



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 6th July 2016 at TOWER HALL Committee Room at 7.30pm

CHAIRMAN:	P Richings Esq.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:	Miss A Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mr P Richings, Mr J Withey, Mr J Wright
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Members of the public = 0
APOLOGIES:	Mrs B Richardson-Todd (another meeting), Mr M Sones (working), Mr B Ward (prior engagement), Mr R Whiting (Tuddenham PC Mtg), Asst Clerk - Mrs J Potter
ABSENT (no apologies):	None
CLERK:	Mr M R Bentley

1. APOLOGIES, APPROVAL OF ABSENCE, PROTOCOL & CONDUCT REMINDERS

The Chairman read out a statement on the Code of Conduct, protocol for debate and statutory rights to film, record, photograph or otherwise report on the proceedings of the meeting.

Apologies were noted as detailed above. Mr Richings proposed acceptance of reasons for councillor absence, seconded by Mr Withey with all in favour.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15th June 2016

Miss Cracknell proposed acceptance of the Minutes, seconded by Mr Withey, with ALL in favour. The Minutes were duly signed by the Chairman as a correct record with no alterations and no matters arising.

3. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST

Mr Newton declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest (LNPI) as a member of Suffolk Coastal District Council and also stated that he may be asked to reconsider any matter from this meeting at District Council and at any relevant Committee/Sub Committee and in so doing, shall take into account all relevant evidence and representations made at the District level before coming to a decision..

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

a. To identify public participation with respect to items on this agenda

There were no members of the public present

b. Public forum – Members of Public/Parish Councillors may speak on any matter

Miss Cracknell reported that the house on the corner of Ickworth Crescent leading to Mannington Close appeared to have erected a fence and attached it to the street name-plate. Mr Wright said he would have a look and report back.

Mr Wright reported that Anglian Water had been carrying out sewer modification work in the PC owned grassed area between Yew Tree Grove and Beech Road. They had removed one of the trees in order to get access. SCC had apparently said they did not know who owned the site so AW had been unable to approach the owners. This raised the question as to whether the PC should have signage on the site stating who owns and maintains the area. Agreed that this matter should be placed on the next PA&S agenda.

5. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/2132/FUL	Hill Farm House, Lamberts Lane	IP5 1DR	<p>1) To extend existing cartlodge to the left hand side as you face it to add enclosed storage area. We would use similar materials to keep the look of the extension the same as existing cartlodge. We have enclosed plans for the extension.</p> <p>2) To install electronic wooden gate at entrance to our driveway. We have a very well used public footpath past end of our driveway and would like to add these gates as security to our home.</p>
<p>Mr Richings and the Clerk gave a situation report following their examination of the proposal documentation. Mr Wright proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Withey. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p>Response: This PC accepts the extension of the cart lodge providing the use is ancillary to the existing dwelling house. However, the proposed solid wooded gates are out of keeping with the grade II listed building and the rural scene – A five bar wooden gate or metal railing gate would have been more appropriate to ensure the listed building is still visible to the public. We consider the open vista should be retained and on balance recommend REFUSAL of this application for the above reasons.</p>			
DC/16/2133/LBC	Hill Farm House, Lamberts Lane	IP5 1DR	Same description as above but application is for listed building consent.
<p>Mr Richings and the Clerk gave a situation report following their examination of the proposal documentation. Mr Wright proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Withey. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p>Response: This PC accepts the extension of the cart lodge providing the use is ancillary to the existing dwelling house. However, the proposed solid wooded gates are out of keeping with the grade II listed building and the rural scene – A five bar wooden gate or metal railing gate would have been more appropriate to ensure the listed building is still visible to the public. We consider the open vista should be retained and on balance recommend REFUSAL of this application for the above reasons.</p>			

6. ANY OTHER PLANNING/TPO APPLICATIONS RECEIVED SINCE PUBLICATION OF THIS AGENDA

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/2592/OUT	Henley Gate, Henley Road, Ipswich	IP6 9AA	<p>Mixed use development comprising up to 1,100 residential dwellings (C3); a local centre inc. up to 250sqm (net) of convenience floor space (A1), up to 300sqm of comparison floorspace (A1), up to 250sqm in use classes A1-A5; and up to 500sqm community centre (D1); provision of land for a primary school (D1); provision of sports facilities, Country Park (including visitor centre D1) and open space (including amenity space/childrens play areas and allotments) and sustainable urban drainage systems; associated landscaping, infrastructure and engineering/earthworks; and the creation of 2No. new vehicular accesses from Henley Road, 1No. vehicular access from Westerfield Road (to serve Country Park only), pedestrian/cycle bridge over railway and vehicular bridge over railway (access only).</p>
<p>Mr Richings and the Clerk gave a situation report following an examination of the application documents. Note:</p>			

there are over 100 documents on-line so it was impossible to examine all of them. However, a relevant sample was checked. It was agreed to use extracts from the letter the PC sent to the developer on 23rd March 2016 in forming our response. It was also agreed to raise concerns over Appendix AA which showed possible rat-runs and included road naming mistakes.

Mr Withey proposed a response format as above, seconded by Mr Wright. Resolved: with ALL in favour
Response: This phase of the development of the Garden Suburb is mainly situated off Henley Road with a small proportion off Westerfield Road. The effect on traffic flows in Tuddenham Road does not appear to be addressed in detail and we believe there will be a marked effect on traffic within and through Rushmere St Andrew.

Currently as soon as the Valley Road, Colchester Road, Heath Road route is busy, traffic starts to “peel off” into Tuddenham Road towards the countryside. Following the route of Humber Doucy Lane this traffic then re-joins Woodbridge Road (A1214) at some point, either via Rushmere Road, Playford Road or, more often than not, via Rushmere Village. There is also the “reverse flow” of this “rat run” to contend with, which continues to add to the traffic problems in Rushmere St Andrew.

We believe it may be difficult to prevent such “rat run” car journeys. However, there is a real chance to address the issue of lorry movements (especially construction traffic) from taking this route. A traffic order preventing such heavy vehicle movements is vital **now** in that if left to chance, residents of Humber Doucy Lane and Rushmere Village will be put at significant risk.

We also point out that ‘Appendix AA – Potential Rat Run Routes’ contains several mistakes:- Tuddenham Road is wrongly labelled as Westerfield Road, whilst the road labelled as ‘Rushmoor Road’ is in fact ‘The Street’. The purple marked rat run route we believe is a rather conservative estimate of reality, as both Playford Road and The Street are already heavily used rat runs for access to the northern outskirts of Ipswich avoiding the A1214.

7. PLANNING & DECISIONS RECEIVED SINCE LAST MEETING

The Clerk reported on planning decisions made by SCDC, which had been received since those reported at the last P&D meeting.

DC/16/2174	13 Quantock Close	IP5 1AS	Proposed two-storey side extension with front porch PLANNING PERMISSION
------------	-------------------	---------	---

8. ENFORCEMENT – Update

There was nothing to report at the moment regarding any outstanding cases within the parish.

9. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING – Update

The last NP meeting at Kesgrave Town Council offices took place on 13th June and was reported at the P&D on 15th June. Since then SCDC had written acknowledging submission of the request for registration of the plan boundaries and project plan. SCDC had placed the submitted documents on their website along with the initial consultation document for comment on the planning area boundaries. It was agreed that this document should be placed on our noticeboards and website.

It was also noted that the published project plan made no mention of Rushmere St Andrew PC – The Clerk to write to KTC querying this omission.

10. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

a. SCDC World of Planning Event 13/07/16

This event would be taking place at SCDC Melton on Wednesday 13th July. The Clerk and Mr Wright had signed up to attend. There were no other members of the P&D who wished or were available to attend.

b. To Note Matters Arising Since Publication of Agenda

1. Potential Referral of planning application DC/16/2074 5 Salehurst Road.

A referral under trigger point 3 had been received from SCDC in respect of 5 Salehurst Road. An email had also been received from the planning officer dealing (Lewis Marshall), stating that the external materials had been changed since our original comments. The cladding was now listed as ‘to match

existing' and the planning officer was happy with that. However, this committee felt that there was still a requirement to request a call-in in view of the overbearing nature of the proposal. Clerk to respond to the referral on that basis. **Response:** We note that the specification for cladding materials has been modified since our initial comments and these are now acceptable. However, we still feel that this proposal represents an over development of the site and has an overbearing impact on adjacent properties (in particular No. 7 Salehurst Road).- Development Management Policy DM23a, DM23c and DM23e apply in this instance. For this reason we recommend refusal of the application and request a referral.

c. Dates to Note

Wed 13th July – World of Planning event, SCDC Melton, 6pm to 8.30pm. Clerk & Mr Wright attending.

Thurs 14th July – PC Meeting, Tower Hall, 7.30pm.

Thurs 21st July – PA&S Meeting, Tower Hall, 7.30pm.

Mon 1st August – Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group meeting, Kesgrave Town Council Offices, 7.15pm.

Thurs 11th August – GP&F Meeting, Village Hall, 7.30pm.

11. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

The Clerk reported that he had been approached by a company who wished to give a pre-application presentation to councillors and public regarding a new small housing development in Clovelly Close. It was agreed that the company should be offered a slot on the agenda for the next full PC meeting on 14th July at Tower Hall.

Contact/Ownership signage for Yewtree Grove to Beech Rd footpath and grassed area - Next PA&S Meeting

12. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.35pm