



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 4th October 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 M Sones, Mr B Ward, Mr R Whiting, Mr J Withey, Mr J Wright
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Members of the public = 1, Mrs S Stannard (Asst Clerk)
APOLOGIES:	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 from were noted as detailed above. There were no councillor absences

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12th September 2016

With reference to item 10 in the minutes of 12th September, Mr Richardson-Todd said she would have liked the discussion about her to have been to her face and not behind her back prior to her arrival at the meeting. She also stated that her comment about a hidden agenda took place after the meeting had closed. It was agreed to strike the wording in the last paragraph of item 10 from the minutes (from the word '.....rather...' to the end of the sentence).

Mr Ward stated that he was marked as both attending and giving apologies for that meeting and he was in fact absent.

Mr Wright proposed acceptance of the Minutes with the amendments as discussed, seconded by Mr Newton, with ALL in favour. The Minutes were duly signed by the Chairman as a correct record 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 Whiting stated that as a member of Suffolk Coastal District Council and Suffolk County Council he may be asked to reconsider any matter from this meeting at District or County 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 or County level before coming to a decision.

Mr Francis declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in planning application DC/16/3375/FUL at 767 Foxhall Road as his dwelling was an adjoining property.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

The member of the public was a resident of Tuddenham and was observing only.

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

Community Speedwatch (CSW) - Mr Wright stated that Kesgrave were willing to join the scheme and all three councils (RSA, Playford & Kesgrave) would vote on forming a joint CSW scheme at their respective November meetings. He also stated that Kesgrave may be willing to contribute some funding

As the funding for the scheme had come from the County Councillor Locality Budget, both the Clerk and Mr Whiting stressed that the funding allocation for the project needed to be apportioned correctly and actually spent on CSW equipment. The Clerk stated that if Kesgrave was going to contribute then it would have to be in the form of equipment maintenance as the capital cost was covered by the Locality Budget.

Mr Wright stated that he would be moving house this week and that only his mobile phone number should be used from now on.

5. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/3375	787 Foxhall Road	IP4 5TJ	Proposed vehicular access and new garage building
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal</p> <p>Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Withey The proposal failed as the majority voted against the proposal with one abstention.</p> <p>After further debate Mr Wright proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Ward, carried on a majority vote with one abstention.</p> <p>Response: The size and placement of the garage building represents an overbearing intrusion on the amenity of No.14 Clovelly Close, whilst the proposed vehicular access looping along both sides of the property would pose a source of noise and disturbance to the amenity of adjoining properties.</p> <p>Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council therefore recommends REFUSAL of the application as it fails to meet the requirements of Development Management Policy DM23 in respect of privacy, outlook, noise/disturbance and physical relationship with other properties.</p> <p>Should the Planning Officer be minded to approve the application then it should be conditional on a programme of planting being undertaken to mitigate the effects on adjacent properties. In addition any subsequent approval should be conditional on use of the garage building being ancillary to the domestic use of the main dwelling only.</p>			
DC/16/3597/OUT	Land & Buildings to East of Bridge Farm, Top Street, Martlesham		Re-submission of application DC/15/4788/OUT - Outline application for up to 140 residential dwellings (including up to 33% affordable housing), a convenience store (Use classA1, up to 400sq.m gross/280sq.m net) with associated car parking. Demolition of existing structure, introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation and attenuation, vehicular access from Ipswich Road and Top Street and associated ancillary works. All matters to be reserved with the exception of site access.
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.</p> <p>Mr Withey proposed a recommendation of refusal and that we should re-state the previous response. Seconded by Mr Wright. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p>Response: Although not a statutory consultee on this application Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council considers that it should comment on the basis that this application, should it receive approval, will place additional traffic loading on the A1214 Ipswich feeder road, which in its current condition will be unsustainable.</p> <p>This will in turn force additional traffic onto the Playford Road 'rat run' and subsequently through to the village part of Rushmere St Andrew.</p> <p>There are also concerns regards the sufficient provision of primary and secondary education places given that local schools are at saturation point.</p>			

<p>The point we are trying to make is that the whole infrastructure of the area requires upgrading before further additional housing schemes can be considered.</p> <p>The earlier application was for up to 215 residential dwellings plus ancillary facilities. In view of the reduction in dwellings to “up to 140” we see no reasons to change our opinion as this number would still represent an overload on the infrastructure of the area and we feel that the application should be refused.</p>			
DC/16/3675	2 Fellbrigg Avenue	IP5 1NZ	Two storey extension
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.</p> <p>Mr Withey proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Francis. Resolved: with ALL in favour Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL.</p>			
DC/16/3737	Mulberry Corner, Tuddenham Lane	IP5 1DU	Reduction of height of existing boundary fence & external alterations
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.</p> <p>Mr Withey proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Miss Cracknell. Resolved: with ALL in favour. Response: This PC recommends REFUSAL as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is for 1.25m close boarded fence with timber gravel board to bottom and capping rail to top, with hedging planted behind, along the whole of the southern boundary continuing along the western boundary. The inclusion of the gravel board and capping would lead to the overall height being more than 1.25m – in reality the reduction in height from the already erected fence would be 0.71m (1.94-1.25). • The reduction in height of the close boarded fence and erection of gates with brick pillars remains inappropriate, because they have/would have a harsh urbanising and dominating effect on the character of the area, by virtue of their height, solid appearance and close proximity to the edge of the narrow highway. The proposals create an unacceptably imposing enclosure at close proximity to the highway, contrary to the simple verdant character of this rural lane. • The scheme is therefore contrary to Section 7 of the NPPF and Policies SP15 and DM21 of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan - Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document, which seek to ensure good design that is not detrimental to visual amenity or the character of an area. • The gates appear to be not part of this application therefore we are not commenting on them. • The exterior alterations mentioned above refer to the building being subject to render / weatherboard with wraparound brick plinth. We have no issue with that part of the proposal. 			
DC/16/3821	30 Playford Road	IP4 5RG	Erection of 1.8m high brick wall along front boundary measuring 11.5m in length and including 1.95m high piers and gate opening
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.</p> <p>Mr Whiting proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Wright. Resolved: with ALL in favour. Response: This PC recommends REFUSAL as:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appears to be insufficient information provided regarding the design of the proposed wall (type of brick, colour, bond, frequency of piers). • The indicated positioning of the proposed wall gives rise to safety and visibility concerns given that the site boundary is very close to the highway. • There are concerns that the proposed wall would be overbearing and out of character with the street scene which is largely hedgerow at this point along Playford Road. Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Policy DM15 applies in this instance. 			
DC/16/3843	54 Woodbridge Rd	IP5 1BQ	Proposed two-storey side extension and alterations
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.</p> <p>Mr Whiting proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Withey. Resolved: with ALL in favour. Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			

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

None received.

7. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

None received this period

8. TO NOTE 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/16/2875	Pound Meadow, Humber Doucy Lane (PC Recommended Refusal)	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 APPLICATION WITHDRAWN 22/09/16
DC/16/3013	30 Salehurst Road	IP3 8RY	Erection of summerhouse at bottom of the garden PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/16/3018/OUT	Part Land South West of 163 Playford Road (PC recommended refusal)	IP5 1DD	Erection of four semi-detached properties with associated parking and external works REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION
DC/16/3030/VOC	Land to rear of 30-38 Beech Road (PC Recommended Refusal)	IP5 1BH	To seek permission for the turning head to be constructed in pavers instead of grass-crete, permission for minor relocation of passing place PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/16/3174	679 Foxhall Road	IP4 5TA	Proposed detached dwelling (amended design and siting to that approved DC/15/5040/FUL) to part rear garden PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/16/3241	17 Elm Road	IP5 1AJ	Erection of detached triple garage PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions

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

Front Retaining Wall 3 The Pastures – Reply received from Cate Buck (SCDC Planning Enforcement Officer) stating: -“With reference to your email, it would appear that for this part of the estate, permitted development for walls and fences are intact so as long as the wall is no large than 1m adjacent to a highway then planning permission would not be required.”

Hence no further action was required.

10. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING – DECISION NOTICE & OTHER MATTERS

Mr Wright and the Clerk attended a meeting at SCDC on 26th September following a substantial number of objections being lodged regarding the proposed plan boundary consultation for the Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan (KNP). The following are the notes from that meeting as published by Andy MacGibbon Planning Policy Officer at SCDC.

“Regulation 6A of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/637/regulation/5/made> states that a Local Authority in receipt of an application from a relevant body must determine the application. The Area Application consultation was duly run between 4th July to 2nd September 2016.

As a result of the consultation period, a large number of objections were received regarding the extent of the proposed KNP area. In particular, a large number of residents of Little Bealings, Playford and Rushmere St. Andrew expressed their opposition to being involved in the plan. Little Bealings and Playford Parish Councils submitted formal letters of opposition to any parts of their areas being included in the proposed KNP.

Whilst pre application consultation with Little Bealings and Playford Parish Councils was not a statutory requirement of the process, it may have been prudent of the relevant body to undertake engagement to ascertain early responses on the likelihood of gaining agreement regarding the suitability of the proposed area. Following the close of the Area Application consultation period, a meeting was held between representatives of Suffolk Coastal District Council (SCDC), Kesgrave Town Council and Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council to discuss the next steps forward. Jonathan Ogden for Kesgrave Town Council, Mel Bentley and James Wright for Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council, and Cllr Tony Fryatt, Hilary Hanslip and Andy MacGibbon for SCDC attended.

During the meeting 3 options for the KNP were discussed. Namely that:

- Kesgrave Town Council withdraw the KNP altogether and instead work closely with SCDC through the Local Plan Review regarding the future development of the Town Council area;
- Kesgrave and a part of Rushmere St. Andrew (Tower ward) proceed together with a neighbourhood plan covering this reduced area; and
- Kesgrave Town Council proceeds alone with a neighbourhood plan covering only the extent of the Town Council area and that Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council will consider the option of producing its own separate neighbourhood plan at a later date.

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides a list of criteria which can be considerations when deciding the boundaries of a neighbourhood plan proposed area (Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 41-033-20140306) <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/designating-a-neighbourhood-area/> Of these, based on consultation feedback, great weight was attached to 'whether the area forms part of a coherent estate either for business or residents' in coming to a decision. As such, the latter option was identified as the most appropriate way forward.

This recommendation was passed to, and accepted by, Cllr Fryatt (the Cabinet Member).

Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan boundary for the Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan Area, to be approved no later than the 30th September 2016, will show the plan area covering the Town Council area only"

The clerk explained that this PC would now need to make a decision at the November meeting as to whether it wished to proceed with an independent NP or work closely with SCDC on a forthcoming local plan review. Hilary Hanslip (SCDC) had explained at that SCDC meeting that a review of the Local Plan was about to commence with an aimed completion date of 2019. This would be about the same timing as for a Neighbourhood Plan. She also explained that SCDC were keen to work much closer with Town and Parish councils following the lessons learned from the current Local Plan and the recent close Working Party liaison with Parish Councils on the compilation and review of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document.

Mr Sones felt that the PC should be satisfied that the new framework will give us the same level of protection and that we have a voice right the way through the process. Mr Whiting commented that even after a lot of hard work the Parish Plan of 2010 was more or less obsolete when finished so we need to be very careful what we commit to.

11. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

a. To Note Matters Arising Since Publication of Agenda

Mr Wright stated that there were forthcoming road closures in Bell Lane and between Bell Lane and the Foxhall Road Waste Site.

b. Dates to Note

6th October, Allotment Holders AGM, Tower Hall, 7.30pm

13th October, GP&F Meeting, Village Hall, 7.30pm

13th October, SNT ASB Meeting, Woodbridge Police Station, 10.30am

31st October, Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting, KTC Offices, 6.15pm

12. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

Neighbourhood Plan, PC Meeting 10th November.

13. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.23pm