

# Consultation Log

## South Lowestoft/Kirkley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan

### First round of Public Consultation 15/07/2021 – 26/08/2021

A draft version of the South Lowestoft/Kirkley Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan was drafted and taken to public consultation from 15<sup>th</sup> July 2021 until 26<sup>th</sup> August 2021.

A letter was sent to the following:

- Every address within the existing Conservation Area boundary
- Every address which is proposed for inclusion within the extension to the Conservation Area
- Every address proposed for removal from the Conservation Area boundary

The letters advised of the consultation process, dates for face to face engagement events, how living in a conservation area affects property owners, how to comment on the proposals and get in touch. The letters also included a summary of the key proposed changes to the Conservation Area boundary and included a map of the existing and proposed Conservation Area.

Below is a summary of responses to the Public Consultation 15/07/2021 - 26/08/2021:

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>ESC response</b>
Private individual 1	Raised concerns about the condition of the bridge proposed for inclusion in CA boundary as pavement is very narrow and unsuitable for mobility vehicles, and overgrown with ivy and vegetation. (Telephone call)	Will raise issues with Suffolk County Council as responsible highway authority.
Private individual 2	Queries relating to the purpose of the CAAMP and public consultation. Specific query concerning Jubilee Chalets planning application.	Responded to individual explaining objectives of appraisal and purpose of consultation. Planning Officer responded to query concerning Jubilee Chalets.
Private individual 3	Welcomed extension to include full extent of Lowestoft train station. Other comments relating to High Street and large retail units in London Road North outside of boundary.	Referred individual to Town Centre Masterplan and North Lowestoft CAAMP.

Private individual 4	Identification of drafting error which incorrectly referred to St Peter and St John's Church as St Paul and St John.	This reference was in the press release and has been amended. All references within the appraisal are correct.
Private individual 5	Clarifications around boundary concerning Toyota garage and McDonald's.	The Toyota garage is proposed for removal from the boundary, whereas the Mill Road McDonald's is not within the existing or proposed boundary.
Private individual 6	Agreement that Toyota site should be omitted and suggested alternative sites and redevelopment of land.	Noted.
Private individual 7	Does not support inclusion of London Road Baptist Church and restraints inclusion within CA would have on future of the church	London Road Baptist Church is proposed for inclusion due to its architectural interest. Inclusion within the boundary would protect the significance of the building but would not impact how the church interacts with the community.
Private individual 8	Notes removal of 'Local List' terminology and exclusion of 408 London Road South from local list.	408-410 will be added to the positive contributor list in Appendix 1.
Private individual 9	Agree with proposed additions to boundary but also recommended including signal box on Denmark Road and new CEFAS buildings. Agreed with proposed removal of Toyota Garage but also recommended removal of KFC and McDonalds drive-thru sites.	Signal box is a heritage asset but to redraw the boundary to include it would be very convoluted, although does make a contribution to the setting of the CA. The modern CEFAS block is of high quality design but is considered to be too modern to be added to the boundary. McDonald's is not proposed for inclusion, however KFC is proposed to remain in the CA as it is within the core of the boundary and would result in a contrived 'donut' of exclusion.
Private individual 10	Notes typo with regard to development of London Road South	Noted, appraisal will be amended.

	and clarifications with regard to Windsor House and 21 Cliff Road.	
Private individual 11	Welcome amendments to boundary. Comments relating to sash windows and timber/UPVC. Concerns over loss of trees along London Road South and environmental benefits of tree planting.	Noted, response provided to individual.
Private individual 12	24 Windsor Road should be included in character area description, as retains the most historic features of any property in the street (verbal comments).	Noted, appraisal will be amended.
Private Individual 13	Information on George Glover, a relatively unknown architect who lived and worked in Lowestoft from 1850 to 1886. His Lowestoft buildings include the listed 70-71 High Street, the Coffee Pot Tavern on the north side of Mutford Bridge (now the Oulton Broad Branch Library), and St Marks Church, Oulton Broad. He also designed Apsley House and Blenheim House on Victoria Road, which together became the [unknown name]. They have since been demolished and replaced by Sir Morton Peto House.	Noted, and appraisal will be updated with this information
UK Power Networks	<p>'Having reviewed the electricity network in the area of each of the sites Listed:</p> <p>Lowestoft Station  Claremont Pier and Beach  Former Rail Bridge at Mill Rd  The Toyota dealership, London Rd  South Lowestoft Methodist Church, London Rd  London Rd Baptist Church.</p> <p>UKPN find that each of these sites are fed by an underground main and service cable. UKPN have no comments to make on the inclusion or exclusion of any of the listed sites.</p> <p>Should there be a requirement for alteration to the electricity supply of</p>	Noted.

	the listed sites then applications can be made via UKPN's website'.	
Natural England	Natural England has no comments to make on the Article 4 Direction - Changes to South Lowestoft & Kirkley Conservation Area Consultation.	Noted.
Councillor Rivett	Does not agree that the Toyota site warrants exclusion over other sites in the conservation area boundary. Methodist Church should not be included over CEFAS campus.	Response provided to Cllr Rivett to explain methodology in decisions to amend the boundary.
Players Theatre	Welcome inclusion within the South Lowestoft and Kirkley Conservation Area boundary. Provided information relating to the history and future plans for the building.	Noted.
Suffolk County Council (Archaeology)	<p>Welcomes updates to appraisal with recommendations for amendments:</p> <p>Page 16 – Happisburgh now has the accolade of having the oldest human remains</p> <p>Page 110 NPPF paragraph 189 of now 194</p> <p>Page 110 – please add 'SCCAS suggests that applicants for planning permission get in touch for free pre-application advice about archaeology on application sites. We also recommend viewing the Suffolk Heritage Explorer for the first step in understanding what archaeology may be present</p> <p><a href="https://heritage.suffolk.gov.uk/">https://heritage.suffolk.gov.uk/</a></p>	Amendments will be made to reflect comments
Historic England	<p>Welcome updates to appraisal and proposed extensions with recommendations for amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interactive map to include layer identifying opportunity sites that detract from character of area</li> <li>- Although interesting, 'origin and history' section is too long and would benefit from being refined</li> <li>- Concern over reference to demolition on page 38</li> <li>- Page 40 add reference to ESC's Building at Risk register</li> </ul>	Amendments will be reflected in final document

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Page 106 reference to repointing should specify use of traditional lime mortars</li> <li>- Reference to shopfronts could include Historic England’s North Lowestoft HAZ shopfront research</li> <li>- General rephrasing where making recommendations to East Suffolk Council</li> <li>- Refer to Historic England’s Enforcement Guidance <i>Stopping the Rot</i> in management section</li> <li>- Add images to ‘Positive Unlisted Building’ table in appendices</li> </ul>	
Councillor Gooch	<p>Welcomes focus on Kirkley and updating of the appraisal and supports the proposed inclusions. Noted concern over SCC LBC Divisions which will subdivide Kirkley and Pakefield.</p>	Noted.
Lowestoft Town Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members questioned the title of the Conservation Area given that buildings such as the Old Post Office and Railway Station are included in the area but are not located in South Lowestoft.</li> <li>2. The Toyota Dealership – the proposed wording, below as extracted from the consultation, appears to be quite judgemental and negative given that it is a business providing jobs and revenue to the local economy.  <b><i>Exclude the Toyota dealership:</i></b>  <i>This building makes a negative contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Its massing, materials and expanse of glazing on the ground floor level are not in keeping with the area, and the introduction of parked cars, large signage and flags to the front of the building create a cluttered appearance. These elements make a negative contribution to the street scape</i></li> </ol>	

	<p><i>and the building lacks special interest, and it is therefore proposed that the boundary excludes this modern building.</i></p> <p>The Town Council would suggest that wording such as ‘not to include as has no historic value’ be used instead.</p> <p>3. The Town Council welcomes the inclusion of the Claremont Pier into the Conservation Area and encourage an emphasis on respecting the individuality of the assets in the large and diverse area that makes up the Conservation Area.</p> <p>4. That due consideration is given to all public comments submitted as through these local people have expressed what they value as heritage assets within their town.</p>	
--	--	--

The following comments on the draft appraisal were provided by East Suffolk Building Preservation Trust, although were received on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 following the end of the official consultation period:

*Thank you for permitting us to make late representations, in our capacity as HAZ Partners who also have a great interest in ensuring the preservation of the built environment in Lowestoft and East Suffolk more widely.*

*Most of our Trustees have reviewed and considered the draft Appraisal and the comments below represent a consolidated response from the ESBPT Trustees.*

- *Whilst noting the different approach adopted by the consultants to that used for the North Lowestoft Conservation Appraisal, we regard the thorough description of each asset coupled with illustrations of each structure identified as contributing positively, as helpful for the use of the Appraisal as a planning document*
- *The proposed additions to the Conservation Area we regard as appropriate, including the Beach*
- *We have very fundamental concerns about the lack of reference to both the Historic England and East Suffolk Council Buildings at Risk Registers and more significantly the lack of any assessment of Buildings at Risk for inclusion within the Registers. We regard the declaration that ‘There is currently no Heritage at Risk identified within the South Lowestoft and Kirkley Conservation Area’ as both misleading and not true. In our opinion the Grade II Listed Port House should probably be on the Historic England Buildings at Risk Register and the regular references throughout the document of poor building maintenance and repair coupled with our local knowledge, strongly suggests to us that a walk through the Conservation Area would certainly identify properties for inclusion*

*upon a Building at Risk Register, most probably the East Suffolk Council BAR Register. These significant omissions from the Appraisal are likely to be detrimental to the conservation of the built heritage of the Conservation Area and make it more difficult for us as a Building Preservation Trust to provide our assistance, where required, to clearly identify candidate buildings when it becomes necessary for the service of Repair Notices and if necessary, the ultimate sanction of Compulsory Purchase.*

- *As a minor point, the references within the Appraisal to the NPPF need to take account of the recent 2021 revision.*

*Because of our involvement and interest in the HAZ, Conservation Area and more widely, we would be pleased to provide further comments and observations, if deemed appropriate.*

These comments are noted, and the appraisal has been updated to include an expanded section on 'at risk/poor condition' sites.

## **Face to Face Consultation Events**

Two face to face drop-in events were held during the 6 week consultation event over the Summer of 2021. These were attended by 2 consultants from Place Services who drafted the appraisal, and Rebecca Styles, HSHAZ Project Officer for East Suffolk Council.

### **Parcels Office, Denmark Street, Lowestoft 12:30-15:30**

12 people attended the drop in event and covered the following topics:

- Enforcement complaint – painting of exterior of Grade II listed Wellington Esplanade
- 408 London Road South – previously included on Local List in 2007 CAAMP, request to be included as a positive unlisted building in this appraisal.
- Query regarding alterations to side elevations and replacement guttering and effect of Article 4 Direction
- General queries over the status of the redevelopment of East Point Pavilion
- General planning enquiries regarding properties on Denmark Road
- Query why KFC on London Road South is not proposed for removal from the conservation area boundary
- Query why Claremont Pier is proposed for inclusion given recent alterations, particularly relating to signage
- Complaint about Claremont Pier laser show
- Climate change concerns relating to single glazed windows
- Concern about the tired appearance and cleanliness of the area, particularly pavements and public areas.
- Recommendation for signal box and stables to be included in boundary

A signed statement was also handed in at the drop in session at the Parcels Office, relating to climate change concerns, this is at Appendix 1 of this document.

### **The Kirkley Centre, London Road South, Lowestoft 17:00-20:00**

7 people attended the drop in event and covered the following topics:

- Query over removal of trees at Union Place without permission
- Query regarding removal of the merit in removing the Toyota Garage
- Concern over design of the new beach huts and untraditional design
- Complaint concerning lack of enforcement with regard to replacement windows installed without planning permission
- Comment that more should be done to market the area
- Concern over condition of existing assets along the seafront and tired appearance of the area
- Complaint about the time taken to repair the vandalised shelter on the upper promenade
- Suggestion that area could be improved with tree planting along London Road South

### **Second Public Consultation 22/10/2021 – 12/11/2021**

Following the first round of public consultation, several comments were received which recommended the Council consider a further extension of the Conservation Area boundary around the train station to also include the signal box and stables on Denmark Road.

As such, a second round of public consultation was initiated in this respect, from 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2021 until 12<sup>th</sup> November 2021. A notice of consultation was published in the local paper on 22<sup>nd</sup> October alerting the local community of the consultation, and the landowner who would be affected by the proposed boundary inclusion (Network Rail) were written to directly to notify them of the proposed extension.

No comments were received during this second round of consultation.

**Appendix 1: Signed statement handed in at drop in event held at the Parcels Office**

Please help lift building restrictions that prevent environmentally friendly changes being made to buildings on Lowestoft seafront.

Let's fight the red tape!                      I have no commercial interest

Why am I ? (and all my Neighbours) freezing our asses off in single glazing when the East wind blows?

Why are we protecting buildings built by people who started climate change? Why would we still want to use Victorian technology?

How Lowestoft seafront looks matters.

BUT

We shouldn't protect our history at the expense of our future.