very poor use of public money, and business models that require the investment of substantial sums on uninsurable caravans (either from public funds or from individuals) seem doomed to failure. Furthermore, there is so little detail in vision that it is pointless to ask for feedback. How can caravan owners (or anyone) give informed feedback to such vague proposals? The impression given throughout this process has been that ESC's primary goal is to raise money. But there are no details or costs for any option? How much will rent go up? How often will caravans have to be replaced? Will owners be able to buy them on the open market or

will it have to be through ESC's preferred supplier at marked-up prices? Will there be year-on-year rental caps? Will owners be able to opt out of supplied electricity and have their own solar? What other hidden costs (electricity, maintenance etc) will face leaseholders? As it stands, asking for feedback on this detail-light vision is like asking someone if they're interested in buying a car, but without telling them how much it costs, what model it is and how many miles it has on the clock.  
23/04/2024 14:46

No  
22/04/2024 09:56

little content or facts provided in Vision documentation  
21/04/2024 09:27

Provision for ordinary people who visited southwold long before it became so desirable that local people could no longer live there  
20/04/2024 13:31

Consideration of how it will affect the current residents of the caravan site who have been there for many years.  
19/04/2024 11:38

There should be an option for a renters management committee and input.  
19/04/2024 07:22

Exactly what the vision is for the static caravan park It is not very clear what the vision is and how this will impact on the owners of the caravans.  
19/04/2024 06:14

It doesn't really have the actual detail of what will sit behind the vision so it's very hard to say and answer the above Q properly  
18/04/2024 21:08

I think this vision statement should acknowledge the present run down condition of property and access provision.  
18/04/2024 21:06

As a caravan owner its difficult to complete at this time. At no stage have I seen any reference to Insurance against flooding! That is THE major concern for existing caravan owners and for any new potential investors if you can insure against flooding?  
18/04/2024 19:49

An unnecessary greedy approach that intends to milk a local treasure to fund an underperforming council authority.  
18/04/2024 10:07

Improvement to berthing facilities - particularly replacement of the staging with pontoons, and providing toilet and washing facilities  
18/04/2024 08:33

Images would be a good idea

17/04/2024 08:19

It should include maintaining the unique way the site works whilst proving utility connections. The harbour would benefit from funding spent on up grading the road, introducing a modernised cafe and fish stalls plys reibstrate a smoke House and fish and chip shop. Enable the boat owners to carry out their work with improved mornings etc.

16/04/2024 22:38

far more consideration of the caravan owners' views

16/04/2024 19:00

I believe that one problem which needs be looked in the plan is travel links such as do there need to be more bus services and road improvements such as the flooding at Potters Bridge.

15/04/2024 17:18

Over the years the Harbour has always been seen as 'the poor' end of the town and never seen the investment that it has needed. Perhaps this is what is needed now at least from the Harbour point of view. However from the Caravan site, the last thing this needs is a complete redevelopment. The paper talks about Heritage and charm of the area, yet turning the site into what tantamount into a Park will destroy the history and heritage of the area.

15/04/2024 14:17

The 'vision' is both very poorly defined and the business plan totally unrealistic.

15/04/2024 13:35

I'd love to see at least one or two caravans that could be rented to people on low income or with life difficulties to allow them to have a break in Southwold, an area that normally takes a high income to afford, perhaps even for the many who work in Southwold but couldn't afford to stay there (and def can't afford to live there)

15/04/2024 09:15

It needs to be left as is

15/04/2024 08:21

Harbour has opportunity to be leisure activity, arts and food hub of Southwold and Walberswick by encouraging entrepreneurial chefs, hospitality leaders and activity organisers to 'cluster' in the harbour buildings Consider including the sandy/dune shoreline along Ferry Road as part of the Plan to connect to the town and provide other facilities and opportunities along that stretch to may the Plan appealing to the next generations

14/04/2024 16:32

How much options would cost for caravan owners

14/04/2024 15:13

Dredging the canals

14/04/2024 05:44

Reference to the environmental capacity of the harbour area to achieve the wide range of ambitious objectives

13/04/2024 23:30

An express commitment to connect caravans to mains water and drainage and not to keep delaying it, as has happened until now

13/04/2024 13:00

A motorhome and campervan overnight parking site? Similar to a French 'Aire de Service'

12/04/2024 16:19

The facilities for visiting yachts are very poor and very expensive. A modern floating pontoon and more mooring is critical

12/04/2024 14:56

The vision is contradictory: on one hand promising preserving the harbour's historical and cultural uniqueness- which brings in the many visitors we already have - while also proposing redevelopment that is 'modern', to make it a 'fiscal powerhouse' with the aim of helping Southwold economy. Real danger of killing off the golden goose - getting a redevelopment that is like everywhere else and certainly no longer unique

12/04/2024 11:06

Provide proper daytime and overnight facilities for motorhome and campervan visitors, (known as motor caravans) in the form of an aire. Aires are parking areas for motor caravans for overnight visits and usually have marked spaces for a small fee (£5 if basic area or £10 with water and waste facilities). These are all across Europe and facilitate tourists to stay local in towns and villages and spend money locally.

11/04/2024 21:57

How does it affect the Warbleswick side of the harbour? Are there any improvements proposed for pilotage into the harbour?

11/04/2024 18:57

Perhaps some more illustrative visualisation of what the enhancements would look like.

11/04/2024 16:28

Money. While the caravan site is clearly an under-utilised asset, capable of generating more funds than at present, it will only fill part of the funding gap - whether in private or public hands.

11/04/2024 15:37

Amy structure or content that could give an indication of the direction these changes might take.

11/04/2024 15:28

As you say, considerable external funding would be needed to safeguard the future of the caravan site in which case I think the caravan site should be re-developed into a new marina with modern pontoons, restaurants and surrounding flats and shops. That would bring in yachtsmen and women from here and abroad who would spend money in the local community, use the bars and restaurants and spend in the shops. It would also be an attractive place for visitors to spend time in. One only has to look at how successful places like the ipwsich water front has become and how many visitors it attracts by boat and road.

11/04/2024 11:48

The main worry I have is the focus on increased footfall. The harbour already feels overcrowded on a sunny weekend and is at its most charming in January, when the birdlife can be heard.

11/04/2024 08:15

Provision for touring motor homes, with basic facilities for overnight parking, drinking water supply and waste water and toilet disposal for a reasonable charge, similar to the French aires.

10/04/2024 22:29

The vision doesn't say anything it is so vague.

10/04/2024 19:29

Provision for visiting using motorhome, not a campervan. An Aire type facility for limited overnight, eg 2 nights maximum, and include waste, cdp (chemical disposal point) and water.

10/04/2024 19:19

Motorhome stopovers

10/04/2024 19:01

As a retired couple who spent months touring in our motorhome through Europe and UK, we suggest a Motorhome Park - hardstanding parking/overnight places off-road and close to walk into town centre to visit hospitality and tourism businesses. We only require 24 hours and level ground. If Services (waste disposal points and fresh water top ups) are available all year round at the campsite that's good, but we need access every 3/4 days so only one Service Point in town is required to enable a stream of motorhome tourists to come and spend good money in town. Spaces for 5-10 vans may soon not be enough due to popularity of Southwold so extra space eg beyond the Pier Car Park would be ideal. Charges to stay at £5/night has brought almost £26,000 in '22/'23 to Flertwood council near Blackpool, and it's estimated that the local economy benefitted by over £268,000 in that 12 months from motorhomes and campervans alone.

10/04/2024 17:52

Club house on site

10/04/2024 17:33

Today caravans are not the only way people visit the area many being motorhomes which do not need ask the facilities caravans do. Access to a motorhome aire or somewhere to park a motorhome overnight would increase footfall.

10/04/2024 17:04

Provision for overnight parking of motorhomes. Similar to Aires which are very popular and well used on the continent.

10/04/2024 16:52

Now a days the popularity of motorhomes is significant. The revenue they bring to the areas that they stay in is very high. It's been proved that the addition of a motorhome stop is an excellent input to the viability of the area.

10/04/2024 15:55

Although there is a need for commercial involvement, the joy of the static caravan park is the lack of amenities & facilities. The caravan users use the local, independent shops & services that contribute to Southwolds economic life

10/04/2024 11:14

The harbour is fundamentally a place for boats of all types to use/ visit. The plan should therefore have this as a central point, with other issues being secondary.

10/04/2024 09:54

Details of what exactly will be happening.

10/04/2024 09:04

Consideration for existing caravan owners

09/04/2024 20:04

I think keep it for some of the fisherman and stop trying to make money on large rental

09/04/2024 19:13

More opportunities for people to own caravans

09/04/2024 18:14

Practicality and common sense. The needs of the local people and the businesses working there

09/04/2024 16:38

Leave it as it is

09/04/2024 16:21

The vision document doesn't actually explain anything of substance, just management buzzwords. What's missing: fix the road and pot holes. Make it pedestrian only for public unless or commercial harbour vehicles or customers etc. replace public toilets. Don't go all modern where it's not needed. Allow crabbing back again. More pop up huts for small businesses towards the rnl end of the harbour area. Don't allow caravan area to be elite, make it accessible and short term.

09/04/2024 15:39

-

09/04/2024 15:17

I hope all can use this caravan site in the future ie the hiring of static caravans, and will be nice to see the harbour developed we love it down there space for a lot more things there

09/04/2024 14:18

Improvements definitely required..try to keep the charm though and not over development of harbour rd..might become too busy with traffic

09/04/2024 14:06

It seems a bit vague overall, difficult to agree or disagree

09/04/2024 13:51

It's all very vague concerning the harbour and marine activities (fishing, recreational boating etc). More info on what is to be provided e.g. sheds, stages and what may be taken away or lost. Plenty

of vision on how to extract money from the caravan site, which given past WDC behaviour will be spent anywhere but Southwold and harbour.

09/04/2024 13:25

Global warming is wiping out the harbour and road.

09/04/2024 13:09

I do not agree with the precept that development is required and that as much money as possible is extracted. You will eliminate the very reason why the harbour is so special. Making it a through road was a mistake and the over development of the present fish and chip shops has spoilt what was once a truly remarkable location for the locals.

09/04/2024 08:40

The main issue for the future of the harbour is flooding which will become worse with sea level rise and the silting up of the floodplain areas. Plans to raise river walls will shorten effective life of the harbour

09/04/2024 08:38

Much needed work on toilet block

08/04/2024 20:45

Although tourism has been thought about in southwold. The vision needs to help local independent businesses all year round.

08/04/2024 20:32

Need to keep the Same felling of untouch fisherman hunts and local fisherman run business

08/04/2024 18:58

The current plan is vague management consultant speak. You need to be much more specific about what will be preserved and any innovations.

08/04/2024 17:42

The parking will be a problem as there is already insufficient parking in the Harbour and Town even before the new improved Harbour. I feel you need to provide residence parking permits (remember we will support these new businesses all year round) as well as increased parking spaces and then we will be in full support of generating artisan businesses providing the history and charm of the harbour will remain

08/04/2024 14:51

Visitor mooring facilities. Proper floating pontoons required for convenience and safety reasons.

08/04/2024 14:49

I can see no mention of a much needed upgrade of the access roads to the harbour.

08/04/2024 11:44

x

08/04/2024 11:12

There are key fundamental details missing from the options - long term leases "Potential up to 20" option two for example. How are we meant to comment on this appropriately when there is a complete lack of detail.

08/04/2024 10:44

## Question 7 - Do you have any other comments?

It is not clear what the actual proposals are regarding the changes to the harbour. There is mention of artisan shops and markets - this will cause significant issues with traffic, congestion and pollution. There is not sufficient consideration to sustainability and environmental factors.

22/05/2024 23:32

The detail will be crucial in terms of site fees, services, lease length etc so impossible to respond meaningfully at this stage. Planning concepts must be careful not to invest heavily with public money in a site which floods especially when interest in UK holidays is waning. Ideally the rustic nature will be retained for long-standing van owners, and the offering will be affordable despite the flood risk and long term insecurity of the site due to being on a flood plain. Over development will make the site unattractive for those who choose Suffolk for holidays.

22/05/2024 21:11

Since the start of these conversations around the development of the static caravan site over a decade ago where has the income generated from the site been spent? I have not seen it being spent on the site. Part of the charm is that it is rustic, but I'm pretty sure amongst other things that open drains in the toilet blocks shouldn't still be allowed. Also due to the ongoing council indecision around what may or may not happen to the site, there has been considerable loss of revenue over the years given the HUGE waiting list & the large number of empty pitches on the site.

22/05/2024 20:29

Plans to commercialise the site through the introduction of holiday lets and/ or commercial caravan park-style leases for caravan owners, there is a very real chance that the existing community of caravan owners will be destroyed. I have been brought up on this site. And the thought that this poorly thought through proposal will ruin what is a peaceful special place. Many caravan owners have deep-rooted connections to Southwold and the surrounding area, and care deeply for the place in ways that cannot easily be replaced. The vision states that the caravan site will be 'a premier coastal holiday destination' by 2035. This suggests a large weekly rental site which will increase footfall, traffic, pollution, noise and be detrimental in an AONB. It will undermine the existing holiday rental market in town (which is currently in decline and discounting rates) and be a blight on a beautiful and tranquil part of Southwold .

22/05/2024 18:50

Making the area into a commercial hub goes against the whole atmosphere of the harbour. People come to this area precisely because it is not commercialised and is not a shopping destination. Southwold town already fulfils that function. People come for the birds, the working harbour for fish.

22/05/2024 18:07

The consultation doesn't have much detail so it is difficult to comment. The vision of a commercial hub in what is a quiet area of an otherwise busy tourist town is concerning without proper detail.

22/05/2024 17:29

I think we should have an ecological filter 's for all considerations

22/05/2024 16:54

This is an opportunity to do something very exciting and green! There is a fantastic community at the caravan site which needs to be preserved. Ecologically sound solutions like solar energy and much more choice about how we get energy are needed - it's a very outdated old fashioned plan  
22/05/2024 16:42

There has been a lot of uncertainty about future plans and this is impacting the Static Caravan site as the list for caravan spaces is closed and new static caravan owners paying annual rent has been lost and less people are benefitting from the experience of Southwold Caravan and Camping Site  
22/05/2024 16:15

There are significant number of variables and unknowns at this stage, it rather precludes comment. See below.

22/05/2024 15:52

Whilst the vision says that "the essence of the harbour will be preserved", that clearly isn't true if some of the changes to the caravan site are approved, as it is part of the harbour. The vision talks about the "quintessential charm" of the harbour remaining a source of pride for generations to come, but it seems to be at the expense of the quintessential charm of the caravan site, which it appears will be set aside in order to turn it into a money-making asset for the harbour and the Council as a whole.

22/05/2024 15:21

The document contains a number of worthy aspirations but without further details it is hard to comment further other than to reiterate the importance of maintaining the character and feel of the area as a working harbour and the importance of any monies from increased revenue being being ring fenced for the Harbour lands.

22/05/2024 14:49

You have not truly considered the deep involvement of the caravan community. As a family, we have had a caravan at Southwold for almost fifty years and four generations of our family have enjoyed the peaceful, safe, sustainable and low-key bolt-hole. We anticipate the entire nature of the site and area will be irreparably damaged by commercialisation. After all this time we, sadly, expect to have to leave.

22/05/2024 14:38

The current site is liable to flooding, these plans don't seem to acknowledge that.

22/05/2024 13:53

My family and I grew up in Southwold dating from the mid 19th Century. Please keep a functioning harbour. I am for change and rejuvenation though. Clearly the council feel there are issues. Pollution from caravan park and aging boats? Please make these known so we as a wider community can address them. Five members of my family live in Southwold today.

22/05/2024 08:30

The vision talks about increasing footfall/visitors to the harbour/southwold and there are already more visitors than southwold/local restaurants can cope with.

21/05/2024 21:49

If the harbour wall needs attention it should be fixed if there is a duty for the council to keep the harbour in a safe condition for the vessels using it, irrespective of any development plan. If a local road was unsafe due to say, an imminent land slip, it would be fixed PDQ to avoid a potential tragedy. Why not the harbour wall? Different budget? What consideration is there for flooding

along the harbour road for the new commercial developments? Assuming they will be required to be built on stilts to get planning go ahead and insurance, how could a small hut selling artisan nic-naks incorporate an access ramp or would there be a raised board-walk in front of a group of businesses?

21/05/2024 21:20

The reason I put 'very poorly' is because I am really anxious that the changes proposed will put up prices too much so that myself and the community there will have to leave. I have been coming every year since my daughter was a toddler, staying with friends, and as a single parent it was the only place where my daughter could be free, learn to ride a bike, have outdoor space and where I got the support I needed from others on the site. We have both built a community on the caravan site. I am very worried that having waited nearly 20 years for a caravan I am not going to be able to afford it, especially as I received an email saying I would have to buy a one-year old caravan and on top of that maybe via the site at inflated costs. Personally I have no need for on-tap electric, water etc. I like meeting others at the communal washing-up areas. But if it does have to change then can slightly older caravans be bought (eg 5 or 10 years) and MOT'ed every 5-10 years - and bought independently not via the site management with a mark-up?

21/05/2024 21:14

If the vision goes ahead, I will not be able to accept a caravan if I am offered it. I do not trust the price will not continue to increase. And I do not want to be on a site that has no sense of community.

21/05/2024 21:06

There is essentially nothing wrong with the caravan site. it is a perception from the caravan site that it needs to be 'improved' and money must be made from it, to support wider projects. The site for the caravans and the camping is fine and unique. It treads lightly on the earth and the tourists seem to visit the area for its beauty and authenticity for its authenticity not a boring, overly designed identikit resort from a top down approach.

21/05/2024 19:54

i.Flood risk:The paper talks about needing to raise £11m for the south harbour arm, but the Haskonen report says clearly this will not mitigate flood risk. (aside: Also how would the proposed LIONlink cable and buildings proposed for Walberswick beach affect the South Harbour Arm? Will this change the proposal for the harbour?) . ii.Speculation: Redevelopment of the caravan site on a level 3 flood plain, where currently caravans cannot be insured against flooding, looks a risky speculative proposal, and particularly so if using public money. This is not addressed. iii.Alternative options: The paper focuses on the caravan site as the cash cow, to supply the money for the council to be able to raise and repay a public loan from the government. (it doesn't say how the harbour itself might contribute). However, there are alternative examples elsewhere where community and public sector have worked together and levered in huge amounts of grants for appropriate sensitive and complex development. This approach is missing. iv.David Beavan said in one of the meetings, 'This end of Southwold and the beach is underdeveloped.' Would his constituents agree? That is precisely its charm and attraction. How would more cars and people affect it?. (noise, footfall, traffic, pollution, congestion, environmental damage?) Also the harbour itself is a working boatyard with a narrow road along it, and narrow roads accessing it at both ends. This end of Southwold is quiet, marshland and beach. People come to Southwold for its

peace and undeveloped nature. I don't like the vision paper wanting the harbour to be a 'commercial and cultural hub', when it is in a conservation area, and AONB.

21/05/2024 19:03

There must be a considered long term vision for the harbour that does not solely rely on the caravan site. The opportunity is there, it would be incredibly shortsighted not to take a step back and develop and plan that addresses long term needs more holistically and with genuine community engagement.

21/05/2024 18:24

Caravan site desperately requires the mains facilities, but should not be at expense of turning it into a purely money making project and losing a valuable part of the Southwold community.

21/05/2024 16:57

Rather soulless proposed layouts of the caravan site. More community/breakout areas required at the ends of the rows.

21/05/2024 16:27

There is no doubt that the council needs more money but why have the caravan owners been put at the front of the queue. The town is awash with second/ holiday/ rental homes, in short, some of the most desirable properties in Suffolk bought as investments by people or companies with very deep pockets. Surely when gathering taxes/ revenue these are the people you should be looking for.

21/05/2024 15:26

The huge capital cost of redeveloping the Caravan site in no way demonstrates 'Fiscal Prudence' approach. The present arrangements guarantee a revenue stream, with or without enhancement. Will big Capital outlay significantly enhance revenue long term?

21/05/2024 12:56

From the view of council tax payers consideration should be given to the cheapest solution to the site to support the harbour by ensuring the vacant sites are occupied thus maximising the return from the site.

21/05/2024 11:32

Environmental impacts have not been assessed as well as I think they should be - suggestions such as replacing your caravan every 5-10 years is, in my opinion, an absolute tragedy and completely unfeasible. People love Southwold because it's NOT been overly developed, and some of the proposals would lead to this.

21/05/2024 11:20

Implications of all proposed options implies increased costs which I fear, though not clear in any of the documentation, that we will no longer be able to afford keeping our caravan on site. A site we have been involved with first as campers, then as friends of the SCOA community and then with a plot and caravan almost 10 years ago.

20/05/2024 21:52

Taking the point above, if the intention is to increase visitor numbers and footfall for Southwold, the development of the harbour needs to be accompanied by a clear secretary for managing that increased footfall and road traffic. At the moment, the current infrastructure struggles to meet high points of demand in summer. This would point towards some sort of park and ride scheme for the town and harbour using car parking outside the town. It might also require some improvements to the structure and integrity of the York Road access to the harbour.

20/05/2024 14:28

- The R Haskoning Report deals with the effects upon the harbour of not repairing the South Arm. Is this the only thing necessary to "save the harbour from falling into the sea" (to quote David Beavan)? - What will this cost? - If more work than this is needed, what is it, exactly, and what will that cost? - Finally, who will be paying for these improvements? Given that the main beneficiaries of an improved and 'saved' harbour will be those many and diverse businesses along the Blackshore (one of them an international multi-million pound concern) it seems logical that they should be making a significant contribution to these repairs. All we have been given so far is that the Static Caravan Site will have much-increased fees to 'save the harbour'.

20/05/2024 10:23

Any dramatic changes to the caravan site will have a detrimental affect on the harbour area

19/05/2024 13:06

The consultation is faulty, without detail and without weighting to caravan owners. The initial consultation meeting with caravan owners was cancelled at the last minute and instead Councillor Beavan met with a few of us on a different day in an inaccessible caravan that did not fit us in. He did not have any council officers with him and he did not show us the proposed new layouts for the caravan which were shown at a later meeting. The consultation has changed as it has gone along and people who filled in this survey earlier in the process did not have documents which were revealed later on. The proposals and this official survey are based on four models: Participants are invited to give their preference from these. But in meetings with David Beavan he stated verbally that options 1 and 4 had been discounted. This invalidates the survey results. How can people state a preference between options and have their responses counted as part of the consultation outcome, when they do not know which of them are the real options? ESC are missing a trick. Greater income could be generated with a forward-looking, sustainable model matching the outlook of visitors to and residents of Southwold. The current vision is yesterdays vision - an 80s style caravan site which will neither excite nor attract new visitors to Southwold Harbour. Since the flood risk also makes it a very risky investment, planning needs to be visionary and convert this weakness to a strength: Southwold will attract those seeking eco and off-grid holiday alternatives and a vision which exploits these options will produce a greater income. The plans indicate that the revenue to be raised for the harbour will come almost entirely from the caravan site, without a wider vision for the role of the harbour itself. Increased weekly rental caravans (30% in option 3) The published vision for the harbour includes markets and artisan shops. These will increase congestion in the area, destruction to wildlife and the environment and radically change the caravan site and this part of Southwold. There is no mention of AONB. The top priorities should be: forward looking and sound public investment, environmental sustainability, community asset, historical preservation and operational harbour.

19/05/2024 11:27

Proposed high density caravan park is unsightly and will attract a different mix of people who may not be as interested in the community aspects of the site as present today. Particularly when seeing some options to buy/sell leases, which will lead to financial driven leaseholder decisions, not community related The concept of the council owing 30% of the site will undoubtedly lead to more financial exploitation of leasehold caravan owner as is common practice in social housing

with a mixed ownership. Finally, on the plus side is the brutal honesty of the council to use the caravan site as the sole/primary cash cow for funding the harbour improvements. My question is - what is the harbour operation itself contributing to the site improvements?

19/05/2024 10:23

The proposals for the caravan site are completely at odds with the views of the caravan owners. The long-term leases and replacing of caravans on a 10-year cycle are concerning. Some, but not all, caravan owners at the Southwold site are at or over retirement age. The prospect of committing to a long-term lease present myriad issues, including the concerns over such a long commitment, the financial penalty imposed if for any reason the owner has to leave the site during the period. The beauty and charm of Southwold is that it has remained relatively unchanged and has not been overdeveloped. I have been visiting the site for over 25 years and my wife has been visiting the caravan site since she was a young child. Although the simplicity of the site is a major attraction for caravan owners, the need for general investment is needed; however, as a caravan owner, it is concerning that although the fees rise each year, the investment in the caravan site has been woeful considering the amount of income made from the fees charged to caravan owners. The site itself has been allowed to deteriorate, which, given the site has been shown to potential site developers, one could see this approach as cynically tactical in terms of presenting a much-loved site as down at heel and in need of great change. We have wanted to make improvements and upgrade our caravan, but were told that it would be best to wait to see what the outcome of the consultation would be. At this point, this seems to support the cynical approach that could be seen as being taken by the council. The long-term agreements for caravan owners appear to be selected due to them being unfavourable. A shorter term agreement (perhaps five year periods) seems far more agreeable and would benefit both groups. In terms of caravan age, insisting on a 10 year churn seems at odds with the need for society to stop consumerism at such speed. If a caravan is unsafe at 10 years of age, then it seems reasonable to request the caravan is made fit, replaced or removed, but if a 10 year-old caravan is sound, it does not seem reasonable or sensible to replace them. One must also consider the economic environment: asking people to tie into long-term agreements with a need to make substantial monetary outlays every 10 years with large buy-out fees, in addition to the yearly site fees being raised on a yearly basis could be considered as an unethical thing for the council to do. The proposals change the very nature of the site, removing the community aspect and turning it into a cash cow while risking the things that make up the very essence of Southwold: the environment, biodiversity, tranquillity and community.

18/05/2024 19:05

The priority should be to maintain and develop a working and commercial environment.

15/05/2024 17:32

The attached documents, possibly with the exception of the Royal Haskoning report explain nothing making this consultation meaningless.

15/05/2024 14:13

THE CARAVAN SITE HAS ALWAYS BEEN USED A CASH COW BY WAVENY DISTRICT COUNCIL AND ESC EVER SINCE IT WAS GIVEN TO THEN IN 1974. SINCE THEN NO SIGNIFICANT INVESTMENT HAS BEEN MADE IN THE SITE DESPITE THE HUGE AMOUNTS OF MONEY TAKEN FROM US ALL IN SITE

FEES. AT A ROUGH ESTIMATE ABOUT 12 TO 15 MILLION POUND WHICH SHOULD HAVE GONE TO SOUTHWOLD TOWN. (SEE THE BEQUEST FROM WILLIAM GODYLL)

14/05/2024 22:18

I have been coming to Southwold and staying in our family caravan all my life. If the costs become extortionate, there is no way me or my family would be able to afford a plot. I think this will apply to lots of people on the site, so the vision risks changing the whole character of the caravan site, and destroying a community. If the footfall increases drastically, it will disrupt the whole harbour, which is already busy and I feel that the residents of Southwold and other harbour users will not appreciate this.

14/05/2024 20:09

No

14/05/2024 17:23

An opportunity appears to be being lost to trial, for example, a small number of plots on the site retained and leased. This would serve to 'test the market' for at least two of the four options proposed in the consultation.

14/05/2024 14:36

It depends on how much any changes up-stream will affect the harbour

14/05/2024 12:26

No

14/05/2024 11:02

What might readily be undertaken would be restoration of the harbour mouth.

13/05/2024 09:49

I like it just how it is now. We have 4 generations of van on site owners and are more than happy for it to stay exactly as it is

12/05/2024 07:52

The emphasis on increased footfall is not always compatible with retaining and ensuring the " the harbours natural beauty is preserved for future". Greater footfall results in increased pollution across the board. This will have to factored in.

10/05/2024 17:09

The caravan owners need to pay a commercial rent

09/05/2024 17:02

Where did the proposition that there was little opportunity for visitors to come to the site? There is no evidence for this and the camping site has very many motor homes tourers and tents.

07/05/2024 11:09

What are the plans for protecting against high tides. This seems fundamental to any discussion of revitalisation of the harbour.

05/05/2024 17:35

The vision should include the principal issues that will need to be addressed to realise the objectives

03/05/2024 13:13

The charm of Southwold resides in its relaxed, low-key atmosphere linked to age-old local fishing businesses, eateries and pubs.

03/05/2024 10:57

There has been no details consulted with SCOA members, It is unclear whether its the harbour or caravan site .

30/04/2024 22:37

The unique nature of the harbour, which is shared between Walberswick and Southwold, is the result of a centuries old effort to preserve its fundamentally unspoilt character, however the

proposal to turn it in to a commercial powerhouse is entirely inconsistent with this historic site and would ruin the character, appeal and natural harmony of the Blackshore. Whilst it is essential that repairs be undertaken on the piers, a major commercial revamping of the Southwold side of the Blackshore would destroy the traditional symmetry, harmony and homeostasis which exists between the two shores and negatively effect its unique appeal to both residents and visitors. Walberswick is intentionally a 'dark village' meaning that it avoids street lighting, the impact of 'taverna' style external lighting already existing at the Sole Bay Fish Company already demonstrates the negative effect of light pollution on the tranquility of the harbour. The Walberswick Ferry service, one of very few small boat river ferries in the country and a beloved attraction to visitors, is only able to exist whilst the traffic into the harbour is manageable, substantially increasing moorings on the river would lead to a significant increase to river traffic and jeopardise the safety of this vital service. Commercial infrastructure should be limited to the caravan park, it is not suitable to place this within a traditional harbour which has long been characterised and identified with the fishing industry and all things relating, to convert it to a retail area would harm not only the appeal of the area but interfere with the all the wildlife (including seals, birds and otters) which finds sanctuary in this peaceful area.

29/04/2024 09:44

Options 1 and 4 are not being considered, there is insufficient detail in the plans

28/04/2024 20:13

The location of the Southwold caravan park is a high-risk flood area, and unless the council can provide a flood insurance solution asking people to invest in a new caravan with a 10-year churn is wholly unreasonable, given the main risk on site is 'flood' with both frequency and severity of high tidal waters, providing flood insurance solution is very important. We disagree with all the proposals put forward by ESC for the caravan site. None of them work. The existing model is perfectly reasonable, and I am confused as to why ESC is putting forward such unattractive proposed models. This caravan site has existed for many decades and is loved by those who subscribe to it, the caravan owners' community are all heavily invested in the site, respect its biodiversity, and love all that Southwold Caravan Site offers. The under-investment in the caravan site in recent years could be perceived to be tactical in nature. In recent history the site appears to have been left to become run down, certainly in the last few years pitches were not being released for let when owners leave, and allocation of the income derived from the site does not appear to be invested back into the caravan site as expected. Renting out caravans to other independent parties could disturb the tranquillity of the caravan site. Noise is a big concern, along with antisocial behaviour. Long leases of 15 years + are quite hostile from an affordability stance, there is a proposed release from contract fee which is very high, Although not identified as stakeholders, caravan owners should be, given they have been located on the caravan site for many years. They have invested in the area for years, both in fee income via the caravan pitch charges and contributing to and supporting the local economy by buying locally. Can the council be fully transparent about their site investment decisions? Please offer reasonable proposals, and work with those stakeholders (caravan owners). Caravan owners would like to know exactly how the site fees are apportioned to the harbour area, so they can understand where the site fees collected by the council are being used, and where they are being used concerning the caravan site. Caravan owners want clear, concise communication, and transparency of proposed plans, including how the money from the caravan site fees are used and will contribute to the protection of the area and the harbour's future. Right now, the redevelopment proposals put forward by ESC for the caravan site are so broad, without any detail, are unworkable, are unreasonable, and are unattractive. Should any of those proposals be put into action it would have detrimental effects on those caravan owners who have contributed financially to the area, and the harbour for many years, enjoying the site, especially for their affordability and the area's tranquillity.

28/04/2024 17:21

the consultation is flawed and lacking in detail. options 1 & 4 appear to be fictional.

28/04/2024 17:10

It is essential that the uniquely peaceful and unspoilt Nature of the Black Shore should be preserved. The harbour has remained free of nocturnal illuminations and Overdevelopment for centuries, to disrespect this would be to ruin the unique Natural beauty of the area. Unfortunately, the Sole bay fish company have already been allowed to install Taverna style external lights which has interfered with the 'dark' village status which Walberswick enjoys - if this infringement is magnified by similar schemes the harbour will lose its unique nature and its historic significance. Similarly over commercialisation of the fisherman's huts etc will Irrevocably damage the timeless appeal of One of Britain's great beauty spots.

26/04/2024 11:24

What are the plans for the caravan site? There are lots of grand 'words' in the vision but no actual detail.

25/04/2024 17:26

The word commercial is seen to often. There is no mention of the caravan site or SCOA. This is a community that has been there for over 50 years! And also no mention of flooding form the harbour which is imminent.

25/04/2024 16:58

The order of projects. The static caravan owners get a poor deal now. There is a lack of customer service and the way the site is run is archaic and has not kept up with the times. There is no detail for caravan owners to be able to properly understand. Also a timeline of 2035 is way too long. Most caravan owners with be in their 70s or 80s so won't get the benefits and due to the options laid out, we would not be able to transfer to our children.

25/04/2024 16:29

In 'Core Vision Elements' d. Environmental stewardship and cleanliness should include supporting a healthy natural environment and ecosystems.

25/04/2024 11:17

The consultation is not clear - without any detail it's impossible to comment and options 1 and 4 we believe has been ruled out by HMC

25/04/2024 07:16

Lots of aspirational PR , but very short in detail

24/04/2024 18:15

Ensuring the links to Walberswick are understood

24/04/2024 14:03

If the council presses ahead with a plan to commercialise the site through the introduction of holiday lets and/ or commercial caravan park-style leases for caravan owners, there is a very real chance that the existing community of caravan owners - many of whom have been connected to the site for 50 years, through several generations - will be destroyed by the introduction of a poorly thought through and deeply flawed proposal, that will not even succeed in achieving the council's statedgoal of generating increased revenue. The caravan owners have deep-rooted connections to Southwold and the surrounding area, they care deeply for the place in ways that cannot easily be replaced. We are not stuck in the past and accept that some upgrading is necessary, but none of the options identified offer this in a forward-looking, sustainable way. The vision states that the caravan site will be 'a premier coastal holiday destination' by 2035 (when Southwold is projected to be at flood risk). This suggests a large weekly rental site which will increase footfall, traffic, pollution, noise and be detrimental in an AONB. It will undermine the existiing holiday rental market in town (which is currently in decline and discounting rates) and be

a blight on a beautiful and tranquil part of Southwold - and for what? A huge loss for a very less than certain gain.

23/04/2024 14:46

Vision didn't actually explain what the council intend to do.

23/04/2024 03:25

No

22/04/2024 09:56

Very little content regarding caravan site which is odd considering its pivotal role within the harbour lands

21/04/2024 09:27

The face of southwold has changed completely in the 40 plus years that I have had a caravan.

20/04/2024 13:31

Does Southwold really want a caravan site that will end up looking like Yarmouth and many of the over developed resorts

19/04/2024 11:38

This site has been badly managed and neglected over many years. I have rented a static caravan since 2013 and was on a 'waiting list' since about 1999. The way in which spaces were managed was very opaque and subject to abuse. Since 2019, the site had been allowed to deteriorate with little investment. There is also a false narrative that has been created - that the primary purpose of the site has been to fund the harbour. The costs of the harbour should be met through local tax revenues and the caravan site should be self-funded and to a high standard.

19/04/2024 07:22

As a caravan owner I'm keen to understand what the 'vision' is for the site

18/04/2024 21:08

It will be difficult for ESC to encourage long term investment/expenditure unless they underwrite the insurance for major caravan exchange schemes. Purchase or Lease.

18/04/2024 19:49

This project will damage the local fabric of the area and unnecessarily affect the environment

18/04/2024 10:07

Good luck

18/04/2024 08:33

Maintain the character with sensitive renovations and up grades.

16/04/2024 22:38

the caravan owners have been promised water & electricity to all the plots for many years now. That and the right to enjoy a beautiful and peaceful Southwold holiday location is all we really want as caravan owners. We have been promised an update for many years but now ESC councillors & staff who know very little, or indeed anything, about the site are proposing changes which are not wanted. The caravan site has made a considerable amount of money for ESC over the years, very little of which has been re-invested in maintaining or improving the site.

16/04/2024 19:00

Important to maintain the attractiveness of the harbour for visiting yachts. Such visiting yachts help make the harbour entrance attractive to other land-based visitors and the yachtsmen tend to spend heavily in the immediate environs ( Pub, Cafes, Chandlery) as well as in the town itself.

16/04/2024 17:03

It will be good to see a sensitive refurbishment of the area

15/04/2024 22:38

I believe the harbour and campsite have the potential to key to future of Southwold with careful planning and investment and increased infrastructure.

15/04/2024 17:18

The vision should be to update the facilities in keeping with the area so people can enjoy it as it is, without destroying the area's natural beauty.

15/04/2024 14:17

The 'Plan' whilst not stated is simply to monetise the Caravan Park and maximise the short-term revenue for East Suffolk. It takes no realistic account that by monetising the Harbour will actually destroy the attractiveness of the area.

15/04/2024 13:35

There is a significant campaign by owners against the project, my role is to work with the residents and I'm keen that the development works for them first and foremost. Residents need year round facilities, community activities that counter the ghost town effect in winter, places to park, reasonable prices and opportunities

15/04/2024 09:15

Act faster; 2027 for implementation is too long Consider energy opportunities eg tide, solar, wind to lead net zero transition for Southwold and educate young generations

14/04/2024 16:32

Difficult to make a comment on proposals without more detail

14/04/2024 15:13

Greater use of plain language and clear explanation might encourage more understanding

13/04/2024 23:30

The possible idea of removing existing caravan owners is monstrous and would be challenged via judicial review

13/04/2024 13:00

The harbour in its current state, is an attraction for locals and tourists already. There is no need to try and attract more visitors. Fill in the pot holes, add decent toilets, history information boards and maintain what is already there. There is such a thing as over modernising something. Where the original historic attraction disappears and it becomes another over modernised place. No more food or drink sites. Return the cafe back to its traditional ways and menu.

12/04/2024 14:38

We need an idea of the scale of potential redevelopment. Some sensitive development could work but not large scale commercial which would kill the area's beauty and attraction Secondly, Walberswick also depends on the harbour for its tourist economy and should be specially included in any future plans

12/04/2024 11:06

Whilst appreciating the Council's need to make the area commercially viable, I think the plans will ruin the unique nature of the Blackshore area. It will change it from a working harbour into another tourist area. Most of Southwold is already very geared towards tourism and the Blackshore area is one of the last areas that is more for the local people who work in Southwold, (although even now it is becoming more crowded). There needs to be some part of Southwold that is allowed to remain genuine and unique and not become even more of a pastiche. I believe the proposals will push out most of the fishermen and locals from the one area of Southwold that is truly a working harbour.

12/04/2024 09:13

I think the caravan park needs to be brought into the 21st century, it's really not up to standard. Having had relatives staying here, I think that the addition of mains water, sewerage and electricity would be a very positive thing.

12/04/2024 08:15

I have visited Southwold in my motorhome in February but the campsite nearest the centre was not open so we could only park in the daytime and had to leave the area for the evening. We

therefore were unable to eat out or visit a pub that evening in Southwold as we had hoped and went elsewhere. An aire would have been perfect in the town.

11/04/2024 21:57

The harbour area is already in far better shape than not too many years ago. It should remain as a working harbour; for fishermen, leisure sailors and visitors alike. Too much improvement could lead to Disneyfication and the loss of what it makes it so special in the first place. Tidying up the road, the riverside path on the Walberswick side and keeping the rest of the area tidy, would probably be sufficient.

11/04/2024 15:37

It is hard to think of any possible future development that the vision either rules in our rules out. It is very high level so no real ability to feed back at this stage.

11/04/2024 15:28

no

11/04/2024 11:48

The upgrade to the actual harbour facilities around 10 years ago was done well, respecting the harbour's quaintness and history. I do not think the harbour would benefit from any attempt to squeeze in more vessels.

11/04/2024 08:15

We have visited Southwold in our motorhome but have not stayed overnight as the campsite is not very good and there are no other motorhome facilities. We would stay longer and spend more locally if there was a good standard site or facilities

10/04/2024 22:29

Given the huge rise in motorhome ownership in the UK it is disappointing to see that no provision has been made for motorhome users in the plans. Other councils are offering aire type facilities as parts of regeneration works.

10/04/2024 19:50

Southwold town is packed during a few summer months a year, during this time the supermarkets cannot keep up with the demand and there are not enough restaurants pubs available to dine. The harbour itself is full of tourist cars which are dangerous there should be more parking outside of the harbour only allowing working or workers vehicles in the harbour to keep the harbour as a working harbour. All the statements about safe clean and sustainable should be already in place. There has been no investment from the council for years I don't know how many but maybe 30. There is a mention of footfall in the town, the town only struggles in the winter because you have allowed so many holiday homes so guest houses have closed and sold up to become holiday homes. Absolutely no investment in the caravan site therefore although it is open in March until the end of November the caravans are not habitable during the colder months without electricity. The site have easily put electricity into the camping area so even camper vans are better off. If the investment in electricity had been made 10 years ago when they were talking about it the caravans would be more usable. Instead they made it available until end of November when you can't use them and charge more.

10/04/2024 19:29

Rallies for motorhomes are held annually on rugby grounds and cricket grounds across the country and there's no trouble from them at all, and they spend a lot too.

10/04/2024 17:52

The statics need running water. Flushing toilets and power

10/04/2024 17:33

The campsite needs to be accessible 12 months in the year to allow off season visitors to stay in the area

10/04/2024 17:04

Thanks for listening!

10/04/2024 16:52

There is a group called CAMpRA who are actively working with councils, National trust all over the country. They can help with setting up a site with all the information you would require . We are put off visiting Southwold due to no parking for a motorhome. We all travel all seasons so a year round source of funds being spent in the area. Put in properly a site say for 5vans can only enhance the area.

10/04/2024 15:55

To encourage the community spirit of the static caravan site,the restriction of ' not to let ' should continue

10/04/2024 11:14

Your outline has given no clear details or financial implications of exactly what or how you will be changing the caravan site and surrounding area. I know that 4 vague ideas have been outlined but there has been no talk of how the infrastructure of the roads leading to the harbour would be updated, surely a more 'parkdean/hoseasons' style caravan site would create many more cars travelling through the town itself as well. Another consideration that has not been discussed is that the caravan site is on a flood plain, last year when we were staying, it rained so intensely and flooded so rapidly that my children could paddleboard between the vans. How would this situation be sorted? I have camped at southwold all my life. My parents signed up for a caravan when we were young and waited for about 15 years to be given a van plot in May 2009. My dad sadly, suddenly died in Dec 2009 so only enjoyed their van for a year but fell in love with the site. My mum continued to use the van as this is what dad would have wanted. I also signed up for a van plot when I was 18! 24 years later, in the July of 2021 my van was put onto the site next to mums van. At the time, mum was fighting cancer for the third time. Sadly in the August of 2021 she also died but knew that my dream of a van had come true. Mum had already signed her van over to my sister and we now both continue to enjoy the vans together with our friends and families knowing that this is what our parents would have wanted. This is only my story, I'm sure if time had be taken to consult other owners there would be many more similar stories of why we all love the site so much. We all pay our fees and love and enjoy the beautiful, calm and quiet of the site. Yes, it doesn't earn as much as it potentially could but in this day and age it seems so unfair to destroy such a beloved place. Southwold is full of houses that are unaffordable to most, the site allows normal, hardworking (or retired!) people an opportunity to their own little haven! No doubt you'd say all the vans would need removing and go to landfill, when we're constantly thinking of ways to protect and save our planet, this doesn't make sense. The site should be left as it is for the people to enjoy. Locals feel the same as it's been like this for so many years. You have asked us to complete a very basic survey and asked our opinions of very vague proposals with no finances being discussed which seems ludicrous and unfair.

10/04/2024 09:04

The caravan park is lovely how it is and no change is needed apart from keeping the essentials updated. Asking people to put brand new vans on to rip out toilets is silly. As long as they are kept well it shouldn't matter.

09/04/2024 19:13

Who writes this drivel, it is obviously not a harbour user/ boat owner or anyone that understands the local area. The whole area is within flood zone and with ongoing climate change and continued lack of investment over the last 50 years, is likely to be underwater by the time this comes to fruition. I think it is what is known as 'kicking the can down the road'. It must say that this is the most disappointing report, with little background knowledge or research. Many local people have far better knowledge, and could have been approached prior to this being released.

09/04/2024 18:09

This is not a suitable site for Artisan shops etc as the building there are flooded at least once or twice a year. It should remain a working harbour

09/04/2024 16:38

No

09/04/2024 16:21

-

09/04/2024 15:17

Caravan site. An eye sore at the moment, plus the toilets and showers desperately need updating/increase number of showers (lose the temporary ones). We used to stay in Southwold a lot (only live in Pakefield) but the state of the whole camp is now just not worth the money. A shame as the surrounding area is great.

09/04/2024 14:06

Whatever is proposed will inevitably be very expensive for users, both local and visiting.

09/04/2024 13:25

Climate change is not being addressed and any development plan that ignores it is bound to fail.

09/04/2024 13:09

Tidy up of all the unused boats.

09/04/2024 10:56

The focus should be on preserving what we have against flooding and creeping commercialisation. People visit the harbour for its historic nature, not to get a costa coffee.

09/04/2024 08:38

No

08/04/2024 20:45

The most important thing with the development is that southwold harbour does not lose its rustic, historic edge. The appeal of southwold harbour is its authentic, working harbour character in contrast to the more touristy areas in southwold, such as the pier. Its this difference that attracts a wide range of visitors and so it would be important to not lose that. A point for consideration is that it would be great to get Mrs Ts back! If investment is being made into the area, helping to get them back up and running would be a great way to show a willingness to embrace the existing charm of the harbour. There's huge support online for Mrs Ts, so I'm sure that an investment in them, would really help to get community support.

08/04/2024 20:17

My biggest concern is that the appeal of the harbour is its old time charm, and too much modernisation could negatively impact that. However if the alternative is the harbour struggles to function I can understand that some redevelopment is required. As new businesses and opportunities are floated, i would be keen to keep aware to see if they fit the right mould. If the authority wanted to invest in a prime bit of harbour history for example, getting Mrs Ts fish shop back on their feet after last years fire would be a good start

08/04/2024 20:16

The whole harbour area needs tidying up and modernising.

08/04/2024 14:49

x

08/04/2024 11:12

We are currently a "resident" as you refer to us in the consultation on the static caravan site and have been for many years. However, not once have we been directly asked what we think should happen or even our ideas.

08/04/2024 10:44

## Question 9 - Is there anything missing from this list of priorities and, if so, what should be included?

The fact that this is an area of outstanding beauty should be of paramount importance.

22/05/2024 23:39

It is not quite clear what 'the harbour' is. Plans are somewhat reminiscent of a coastal theme park for transient visitors. What is more meaningful are sustainable jobs all year round for local people and a reliable and manageable source of income from caravan owners already invested in the area and with historical connections.

22/05/2024 21:13

Some of the above priorities work hand-in-hand with each other. Others are detrimental to each other as they are competing priorities (increased volume of tourists down the harbour impedes actual operational BAU etc)

22/05/2024 20:29

Flood protection. Environmental protection plan.

22/05/2024 19:11

Retaining the unique environment.

22/05/2024 18:13

Flood Mitigation

22/05/2024 17:46

Flood mitigation.

22/05/2024 17:16

An eco approach

22/05/2024 17:00

Again the green solution! Where is it? It needs to be in all thinking.

22/05/2024 16:55

See below

22/05/2024 16:46

Sustainability and emphasis on reusing materials and assets - not landfill for caravans which are perfectly good

22/05/2024 16:45

Maintaining its quintessential charm and preserving its essence. I'm surprised that this is not in the list as it is included in the vision statement.

22/05/2024 15:25

Flood mitigation. Consideration of current caravan residents who will be seriously affected.

22/05/2024 14:41

It doesn't reflect the existing caravan community and the economic impact we provide every year to the town. I'm fifty and I've been coming to Southwold regularly all my life, as my children do now also. I'm very supportive of upgrading the harbour and caravan site so future generations and the local community can continue to enjoy, and, as such, would value more detail on the plans.

22/05/2024 13:57

Heart Sensitivity to the existing fishing community. After all it's a harbour. Flood prevention  
22/05/2024 08:38

Flood risk. Also what does 'community asset' mean here?  
21/05/2024 21:37

Recreational and leisure space. Family friendly. Affordability.  
21/05/2024 21:20

Affordability. Different ways that income might be generated - especially those that do not threaten existing communities eg fishermen, caravanners

community led design decisions and suggestions. Affordability. Economic inclusivity Views of future generations  
21/05/2024 20:07

i. Sustaining community: There is no reference to the existing caravan community, which has been in Southwold for 50 years and many for 5 generations, very fearful of being priced out in the rush to commercialisation. The long standing caravan community has paid its fees for decades to Waveney / ESC but received very little in return. Caravan owners are not included in list of stakeholders in the consultation documents. Development without community is simply commercialisation. Public sector development should take a wider view than just profits.  
ii. Mitigation of flood risk iii. Addressing the flood insurance problem It is not clear if this is about the harbour, or the caravan site, or both. Harbour proposals include markets and artisans. Option 3 suggests up to 30% could be weekly rental caravans. Markets and a large number of rentals would cause congestion (traffic, noise, pollution, crowds) in the area, destruction to wildlife and the environment and radically change the caravan site and this part of Southwold (which is included in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is a Conservation Area).  
21/05/2024 19:11

Flood defences need to be installed to protect the caravan site and the harbour  
21/05/2024 16:27

The harbour cannot be redeveloped, its life as a harbour is so short and the cost so great it would be complete and utter madness to mislead people into thinking otherwise.

21/05/2024 15:37

Conservation Area Status/ Historical Continuity  
21/05/2024 12:56

It is essential to maintain the uniqueness of Southwold. No idea how to nominate priorities.  
21/05/2024 11:39

Flooding risk

21/05/2024 11:24

Flood mitigation

20/05/2024 21:59

Please see previous answer about the need for any harbour development to be integrated with the needs of the town as a whole

20/05/2024 14:29

See below.

20/05/2024 10:32

Care needs to be taken not to overdevelop the harbour area

19/05/2024 13:15

The consultation is faulty, without detail and without weighting to caravan owners. The initial consultation meeting with caravan owners was cancelled at the last minute and instead Councillor Beavan met with a few of us on a different day in an inaccessible caravan that did not fit us in. He did not have any council officers with him and he did not show us the proposed new layouts for the caravan which were shown at a later meeting. The consultation has changed as it has gone along and people who filled in this survey earlier in the process did not have documents which were revealed later on. The proposals and this official survey are based on four models:

Participants are invited to give their preference from these. But in meetings with David Beavan he stated verbally that options 1 and 4 had been discounted. This invalidates the survey results. How can people state a preference between options and have their responses counted as part of the consultation outcome, when they do not know which of them are the real options? ESC are missing a trick. Greater income could be generated with a forward-looking, sustainable model matching the outlook of visitors to and residents of Southwold. The current vision is yesterdays vision - an 80s style caravan site which will neither excite nor attract new visitors to Southwold Harbour. Since the flood risk also makes it a very risky investment, planning needs to be visionary and convert this weakness to a strength: Southwold will attract those seeking eco and off-grid holiday alternatives and a vision which exploits these options will produce a greater income. The plans indicate that the revenue to be raised for the harbour will come almost entirely from the caravan site, without a wider vision for the role of the harbour itself. Increased weekly rental caravans (30% in option 3) The published vision for the harbour includes markets and artisan shops. These will increase congestion in the area, destruction to wildlife and the environment and radically change the caravan site and this part of Southwold. There is no mention of AONB. The top priorities should be: forward looking and sound public investment, environmental sustainability, community asset, historical preservation and operational harbour.

19/05/2024 11:28

Flood mitigation.

18/05/2024 19:19

with the vision for increased footfall please state where all the cars will be parked and how the cars/vehicles will navigate the tiny roads. How will the delivery trucks/lorries access the 'new' businesses, unload and avoid blocking traffic/access.

16/05/2024 15:51

flood mitigation (would impact a few of the above list)

16/05/2024 14:10

CURRENT CARAVAN OWNERS VIEWS AND NEEDS AND RETENTION OF COMMUNITY SPIRIT THAT CURRENTLY EXISTS

14/05/2024 22:24

It is not clear how any of the above relate to the issue of flooding.

14/05/2024 20:13

Maintenance of River banks above the Bailey Bridge

14/05/2024 17:34

That plans for the caravan site are properly scoped out and trialled before options are implemented.

14/05/2024 14:47

It depends on how much any changes up-stream will affect the harbour

14/05/2024 12:26

The views of stakeholders (such as SCOA) should be paramount.

14/05/2024 12:26

Income to keep harbour operational

14/05/2024 11:06

Flood and coastal erosion protection

13/05/2024 23:28

The option of avoiding "redevelopment" is not mentioned. The assumption underpinning the "priorities" is the mistaken one of assuming that redevelopment is the only option.

13/05/2024 09:54

Information about how the caravan site changed benefit us as owners

12/05/2024 07:56

Aesthetically pleasing

11/05/2024 20:24

Continued consultation and consideration with all stake holders regarding the detail and time scale of the plans for redevelopment of both the harbour and campsite.

10/05/2024 17:27

Controlling high tide, storm surges and sea level rise affecting the harbour.

05/05/2024 17:38

The harbour road needs major repairs and is not accessible by all vehicles

30/04/2024 22:45

sustainability of the Walberswick ferry

29/04/2024 09:47

Flood mitigation Preservation of the caravan site as separate from the harbour - peace and quiet

28/04/2024 20:16

Not clear if this refers to harbour/ caravan sit or both. Could cause more traffic congestion and disturbance to an AONB.

28/04/2024 18:12

Flood mitigation. Community engagement. Ensuring the legacy of those invested in the caravan site is consulted in the project. Carbon neutrality.

28/04/2024 17:27

Mainly the harbour rd to be kept in good condition

26/04/2024 08:35

The caravan site ... yet again as a holiday community that supports the town and other local businesses.

25/04/2024 17:01

There needs to be deliverable tangible outcomes during the 2024 - 2035 period. Regardless of the governance and leasing structure, the improvements need to start at the caravan site without any more delays

25/04/2024 16:34

I have not ranked the priorities 2-8 but put Environmental Sustainability at no.1 as this is essential for underpinning the Vision to deliver on its other key priorities and objectives.

25/04/2024 11:23

Flood risk The site is uninsurable

25/04/2024 07:33

Facilities for caravan site. E.g. running water and electric

23/04/2024 22:46

Again, no reference is made to flooding. The Haskonen report commissioned by ESC says that the works will strengthen the harbour wall but not prevent flooding.

23/04/2024 14:57

No

22/04/2024 09:58

Local traders have been priced out of southwold because of expensive rent increases. Inclusivity will not exist and nor will the southwold I know if it is sacrificed to the gods of money and Commercialism.

20/04/2024 13:46

Balance of local community & tourism, Southwold town is out of sync now it would be a same for the harbour to go the same way - it needs to work for all

18/04/2024 21:11

Protecting long cherished site for owners and local people and maintaining affordability

18/04/2024 10:10

the adequate maintenance of both harbour & caravan site while decisions are being made

16/04/2024 19:17

The views / preferences and interests of Southwold Residents.

15/04/2024 13:40

There needs to be some realism about what is achievable given available resources

13/04/2024 23:34

A recognition that long-suffering owners ( who were on the waiting list for up to 20 yrs) have been given many false dawns in the past - especially about site improvement.

13/04/2024 13:09

Keep the character and past and present atmosphere

12/04/2024 14:40

Provision of berths for visiting boats rather than "tourist attraction"

11/04/2024 19:04

Space for incubator innovation. Local start ups. Artisan industries.

11/04/2024 16:31

no

11/04/2024 11:51

Facilities for self contained touring vehicles

10/04/2024 22:31

Safety and reduce tourist traffic

10/04/2024 19:33

Support for hospitality businesses to reduce high cost of meals out for tourists

10/04/2024 17:58

Tourists include those who live in Norfolk and Suffolk and visit for day trips or just a couple of days often outside main holiday season. Don't forget them

10/04/2024 17:07

Security having motorhomes on site all year round . This has also been prove to help

10/04/2024 15:59

Prevention/restriction of Chain Retail outlets that would mean the Harbour looked like everywhere other Harbour ,large&small

10/04/2024 11:19

Remain a harbour for shelter.

09/04/2024 18:12

leave it as it is

09/04/2024 16:22

Harbour and associated activities too-new opportunities for boating.

09/04/2024 15:40

-

09/04/2024 15:17

I think there should be things there for all not just a certain sector

09/04/2024 14:21

Fewer empty properties. More need to be lived in regularly, weather by renters or otherwise. It's a ghost town out of season.

09/04/2024 14:11

Role in connecting Walberswick/Dunwich and Southwold and wider areas

09/04/2024 13:54

A comprehensive plan of ongoing repairs and maintenance to ensure its viability, as opposed to letting things fall into disrepair with major restoration then needed.

09/04/2024 13:31

Viability given climate change

09/04/2024 13:10

Economic development should not be a criteria. The precept that it has to pay for itself is not realistic. For example it is a harbour of refuge and site of the lifeboat. Other national funds should go towards maintenance of the harbour for people's safety.

09/04/2024 08:49

Resilience against flooding - eg restricting the width of harbour entrance (reduces flooding), raising paths over time, do not raise the river walls too much as it will make flooding in harbour worse.

09/04/2024 08:43

Ensuring that the current community benefits from any changes

08/04/2024 20:18

Visiting boats need better facilities

08/04/2024 14:52

x

08/04/2024 11:13

## Question 10 - Do you have any other comments?

I am hopeful that this consultation will really influence the decision making in a positive way. People come to the harbour because of its unique beauty- any changes should be minimal to reflect the desire to preserve this uniqueness.

22/05/2024 23:39

Will you publish these results, how will the results be used? All stakeholders will have differing priorities so how will ESC recognise & manage this in a collaborative manner?

22/05/2024 20:29

The calm peaceful harbour is already a tourist attraction. Trying to improve on it might mean ruining it.

22/05/2024 19:11

Tourism is already well established here. The harbour businesses are very busy at certain times of year and the beach is packed on sunny days. Better management of the caravan site ie no empty pitches, collection of fees from harbour properties, management of parking etc could bring in more income.

22/05/2024 18:13

T

he list is not independent priorities but are interlinked eg economic development and tourist attraction in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will work against environmental sustainability without careful planning. An operational harbour and tourist attraction may not be compatible, particularly in Southwold's narrow harbour road which is also a working boatyard.

22/05/2024 17:46

In a professional context, it's important to note that these priorities are interconnected rather than standalone. For instance, economic development and the creation of a tourist attraction within an Area of Outstanding beauty could potentially conflict with environmental sustainability objectives without meticulous planning. Furthermore, the coexistence of an operational harbour and a tourist attraction might present challenges, especially in Southwold's narrow harbour road, which also functions as a working boatyard. These complexities underline the need for a comprehensive and balanced approach to redevelopment planning.

22/05/2024 17:16

This is an outdated and near sighted plan which seems to solve nothing and cause disruption and cost a lot of money

22/05/2024 16:55

By adopting 'industry-standard' practices, which are commonplace in the private sector, the council is introducing major policy-changes with little regard to the likely outcomes. The new rule that caravans of only up to 2 years old will be allowed on the site will be counter-productive. It will transform the character of site as the £35-40k entry cost will make it unaffordable for many on the waiting list. The high cost will deter existing caravan owners from renewing their caravans and -

together with the rent rises proposed- make the option of owning a caravan at Southwold unaffordable for all except relatively wealthy (usually older) people - who tend to visit relatively infrequently. The new policy is regressive and at odds with the council's progressive agenda. A better option would be to allow vans on the site up to 12 years old; this would encourage investment & enable owners to take advantage of the glut of 10-12 year old vans available (due to owners elsewhere being obliged to dispose of them) ; they should then be allowed to remain on site indefinitely, subject to MoT-type assessments. Other thoughts: access to the Sailing Club bar should be made open to caravan owners; the club could use the business and it would foster a community spirit across harbour area users. The council should be very careful before investing in facilities to rent; as well as changing the character of the site, it is not clear there is a market outside the school holidays. The privately-owned and rented cabins on Walberswick beach -where people can sleep overnight; could offer a model.

22/05/2024 16:46

Creative thinking here about moving forward could be ground breaking let's not miss the opportunity

22/05/2024 16:45

The same priorities of maintaining its quintessential charm and preserving its essence should apply equally to the caravan site.

22/05/2024 15:25

If you prioritise tourist attraction and income generating, they will almost certainly counteract the environmental and historical priorities. Southwold is attractive simply because it isn't overwhelmed by traffic, tourists and commercial interests. We, like many others, would no longer enjoy the environment that is currently loved, nor would we feel welcome. I was once a governor of a successful and popular school that considered enlarging. It would bring in welcome funds, but we chose not to because it would have spoiled the treasure that we had and parents valued. You are in grave danger of killing your golden goose. Currently the caravan owners are a settled community who care for the site. If caravans were rented out it could well lead to disruption, noise, lack of care and consideration for the site and others.

22/05/2024 14:41

Please keep the community informed and hopefully on side. Please tread carefully. Thank you for addressing the issues in this part of Southwold. Please make true issues known.

22/05/2024 08:38

The working harbour is not really the place for generating new businesses. The parking is already a nightmare for us owners of fishing sheds. The many people walking don't think they are walking in a road, they just think they are walking along a general footpath, too many pedestrians.

21/05/2024 21:54

Southwold Harbour is lucky to still be a real working harbour as well as a harbour for leisure boats. I don't think this means it should become a museum piece. The facilities added for fishing boats adjacent to the Lifeboat Station show how things can be developed without killing the charm of the place that visitors come to see close up.

21/05/2024 21:37

Have you considered inviting the caravan owners and people on the waiting list to help you develop your vision, as a collaboration that genuinely takes into account their opinions?

21/05/2024 21:20

Needs to mitigate climate crisis as much as possible eg not forcing people to get rid of good working caravans and buy new, retain as much of existing site as possible eg current road, being careful not to encourage too many cars into harbour.

21/05/2024 21:19

The consultation process is flawed in presenting four scenarios of which 2 & 3 are really on the table. This came to light in the public consultation where council representatives made it clear that 1 & 4 were peripheral. The list is not independent priorities but are interlinked. Economic development and tourist attraction in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will work against environmental sustainability. An operational harbour and tourist attraction may not be compatible, particularly in Southwold's narrow harbour road which is also a working boatyard. They are mutually incompatible and as I have said before the place works, incremental maintenance is needed not whole sale structural change.

21/05/2024 20:07

These priorities are not independent but are interlinked eg economic development and tourist attraction in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will work against environmental sustainability without careful planning and consideration of numbers. An operational harbour and tourist attraction may not be compatible, particularly in Southwold's narrow harbour road which is also a working boatyard, and the access roads to it. Tourist attraction and economic development will likely be in conflict in an area like Southwold where the attraction is its undeveloped nature. In addition spending public money on a flood plain is surely against the 2022 public sector risk amendment to the Public Loans Board.

21/05/2024 19:11

**BE HONEST WITH THE COMMUNITY**

21/05/2024 15:37

Harbour is a focus and centre for visitors, cyclists, walkers and birdwatchers to the wider area - Walberswick, Blythborough and the Estuary not only Southwold.

21/05/2024 12:56

The whole situation has arisen because previous councils have failed to ring fence income & expenditure of the harbour lands with constant excesses of income being spent elsewhere.

21/05/2024 11:39

I understand the need for economic development to ensure the upkeep of the site and harbour lands, but that can't be at the detriment to ruining an area of outstanding beauty and meaning.

Southwold loses it's "appeal". It is, by nature, a tourist attraction because it hasn't been overdeveloped.

21/05/2024 11:24

Over commercialisation of the caravan site and harbour site would lose an historical charm and aesthetic which is part of the locations beauty and why people come there and keep returning.

20/05/2024 21:59

Whilst 'environmental sustainability' is mentioned above, nowhere have the Harbour Management Committee laid out their plan to mitigate the damage to local fauna and flora; damage to local biodiversity, increased noise and light pollution will be the inevitable consequence of the 'increased footfall' hoped for (and actually planned for in 2 of the 4 'options' for the economic models for the future running of the Static Caravan Site). What are the plans to eradicate or offset these unwanted effects?

20/05/2024 10:32

All 8 priorities and objectives are important and one leads to another so I am concerned about the reasons why they are being ranked

19/05/2024 13:15

An operational harbour and traditional style tourist attraction may not be compatible, particularly in Southwold's narrow harbour road which is also a working boatyard. The caravan site is currently a quiet, tranquil, sensitively lit space surrounded by AONB with dark skies at night. This is why people spend their holidays here. They will change their minds when the currently unmade up harbour road becomes a busy, congested tarmac road, when the soft grassy lanes in the site where vehicles HAVE to drive slowly and allow children to play safely, have become tarmac roads and when the site and surrounding area is full of motor traffic, air pollution, litter, noise and insensitive lighting. The consultation process itself needs a rethink: Create collaborative discussion with all stakeholders through supply of FULL and HONEST information including costs (and voting rights) Time must be allowed for all ideas and possibilities to be openly discussed and evaluated. Full, honest and lengthy discussion will allow ALL stakeholders to agree to adjust their position to accommodate, and also to put forward alternative options which may not have seemed appropriate or obvious beforehand.

19/05/2024 11:28

The list of terms does not have context or explanation. The term "tourist attraction" for example is open to interpretation. Southwold is a tourist attraction. What is attractive is that Southwold remains unchanged. The views I saw 25 years ago and the views my wife saw as a child remain as beautiful as they did on first sight. This historical preservation and sympathetic approach to development and process is essential to maintain the attractiveness of Southwold for the residents of the town, caravan owners and tourists alike. The natural environment must be maintained and cared for at all costs.

18/05/2024 19:19

different stakeholders will have different priorities. All information should be shared and openly discussed to understand each others' perspective

16/05/2024 14:10

I understand that it is important for the council to raise money, but it seems that the only focus is on the caravan site in order to do this. Perhaps there are much more creative, sustainable ideas for raising money that have not been considered.

14/05/2024 20:13

Ensure there is continuity of management from ESC, investment budgets and ringfencing of all income.

14/05/2024 17:34

If the harbour redevelopment is intended to benefit the whole community then the whole community should be within scope to make some level of contribution to the redevelopment.

14/05/2024 14:47

I want the very best for Southwold and Reydon, which is (literally) my home from home and continue to follow the fortunes of the Caravan Site. I would be happy to participate in the ongoing discussions for the future.

14/05/2024 12:26

No

14/05/2024 11:06

See above. There is no need to redevelop the harbour and doing so would be a failure of "vision".

13/05/2024 09:54

As I've said the caravan owners seem to be the ones paying the price for the changes. Quite literally with paying financially for the development of the harbour with changes to the site we don't want

12/05/2024 07:56

The categories are too general and without detail are difficult to rank

10/05/2024 17:27

Open and honest consultation with Southwold people and caravan community

03/05/2024 11:13

All caravan owners to have full and honest information as we are the people paying for the work to be carried out

30/04/2024 22:45

Flooding is going to be a major problem in coming years due to our soft rapidly eroding coastline. This appears to be being ignored. The insurance companies are way ahead on this. Quite how ESC are going to stop the harbour from "falling into the sea" has not been explained.

28/04/2024 18:12

Ensuring the legacy of those invested in the caravan site is consulted in the project. These priorities are not independent but are interlinked from economic development and tourist attraction to environmental impact to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will work against environmental sustainability without careful planning

28/04/2024 17:27

It's important that the harbour remains operational but not at the loss of historic and environmental benefits that the harbour and surrounding area bring to Southwold.

25/04/2024 17:26

In a protected area of AONB this has to be paramount in all plans and does not sit well with a commercial enterprise.

25/04/2024 17:01

Some of the list are a given. The issue I have is that the council see the caravan site as limiting income. Well, the improvements that have been made in the 20 years we have been there can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

25/04/2024 16:34

The caravan park could certainly be upgraded to reflect the harbour and facing architecture at Walberswick with a mixture of privately owned, rentable and a touring site.

25/04/2024 13:16

The potential for the other priorities and objectives to impact on environmental sustainability must be considered so that the measures designed to achieve these support environmental

sustainability. For example, managing the environmental impacts of increased tourism and footfall.

25/04/2024 11:23

There needs to be full and honest consultation with the stakeholders which is not apparent currently. Properly set up and planned ahead with a timetable to reach alignment on a way forward. It is ill advised for ESC to invest in caravans that cannot be insured on a flood plain and the staffing to clean and maintain them is not available - ESC would be walking into creating an embarrassing costly white elephant. By all means upgrade the site, bringing services to the site but be sensitive to the needs of today and the future. Allow for caravans to choose to be off the grid, generate solar from the roofs, be an exemplar for sustainability with van passing a MOT after 10 years to stay on the site. To retain the guaranteed secure income from the caravan owners there is a simple solution - 'share the detail of some real options for the future' that are realistic and take account of the flood risks, impact on the environment the need for upgrading the services, energy generation, lease term, costs, MOT plan

25/04/2024 07:33

The rustic , traditional qualities must be retained . We dont want a money making theme park

24/04/2024 18:18

Can the site be expanded into neighbouring field. Lack of clarity on cost impact of changes to caravan owners which are an important factor in decision making.

23/04/2024 22:46

It is not clear from this survey, whether the above priorities relate to the Harbour redevelopment as a whole, or the caravan site in particular. If the outcome of the vision is vastly increased holiday rentals and/or increased footfall to artisan stalls etc developed along the harbour, the outcome will be increased congestion, danger to wildlife and biodiversity, and the undermining of an AONB. It is also hard to see how such developments are compatible with a working harbour/boatyard.

23/04/2024 14:57

No

22/04/2024 09:58

Consultation in .y experience usually means a decision has already been made

20/04/2024 13:46

The caravan park is affordable for many

18/04/2024 21:11

Southwolds charm is that its a Victorian seaside town. We completely understand that it needs bringing up to date but nothing should move it away from the "Southwold charm" as that is the resorts major selling point.

18/04/2024 19:56

This scheme is atrocious and must be scrapped. Southwold Caravan site is perfectly functional as it is and should not be used as a commercial cash cow to prop up its local authority. The grounds for which it is based is harbour land and long disputed in its ownership

18/04/2024 10:10

Listen to individuals who use the harbour.

16/04/2024 22:43

Listen to the people who currently use the area - they know it best. Seems to me people who have come up with these ideas are not listening.

15/04/2024 14:20

The default list of priorities has been set to favour Economic Development and Income Generating. This betrays bias in the consultation.

15/04/2024 13:40

Look at communities like Looe where a working fishing harbour and holiday activities thrive Look at harbour and beach facilities at attractive resorts for the younger generation who could then be engaged with Southwold harbour and town for the next 20+ years

14/04/2024 16:33

I do not agree with some people who think that a 20 year Lease/commitment is too long - especially if the Lease could be assigned/ transferred

13/04/2024 13:09

The harbour should not be a milk cow for commercial interests and not seen as a “potential fiscal powerhouse” .

12/04/2024 11:16

While I understand the economics of making it a tourist attraction the potential for attracting coach loads would severely detract from the charm of the harbour.

11/04/2024 19:04

The distance from the town limits the ability of the harbour to be a tourist destination without the kind of cornerstone development that many residents would find unacceptable. As a result it would be best to prioritise the community asset and decline of the harbour. There is potential economic benefit from improving these facilities

11/04/2024 15:33

no

11/04/2024 11:51

Please avoid radical change, this place benefits from gentle handling

11/04/2024 08:21

Love Southwold but the campsite is poor

10/04/2024 22:31

If staying for more than 1 or 2 nights in my motorhome I would check into the campsite, though it is regarded as being expensive, is not open half the year (Oct to Easter) with soggy unsuitable ground conditions, requires advance booking, check in during office hours ... and needs a separate motorhome area from static caravans which have reduced numbers of touring spaces.

10/04/2024 17:58

Full details on the CAMpRA site

10/04/2024 15:59

Keep the facility to 'crab' on the Harbour walls. Generations have loved the pastime & it is part of Southwolds history&heritage

10/04/2024 11:19

Please do not change the quaint beauty of such a special place. It should not be turned into a tourist attraction! This is not what such a naturally beautiful place needs. Listen to what the locals and caravan owners actually want and not what you think it needs to make more money

10/04/2024 09:08

-

09/04/2024 15:18

Tourist trade is already established. Southwold needs to become more alive. Also, improve access via the two roads.

09/04/2024 14:12

Stop wholesale developments, especially those requiring retrospective permissions.

09/04/2024 13:32

The plan is high risk.

09/04/2024 13:10

Protect against flooding, Improve the caravan facilities and renew the public moorings on the Southwold side. Do not further commercialise the harbour - that goes against its historic value.

09/04/2024 08:43

Will we receive feedback from our comments

08/04/2024 14:53

x

08/04/2024 11:13

**Question 11 Idea 1 What methods or approaches would you suggest to ensure effective local engagement in the ongoing process, involving a broad and representative spectrum of the community? Please provide a maximum of three options/ideas.**

Weekend consultations

22/05/2024 23:50

Flyer homes and businesses.

22/05/2024 21:17

More ideas to discuss instead of general terms that don't mean much.

22/05/2024 19:18

Create collaborative discussion with all stakeholders through supply of full information including costs

22/05/2024 18:19

Create collaborative discussion with all stakeholders through supply of full information including costs

22/05/2024 17:53

Allocate sufficient time for open discussion and evaluation of all possibilities.

22/05/2024 17:20

A new sustainable vision

22/05/2024 17:00

Some surveys

22/05/2024 16:57

Ecologically viable solutions

22/05/2024 16:47

continue to use different forums to consult in person and on line

22/05/2024 16:33

Follow up surveys at each stage of the process.

22/05/2024 15:30

multiple in-person information sessions in accessible venues and at different times of day

22/05/2024 14:57

All stakeholders should have equal say.

22/05/2024 14:42

A committee should be established with representatives of all harbour stakeholders - business owners, fishermen, caravan & campsite owners and workers, members of the local community and council - to work together and ensure all views are heard and understood.

22/05/2024 14:03

Involve older, wise, experienced generations.

22/05/2024 08:41

Sharing full and honest information with all stakeholders including caravan owners

21/05/2024 22:04

Have engagement events at the weekend when more people can attend.

21/05/2024 21:43

Open meetings with caravan community to develop the vision

21/05/2024 21:28

Invite all caravan users and harbour workers to help develop a community plan

21/05/2024 21:27

Voting rights for caravan owners on the harbour committee

21/05/2024 20:28

Create honest and collaborative discussion which only happens when there is time and a full and honest supply of all types of information including potential costs

21/05/2024 19:16

Workshops with community stakeholders to develop a vision for the harbour as a whole, not only the caravan site

21/05/2024 18:30

Transparency in discussion/decisions made

21/05/2024 16:27

Listen to local people

21/05/2024 15:48

Ensure all parties directly involved are clearly advised of all steps taken

21/05/2024 15:34

Public meetings with ALL costs and clear proposals

21/05/2024 13:09

Annual Fish Food Fair Centred on the Harbour

21/05/2024 12:56

Detailed and honest information and costings with the proposals

21/05/2024 11:30

Transparency of process

20/05/2024 22:13

Use e-mail addresses of survey respondees to gather further views

20/05/2024 14:31

Conduct an honest and open Consultation.

20/05/2024 11:04

greater publicity for the general public

19/05/2024 13:19

Real, informed stakeholder engagement - sound survey methods

19/05/2024 11:33

Development of other income generating ideas for the harbour

19/04/2024 07:25

Newspaper articles

18/04/2024 21:10

social media

18/04/2024 17:35

Consult scoa heavily within process

18/04/2024 10:12

Local Newsletter

17/04/2024 08:21

harbour & caravan site users must be part of the decisions

16/04/2024 19:19

Consider additional options for caravan owners

18/05/2024 19:28

please note that not all caravan owners are SCOA members so any communication must reach out to all owners not just via SCOA

16/05/2024 16:15

full sharing of information

16/05/2024 14:16

The main Trust committee should be aligned with Southwold Town, Reydon and Walberswick parish councils

15/05/2024 17:37

INFORMATION LEAFLET DROP TO ALL RESIDENTS IN SOUTHWOLD

14/05/2024 22:34

Invite additional ideas for raising revenue from the local community, including caravan owners and all other stakeholders.

14/05/2024 20:44

Forum for business and resident

14/05/2024 20:13

Further consultation with detailed proposals

14/05/2024 17:37

ESDC to ensure renters can insure their caravans.

14/05/2024 15:09

engagement with stake holders that is full, not just a sop.

14/05/2024 12:29

Consider the Harbour and Caravan Site independently where possible.

14/05/2024 12:29

Option chosen needs selling

14/05/2024 11:52

Explain the impact of do nothing approach

13/05/2024 23:33

Survey the caravan owners for opinions

12/05/2024 07:59

Transparency

11/05/2024 20:26

Arrange consultation times that are at times when the maximum number of people can attend

10/05/2024 17:27

Communicating to everyone about local meetings.

05/05/2024 17:42

Form a consultative committee representing interested parties

03/05/2024 13:57

Put up visioning plans somewhere prominent with links to consultation - ie in harbour and on caravan site

03/05/2024 11:17

Flood risk

30/04/2024 22:52

Mail consultation

30/04/2024 09:23

Local news updates

29/04/2024 11:46

Ensuring that the Walberswick community have equal say and representation in the proposed developments

29/04/2024 09:52

Compulsory consultation with stakeholders

28/04/2024 20:18

full and honest disclosure

28/04/2024 18:12

Please engage with the caravan site community and give honest information

28/04/2024 17:34

Equal participation from Southwold and Walberswick

26/04/2024 11:29

Town Hall Events

25/04/2024 17:26

honest discussion

25/04/2024 17:04

Communicate with all caravan owners, not just SOCA

25/04/2024 16:37

Local involvement- choice of say 2 3D versions

25/04/2024 13:30

A well thought out consultation plan and timeline agreed with SCOA

25/04/2024 07:38

Involvement of existing harbour businesses in the process

24/04/2024 18:26

Consolation sessions with local people

24/04/2024 14:0

Notices in town

23/04/2024 22:49

Collaborative discussion with all stakeholders based on FULL AND HONEST information, including costings, financial projections etc and a genuine desire to find a creative solution that works for all stakeholders

23/04/2024 15:29

Being clear and honest with plans

23/04/2024 03:27

Greater involvement with stake holders such as caravan owners

21/04/2024 09:30

Openness from ESC and governing bodies.

21/04/2024 08:40

Speak to real local people not second home owners

20/04/2024 13:57

involve the current residents of the site in meetings SCOA

19/04/2024 11:38

Development of other income generating ideas for the harbour

19/04/2024 07:25

Newspaper articles

18/04/2024 21:10

social media

18/04/2024 17:35

Consult scoa heavily within process

18/04/2024 10:12

Local Newsletter

17/04/2024 08:21

harbour & caravan site users must be part of the decisions

16/04/2024 19:19

Community consultation days

15/04/2024 17:25

Local Produce

15/04/2024 14:21

Inclusion of the views of Southwold Residents.

15/04/2024 13:41

Talk to people at Southwold foodbank and Reydon pantry, these are the local people that are struggling

15/04/2024 09:24

Listen to the community

15/04/2024 08:23

Open meetings for budding entrepreneurs to share their hopes and needs

14/04/2024 16:32

Involve the locals

14/04/2024 05:49

Form a Harbour uses Trust/ Committee

13/04/2024 13:14

Attend local clubs eg WI to explain and listen to views.

12/04/2024 14:46

Walberswick as well as Southwold Parish Council

12/04/2024 11:24

An active website

11/04/2024 19:07

A local contest for ideas for neighbourhood innovation.

11/04/2024 16:33

Form a stakeholder working party.

11/04/2024 15:40

engage with businesses that would be willing to invest

11/04/2024 11:52

Consult current tenants

11/04/2024 08:24

Referendum on Key options

10/04/2024 22:32

Visits to and work with local schools

10/04/2024 21:26

Local planning meeting

10/04/2024 20:04

Deliver questionnaires to businesses in the harbour

10/04/2024 19:39

Local media news/social media followers

10/04/2024 18:00

Publicity with Norfolk and Suffolk

10/04/2024 17:09

Open meetings

10/04/2024 16:04

Information easily available for comment

10/04/2024 11:22

Talking to locals

10/04/2024 09:09

Lower rentals for trades

09/04/2024 19:23

A stall in the centre of town asking opinions

09/04/2024 18:17

Sailing Club and boat users

09/04/2024 18:16

Don't do it we do not want this

09/04/2024 16:23

Ask people to sign up if interested

09/04/2024 15:41

Static let's for public

09/04/2024 14:23

Questionnaire to be given to people staying at campsite/ emailed when booking

09/04/2024 14:17

Town meetings

09/04/2024 13:55

Detailed proposals for all available in writing

09/04/2024 13:35

Town hall meetings

09/04/2024 13:13

Speak plain english

09/04/2024 08:53

See Q11

09/04/2024 08:48

Inclusion of the people to the community

08/04/2024 20:34

Twitter or Instagram

08/04/2024 20:19

Online feedback forms

08/04/2024 20:18

Lots of of meetings, not chaired by councillors or developers

08/04/2024 17:46

Advertisement of meetings in advance

08/04/2024 14:55

Talking to people using the harbour area

08/04/2024 13:05

Local population

08/04/2024 12:18

Quarterly meetings

08/04/2024 11:45

x

08/04/2024 11:13

Full transparency to everyone

08/04/2024 10:46

**Question 11 Idea 2 What methods or approaches would you suggest to ensure effective local engagement in the ongoing process, involving a broad and representative spectrum of the community? Please provide a maximum of three options/ideas.**

Run call-outs in local media for views.

22/05/2024 21:17

More involvement from the people who care about the area. People in Southwold and Walberswick were not properly informed about the consultation.

22/05/2024 19:18

Allow plenty of time for full community engagement and development of ideas.

22/05/2024 18:19

Allow plenty of time for full community engagement and development of ideas.

22/05/2024 17:53

Provide accurate, fact-based information and strictly avoid conflicts of interest.

22/05/2024 17:20

Positive advertising about community on the site

22/05/2024 16:57

Community engagement

22/05/2024 16:47

share information clearly and in a timely way

22/05/2024 16:33

Ensure that respondees to this survey are kept up to date with the process,

22/05/2024 15:30

online information that is detailed, easily accessible and well sign-posted

22/05/2024 14:57

All stakeholders representatives to have voting powers.

22/05/2024 14:42

Consult first home owners

22/05/2024 08:41

Take everyone's opinions into account and give them the consideration they deserve

21/05/2024 22:04

Consider making minimal changes

21/05/2024 21:28

Hold regular meetings to do this - online and in person to allow maximum engagement

21/05/2024 21:27

Community land ownership of the site.

21/05/2024 20:28

Investigate examples from elsewhere of community and public sector working together to lever in a variety of grants , including some large sums, for complex development.

21/05/2024 19:16

Co-design with schools and stakeholders of public realm projects

21/05/2024 18:30

Informing stakeholders without delay of problems and progress

21/05/2024 16:27

Please be honest and fair

21/05/2024 15:48

Be honest & open

21/05/2024 15:34

Everyone to have a vote

21/05/2024 13:09

Annual Race & Regatta to attract visiting Yachtsmen/persons

21/05/2024 12:56

Allow all stakeholders views to be heard and actually listened to

21/05/2024 11:30

Caravan owners need a voting representation on the SHMC

20/05/2024 22:13

Provide accurate costings for the things that you are expecting participants to 'vote' for.

20/05/2024 11:04

a stall in the market place to gather opinions/ideas

19/05/2024 13:19

Honesty about flood risk and risky investment

19/05/2024 11:33

Allow further discussion and add caravan owners as a stakeholder group with voting rights.

18/05/2024 19:28

early, open and honest discussion with all stakeholders

16/05/2024 14:16

SOCIAL MEDIA UPDATES.

14/05/2024 22:34

Work on a proper community plan that considers the whole harbour

14/05/2024 20:44

Consultation with local parish council for benefit for community

14/05/2024 20:13

Setting up a working party including caravan owners

14/05/2024 17:37

If you can't get insurance you're breaching ESDC T's & C's

14/05/2024 15:09

to try to keep the 'feel' of the caravan site

14/05/2024 12:29

Determine what capital is available for investment and advise costings..

14/05/2024 12:29

High level of Public Relations activity

14/05/2024 11:52

Need some mock ups of what is being thought about

13/05/2024 23:33

Survey visitors to the area

12/05/2024 07:59

Alternative plans considered

11/05/2024 20:26

Put all consultation in language that is accessible to all people, especially those unfamiliar with local government speak.

10/05/2024 17:27

More publicity

05/05/2024 17:42

Consider making some facilities a community asset

03/05/2024 13:57

Allow enough time for people to understand, process and respond to what is being proposed

03/05/2024 11:17

Informed information of engagement

30/04/2024 22:52

Email consultation

30/04/2024 09:23

phone-ins on local radio

29/04/2024 11:46

Ensure that the needs of the Walberswick Ferry has priority

29/04/2024 09:52

Compulsory taking into account of stakeholder feedback

28/04/2024 20:18

plenty of time for discussion and evaluation

28/04/2024 18:12

Please engage with the caravan site community about the cost implications and the financial impact for future enjoyment

28/04/2024 17:34

Full disclosure of all proposals

26/04/2024 11:29

Newsletter

25/04/2024 17:26

hearing what the people say and responding to them . The caravan owners for example know what is best for the site

25/04/2024 17:04

Share proposed plans to enable caravan owners to visualise

25/04/2024 16:37

Realistic costing

25/04/2024 13:30

Increase involvement of local people, non politicians

24/04/2024 18:26

Open house sessions

24/04/2024 14:05

Emails to caravan owners and other interested parties

23/04/2024 22:49

Citizen's Assembly to discuss creative solution(s) which is widely advertised and based on realistic timelines

23/04/2024 15:29

Not making it too corporate.

23/04/2024 03:27

Social media updates as and when they happen.

21/04/2024 08:40

Speak to heritage coast

20/04/2024 13:57

arrange meetings with the residents of Southwold

19/04/2024 11:38

A number of places reserved for local residents at subsidised rates

19/04/2024 07:25

Inviting comment at all stages

18/04/2024 21:10

regular visits during popular times ie weekends

18/04/2024 17:35

Regular arranged local discussions in the community

18/04/2024 10:12

Item in EADT

17/04/2024 08:21

Harbour and Campsite open days

15/04/2024 17:26

Local Workers

15/04/2024 14:21

Admit that East Suffolk and Waveney Councils have mismanaged the harbour in the past.

15/04/2024 13:42

Talk to local community groups, VHC, the school, The Old Hospital etc

15/04/2024 09:25

Don't try and make it like London

14/04/2024 05:50

Remember SCOA does not represent all owners

13/04/2024 13:14

On site drop in sessions eg in a gazebo,

12/04/2024 14:46

Walberswick Lands Trust Charity

12/04/2024 11:24

Greater responsibility/obligation for second home owners to economically/materially/financially contribute to the infrastructure and facilities of the town

11/04/2024 16:33

Engage with national caravan and motorhome organisations.

11/04/2024 15:40

engage with locals on how the area could be improved

11/04/2024 11:52

Change to longer term leases

11/04/2024 08:24

Social media

10/04/2024 20:04

Meetings with public involvement

10/04/2024 18:00

Promoting to incoming tourists

10/04/2024 17:09

Working with organisations use to setting up facilities

10/04/2024 16:04

Paper information in shops & library

10/04/2024 11:22

Including caravan owners at all stages

10/04/2024 09:09

Only workers cars able to drive down the harbour/pedestrian

09/04/2024 19:23

Representations at county shows

09/04/2024 18:17

Engage with RYA, Cruising Club to understand what leisure boat users require.

09/04/2024 18:16

Local should include people who regularly visit

09/04/2024 15:41

Accessible community cafe meeting area

09/04/2024 14:23

Active canvassers around town taking views

09/04/2024 14:17

Online consultation

09/04/2024 13:55

Representation forum of all interested parties/organisations

09/04/2024 13:35

Say what it is you are planning to change

09/04/2024 08:53

Writing to local residents

08/04/2024 20:19

Public forums

08/04/2024 20:18

Physical models exhibited somewhere accessible

08/04/2024 17:46

Hours of meetings to suite those who work

08/04/2024 14:55

Harbour users

08/04/2024 12:18

x

08/04/2024 11:13

An easy an open way to communicate with those impacted



**Question 11 Idea 3 - What methods or approaches would you suggest to ensure effective local engagement in the ongoing process, involving a broad and representative spectrum of the community? Please provide a maximum of three options/ideas.**

Discussion and listening to stakeholders and community. Not just businesses.

22/05/2024 19:18

Round table discussions based around alternative visions.

22/05/2024 18:19

Round table discussions based around alternative visions.

22/05/2024 17:53

Thorough, honest discussions enable stakeholders to adjust their positions, fostering collaboration and bring to light alternative, potentially unanticipated solutions.

22/05/2024 17:20

A new green vision for the site

22/05/2024 16:57

Acknowledging the value of the caravan community

22/05/2024 16:47

work together with representatives of the community

22/05/2024 16:33

Make the the website is continually updated.

22/05/2024 15:30

extensive use of social media, local chat forums, local press

22/05/2024 14:57

Honest and transparent, and genuine communications.

22/05/2024 14:42

Include access to harbour stakeholders

22/05/2024 08:41

Put each change up for community vote

21/05/2024 21:28

Take seriously the Vision document by Renshaw, Bashford & Starling

21/05/2024 21:27

consultation without preexisting models, choices or options

21/05/2024 20:28

Use the variety of expertise available among caravan owners, friends and relatives and local people

21/05/2024 19:16

Set up a community advisory board / steering group with representative people to help guide the vision

21/05/2024 18:30

Opportunity to make amendments to proposals before implementation

21/05/2024 16:27

Face to face meetings

21/05/2024 15:48

Ensure decisions made are fair & equitable

21/05/2024 15:34

Annual Shanty/Folk Song Festival

21/05/2024 12:56

True collaboration with all stakeholders

21/05/2024 11:30

Full discussion and collaboration of all stakeholders

20/05/2024 22:13

Be open about what is needed to 'save the harbour' and its cost.

20/05/2024 11:04

correspondence to local households

19/05/2024 13:19

Engage with forward-looking ecological visions which capitalise on need for low impact, low risk investment.

19/05/2024 11:33

Consider the investment (financial and community-based) that the caravan owners have contributed to Southwold over a long period.

18/05/2024 19:28

openness to new ideas

16/05/2024 14:16

OPEN DAY ON SITE FOR LOCALS TO VIEW THE SITE AND TALK TO CARAVAN OWNERS

14/05/2024 22:34

Involve the whole community and stakeholders in decision making

14/05/2024 20:44

Consult with businesses on possible investment and return for funding

14/05/2024 20:13

Improve publicity

14/05/2024 17:37

ESDC to communicate their insurance findings with renters.

14/05/2024 15:09

Maintain community

14/05/2024 12:29

Drop-in sessions are an important part of the consultation.

14/05/2024 12:29

STC, ESC, Harbour Committee & Stakeholder Group aligned

14/05/2024 11:52

Survey local home owners

12/05/2024 07:59

Affordable

11/05/2024 20:26

Have online meeting/ recorded meeting for those who can not attend in person

10/05/2024 17:27

Explaining future protection for the Harbour to a wide audience

05/05/2024 17:42

Publicise in local press and radio

03/05/2024 11:17

Protect the environment

30/04/2024 22:52

Community meetings

30/04/2024 09:23

updates on this website

29/04/2024 11:46

Keeping both the Southwold and Walberswick fully informed of the plans including a presentation and consultation of plans at Walberswick village hall

29/04/2024 09:52

Including caravan owners as stakeholders

28/04/2024 20:18

acceptance of alternative options

28/04/2024 18:12

Please provide flood mitigation plans, costs, and the long terms future and sustainability of the area.

28/04/2024 17:34

Effective Communication of all plans

26/04/2024 11:29

Zoom/YouTube presentations of all meetings

25/04/2024 17:26

transparency form the council especially financial ...

25/04/2024 17:04

Set up a dedicated 'website/community' that can be accessed by all.

25/04/2024 16:37

Onsite tours of proposals

25/04/2024 13:30

Avoid process being dominated by ESC/SCC councillors

24/04/2024 18:26

Social media updates

23/04/2024 22:49

All due process - planning permissions, environmental surveys etc - followed and due diligence on commercial plans, legal implications etc, undertaken

23/04/2024 15:29

Listening to harbour user's opinions.

23/04/2024 03:27

Listen to the Southwold residents.

21/04/2024 08:40

Ask caravaners whether running water and sewage connection is necessary when we haven't had any for 50 years.

20/04/2024 13:57

What are the views of Southwold business owners

19/04/2024 11:38

Create an on-line presence and include opportunities for comment

18/04/2024 21:10

regular conversations with the harbour workforce for ideas

18/04/2024 17:35

People who were born and brought up in the Town

15/04/2024 14:21

Define exactly what 'infrastructure' improvements you propose.

15/04/2024 13:42

Stall on seafront in high season

15/04/2024 09:25

Cut down the number chip shops as they cause congestion

14/04/2024 05:50

Beware those who always hate change

13/04/2024 13:15

Ask for volunteers for a local sub committee whom live or work in the work.

12/04/2024 14:46

Reduction in car access to harbour road

11/04/2024 16:33

Produce some CAD images of what it will look like.

11/04/2024 15:41

Upgrade facilities

11/04/2024 08:24

A local display with ideas and options

10/04/2024 20:06

Prizes and incentives from businesses

10/04/2024 18:01

Wide distribution of planning applications

10/04/2024 11:22

Listen to views of all

10/04/2024 09:09

Caravan site left as it is.

09/04/2024 19:23

Can the site be made larger and include public facilities

09/04/2024 14:23

With respect, try to concentrate on local's opinions and not too much on those with second homes

09/04/2024 14:17

Posters

09/04/2024 13:55

Do not overdevelop

09/04/2024 08:53

Inviting residents to in person meetings

08/04/2024 20:19

Presumption against change unless there is a clear majority in favour

08/04/2024 17:46

Southwold council

08/04/2024 12:18

x

08/04/2024 11:13

## Question 12 - Is there anything missing from this vision and, if so, what should be included?

How ESC will generate funding from elsewhere - walberwsick, Alborough, other Suffolk sites.

22/05/2024 21:17

As stated in my response to Question 5 - a lack of indicative commercial data regarding the likely lease & license costs of the various options for caravan owners as well as indicative investment costs to achieve the various models (whether static caravan site & harbour together or both separately) renders this initial consultation fairly redundant. What is the outcome ESC are hoping to achieve from this?

22/05/2024 20:30

Community engagement. Flood Risk. Protection of the unique environment.

22/05/2024 19:18

How to retain the unique working harbour while maintaining the conservation area and enhancing the ANOB.

22/05/2024 18:19

Flood risk. Community engagement. Honest appraisal of where the money is coming from for the improvements. Different options for find the money needed for the harbour wall.

22/05/2024 17:53

The consultation process for the redevelopment has been flawed due to insufficient stakeholder engagement, inadequate publicity, and delayed communication with caravan owners by East Suffolk Council. The first meeting with the SCOA occurred three weeks into the consultation, further highlighting these issues. Successful consultations require early and comprehensive stakeholder involvement to ensure balanced and inclusive outcomes.

22/05/2024 17:20

A new green exciting vision promoting hope and sustainability

22/05/2024 16:57

More emphasis on ecologically sound solutions

22/05/2024 16:47

The need to see the operation of the caravan site as more than a commercial venture. Income generated from the caravan site should be used to enhance for users, rather than being used as an easy income source for the Council's other projects and obligations.

22/05/2024 15:30

As previously stated, more detail is required before the proposals can be assessed.

22/05/2024 14:57

"Caravan site Revitalisation" is very vague and worries those who will be affected. The site has been deliberately neglected over several years and ESC has taken thousands of pounds from caravan owners and not reinvested it in site improvements.

22/05/2024 14:42

More detail on sustainability features and the costs to current residents.

22/05/2024 14:03

The wider infrastructure. Involving Walberswick residents.

22/05/2024 08:41

How the unique environment will be protected. How flood risk will be dealt with. Stakeholder engagement.

21/05/2024 22:04

Another local stakeholder are the power generation and transmission companies working in the area, including off shore wind and landfall infrastructure plus Sizewell C. Can't these mega projects be tapped up to contribute to protect our harbour?

21/05/2024 21:43

It is important that great care is taken to not gentrify the caravan site, as this will diminish the history and shows lack of respect for the existing community.

21/05/2024 21:28

It is vital that this plan is developed with the community, and especially caravan users, harbour users and harbour workers who are those most affected. However, all local residents should also be invited to be involved. Audit their skills and develop working groups to support a community plan (eg environmental group; planning group; caravan site group; harbour workers group etc.)

21/05/2024 21:27

A vision that is 21st century that realises the economic, environmental and social issues that present us today. The high density caravan site plans look like something out of Levittown from the 1950's. The landscape of sand dunes, grassland and coast is forgotten. Ecology, renewable energy, organic growth and harmony should be the factors for discussion.

21/05/2024 20:28

Citizens assembly: David Beavan mentioned a Citizen Assembly . a Citizens Assembly can be very successful, but only if properly and accurately and widely informed and expertly serviced with FULL and HONEST information. If there are competing interests these must be recognised, and accounted for in information supplied, and fully discussed by all stakeholders in a collaborative manner. All stakeholders must be there on an equal basis. A citizens assembly needs to take as much time as it needs to reach decisions (days/weeks) Only time, and FULL , Honest and lengthy discussion, will allow stakeholders to agree to adjust their position to accommodate, and also to put forward alternative options which may not have seemed appropriate or obvious beforehand

21/05/2024 19:16

- community / place plan to determine and agree key projects with community - more intelligent use of council assets such as moorings, car parks and other council owned land

21/05/2024 18:30

Southwold harbour does not need a vision , it needs sympathetic management by local people who know what works. Not faceless committees whose leaders have to justify their extortionate salaries.

21/05/2024 15:48

Consider the option of limited investment to reduce capital expenditure thus saving council funds but ensure vacant plots are filled.

21/05/2024 15:34

CONTEXT - Future direction for the larger economic area embracing the Town, Walberswick, Reydon. Blythborough Estuary communities. Fountain's Way Industries etc.

21/05/2024 12:56

Flood risk is not mentioned. Environmental protection of area of outstanding beauty.

21/05/2024 11:30

Community engagement. Flood Risk. Protection of the unique environment.

20/05/2024 22:13

This consultation does not give those taking part accurate and honest information upon which to make their decisions. The options need to contain accurate and full information if they are to be seen as anything other than biased.

20/05/2024 11:04

LOTS is missing from the vision. 1. Alternative sewage management plans: There are multiple risks associated with laying on sewerage in flood zones. More people will mean more sewage and ESC need to be sure this can be managed effectively in a high flood risk area, as the consequences of exposing the environment to flood water containing human sewage has serious implications for both environmental and human health. What are the alternatives? 2. Running water: Running water in the caravans would, of course, be convenient. But there are many advantages to using fresh water from the standpipes and the communal service blocks. It is simple, social and efficient in water consumption. The disadvantages of running water in caravans include the risk of burst pipes, of bacterial infection and less efficient water consumption. 3. Solar electricity on site: There is a need to consider this carefully - It may not be possible/wise to build electrical infrastructure on a flood plain and it may make most sense to site solar panels on top of caravans, as the roofs are the highest thing on the site. 4. Sustainable drainage systems - needed for development on a flood plain: Amongst other things, these may include green roofs, permeable surfaces, and purpose built ponds and wetlands. 5. planning for efficient heating and power consumption. This could include air source heat pumps, infra red heating panels, maintaining communal showers and toilets, composting toilets. 6. Capitalising on promoting the site as an eye-catching green holiday destination: Some of the site would be promoted as remaining off grid. This is an attraction to many Southwold visitors as digital detox breaks become increasingly fashionable, it saves money and it promotes the site as forward looking and environmentally aware. Rather than using statics linked to grid/ mains sewage etc for their holiday lets, ESC could make the off-grid nature of the site a virtue – these types of holiday destinations are growing in popularity and would be likely to attract the kind of visitors Southwold would welcome. They could be totally or partially off-grid. Examples: glamping pods, yurts, shepherd's huts, glamping domes, safari tents, bell tents, tipis and wigwams, gypsy caravans. These are all increasingly popular alternatives to static caravans and the income generated in this longer term vision would be greater than from old-fashioned models. Other statics currently on the site could be updated. 7. Areas of the site could be rewilded/left as meadowland. Biodiversity is in crisis and people want to be close to nature on holiday. The current practice on grass verges and farmland is to leave areas wild for biodiversity. The same should be true on the site. 8. There is an opportunity here for ESC council to set an inspirational example of planning for future sustainability, to invest wisely in something which will increase income, is truly green, environmentally sound and socially responsible -something that could win awards and be looked back on in the future as an ambitious and visionary programme which put economic realism, climate change/flood plain considerations and genuine green principles first. I do not want ESC to waste this opportunity.

19/05/2024 11:33

Please detail the harbour operation contribution itself. It is entirely lacking and the business plan appears to be focused exclusively on an appr 50% inches in caravans with no concern what this would mean for the current community.

19/05/2024 10:27

The inclusion of the caravan owners as a stakeholder group. The discussions have not engaged this group in a satisfactory way up to this point. The community has had to be engaged by the Southwold Caravan Owners Association, when the caravan owners should have been actively engaged by the council.

18/05/2024 19:28

to increase charges for overnight stay/mooring fees to yacht owners - their boats cost significantly more than a caravan yet there is no mention of them being cash cows too - their fee should go up pro rata to any increase to static caravans.

16/05/2024 16:15

Protection of AONB Early sharing of information in a standard and timely way, to ensure all stakeholders remaining equally and fully informed. Clear and open communications to avoid it looking like some or being sidelined.

16/05/2024 14:16

OPENESS IN ALL COMMUNICATION AND NOT WITHOLDING THE FACTS REGARDING THE HARBOUR LANDS

14/05/2024 22:34

The caravan owners and other stakeholders have many ideas as to how the site could be improved, and revenue could be generated outside of simple ramping up costs for caravan owners which seems a short term and outdated approach

14/05/2024 20:44

no

14/05/2024 17:37

Please ensure that the value the site brings to those who use it is incorporated within any proposed plans. Otherwise there is a risk that value will be measured in monetary terms alone. And this presents a risk that all stakeholders will lose what they most like about Southwold and its unique identity.

14/05/2024 15:09

See my previous comments.

14/05/2024 12:29

No

14/05/2024 11:52

Any concrete ideas

13/05/2024 23:33

The mistaken starting point is that the harbour area needs to be commercialised to raise money to pay for essential engineering work to the harbour mouth. The vision is therefore blinkered.

13/05/2024 09:58

Thought and regard given to the caravan owners who have provided the income for decades

12/05/2024 07:59

Big restaurant in harbour / make harbour food hub

09/05/2024 17:04

I only heard about this consultation via NextDoor Southwold despite being a resident of Blackshore. Nothing came through the door.

05/05/2024 17:42

11The vision lacks clarity of purpose and is too vague and aspirational without setting out the means of achieving it. Needs to reflect what is possible and what resources are available to achieve it

03/05/2024 13:57

Recognition that Southwold has charm as a low-key old fashioned resort, where people and families and young people feel they are not part of a pressurised, modern business driven world.

03/05/2024 11:17

Caravan owners have not been contacted by ESC about the proposals

30/04/2024 22:52

The environment agency are said to be in managed retreat (in threat from the sea) this appears to be being ignored. Also the options seem short on sustainability.

28/04/2024 18:12

Real informed stakeholder engagement. Flood Risk, mitigation measures and future protection of the area. Protection of the unique environment, sustain the protection of an area of outstanding beauty and create a legacy for future generations to enjoy.

28/04/2024 17:34

people's honest views. The caravan owners care about the site and its location. Why has the Rural Solutions survey been negated

25/04/2024 17:04

A good way of merging tourist and local appeal would be a venue to stage music, arts, theatre events (see Kidogo Arthouse, Fremantle, WA) facing in the direction of the sunset.

25/04/2024 13:30

East Suffolk Council has a statutory duty to enhance biodiversity. Supporting biodiversity enhancement through the delivery of the Vision for Southwold Harbour should be integrated into the Vision's objectives and delivery plan.

25/04/2024 11:29

See comments above

25/04/2024 07:38

Details on cost impact and revenue targets. Details on proposed rules changes and enforcement

23/04/2024 22:49

It is my understanding that SCOA has supplied feedback from caravan owners to years ago in the form of a survey about what caravan owners want for the future of the site. This information has been completely ignored in the current vision, and the most popular option for the future of the site - an unobtrusive and environmentally-friendly upgrading, some certainty for the future, and a realistic and capped increase in fees to reflect improved facilities - has not been included as an option. Trust has sadly been damaged as a result.

23/04/2024 15:29

Some things are left unchanged. Nature always wins in the end. Can the council justify spending millions of pounds on a site that is regularly flooded and will eventually be under water.

20/04/2024 13:57

Keep the feel of Southwold harbour - this is a place that has historically been working / for all needs to keep that ID

18/04/2024 21:13

Southwold has a great reputation for simplicity and "quaintness" the tourists love the natural beauty, dogs allowed on the beach, wooden beach cafes, local produce, not night clubs and late nights, please try to maintain the traditional whilst making any changes.

18/04/2024 17:35

The entire scheme should be scrapped

18/04/2024 10:12

Keep the caravan / camp site and no beach huts second homes

14/04/2024 05:50

To answer 10 one needs to define what is meant by "representative spectrum of the community"  
How does it involve national, regional and local regulatory and funding organisations, representatives of business, residents, visitors etc etc

13/04/2024 23:43

An aire for motor caravan tourists who are badly catered for. They are not tent or caravan visitors who can only stay on a campsite. Motorhomes are self contained and just need to empty waste and refill water every 3 or 4 days so these facilities are easy to use on an aire. Look at CAMBRA website and Facebook for guidance and advice to assist in setting up an aire.

11/04/2024 22:02

Some indication of what would not be in the vision, or would not be an acceptable outcome

11/04/2024 15:35

The vision is missing information on what is actually planned for the harbour and caravan site.

10/04/2024 19:40

-

10/04/2024 18:01

Access to overnight parking/ camping in a motorhome - require less facilities just fresh water and somewhere to drop waste water and toilet waste.

10/04/2024 17:09

Transport to the Harbour & parking.

10/04/2024 11:22

See previous comments

10/04/2024 09:09

Keep it old

09/04/2024 19:24

Plenty

09/04/2024 18:16

-

09/04/2024 15:18

A few more shops in town that are affordable for locals to rent and operate from. Lots of the same national stores...like most tourists coastal towns

09/04/2024 14:18

Some idea of budget or cost benefit analysis.

09/04/2024 13:36

Serious safety concerns with coastal erosion

09/04/2024 13:13

The vision is I am sure well meaning but it lacks any concrete details / examples so its difficult to give meaningful feedback - eg "Improving the harbour's financial performance through strategic enhancements and diversified revenue streams" is very difficult to say whether this is to be supported or not. In terms of community engagement you have to ask for feedback on concrete proposals - eg should we allow retail shops in the harbour (no is the answer BTW).

09/04/2024 08:48

x

08/04/2024 11:14

## Question 13 - Do you have any other comments?

I would like to see more reference to environmental considerations eg I would like considerations given to the idea of an MOT for caravans which would be a more sustainable and environmentally friendly option.

22/05/2024 23:50

Why is the question on the most effective method of local engagement being asked when the process has already begun?!

22/05/2024 20:30

SCOA has supplied feedback from caravan owners two years ago in the form of a survey about what caravan owners want for the future of the site. This information has been completely ignored in the current vision, and the most popular option for the future of the site - an unobtrusive and environmentally-friendly upgrading, some certainty for the future, and a realistic and capped increase in fees to reflect improved facilities - has not been included as an option.

22/05/2024 18:19

So far community engagement has been poor. However I am glad that you have agreed to further consultation and have made some amendments to the survey form based on feedback.

22/05/2024 17:53

We have been told that the four options given for the caravan site are in fact only option 2 and 3 as 1 and 4 are not being considered.

22/05/2024 17:20

This all needs rethinking

22/05/2024 16:57

We need to preserve the unique nature and atmosphere of the caravan site - we don't need brand new caravans all pushed together

22/05/2024 16:47

The Council has allowed the harbour to fall into disrepair and it is neither right nor fair to expect the caravan owners (either present or future) to fund improvements to the harbour. The caravan owners on the site now have remained loyal to the site, despite little investment in it and this is a shabby way to repay them.

22/05/2024 15:30

It is not the responsibility of caravan owners to again bale out a council that has consistently neglected us and used us as an easy cash-cow. Your current models are examples of limited group-think. You should be imaginative in your approach to income generation and not focus entirely on caravan owners who have little to do with the harbour anyway. Look elsewhere to raise your funds without harming the current environment. How about increasing harbour mooring etc. rates, parking fees for traffic clogging the harbour, rent/rate increases for the businesses on the harbour - who will probably benefit from improvements, increase beach-hut rents, increase town retail rates. Look to the local community to contribute to an area that they will own and benefit from. Have you approached the major business - Adnams? They have a pub on the harbour and a contribution from them could help, and the harbour could be a promotional area for the company e.g. the Adnams moorings? Just be a little more imaginative and less threatening to a single group.

22/05/2024 14:42

Thank you for considering these comments.

22/05/2024 08:41

There has been a huge lack of engagement with stakeholders. There are flaws in the consultation. No publicity regarding this vision. Caravan owners have not been contacted directly by ESC about this vision. The first meeting with SCOA was 3 weeks after consultation started.

21/05/2024 22:04

The community currently feels very alienated from the plans.

21/05/2024 21:28

This development could be a stand-out eco visionary exemplar with the right input.

21/05/2024 21:27

This consultation is flawed and has not properly engaged with stakeholders. The dates are wrong on the website and the public consultations difficult for all ages to attend. There has been little or no publicity through the caravan office. Caravan owners have not been contacted directly, it has been a word of mouth campaign.

21/05/2024 20:28

The paper needs a vision of a sustainable and long term approach to mitigating the effects of climate change. The wonderful environment in and around Southwold and its harbour needs protection

21/05/2024 19:16

TALK TO US

21/05/2024 15:48

It is important in view of the limited life of the site due to rising sea levels to maximise the return with limited expenditure.

21/05/2024 15:34

Policies need to be enshrined in a Statutory Local Plan.

21/05/2024 12:56

The 4 options appear partially formed and only 2 and 3 relevant and of serious intent for the caravan site.

20/05/2024 22:13

You mention 'enhancing the quality of life' in the introduction to the consultation. Who's are you referring to ?

20/05/2024 11:04

The three proposed potential layouts for the redeveloped site ('Concept designs' A,B and C): 1. These were only shown to people half way through the consultation. Many people will already have submitted their consultation responses by then, and therefore have been prevented from commenting on these layout plans. 2. Designs A and B include 'visitor/extra carparking' areas. There is no need for these and attracting additional cars to the site is extremely unwise. There will be increased traffic through the site, it will be ugly and children playing will be less safe. If these

are considered necessary because caravans will be closer together than at present, visitors to caravan owners can park in the two public car parks adjacent to the site - the council could make an arrangement with these car parks. 3. In designs A and B the far corner of the site is a designated car parking area. This area currently has a caravan on it (my caravan) and the view from this caravan across the AONB is breath taking. The area is green and lush and rich with birdsong and other wild life. No one in their right minds would change this to a car parking area. In the words of Joni Mitchell - 'They paved paradise, and put up a parking lot' 4. In designs B and C the road has been rebuilt. This is expensive, unnecessary and environmentally damaging. The last thing the site needs is more concrete. In B and C the road is two way. This means it will be wider, uglier and will have greater environmental impact. 5. The current low impact grassy paths for getting cars to caravans beyond the road area are perfectly adequate and ensure slow, safe driving whilst children play and people walk. 6. in A and B caravans are either entirely or partially unstaggered. This means that caravaners are looking out on another caravan. 7. In C there is a footpath between caravans and the black shore. This is a peaceful part of the site and currently caravaners here pay extra for their view of the AONB. Under this layout, their area will be busy with people walking to and from the campsite or the proposed parking areas - see points 4 and 5. 8. The trees are a nice idea, but not if these plans go alongside removing the mature and bird-rich trees already on the site. Have planners considered sunlight direction and whether caravaners will complain that the trees are shading them? Have ecologists been consulted on the most appropriate type of trees to plant for climate change resilience, for optimising biodiversity, and for growing close to caravans? 9. The photos next to each of the plans are disingenuous. They are just copied from other places. They bear no relation either to the actual plan on the page or to the geography of the site at present. Eg, in C, one of the photos shows the caravans in a ring with a lake in the middle. The plan has nothing resembling this on it. In A. the 'gabion wall landscape feature' shows meadowland next to it, but in the plan the wall will simply be between the road and a line of caravans. 10. There is no communal toilet block or wash room. See my points in question 12 about the disadvantages and cost of every single caravan having it's own sewage/running water/electricity. Many caravaners do not want all of these services in their caravan and especially the bother and responsibility of their own toilet. Washing up together is communal and efficient with big sinks and ample shared hot water. Abandoning these shared facilities altogether is short-sighted. 11. The layout of the site at present does not need changing. It needs the wilder areas to be left/ increased- this covers the 'green infrastructure enhancements' suggested on the plans. This will be cheaper, will support biodiversity net gain and will be more attractive. There is nothing creative or visionary about these plans with their serried rows of caravans and additional concrete and nothing here to promote Southwold Harbour as a forward-looking holiday destination. So leave it as it is - there's no net gain in any of these plans.

19/05/2024 11:33

There is concern that not all options are being considered.

18/05/2024 19:28

if caravan owners cannot get full insurance due to the likelihood of flooding BUT they are forced to buy new(er) caravans they will be in breach of terms and conditions of renting on the site. At an open event the councillor spoke of 10% biodiversity net gain from new developments; this needs to be spelt out clearly in the strategy ie how will it be measurable. The Green agenda includes not using fossil fuels, recycling of ancient caravans etc How will this be written into the project? Any strategic plan linked to a vision statement needs to be alongside financial workings - it is impossible to make decent comments on this work to date without knowing what the bottom line is for the work required on the harbour/over how many years is this major funding required, when

does the initial investment turn to maintenance funding, what are the sources of funding beyond the caravan site given the site requires major funding to reposition each van, add sewerage and water supplies etc (Hopefully no electricity as solar panels are far more eco friendly). In the Planning Timelines the 2nd bullet point in No. 2 talks of Leverage Funding - my understanding is that 'leverage' is borrowed money which in itself is a risky source of funds.

16/05/2024 16:15

Engagement is incredibly important and needs hard work!

16/05/2024 14:16

Governance should be more transparent

15/05/2024 17:37

If the caravan site ends up being run in the same way as a commercial caravan park, many of which are notorious for being rip-offs that exploit people, it would be a terrible shame for both the existing caravan community and for Southwold.

14/05/2024 20:44

no

14/05/2024 17:37

Listen carefully to all stakeholders. Although their views may differ superficially, the thread of what many people on the caravan site seem to be saying is the same. People are accepting of necessary change but wish that changes will not lose the unique character of the site and surrounding area. It is what all of us value so much.

14/05/2024 15:09

Not at the time.

14/05/2024 12:29

No

14/05/2024 11:52

A rethink is needed. For the caravan site, option 1 is the appropriate one.

13/05/2024 09:58

Personally I dislike all the proposed plans because the site to me is perfectly fine as it is

12/05/2024 07:59

No

05/05/2024 17:42

No caravan owner should incur additional cost . We do not want to see a 'Hoseason 'type development on this coast .

03/05/2024 22:31

The vision should set out a SWAT analysis to establish strengths and weaknesses to inform the vision

03/05/2024 13:57

There is little consideration of environmental issues both in development and ongoing management.

03/05/2024 11:17

It is hard to believe that ESC is (and asking us) to invest huge amounts of money in something that has a very uncertain future. The effects of climate change , in our case coastal erosion and flooding, cannot be ignored.

28/04/2024 18:12

This consultation is not extended to all members of the community and has not properly engaged with stakeholders, including caravan owners. The dates are wrong on the website. There has been

little or no publicity for the consultation and its potential impact on the existing community. Caravan owners have not been contacted directly by ESC. The first meeting with Southwold Caravan Owners Association members was on 26th April 2024, three weeks after consultation started.

28/04/2024 17:34

Through our Chair, SCOA has tried to support the council in a working solution but WE HAVE NOT been listened too

25/04/2024 17:04

I think it's important to retain the ethos of a working harbour and make the campsite an effective income generating model to fit visually with the local landscape. It looks cheap and rundown currently.

25/04/2024 13:30

See comments above

25/04/2024 07:38

Concern that this is seen as a money making exercise by ESC , with views of locals being disregarded . Possibly leading to a Butlins theme park mass tourism outcome that will destroy the nature of the harbour in pursuit of money for the Council. Concern that as ever , these consultations are a meaningless sham. With decisions already taken behind the scenes- lack of credibility in the mind of many people

24/04/2024 18:26

Would be interested to understand recession making process and weightings being given to different criteria. Currently being in limbo is difficult as a caravan owner as unable to make plans.

23/04/2024 22:49

Unfortunately, despite assurances to the contrary, a widely held perception exists that this consultation merely exists to pay lip service to other views, and that the council has already decided the basic outline of the future of the caravan site - ie a mix of rental caravans and leaseholds based on a commercial caravan park style model. This impression has arisen due to the evasive nature of communication with ESC in recent years, and a lack of direct communication with caravan owners.

23/04/2024 15:29

Vision seems to be well layered in corporate jargon that doesn't actually explain what is intended only that they intend to do "something"

23/04/2024 03:27

No

20/04/2024 13:57

It would be great to have sustainable facilities

18/04/2024 21:13

We have just upgraded our caravan to conform with the caravan sites rules but new caravans require some basic services to be able to run such as electricity, could this be looked at with some urgency, this would encourage those with modern caravans to make use of them for longer in the year thus extending the season by quite a few weeks.

18/04/2024 17:35

I am a caravan owner and local Solicitor who would like to volunteer to be active in the process of moving forwards

13/04/2024 13:15

Listen, to local views. Do not do things just because you think the tourists would like them. They are only their for a day or two. It's the people whom visit regularly that needs to be listened to.

12/04/2024 14:46

The need to protect the harbour is one thing but the need to raise money to do so shouldn't be seen as a reason to significantly develop and change the area. It's attraction to its many visitors is precisely because it is unchanged and been left alone

12/04/2024 11:24

Social media engagement is inevitable but in my opinion is not businesslike or professional.

11/04/2024 19:07

Again, gentle change, not radical

11/04/2024 08:24

No

10/04/2024 18:01

Speak to [campra.co.uk](http://campra.co.uk) about creating a motorhome aire

10/04/2024 17:09

The whole of the countries community views that wish to visit Southwold should be considered and they should work alongside residents and traders .

10/04/2024 16:04

Thank you for your time.

10/04/2024 09:09

Build your local population up so you have a town and it's not full of second home owners

09/04/2024 19:24

-

09/04/2024 15:18

Glad to see improvements are due but in particular, the campsite is desperate for an update.. needs to this year

09/04/2024 14:18

Infrastructural improvements are essential. Sea walls, groynes, sluices must be improved and maintained

09/04/2024 13:13

We need to address the elephant in the room (flooding) else the harbour will not be viable in 50 to 100 years

09/04/2024 08:48

x

08/04/2024 11:14

## Question 15: Do you have any alternative suggestions?

Caravan owners who have been on the site for generations should be given priority considerations on consultations and future caravan. There is not enough conversation about all the ways in which solar/wind etc could be harnessed on the site and how investments in environmental sustainability should be a priority.

22/05/2024 23:59

I have not chosen an option as they are impossible to pick from. There is no detail. No costs. No details of services to be improved. No environmental details.

22/05/2024 21:24

5. Continue as is - annual license but invest the revenue in the site with plumbing throughout for all caravans & the option for electric hookups for all sites. Given everyone's high focus on all things ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance), I would have thought it would be an ESC consideration to develop the site as a minimally as possible. Running water for all would be a great addition & grants for caravan owners to set up their caravans with solar panels so that the site was a flagship site for green energy in keeping with it's location in an AONB. Our caravan hosts a couple of oyster catchers once a year around this time of year, where they nest & hatch their young. Caravans should not be given a lifespan to end up in landfill just because of a random number of years deemed fit - they should be maintained respectful to their environment & within owners financial limits.

22/05/2024 20:30

I have not chosen any of the options due to a lack of clarity on detail and costs. Maintaining the caravan site for owners only would prevent potential anti-social behaviour that might arise if subletting or renting were allowed. This approach would contribute to a respectful community environment, as the owners have a vested interest in maintaining the current peace and order within the site. The vacant pitches should be filled and electric, water and sewage connections added, with fees brought in line accordingly. A lease agreement, more agreeable and shorter than the suggested 20 years, should also be considered but the decision to replace caravans should be grounded in their physical condition rather than their age. This approach aligns with our ecological commitment by preventing unnecessary waste and promoting sustainability.

22/05/2024 19:50

None of these options are what caravan owners have said they want. Where is the upgrade that some, but not all, want? My suggestion is a very limited upgrade of some of the site. A few caravans or other more environmentally friendly huts/yurts/pods to be weekly rentals to see how ESC manage them and to increase revenue and footfall. Filling empty pitches so that younger families on the waiting list join the site. No long leases needed. No new caravans needed causing waste of perfectly decent vans. Some reasonable increase in fees if the site has utilities connected.

22/05/2024 19:32

None of the above options suitable or what caravan owners have asked for. I believe there is the opportunity for ESC to create a forward-looking, sustainable site fit for the future, with little or no CO2 footprint that includes natural flood defence mechanisms and supports wildlife and

biodiversity. It could be a flagship project the council could be proud of, and include many worthwhile initiatives - one idea could be offering caravan owners the opportunity to opt in to a scheme allowing their caravan to be used for two weeks in the year by children in care, or those suffering life limiting conditions - ie going back to the caravan site's original objective, that everyone should have the chance to enjoy wonderful Southwold, not just the cash-rich.

22/05/2024 18:24

For a real discussion, the council needs to explain to caravan owners and harbour businesses and users what money is needed for what, then we can have a real discussion about different ways of getting there. The current options risk pricing many of us off the site, so that ESC loses even more money. The caravan site could be a forward looking, environmentally sustainable site that Southwold and the ECS could be proud of. Where caravans are not renewed for the sake of it, electricity is generated from solar power, caravans are not sited on concrete standing and planting is suitable for the many bird species that visit the site. Sustainability is the best approach.

22/05/2024 18:01

I didn't rank these. Options because there are no costing and none are suitable

22/05/2024 17:00

I don't think any of these solutions is what we need so I haven't ranked them at all. Also how much are they going to cost

22/05/2024 16:58

I have not ranked these I cannot do this without costings. None of these options is in any way an improvement and as they haven't been costed I cannot even begin to comment - I need much more information or this is a pointless exercise. Keeping the roads as they are - they work perfectly well and it would save a lot of money and damage and destruction. Doing the minimum and filling the empty spaces

22/05/2024 16:50

The options need to have more details and costings to East Suffolk Council and to Static Caravan owners now and in the future

22/05/2024 16:42

There is another option of extending Option 1 by increasing the annual fees to fund improvements to the site and its facilities, but maintaining the licence scenario. The considerations are not insurmountable. The limited security is not an issue because, as stated, there is a waiting list so the Council would not have empty sites. As long as the fees are paid, whether the caravans are occupied or not is irrelevant, which is not the case with any rental scenario. If improvements are made to the site, the caravans are more likely to be occupied more frequently and for longer periods.

22/05/2024 15:48

Option 1 is the closest to our choice. But we would not like any of them in their entirety so have not placed them in any order whatsoever. If you do eventually get around to improving the caravan site, then solar generated power would help along with improved toilets and washing facilities. We don't ask for much - just a peaceful, environmentally protected, sustainable and safe place for current and future generations to enjoy. There still needs to be some genuine, honest and real listening on your part. The current impression is that you've made up your minds and will push through come what may.

22/05/2024 14:48

The caravan site could be a forward looking, environmentally sustainable site that Southwold and the East Suffolk Council could be proud of. Development appropriate to the AONB. Where caravans are not renewed for the sake of it, where electricity is generated from solar power, caravans are not sited on concrete standing and planting is suitable for the many bird species that visit the site.

22/05/2024 14:06

No

22/05/2024 08:42

I don't really like any of these options as they are stated. My preferred alternative would be to have electricity/sewage/plumbing/water. A shorter lease would be preferable or the best option would be to keep the 1 year licence as it is now.

21/05/2024 22:12

In the same way the houses along Ferry Road and many of the huts along the harbour are built on stilts, could the pads that the caravans sit on be built up above the predicted flood levels to protect them. Or could the whole caravan site be built up above flood levels by using sand and gravel dredged up from the local sea bed. Dredging for sand and gravel does happen within site of the harbour.

21/05/2024 22:01

I have seen the Vision document sent by Renshaw, Bashford and Starling and I think this is a fantastic alternative vision that can frame the development. I am not averse to change if it means existing caravan users and those who have been on the waiting list for over 15 years can afford to stay. I think their vision document offers ideas for other ways to make the money needed to help pay for the harbour wall in keeping with the current strong community culture on the site.

21/05/2024 21:36

I like the idea of it staying the way it is. But if it is to change then a focus on environmental sustainability and harbour based arts and leisure attractions would be welcome.

21/05/2024 21:36

Do nothing to the site, reflect on where the money we have all contributed over the years has gone and then start a consultation that includes community from the outset.

21/05/2024 20:40

1. Savings on costs: A huge amount of expenditure could be saved by leaving the layout as it is, and caravans in place, rather than a complete reorganization. The roads are good, we don't need parking for visitors, there is a huge car park on the harbour. The Campsite doesn't need a separate road, and the proposal would destroy an existing small wood next to the pond which is usually reserved for walkers or bikers with small tents. If a new entry is needed, open up the existing track from Ferry Road. Infill the vacant static pitches with people who have been on the waiting list for years and want to come here. Rethink the requirement to buy new caravans, which depreciate immediately much like cars. Much more sustainable to buy second hand caravans in good condition. Install electricity (that's the main thing caravan owners want, for heating, lighting etc) and maybe water (although the current standpipes are fine). Charge caravan owners a bit more. Ensure current caravan owners get an affordable deal. Rethink whether to invest in sewage, which would be a huge expense, and especially with the new SUDS planning requirements. Also sewage installation on a flood plain is a serious problem, as flooding could float sewage into fields and drinking water etc. So leave the toilet and shower blocks in situ., and investigate alternatives eg

the various forms of composting toilets for caravans or even for communal use. Investigate alternatives to rental caravans, since investing in new caravans for rental is a huge outlay. This scenario would give ESC a stable income which together with the income from the campsite would produce about £900,000, enough to pay the £700,000 to service the £11m loan for the harbour wall. Funding to develop the harbour would have to come from somewhere else. The caravan site cannot provide all the money. 2. Deep breath!: Most important, take a deep breath, recognize the opportunity that this site offers to do something up to the minute, and splendid, with sustainable green principles addressing climate change. Go back to the drawing board, discuss and work seriously with the skills and knowledge available in the caravan and wider community. Investigate examples of community/public sector joint planning elsewhere which have levered in large amounts of varied grant funding. Plan to create something innovative that Southwold can be proud of.

21/05/2024 19:19

Understand caravan site options 1 & 4 are non-starters. Options 2 & 3 include main requirement of caravan owners e.g. mains water electricity etc. but not enough financial detail to see if is viable for us to remain on site.

21/05/2024 16:58

These options are a joke. PLEASE TALK TO US ABOUT EVERYTHING ALL THE TIME

21/05/2024 15:56

Caravan owners were told options 1 and 4 are not now on the table - so why are they listed here? I have not ranked them. Without indication of costs to caravan owners, and site layout plans, caravan owners cannot opt for any of these.

21/05/2024 13:12

Largely retain existing layout. upgrade power, water and sewage to individual sites, offer short term leases to existing residents. [Revise Access as suggested to Camp Site]

21/05/2024 12:56

These Options do not give anywhere near enough detail for me to make a fully informed decision. With what I have in front of me, I would vote for a mix of Option 2 and 3, WITHOUT the stipulations for 20 year leases (this is not feasible with the lack of flood insurance). The site has had no shortage of people wanting to move on (over 250 on waitlist), so ESC do not need to lock people into such long leases. A lot of the site users are in their later years of life and the lease would outlive them! I also wholly disagree with an arbitrary age of caravans - if they pass an 'MOT' then they should be able to stay on. Getting rid of your caravan every 5/10 years is not environmentally or economically sustainable. I also think 30% leases is quite high - the caravan site is a wonderful peaceful place with community feel, but with a high number of leases the site and town would be negatively affected. I do want to see better services - water, sewerage, electricity and I understand the need for more money to be generated, but these options don't really give me enough detail to make an informed decision.

21/05/2024 12:50

None of the options are good options. All options risk pricing many of us off site resulting in loss of revenue from a very committed and supportive community. Without indication of costs to caravan owners, and site layout plans, caravan owners cannot opt for any of these. For a real discussion,

the council needs to explain to us (and harbour businesses and users) what money is needed for what, then we can have a real discussion about different ways of getting there.

20/05/2024 23:12

I have placed your 'options' in this order as this is the nearest to what is needed; however, none of them reflect what the current Static Caravan Owners wish to see, and have been requesting for at least 5 years. What I would like to see is mains water and 240v electricity supplied to each caravan. This is a relatively cheap thing to install and will not require mass-movement of caravans, laying of concrete plinths or the digging-up of the whole site to install unnecessary mains sewage. This would satisfy 90% of current owners.

20/05/2024 11:11

I can understand the desire to have more income from the caravan site and I am certain that most caravan owners will accept a partial redevelopment and increase in fees. I would suggest looking at introducing solar panels to all caravans with the solar power feeding into the national grid so that even when owners are not at their caravan power is being generated. I understand that having greater occupancy at the caravan site will generate more income in town but I am concerned at what cost. Greater strain on the infrastructure such as sewage could have a very detrimental affect. This will need to be managed very carefully and perhaps partial redevelopment is the key. I for one would be happy to still use the shower/toilet block facilities even if it meant I could not stay for longer periods. I would suggest that I probably stay at my van more than anyone else on the site. As you are aware we cannot get flood insurance and the proposals regarding new caravans is financially and ecologically flawed. If ESC have vans for rental this is something tax payers may be very concerned about. Also, will you attract customers and will you be able to employ staff?

19/05/2024 13:38

During the consultation process some of us were told that actually the only options were 2 and 3. We were told that 1 and 4 were 'off the table'. So why are we being asked to rank all four options? How will the responses be processed if people rank as highest, options 1 and 4, not knowing that their preferred option has already been eliminated? I would like the site to stay as close to it's current state as possible, with an increase in areas to support biodiversity. These plans make unimaginative and expensive changes which in no way guarantee increased income. I would be prepared to pay a bit more to have far less infrastructure and development than is proposed in this vision and these plans. It is more valuable for me to have a peaceful, low-impact, low-tech, environment-rich site, leading the way in eco-holiday design than to have a concrete/hardstanding-rich site evoking the 1980s.

19/05/2024 11:33

Current model but with - longer tenancy term of 5 years, something that people on average incomes can plan for - commit current caravan tenants to pay and install solar panels on their roof to improve the site without costing the council money

19/05/2024 10:34

Option 3 and 4 are completely unacceptable from a caravan owners perspective. Option 1 is the best option. Option 2 is too long a lease period. There seems to be too great a gap between Option 1 and 2, an alternative should be considered and put forward. Is Option 1 even being considered by the council? If revenue creation is the key driver, a more realistic option should be discussed. A 5 year lease would give certainty to the council in terms of revenue and would greatly reduce the pressure on caravan owners.

18/05/2024 20:14

I do not agree with option 2 nor 4. impossible to decide without seeing budget predictions and financial strategy The arguments for Option 1 are invalid - it doesn't have to keep the licence holder fees low. 2 months notice: how frequently does this happen therefore what is the ask? If caravans are not fully occupied the council still gets the full rent. Many people who rent AirBnB or similar will take their own food with them therefore not generating income for local shops and this could be replicated in Southwold if caravans were open for bookings as per AirBnB. Option 2: full leasing model - site reconfiguration is needed for Option 1 to as spacing between vans is very variable now - I do not have enough space to get an average sized caravan as my plot is so small and my neighbour has a miniscule plot

16/05/2024 16:29

My preference would be somewhere between 1 and 2. where the facilities are brought to a sensible standard and an annual licence continues, or possibly a shortish lease arrangement. There should not be an option to sub-let as this will completely change the existing vibe and community feel.

16/05/2024 14:31

OPTION 1 WOULD BE IDEAL FOR CURRENT CARAVAN OWNERS OPTION 2 WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE WITH SHORTER LEASES (5 OR 10 YEARS) FOR CURRENT OWNERS

14/05/2024 22:49

I have answered the question above, but do not think any of the options are suitable. It would be better to go back to the drawing board, consider some more creative options and come up with a proper community plan.

14/05/2024 20:49

Can't see the options

14/05/2024 20:14

see comments below

14/05/2024 17:38

As I have specified already - please consider testing the market first before implementing one of the four options that have been tabled.

14/05/2024 15:34

These options are lacking in detail. 1 is the best options, but this needs change as I acknowledge that services need to be provided and some more money made. 3 and 4 would have huge problems with people renting

14/05/2024 12:33

Option 1 & 2 are a no for us. Option 2 needs further work to develop it as an option, likewise option 3. For both options see comments below.

14/05/2024 11:55

The reconfiguration of roads (apart from new access road to camping field) seems unnecessary work and cost

13/05/2024 23:38

No. My only opinion is for the site to continue as is. That's why it's been so popular for so long and why the waiting list has always been full.

12/05/2024 08:09

The reconfiguration of roads (apart from new access road to camping field) seems unnecessary work and cost

13/05/2024 23:38

No. My only opinion is for the site to continue as is. That's why it's been so popular for so long and why the waiting list has always been full.

12/05/2024 08:09

Reduce the lease period on caravans and do 125 year leases on chalets/log cabins

11/05/2024 20:35

We have not completed the above preference section as we were told at a consultation meeting that these were only broad ideas and that the consultation would generate an actual model that would then go out for further consultation

10/05/2024 17:42

Upgrade the caravan site to meet current model standards. Provide electricity, water and foul drainage Provide owners with security of tenure and allow subletting if more visitors are sought. Clearly fees would have to rise but that is fair if the offering is better than now.

07/05/2024 11:18

I haven't ranked these - there only seem to be three concepts A B and C. Are these 1, 2 and 3 and is there a 4th?

05/05/2024 17:43

No explanation of how the options configure towards the vision. No analysis of relative costs and likely income between the options

03/05/2024 14:01

Fill caravan site to full capacity on current model to generate income. There have been spaces over many years.

03/05/2024 11:20

I've guessed the above as i cant find the options

30/04/2024 23:11

Full exploration of other possible sites in Southwold.

29/04/2024 09:55

I have not chosen an order as I believe all of the options will price out current caravan owners which is unfair An environmentally sustainable approach which takes into account those families who have invested for years is important

28/04/2024 20:20

I have chosen none of the above ,I quite like the site just as it is. I would be quite happy though to upgrade my caravan but we should be allowed to recycle older (15 year old?) caravans which have been forcibly removed from less environmentally concious sites.

28/04/2024 18:15

Given the lack of consultation with the caravan owners, none of the options put forward are acceptable.

28/04/2024 18:06

Show us how Southwold caravan site compares with other sites. How do these other UK sites operate? Show us what 'good' looks like.

25/04/2024 17:54

We have been told that the four options given for the caravan site are in fact only option 2 and 3 as 1 and 4 are not being considered.

25/04/2024 17:05

Cannot comment on the option s as understand 1 and 2 discounted by David Beavan and not enough information / consultation in relation to 2 and 3

25/04/2024 07:41

Could you expand the site into the other fields?

23/04/2024 22:53

In my view none of the above options are fit for purpose. Yes, I do have alternative suggestions but that is a big question. Personally I believe there is the opportunity for ESC to create a forward-looking, sustainable site fit for the future, with little or no CO2 footprint that includes natural flood defence mechanisms and supports wildlife and biodiversity. It could be a flagship project the

council could be proud of, and include many worthwhile initiatives - one idea could be offering caravan owners the opportunity to opt in to a scheme allowing their caravan to be used for two weeks in the year by children in care, or those suffering life limiting conditions - ie going back to the caravan site's original objective, that everyone should have the chance to enjoy wonderful Southwold, not just the cash-rich.

23/04/2024 16:04

If leasing model, reduce term to 10 years with option to renew, but no large fees

23/04/2024 10:42

No

22/04/2024 09:59

5 year lease is more inclusive than a 20 year lease. A 20 year lease will clearly discriminate against older caravan owners

21/04/2024 09:37

Deal with the white elephant first and foremost. Flooding as we keep being told is the real problem moving forward. Address this and investors can then make a logical choice.

21/04/2024 08:47

I don't think my preference will make any difference yo what the council has already decided.

20/04/2024 14:01

With option 1, share costs for electricity and water with static owners - give residents options to connect to electricity and water at a cost

19/04/2024 07:27

The above just has the options labelled as options not Qs so can't comment

18/04/2024 21:15

None of the above

18/04/2024 10:12

I have no preference for the option that is used

17/04/2024 08:24

Going with option 2 but allowing the leaseholders to rent out there caravans, possibly to be managed by an onsite team.

15/04/2024 17:30

Only potential options is to split Option 1 & 2 as there are families who have had Caravans on this site since its inception. To change now would make things unfair and possibly too expensive for some.

15/04/2024 14:29

The options should be derived from the proposals for the site and harbour when these are defined,rather than be dealt with in isolation

13/04/2024 23:45

Allow current caravan owners to rent their caravans short term for a MINOR part of the year so they can recoup some of the annual cost to them - not so as to 'cash in'.

13/04/2024 13:24

No idea what the above options relate to.

12/04/2024 14:48

Sell lodges on industry standard terms. Needs infrastructure but pays its way. Lease caravan plots on industry standard terms - including age of caravan, market rents etc. Have a mix of static and tourist pitches on the touring fields - statics for short-term rent.

11/04/2024 15:47

Remove caravan site altogether and re-develop entire area to bring it in line with modern needs and wants for the community and tourism

11/04/2024 11:57

5 year lease might be more agreeable especially as flood insurance is not available on the site.

10/04/2024 19:57

Please remind me of these options at this stage in the survey

10/04/2024 18:03

I cannot find the details of the 4 operational models. Please email to me at

[carolpratt51@hotmail.com](mailto:carolpratt51@hotmail.com)

10/04/2024 11:24

The site facilities are upgraded and all current caravan owners are offered the option to stay, with their current caravans (if possible- in this day and age we should not be scrapping perfectly good caravans at 10 years old).

10/04/2024 11:21

What are the options?????

09/04/2024 19:24

Where are the options ?

09/04/2024 18:17

where are the options? I have not completed the above as I cannot find the options

09/04/2024 16:46

NONE

09/04/2024 16:23

This is not clear what it means

09/04/2024 15:41

I couldn't read/ find what the options were for no 13

09/04/2024 14:19

Be reasonable with the current caravan owners

09/04/2024 09:00

Increase the area available for camping in the summer subject to STC allowing the use of the extra land

09/04/2024 08:51

Can't comment as do not own a static caravan

08/04/2024 15:00

Option 1 and 2 I would fully support - however for option 2 we would need details BEFORE on the length of lease, buy out costs, etc.

08/04/2024 10:49

## Q 16 - Do you have any other comments?

It is all rhetoric. And adjectives. There is no actual factual basis for any of it. Or meaningless detail to evaluate and respond to. Cramming in caravans, pouring in concrete to a non draining flood plain, no consultation for owners and townspeople, no sustainable planning, it doesn't seem to have been thought through by people who love Southwold or enjoy spending time in it.

22/05/2024 21:24

Southwold has always been like stepping back in time & that is the beauty of it. Any development needs to be in keeping with that & not a money grabbing exercise.

22/05/2024 20:30

On a more personal note, my gran, Mabel **Rice (nee Standard)** was born on Constitution Hill, moving onto 5 Pinkeys Lane - where my Dad lived with her for a while. My uncle, Arthur **Standard**, was a drayman for Adnams brewery. Due to these links, generations have been camping in Southwold and now make use of the caravan, thanks to my parents. We have spent many a good year visiting Southwold, going on walks, and enjoying the local restaurants, shops and pubs. We still visit as many times a year as we can, sharing the caravan with my sister, brother, and their families - another 2 generations falling in love with Southwold. It is a welcome break from the working week, where we can come to a lovely part of the country, leave our cares at home, and enjoy the walks and fresh air. It is sad that this is now being threatened in the name of progress, and we hope that the progress will see that we are not just moaning for moaning's sake but trying to keep this special place within our grasp. The site's apparent decline raises questions about whether this is a strategic move to facilitate a specific option. The ongoing non-renewal of vacant plots contradicts the revenue generation objective, resulting in an annual income loss of £90k per annum. Additionally, if we are paying, as stated by a local councillor on social media, £10/day, that equates to £300/pcm, comparable to Southwold's council tax for a reasonably sized house, but without the luxury of running water, sewerage or electricity. Given the lack of site investment thus far, these financial aspects warrant further investigation. The introduction of electric hookups for caravans, mirroring successful implementations at the campsite, would be a welcome improvement. Ideally, this should be complemented by a regulated solar panel installation on caravans (most caravans already have these), feeding back into the site transformer, enhancing cost-effectiveness. Discussion of caravan compliance should only begin once the amenities are in place on the caravan site. Introducing a new, fully equipped caravan on the site without these amenities would be inappropriate. The expectation that well-maintained caravans will be discarded due to age contradicts our ecological commitments. While some caravans indeed require repair, others should be preserved. The requirement to purchase replacement caravans from a specific provider, potentially at an inflated cost due to additional commission, raises concerns. This, coupled with the inability to secure flood insurance, could indeed make it a risky investment. Are East Suffolk Council prepared to provide blanket flood insurance for all caravans purchased for the site? It's crucial to ensure that any redevelopment of the caravan site aligns with the unique character and natural surroundings of this part of Southwold. Modernisation, if not done thoughtfully, can transform the site into a commercial holiday camp, potentially leading to noise pollution, maintenance issues, and other problems. Overcrowding and congestion could detract from the charm of this part of Southwold, leading to regrets about overlooked environmental considerations. It's important to balance development with preservation, particularly at a time when environmental issues are at the forefront of public consciousness. This approach will help maintain the quaint and unique outlook of the area while ensuring its sustainability for future generations. I hope that the current ESC is remembered for developing something environmentally splendid, potentially award winning, and socially responsible to a long standing community and not a financially disastrous white elephant.

22/05/2024 19:50

Why has the site been left so rundown with so many empty pitches? What benefit are leases to caravan owners? Only if you are going to make us buy new vans (which we can't afford) and then you use the Parkdean style rundown lease do I see any use in them and then that is all for your benefit. It looks like you have taken a model from commercial caravan parks that offer lots of amenities. The beauty of Southwold is that these amenities are not needed as the natural environment is what is attractive and what I have loved from when I first came here as a small child.

22/05/2024 19:32

It seems that ESC intends to use the caravan site as a cash cow, with revenue superceding all other concerns. In the absence of more creative, forward-looking solution, I believe a compromise solution (possibly based on a model in which a limited number of caravans are used as holiday lets to generate revenue with reasonable leasehold terms, and minimal impact upgrading, for existing owners) could be achieved if negotiations were based on full, open and honest disclosure of costings, financial forecasts. The caravan owners are currently contributing around £300k annually to ESC and have received very little in terms of facilities or investment on the site in return. I suspect that any major commercialisation of the site, change in the character of the place, or unreasonable lease terms will result in the current loyal and devoted caravan community voting with their feet, and ESC struggling to replace them due to flood risks and decreasing demand. Demand for static caravans is already in decline, as is demand for staycations (evidence for this can be provided if required), and I think ESC risk destroying something valuable and not be making the money they envisage.

22/05/2024 18:24

Caravan owners have been promised an upgrade of the site for many years including electricity, water and sewerage connection. The council gets £300,000 annual income from caravan owners (and more from campsite). The site has become run down and empty pitches have not been filled, losing approximately £90,000 a year income. The caravan site is a long term community of people, many of whom have connections to Southwold going back 4 or even 5 generations. We are invested in Southwold and the local area. We want to come to a good solution in proper consultation with all stakeholders. Asking for ideas from us, when we do not know what you need to gain from the caravan site is tricky. From what I have read it is not known if works to the south training arm will have the desired affect . I do not think the vision is visionary enough.

22/05/2024 18:01

Without costs the ranking would be pointless there's a big bit of this plan missing!

22/05/2024 16:58

Communal washing up and toilet facilities promote community - this option should be preserved.

22/05/2024 16:50

I am concerned about the amount of borrowed money is anticipated to build a part council owned Static caravan/cabin site when the likelihood of more flooding is high and insurance does not cover flooding so borrowing is very risky. There will be more participation from static caravan owners during the school holidays when they are more likely to be on site.

22/05/2024 16:42

Please note that I have not ranked the Options as I believe the only fair and workable option, whilst maintaining the character of the site and the area, is Option 1, possibly extended to allow for higher fees to be charged in order to fund improvements to the site. Introducing a 20 year lease would be detrimental to, and discriminatory against, current caravan owners, many of whom are older and would not be able to commit to

such a long lease. Any option with an element of short term renting would completely change the nature of the site and be detrimental to the "quintessential charm" of the harbour area that the Council professes it wishes to retain. There has been talk of a minimum age of caravan, regardless of condition. This would cause unnecessary expense to, and again be discriminatory against, many of the existing caravan owners. It would also be completely at odds with any environmental and sustainability standards the Council has. Why scrap a caravan purely due to age, regardless of condition? With regard to the concept designs, more consultation on them should be carried out when a decision has been made on the future of the site. However, my initial thought is that it is unrealistic to allow only one car by each caravan when they have 2,3,4 bedrooms. In that case, the extra car parking suggested is woefully inadequate.

22/05/2024 15:48

We do not feel able to rank the four options in order of preference as we do not believe that there is sufficient detail in the consultation documents to enable us to do so. We would comment on the options as follows:

- Option 4 – we do not consider this option to be viable or appropriate
- Option 1 – this option would not be appropriate if it continues to result in insufficient investment and a failure to provide basic services to the site. We do not see why this option should result in a “long waiting list for a site” – our understanding is that there are currently some 30 vacant plots on the site (resulting in a substantial loss of income)
- On balance, therefore, options 1 and 4 should be discounted
- Options 2 and 3 – we do not feel that there is sufficient detail or information to enable us to give an informed response to these options. We have many questions and concerns, for example; how long would the term of the proposed lease be? what are the notice provisions? what are the proposals for caravan ‘replacement’ and could these be overly onerous? how does this more expensive model fit with the fact that the caravan site is in a designated flood zone (flood zone 3) such that caravan owners are unable to obtain flood insurance? We cannot see any reference to the risk of flooding in the proposals. We are anxious that the existing site users, many of whom have been on the site for generations, should not be priced out of the site. Whilst the annual charges may have to increase if additional services are provided to the site, we would not want to see an overly onerous financial burden placed upon them. The majority of the cost of installing the services and otherwise improving the site should surely come from the substantial income that the site generates annually (we understand the figure to be in the region of £300,000 to £330,000 from the caravan site alone). We note that the Harbour Vision document refers to the caravan and campsite as “a potential fiscal powerhouse for harbour operations” with “Fiscal strategies...leveraging the synergy with the Caravan and Campsite”. Should the income generated by the site not first be applied for the benefit of the site itself? We are concerned that there is no mention of environmental sustainability in the proposals.

There is so much that you can improve with your current thinking because you seem to be ignoring the most crucial elements, namely the people who are currently on the caravan site and who have shown love and commitment for generations. It looks like we will be forced out because of costs and especially the terms and conditions that you would impose. For example, on both economic and environmental grounds, we strongly disagree with disposing of any elderly but well maintained caravan. It is both environmentally wasteful and morally wrong. Nor can we agree to the suggestion that caravans can only be sourced through one designated company. This is an unacceptable commercial monopoly that takes away our choice and control in the purchase and adds a significant cost that we could not tolerate in these economically difficult times. In addition, as older owners we cannot contemplate more than a five year lease. And do remember that we are unable to get insurance for flood damage as the site is clearly on a flood plain which is predicted to get worse in the near future. We would really love to be able to remain on the site, and would upgrade our caravan if the site terms and conditions remained similar, with some upgrades of facilities and utilities. However the current uncertainties have prevented us from doing this. We believe that the caravan site could be a uniquely forward looking and environmentally sustainable site that Southwold and the ESC could be proud of. The undeveloped site offers you a rare opportunity to do something environmentally amazing, potentially award winning, and socially responsible for a longstanding and loyal community. With some creative thinking, this is your chance to set an inspirational precedent in planning. All you need to do is to have consideration for the people involved, for environmental sustainability, for tranquillity, for aesthetics, and for a biodiversity

net gain. By doing this you will be maintaining community and local stakeholder harmony. This could be a beacon site in the UK for sustainable holiday planning. Don't let Southwold and the caravan community down.

22/05/2024 14:48

Waveney and then ESC have for years taken an annual income of £300,000 from caravan owners, plus more than that from the campsite, and not even installed electricity for caravan owners. In addition, poor management has left empty pitches unfilled, losing the council approximately £90,000 a year income. I would like to see the site better managed in the future and profits reinvested in the harbour and surrounds.

22/05/2024 14:06

No

22/05/2024 08:42

Any sub letting by caravan owners or the council would completely change the feel of the site. I don't understand why it's necessary to change a caravan every 10 years, it's not good for the environment, more sustainable to keep them longer. Without any detailed costs/terms and conditions to us it's impossible to make an informed decision.

21/05/2024 22:12

With the high flood risk at the caravan site meaning that getting flood damage insurance is not a possibility, how are caravan owners expected to spend say £50k on a new van via the council when it could be washed out to sea the following winter. If the council decide to run say 40 caravans as a rental business alongside the leased plots. How could they justify the spend on caravans and infrastructure if they could be destroyed overnight. Surely not a good use of public money.

21/05/2024 22:01

Please don't destroy our community. Caravan sites were originally created for working-class people to afford holidays, Southwold is already a highly gentrified town, it is crucial that this does not also happen to the caravan site.

21/05/2024 21:36

I think caravan sites should pride themselves in being accessible to those who cannot afford expensive holidays, and should keep this integrity rather than appealing to those who can pay more.

21/05/2024 21:36

We believe that in the long term, the gain will be greater if plans are based on ecology and community and forward thinking environmental practices in planning design, building and construction. Who gains if the site ends up looking like so many other scorched earth caravan sites around the country? People will look back and say, 'what a lost opportunity', 'Why on earth were environmental considerations ignored, precisely when everybody knew how vital they were? The structural issues with the harbour wall are separate to the caravan site and there is little possibility of income from this site offsetting the development of this infrastructure project. Models of economic self sustainability and community ownership would encourage a shared vision and future.

21/05/2024 20:40

This section is headed revitalisation, but the proposals are actually complete redevelopment I have not ranked these options because it is not possible, because in the consultation meetings, ESC officials and councilor said that options 1 and 4 are not being considered. Option 4 meant no static caravans, only rentals. Options 2 and 3 include static caravans both rental and owned. Without details of the financial deal, it is impossible to choose any option. What I and other caravan owners want is a reasonable and affordable deal to enable us to stay on the Southwold caravan site. David Beavan stated in one meeting that he doesn't want anyone to leave,

however many current long standing caravan owners will be forced to leave if the annual fees are increased too much and they are forced to buy new caravans.

21/05/2024 19:19

The options cannot be viewed in isolation and so should not be consulted on. This is not good practice for community engagement

21/05/2024 18:30

Caravan site desperately requires the mains facilities, but should not be at expense of turning it into a purely money making project and loosing a valuable part of the Southwold community.

21/05/2024 16:58

The upgrading of the caravan site to meet model standards is, no doubt, the future. The costs, upheaval and uncertainty will have a considerable effect on the present caravan owners many of whom will leave and their community will be lost. New owners will come and enjoy the fruits of the upgrade which, in order to recreate that community, should be done in a responsible and environmentally sustainable way. A caring and sensitive management system will attract caravan owners and holidaymakers.

21/05/2024 16:31

Our caravan is our refuge, safe space, family retreat and we consider ourselves so fortunate to be the current custodians. PLEASE DO NOT RUIN IT

21/05/2024 15:56

To truly maintain the uniqueness of the area it is essential not to move to sub letting

21/05/2024 15:40

For a real discussion, the council needs to explain to us (and harbour businesses and users) what money is needed for what, then we can have a real discussion about different ways of getting there. The current options risk pricing many of us off the site, so that ESC loses even more money. The caravan site could be a forward looking, environmentally sustainable site that Southwold and the ECS could be proud of. Where caravans are not renewed for the sake of it, electricity is generated from solar power, caravans are not sited on concrete standing and planting is suitable for the many bird species that visit the site.

21/05/2024 13:12

All of the 4 illustrative layouts are over elaborate expensive and not well designed. For example the existing well established hard roadways are obliterated The illustrations are unrealistic and would not be achieved. So much in all of them is not Satisfactory. I am a retired member of the Royal Town Planning Institute BA(Hons Town and Country Planning) MA(Conservation Policy) with design experience.

21/05/2024 12:56

Why have options 1 and 2 even been included when we were told at the caravan owners meeting that these are essentially red herrings and not being considered? The site plans include lots of regimented rows of caravans with additional (concrete?) roads - I really think great care and consideration needs to be given to maintaining the uniqueness of the site and I would like to see the least amount of the site covered in concrete as possible. On another note - I worry this consultation is disingenuous. A worker on the site told a family member that the decisions were already made and this consultation was just being offered to keep people 'calm'. I also think some of the attitudes of ESC towards SCOA and members has been pretty disheartening to see. Caravan owners are a group of passionate people who just want to ensure the place they have loved and supported for decades, is not ruined by ill thought-out plans. The impression is that the council would prefer the caravan owners to go quietly. I have been coming to my caravan since I was 2 weeks old, spent all my childhood holidays here and many more as an adult. It is somewhere that is very important to me and think it could continue to be for many generations to come. If ESC take this opportunity to really think about the community and environmental aspects, the site can continue to economically provide for the harbour lands and be somewhere many future generations can enjoy.

21/05/2024 12:50

It is understood that in the long term, the financial gain will be greater if plans are based on ecology and community and forward thinking environmental practices in planning design, building and construction. We believe that in the long term, the financial gain will be greater if plans are based on ecology and community and forward thinking environmental practices in planning design, building and construction.

20/05/2024 23:12

Any scheme which increases short term receipts from the site needs to ensure that those receipts are ring fenced to invest in the site and/or the local town infrastructure. Otherwise, this is simply a new form of local taxation.

20/05/2024 14:37

1. The 'options' you offer, above, contain 2 very obvious 'untruths'. At Option One, there is NO mechanism to eject caravan owners from the site with 2-months notice, in the way that you suggest. Also, at Option 3, on the figures provided by the Campsite Office, at least 13 current caravan owners will be forced to leave if ESC are to hire out 30% of the site's caravans. This are warped options and the public are being asked to chose options which contain blatant errors. 2. One of the things strictly forbidden to current caravan owners (on pain of ejection from the site, with no refund) is the sub-letting of caravans. Yet, at Options 3 and 4, ESC propose to do that very thing themselves! Having short-term holiday-makers on the site will completely alter the quiet, family ambiance of the site leading to more noise, rowdiness and light pollution; this is why ESC do not allow it. 3. Consultees are offered the option of up to 20-year leases; yet nowhere do you make clear the cost of these, or the cost of getting out of one. 4. Nowhere is the age of caravans coming onto site, or the age at which they must leave mentioned. This is vital information for caravan owners. Of note, I understand the a letter has gone out to all those on the caravan plot waiting list, telling them that if they do come on site, their caravan must be 'less than one year old'. Despite ongoing discussions, this matter has clearly been pre-judged by ESC. 5. Compliance with 'Industry Standard' rules is mentioned; however, nowhere does it say what these are, so how can consultees be expected to accept or decline these options? 6. Finally, the Environmental Agency survey shows that much of the caravan and camp site will be regularly flooded by 2035. (Nothing to do with the harbour arms). Why are you seriously considering investing a huge amount of Council money in a site which has such a future? Caravan owners are unwilling upgrade as they cannot get flood insurance for their current caravans, never mind a 'less than one-year old' caravan.

20/05/2024 11:11

Whatever ESC decides the area will flood, we cannot escape climate change and coastal erosion. In the meantime you have caravan owners willing to pay an annual fee which will bring in a sizable income. I have attended most harbour lands committee meetings and although I do not understand the different ideas regarding the south trading arm and/or dredging I am aware that no one has come up with a cast iron solution and millions could be spent on something that doesn't work. I do not know the solution but ruining the caravan site is not the answer and many local people feel the same way. I am a regular visitor, I play tennis at the tennis club, I litter pick and I pet sit locally. Please remember you are a green/ lib dem council and use this opportunity to put your principals to great effect

19/05/2024 13:38

There is an opportunity here for ESC council to set an inspirational example of planning for future sustainability, to invest wisely in something which will increase income, is truly green, environmentally sound and socially responsible -something that could win awards and be looked back on in the future as an ambitious and visionary programme which put economic realism, climate change/flood plain considerations and genuine green principles first. I do not want ESC to waste this opportunity. I am a long standing caravan owner and I love Southwold, its harbour, wild beaches and green spaces. The current Southwold caravan site is a long standing community, some caravanners have been here for 4 or even 5 generations. ESC has opened a short consultation which has not been widely publicised. There is little detail in the proposals, little time for

real consultation, and some very worrying suggestions - worrying both to caravan owners and to Southwold residents, business people, visitors and all who love this place. I urge you to consider the issues which I have listed below:

1. What worries me in these proposals:
  - I am very worried about the proposal for a large development of the harbour - to include markets, artisan shops etc in an area which is currently a working harbour and boatyard
  - I am very worried about the proposal for installation of a large fleet of weekly rental caravans onto the caravan site, which to date has been a quiet static site.
  - I am very worried about the stated aim in the ESC paper 'Southwold Harbour Vision 2035' is for the Caravan site to be 'a premier coastal holiday destination' by 2035 and through this, for the caravan site to provide funds for harbour development. My vision for the site and harbour as a prime holiday destination is very different - it is economically sounder and based on progressive, creative holiday ideas for environmental sustainability.
2. What are the threats?
  - Impact: The proposals above will hugely increase footfall and traffic in an area within AONB and Suffolk Coastal, with narrow roads, sand dunes and peaceful beaches along a wild and beautiful coastline full of wildlife. Footfall and car traffic will increase hugely through a working harbour and boatyard. Estimate from caravan rental fleet alone, an additional 300 to 1000 individuals per week (depending on number of rental caravans). With this increase will come more air, noise and light pollution in an area of outstanding natural beauty with narrow roads and limited car parking
  - Flood risk: the site is on a flood plain. It is still unclear how the current plans are taking this into consideration. There is an urgent need for as little concrete and hard standing as possible to maintain drainage. But also, if everyone on site is made to buy an expensive new caravan and much of the area is taken over for caravans to be let out by the week, how will any of this be insured for flooding?
  - Competition with existing holiday rentals in Southwold and Walberswick: Peak demand for accommodation is in summer school holidays, but the rest of the year there is plenty of accommodation available to rent in the local area. Would the huge ESC investment in a fleet of rental caravans, be a viable use of public money, unless the weekly price seriously undercut the price of a local cottage or flat?
  - Effect of weekly rental caravans. Weekly renters will not have the same respect for the area as annual static owners.
  - Risks to environment: We are hearing from the council that the caravan site must be a money maker for the Harbour, should pack in as many units as possible, increase the fees enormously, and require caravan owners to replace their caravans every 10 years (sending perfectly viable caravans to landfill) in order to earn more money by making us buy caravans from the council at a hugely inflated price. And in the redevelopment process, destroying the shingle bank (a flood plain) and the local flora and fauna, some of which is rare.
  - The AONB is not mentioned in the plans
3. What is to be gained - green financial opportunities to seize: The undeveloped Southwold caravan site offers a rare opportunity to do something economically beneficial, environmentally splendid, potentially award winning, and socially responsible. With some creative and visionary thinking, this is a chance to set an inspirational precedent in planning - for environmental sustainability, for tranquillity, aesthetics. For biodiversity net gain and for maintaining social community.. I would like to see a plan which centres on community and the ecology of the site. This could be a beacon site for the Green agenda in holiday planning in UK. The tide is turning across the country and with it the financial gain for councils. ESC will gain far more with something matching the national zeitgeist. People now realise that we cannot afford not to put climate and biodiversity priorities first. Wellbeing and mental health concerns coincide with the climate and ecological crisis. People need nature and a feel of the wild, when they are on holiday, just as urgently as nature itself needs to be preserved.
4. Environmental priorities and necessary first steps: Both the construction process and final product will need to make environmental sustainability the first priority. A thorough biodiversity survey combined with planning to increase this, must be the basis of the plan. Sustainable power sources, green roofs, composting, recycling and low impact waste disposal needs to be built into the plan as well as the need to retain and increase wilder areas on the site, tree cover, and quiet, undisturbed areas for plant and animal species to flourish. The small but much enjoyed area thoughtfully set aside currently by a gardener on the site, for caravan owners to grow and pick their own herbs and vegetables could be expanded. Concrete, plastic and plastic-based products would be kept to a minimum. The long term plan for retaining or replacing the caravans themselves would have to put environmental concerns as well as the concerns of lower-income families first.
5. The worrying alternative - putting short-term financial considerations first: We know that some of the current thinking only sees the site as a cash provider for the rest of the harbour. The land was bequeathed for people to enjoy peaceful time away from the city without vast expense. It was not bequeathed to provide an income for the

harbour. We believe that in the long term, the financial gain will be greater if plans are based on ecology and the community. Who gains if the site ends up looking like so many other scorched earth caravan sites around the country? People will look back and say, 'what a lost opportunity', 'Why on earth were environmental considerations ignored, precisely when everybody knew how vital they were?'

19/05/2024 11:33

The caravan owners make a considerable monetary investment (£300,000 per annum) and are not seeing the fees invested back into the caravan site or their views considered. The site has been allowed to deteriorate over a number of years and Options 3 and 4 are disdainful. Why have the caravan owners not been included as stakeholders given the "options" affect them so greatly? As a group, the caravan owners have invested large sums of money over a long period via fees. In addition, they are active members of the Southwold community and spend money with local businesses and the local community each year on an ongoing basis. A weekly rental model would not only change the caravan site itself, but would change the town and put stress on the local infrastructure. The eviction of caravan owners and the destruction of such a long established community would be detrimental to the town. Canvassing the views of non-caravan owners who do not have a vested interest in the site ignores the response from the Southwold Caravan Owners Association to the Rural Solutions report. Seeing the caravan site developed as an area of natural beauty, with a focus on sustainability, as opposed to turning it into a heavily commercial cookie cutter caravan site is a valuable opportunity for the council, caravan owners and the local community. We would welcome additional options to be discussed with a view to achieving harmonious progress while maintaining the unique beauty of the location.

18/05/2024 20:14

Any new model must have a 'test the market' trial. I would agree to 6 lodges being established for trial to explore impact on staff, cost of extending utilities, cost on 24hour availability of oncall staff for emergencies, cost of marketing and effectiveness of marketing etc. These will erode profit margin and need more staff for admin, cleaning, bookings etc Evaluate for 2 years. Lodges need to be above flood water line. Why are Southwold and Warbleswick towns seen as source of additional funding - street and carpark charges (exemptions for local residents - not for 2nd home owners)

16/05/2024 16:29

The caravan site needs to be environmentally friendly and sustainable. Replacing caravans at a set number of years is definitely not environmental, but more capitalistic. The vans should be allowed to remain as long as they meet health and safety regulations. There is no level of useful detail for caravan owners (site layout, costs, T&Cs), so a preference in options is impossible to make in an informed way. A huge amount of revenue has been raised over the years by the caravan site fees (and a great deal lost due to bad management - empty sites etc) without any reinvestment in the site. It now feels like the caravan owners are being made to pay that price. Caravan sites are currently suffering decreased short term lets which would make an investment in council owned caravans for such a purpose a risky strategy. Non-caravan owners would have very little insight into what these options mean for the caravan community - how will their relatively uninformed responses be tempered when analysing the survey results?? The caravan owners should have clear input as detailed plans are produced - site layout, lease lengths, etc.

16/05/2024 14:31

OPTIONS 3 AND 4 WOULD NOT BE VIABLE AS THE SITE NEVER FULL AND LETTING OUT UNITS OWNED BY ESC WOULD NOT GENERATE ENOUGH INCOME FOR THE HARBOUR LANDS. IN MY OPINION NO FINANCE HOUSE IS GOING TO LEND THE MONEY TO ESC SO THEY CAN PURCHASE (40 UNITS IN OPTION 3 OR 140 IN OPTION 4) THAT CANNOT BE FULLY INSURED DUE TO THE FACT THAT THE SITE IS ON A FLOOD PLAIN.

14/05/2024 22:49

I think that ESC may be missing a trick - there may be many more sustainable ways forward for the harbour that take the flood risk into consideration.

14/05/2024 20:49

no

14/05/2024 17:38

Some of the consultation documentation negatively references caravans not always being fully occupied. It should be remembered that fees have been paid - so no loss of revenue and less pressure on the facilities and services on site. Please consider supporting the transfer to renewable sources of energy on site, such as solar and wind. Many owners have gone to some significant expense already to do this. Please consider other options to increase the green/wild/biodiversity of the site such as leaving green patches to aid wildlife and cut emissions (many council's are doing this already). Consider an environmental impact assessment where species present on site are identified and counted. If, at least some transfer of this kind is made the Council can achieve its obligatory 10% biodiversity net gain. There is a real opportunity in the site to make it a beacon of innovative environmental thinking and action. A small field in a vulnerable position next to the North Sea that people are trying to safeguard in the best possible way.

14/05/2024 15:34

There needs to be much more detail, but after fuller consultation.

14/05/2024 12:33

Southwold Town Council recognises the cost and difficulties of maintaining the harbour and understand the need for funding to keep the harbour operational. Changes to the existing model on the caravan site to help achieve this funding is understood and desirable. The low key nature of the current site in some way should be retained with facilities & amenities only for local support not high level holiday entertainment plus style activity. This implies that the options proposed specifically 2 & 3 need to find a happy medium to achieve this objective and therefore needs further work to arrive at this position. We are not in support of option 4 but recognise option 1 is no longer supportable. Any medium to long term changes need to take cognisance of the existing caravan site licence holders and not be taken as an opportunity to totally refresh those already on the site. We also believe existing caravan licence holders retain their status quo if they choose, albeit within a mix of leaseholders. Irrespective of the outcome the site sewerage issues need to be resolved. Finally insurance unavailability due to flood risk needs a solution.

14/05/2024 11:55

Options 3 and 4 are altogether unsuitable.

13/05/2024 10:00

It's a shame you overlook the fact that the reason the caravan site has been successful in generating income for so long and with so many owners having been there for many generations is because it's loved for what it is now and how it operates now. So many of the long term families will not want to stay if all these changes happen and it's a really sad thing that you are doing. Simply allowing current owners to rent out their vans would mean the site would be fully occupied full time. That's one thing you say you want but have failed to allow. No doubt that would have meant the site could have generated more income for many years and because you've denied that for so long you've missed out on massive income. No owners I have spoken to want your planned changes. You will lose the current owners in droves. Those who have loved and supported for generations for decades, and a new type of owner will emerge changing the whole dynamic of the place. Those who love it for what it is and always had been will leave. You will be responsible for that and for the new style of site and owner you attract. May as well go to any other caravan anywhere as the uniqueness and quintessentially southwold appeal will be gone forever

12/05/2024 08:09

Is the section of the campsite which belongs to the Harbour Lands being considered for development as an area for static rentable caravans? The design of the caravan site should include areas of recreation, not a playground, for children to play. Without this ball games will be played in the road. Maximise profits by having an onsite coffee/snack shack run by the Harbour Lands/ Campsite. Have pop up visiting food outlets regularly on the site during peak periods who pay a fee to the Harbour lands/campsite. Use the third field for a monthly car boot sale, fees to the Harbour lands and campsite. Run events quiz's, barn dances etc to raise funds, encouraging the campsite visitors and harbour users to get to know each other, creating a joint community.

10/05/2024 17:42

If there is to be an age limit on caravans allow leeway with some sort of "mot" for older vans. Do not make purchasers have to buy vans through ESC. This would fall foul of competition rules in any event.

07/05/2024 11:18

I think this is for the caravan owners' comments to have priority.

05/05/2024 17:43

The plans appear to require the removal of Some like it But and no obvious replacement. This will leave the Touring Camp site with inadequate facilities notwithstanding an increase in use by moribund that might have their own facilities on board

03/05/2024 14:01

Has flood / climate emergency/ changing sea levels/ Sizewell development been considered in plans/ visions?

03/05/2024 11:20

The rest of the site need a really good tidy up as its disgraceful as it currently is with old unused caravans ,rusty old bikes and neglected surroundings

30/04/2024 23:11

For many years the caravan site and harbour have been poorly managed and a great deal of money earned has gone elsewhere. Now we are being viewed as a resource to be mined. An opportunity is being missed to create, with visionary thinking, a unique environmentally sustainable site. More and more people now want to connect with nature....not Pontins!

28/04/2024 18:15

Over the years, Waveney and subsequently East Suffolk Council have derived significant revenue, in recent times this is totalling over £300,000 annually from caravan owners and additional proceeds from the campsite yet have failed to provide electricity for all permanent pitched caravan owners. Moreover, it appears inadequate management has resulted in unoccupied pitches, translating to an approximate annual income loss of £90,000 for the council. Consequently, it is concerning to note that caravan owners are omitted from the list of stakeholders to engage, while the strategy includes "leveraging funding from caravan and campsite redevelopment." The viability of investing in caravan weekly rentals is now in question given the decline of 'staycation' economics post-Covid, with holiday and caravan rentals decreasing nationwide. Is this an opportune moment for ESC to allocate public funds that might not yield a satisfactory return, especially considering the inability to insure against flood risk and the likelihood of flooding by 2030 as per government projections? Seeking opinions on these matters from non-caravan owners undermines the perspectives of caravan owners and disregards the response from the Southwold Caravan Owners Association (SCOA) to the Rural Solutions report from two years ago. The caravan site represents a longstanding community with deep ties to Southwold spanning four or even five generations. Caravan owners are deeply invested in Southwold and its local area and seek to arrive at a viable solution through comprehensive consultation with all 'stakeholders'. The discontent arising from this survey has spurred constructive discussions among caravan owners and others, exploring costs and possibilities. There is a promising opportunity for well-organised and substantive discussions among stakeholders to arrive at a collaborative solution. However, this can only succeed if the council abandons its current approach and embraces a more collaborative, informed, and inclusive stakeholder engagement process. ESC is overlooking a significant opportunity. The undeveloped Southwold caravan site presents a rare chance to undertake an environmentally splendid, potentially award-winning, and socially responsible project for a longstanding community. Through innovative and visionary thinking, we can establish an inspirational precedent in planning—emphasising environmental sustainability, tranquillity, aesthetics, biodiversity, and the preservation of social and local stakeholder harmony. This site could become a beacon of sustainable holiday planning in the UK. The tide is turning nationally, with increasing recognition that prioritising climate and biodiversity is imperative. Wellbeing and mental health concerns align with the climate and ecological crisis, emphasising the urgent need for nature experiences during holidays. We firmly believe that long-term financial gains will be maximised by basing plans on ecological principles, community involvement, high level stakeholder engagement, and forward-thinking environmental practices in planning, design, and construction. Who benefits if the site ends up resembling countless other barren caravan grounds across the country? What if this part of Southwold becomes congested and loses its tranquil, rural character? Future reflections might lament missed opportunities and question why environmental considerations were sidelined when their importance was widely acknowledged. For caravan owners facing the prospect of losing generations of experience with the Southwold caravan site, these discussions are profoundly challenging. Conversations with harbour stakeholders suggest a reluctance for radical upgrades akin to those in Lowestoft or Ipswich, which do not

align with Southwold's quiet and rural image. Therefore, we are confident that if ESC engages with the stakeholder and the caravan owner community, through genuine and informed discussions, a collaborative compromise can be achieved. Work with us ESC. ESC, this is your opportunity to do the right thing and work with the local community, including the caravan owner's community, to create a mutually agreeable and sustainable vision, with an environmentally friendly legacy, to be delivered for and enjoyed by future generations of the caravan site and the local community of Southwold, and the nearby community at Walberswick.

28/04/2024 18:06

The caravan site has been popular for many years with little amenities for caravan owners. Keep it simple. If there is a waiting list why are there so many vacant plots?

25/04/2024 17:54

AS Above and we would need far better detail to make a considered opinion

25/04/2024 17:05

There is a need to allow sites to be handed down to children. If the historical perspective is what is needed, the caravans have been occupied by families for generations.

25/04/2024 16:38

I have not answered this question as it falls outside of Suffolk Wildlife Trust's charitable remit.

25/04/2024 11:30

Further consultation and information required to make a meaningful way forward

25/04/2024 07:41

The site currently does look pretty tatty and isn't a good advertisement for the town

24/04/2024 18:27

What is the risk of flooding and how could this impact on owners over a 20 year horizon? The current site is charming with each caravan being unique, need to be mindful of making significant changes and pricing people out who have waited years for a place. Would also be good to be able to fish in the harbour again!!

23/04/2024 22:53

In view of the perception that ESC intends to use the caravan site as a cash cow, with revenue superceding all other concerns, I recognise that the above vision may be regarded as a pipedream - a shame because ESC will be missing a trick. In the absence of more creative, forward-looking solution, I believe a compromise solution (possibly based on a model in which a limited number of caravans are used as holiday lets to generate revenue and reasonable leasehold terms, with minimal impact upgrading for existing owners) could be achieved if negotiations were based on full, open and honest disclosure of costings, financial forecasts etc. The caravan owners are currently contributing around £300k annually to ESC and have received very little in terms of facilities or investment on the site in return. I suspect that any major commercialisation of the site, change in the character of the place, or unreasonable lease terms will result in the current loyal and devoted caravan community voting with their feet, and ESC struggling to replace them due to flood risk and decreasing demand, so it will all be in vain. Demand for static caravans is already in decline, as is demand for staycations (evidence for this can be provided if required), and I think ESC risk destroying something valuable and not be making the big bucks they envisage.

23/04/2024 16:04

whatever happens, the site must be updated with water & electricity for all plots. This has been promised for years now and until done will prevent most owners from committing to newer caravans

23/04/2024 10:42

No

22/04/2024 09:59

Due to the inability to obtain flood insurance for a caravan on this site, how does the council propose to provide insurance or unwrite the insurance provider in the event of flood damage.

21/04/2024 09:37

Please re send the options

18/04/2024 21:15

Some consideration should be made to appreciate those who have supported and used the caravan site for many previous years, these owners should be given priority and first refusal on pitches and offered favourable terms.

18/04/2024 17:44

The Caravan Site itself falls well below current standards. The pitches are very small, the ground is waterlogged and the toilet/shower facilities are in desperate need of updating.

17/04/2024 08:24

It appears as though Money is the driving factor - yes the area does need investment and updating, at the cost of who or what? Totally changing the site could have a detrimental effect on the area and the Town itself, it has become very expensive over the years and some families can only afford to holiday on the site, especially for the families who have had caravans on this site since the fifties.

15/04/2024 14:29

Existing caravan owners ( like me) must accept that if facilities are to be upgraded then they must contribute to the cost - which could be partly defrayed by allowing a small amount of short term renting out

13/04/2024 13:24

Would like to be able to read the options.

12/04/2024 14:48

I'm not a caravan holder so can't comment

12/04/2024 11:25

What are the options??

11/04/2024 19:08

The site is constrained by its size. It is not large enough to become a major source of revenue. Consider long-term rental to a private operator, with infrastructure and improvement covenants.

11/04/2024 15:47

The options for this are in the document titles as background information, which many people will not read as its not clear it has this content in it, and the irons above are not described . Do watch out if you get lots of 1-2-3-4 responses as that may just mean that people skipped this page

11/04/2024 15:39

You state the caravans are not occupied that often again this is due to the lack of investment and not having electricity in the caravans. There are more camper vans on the camping field during the colder months as they have electricity. Again Southwold catering businesses are working at maximum capacity during the summer months and they are unable to recruit staff with no housing in the town. There is a much bigger picture here to look at to help the town through the winter months. The town does not need more footfall in the summer, there are days coach trips arriving in the town which fill the pubs.

10/04/2024 19:57

No

10/04/2024 18:03

I would rate the option if I knew what they were ???

10/04/2024 16:06

As a caravan owner on the site I am very worried that I will have to leave if one of options 2-4 are implemented. I really want to stay and was told when i moved on to the site that services were to be installed eventually and obviously rent would go up, which is fine, but I would be able to stay and there would be some rearrangement if caravans. I can't see this option anywhere. I can't pick any other option than 1 because there is not enough information on the other three. We are paying rent of approximately £3000 each per year. This is more than a lot of households pay in council tax. I appreciate that the caravan site is a business but feel that the owners are not being treated fairly considering our financial contribution to Southwold.

10/04/2024 11:21

Unable to read options

10/04/2024 07:29

Very poor survey

09/04/2024 18:17

Providing the caravan site does not have entertainment and generate the wrong type of tourist I am happy for improvement of the site

08/04/2024 15:00

What are the options

08/04/2024 12:19

For option 1, you refer to long waiting list and caravans not always fully occupied. Does it matter how much people use their caravan if they are paying their fees? I presume not. Also, there have many several empty spots for a considerable number of years, this is down to management and not an issue for caravan owners who do not stay every weekend. Option 4 I do not support in the slightest, We have made our caravan home from home, spent many weekends here over the last few years and feel we are being unfairly treated.

08/04/2024 10:49