



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 15th August 2016 at THE VILLAGE HALL Committee Room at 7.30pm

CHAIRMAN:	P Richings Esq.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:	Miss A Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mrs B Richardson-Todd, Mr P Richings, Mr B Ward, Mr J Withey, Mr J Wright
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Members of the public = 4
APOLOGIES:	Mrs B Richardson-Todd (would be arriving late), Mr M Sones (Working), Mr R Whiting,(unwell), Asst Clerk Mrs J Potter
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 Wright proposed acceptance of reasons for councillor absence, seconded by Miss Cracknell with all in favour.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6th July 2016

Mr Newton proposed acceptance of the Minutes, seconded by Miss Cracknell, 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..

Mr Newton declared a LNPI in respect of DC/16/2875/FUL as he is member of the British Horse Society.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

Members of the public indicated they wished to speak in respect of DC/16/3018/OUT (163 Playford Road) and DC/16/3030/VOC (30-38 Beech Road).

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

Miss Cracknell expressed concern that notices had gone up in the last few days advertising a consultation regarding the Neighbourhood Plan boundaries but the expiry time of the consultation was very short compared to the time the notices had been put up. The Clerk explained that SCDC had put up these notices but identical notices had been erected by the Parish Council on our noticeboards some 2 to 3 weeks prior to the SCDC notices.

Mr Wright queried why the move of the Playford Lane gate at the allotments had not been included on this agenda as he understood it would be considered this evening. The Clerk explained that it was not in reality a planning matter as no formal application from the Oak Tree Farm had yet been made. It was however an

internal decision to be made within the Allotment Management Panel and the PA&S Committee and had in fact been included on the Allotment meeting agenda for the following evening.

5. TO NOTE RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/16/2132/FUL	Hill Farm House, Lamberts Lane	IP5 1DR	1) To extend existing cart lodge 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 cart lodge. We have enclosed plans for the extension. 2) To install electronic wooden gate at entrance to our driveway.
<p>Following a recommendation of refusal by this Committee on 06/07/16 and a suggestion that an open style gate would be more acceptable, the planning officer had gone back to the applicant seeking modification to the design.</p> <p>The Clerk and Chairman recommend conditional approval of submitted front gate re-design on 20/7/16. On 01/08/16 the Planning Officer sent a final design of gate which fulfilled our recommendation.</p> <p>The P&D Committee noted and approved the responses.</p>			

6. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS & TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS (TPO)

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/3018/OUT	Part Land South West of 163 Playford Road	IP5 1DD	Erection of four semi-detached properties with associated parking and external works
<p>The Clerk and Mr Richings gave a situation report following their examination of the proposal documentation. The Clerk had also visited the area of the proposal today.</p> <p>Mr Durrant, the applicant explained his reasons for re-submitting following a previous refusal and failure of an appeal. The applicant also stated that he had sought advice from a planning consultant in making this new application. Councillors were generally very sympathetic with the need to build there but felt that they had to be guided by the planning rule-book.</p> <p><i>[Parish Councillor Mrs B Richardson-Todd arrived at this point in the meeting]</i></p> <p>Mr Wright proposed a recommendation of refusal as DM3 & DM4 still applied, seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p>Response: Whilst this Parish Council has considerable sympathy for the applicant in trying to improve this portion of Playford Road we have taken into consideration the previous application (DC/15/2718/OUT) plus the report of the Planning Inspectorate following appeal and we consider the current application has very little to offer in terms of material changes with respect to the original application.</p> <p>The applicant has taken advice from a planning consultant since the previous application, but has not at any point sought pre-application advice from SCDC. We have now advised him to do so especially with respect to the interpretation of 'footway' and 'footpath' and the interpretation of 'clusters' as defined within the SCDC Core Strategy and as they may apply to this particular site.</p> <p>Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council therefore recommends REFUSAL as the proposal is outside the Physical Limits Boundary and continues to fail to meet the requirements of SCDC Development Management Policies DM3 and DM4.</p> <p><i>[Two members of the public left at this point]</i></p>			
DC/16/3013/FUL	30 Salehurst Road	IP3 8RY	Erection of summerhouse at bottom of the garden
<p>The Clerk gave a situation report following his visit to the area of the proposal and Mr Richings submitted a written appraisal.</p> <p>Miss Cracknell proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Withey. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p>			

Response: This PC notes that this is a retrospective planning application and recommends APPROVAL			
DC/16/3030/VOC	Land to rear of 30 to 38 Beech Road	IP5 1BH	To seek permission for the turning head to be constructed in pavers instead of grasscrete, permission for minor relocation of passing place
<p>The Clerk gave a situation report following his visit to the area of the proposal. Two local residents attended this meeting and gave some insight into the situation regarding this proposal from both the re-location of the passing place and the proposal to use pavers instead of grasscrete in the turning head.</p> <p>Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Wright, with ALL in favour</p> <p>Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council notes that this is a retrospective application and that the installed pavers have aggravated an existing flooding problem (according to residents). There appears to be no evidence as to whether the soakaways indicated in drawing 7178-01 have or have not been installed and it is unclear as to their actual purpose as there is no connecting pipework shown. By inference it would seem that they are only there to drain the rear gardens of the properties and not address the flooding on the road, there being no explanation provided in the application as to the purpose of the soakaways.</p> <p>With respect to the 'minor relocation' of the passing place, the revised position is more restricted in width than the original location and would serve little purpose as it is now situated almost at the entrance to the paved road area.</p> <p>It is for the above reasons that this Parish Council recommends REFUSAL of this application and the original agreed area of grasscrete should be restored along with the original agreed position of the passing place.</p> <p><i>[The remaining 2 members of the public left at this point]</i></p>			

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

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/2875	Pound Meadow, Humber Doucy Lane	IP4 3PF	Improvements to the existing equine enterprise. Demolition of old corrugated iron pole barn and replacing with managers residential accommodation. Existing stable block to be relocated Proposed new hay/bedding store
<p>The Clerk and Mr Richings gave a situation report following an examination of the application papers. Mr Withey proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Wright. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p>Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application is for development outside the Physical Limits Boundary and therefore does not meet the requirements of Development Management Policy DM3 of the LDF. The proposal fails policy 55 of the NPPF as the development cannot be classed as re-use of a redundant or disused building. Similarly it cannot be considered to comply with policy DM13 of the LDF as the application in part is for a replacement of a barn with a dwelling house and therefore has to be considered in the same way as an application for a new building in the countryside. 			
DC/16/3174	679 Foxhall Road <i>Note SCDC application cover letter is incorrect previous application was DC/15/5042</i>	IP4 5TA	Proposed detached dwelling (amended design and siting to that approved DC/15/5040/FUL) to part rear garden
<p>The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. Miss Cracknell proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mrs Richardson-Todd. Resolved: with</p>			

ALL in favour Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL			
DC/16/3241	17 Elm Road	IP5 1AJ	Erection of detached triple garage
The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. Mr Richings proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved: with ALL in favour Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL on condition that the triple garage is ancillary to the domestic use of the dwelling with no business use.			

8. 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/15/5060	823 Foxhall Road (PC Recommended Refusal)	IP4 5TJ	Proposed erection of acoustic fence and gate PLANNING PERMISSION
DC/16/2074	5 Salehurst Road	IP3 8RT	Two storey front and rear extension, single storey side extension PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/16/1976	Mulberry Corner, Tuddenham Lane	IP5 1DU	Erection of boundary fence and gated entrance to site REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION
DC/16/2311	66 Kelvedon Drive	IP4 5LQ	Single storey rear extension PLANNING PERMISSION

9. ENFORCEMENTS & APPEALS – TO NOTE/REPORT ANY RELEVANT MATTERS

- a. ENF/2014/0081/DEV – Mulberry Corner, Tuddenham Lane – Latest information from SCDC was that on 27/07/16 the order was given for an Enforcement Notice to be drafted with a compliance date of 30/09/16.
- b. Mr Francis enquired whether the frontage at No 3 The Pastures had yet been reported to SCDC Enforcement. The Clerk stated that it had not yet been done as he had omitted it from the work list. It would now be added to his list.

10. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

a. To Note Matters Arising Since Publication of Agenda

i. Neighbourhood Plan –

Email received from Kesgrave TC saying “*In order to feed into the Neighbourhood Plan and the Tasks section of the current Terms of Reference document, it would be prudent to have representation from Rushmere St Andrew on Working Group Number 4 – Play Area and Open Spaces and Working Group Number 5 – Highways and Pedestrian (already set up and established), in order to comply with the current Neighbourhood Plan Terms of Reference. Rushmere St Andrew may however, wish to set up separate Working Party/Steering Groups for these areas. The updated Terms of Reference document is attached. Please let me know the thoughts of your Council as soon as practicable*”.

After some discussion on the merits (or not) of running our own working groups it was agreed that we would send representatives as required to any of the working groups hosted by Kesgrave as there was little chance we would be able to get sufficient numbers to form our own groups.

[Mr Withey left the meeting at 9.35pm as he had an early start the following morning].

b. Dates to Note

- 16th August – Allotment Panel Meeting 7.30pm, Village Hall Committee Room with a site meeting at 6.30pm
- 18th August – 12PT meeting, 10am, Royal British Legion Hall at Kesgrave
- 7th September – Neighbourhood Planning Seminar at Hatcheston – Mrs Richardson-Todd attending and would also take Cllr Ogden from Kesgrave TC.
- 8th September - PC meeting, 7.30pm, Tower Hall main hall
- 15th September - PA&S meeting, 7.30pm, Tower Hall main hall

11. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

No.3 The Pastures – Enforcement status of report.

12. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.52pm.