



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 12th September 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 (Arrived at 8.35pm), Mr P Richings, Mr J Wright
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Members of the public = 0
APOLOGIES:	Mrs B Richardson-Todd (arriving late), Mr M Sones (Working), Mr B Ward (Holiday), Mr R Whiting (KTC Meeting), Mr J Withey (Another appointment)
	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 15th August 2016

Miss Cracknell pointed out that the previous Minutes section 4b had quoted her as stating that '...notices had gone up....' whereas she had reported that only one notice had been put up. Mr Wright and the Clerk stated that other copies of the same notices had been placed around the parish. It was agreed the Minute should stand as presented. 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..

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

No public in attendance

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

Village Ward Councillors had received letters from a planning consultant acting on behalf of the owners of 163 Playford Road. The letter had requested Parish Councillor support for the recent outline planning application on that site. This was noted and also that the response window on that application had now closed.

5. TO NOTE RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATION

DC/16/3244	30 Elm Road	IP5 1AJ	Permission sought to erect single storey, flat roof extension to the rear of the property. Approximate size of the extension to be 3m x 3m to increase the floor space of the existing kitchen area. The property has already been subject to a single storey flat roof extension to side and rear elevations. The proposed extension will be to the same standard and specification of previously completed works. The original property was relatively small but given the size of the plot and that there are no impacts to boundaries, public or vehicular access or neighbouring properties the proposed extension remains modest.
<p>The response date on this application was 8th September, The Clerk and Chairman had examined the application and submitted a response of 'Recommend Approval' on 4th September, Councillors noted and approved the response.</p> <p>Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			

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

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/3446	714 Foxhall Road	IP4 5TD	Proposed rear extension
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. Miss Cracknell proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p>Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			
DC/16/3461	149 The Street	IP5 1DG	Single storey side extension
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal. Mr Francis proposed a recommendation of approval seconded by Miss Cracknell. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p>Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			

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

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/3564	36-38 Woodbridge Road	IP5 1BH	Erection of new store/office building to be used in association with the existing ceramic tile and natural stone showroom & sales
<p>The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation and a conversation with a local resident. Councillors noted that there had been no tree survey included with the proposal. Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of approval seconded by Mr Wright. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p>Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL subject to appropriate protection being given to the boundary oaks at the rear of the site.</p>			

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/16/2132/FUL	Hill Farm House, Lamberts Lane	IP5 1DR	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. 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. PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/16/2133/LBC	Hill Farm House, Lamberts Lane [Listed Building Consent]	IP5 1DR	Details as above. APPLICATION WITHDRAWN 24/08/16

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

3 The Pastures, IP4 5UQ. - Complaint received that No.3 The Pastures may not have planning approval for the construction of the front retaining wall, if indeed it does require approval? A request for clarification had been sent to SCDC along with photos of the said wall.

ENF/2014/0081/DEV: Mulberry Corner, Tuddenham Lane – Latest information on the SCDC website is that the Enforcement Notice has been drafted and the compliance date has been pushed back to 30/11/2016.

10. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING - UPDATE

There was a meeting of the Transport & Pedestrian Working Party at KTC Offices scheduled for 6.15pm on 19th September. The Clerk and Mr Wright would be attending.

Several hours before tonight's meeting the Clerk had received an email from Andy MacGibbon, Planning Policy Officer at SCDC. In summary the email stated that:- *"The Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan boundary consultation closed on 2nd September. SCDC received approximately 150 responses which, for neighbourhood planning in this District, was a very large number..... You will see that with regards to parts of Little Bealings and Playford parish councils being included within the plan area there were only comments of objection. A further large number of objections were received from Rushmere village ward with regards to this ward being included in the NP area despite Rushmere St Andrews parish wishing to be involved."*

In addition to objections from Little Bealings PC and Playford PC some light had been shed on possible reasons for the high level of objections to the plan in that a flyer had been hand distributed to many households in the Village Ward of this Parish. This urged parishioners to object to the proposed boundary of the Kesgrave Neighbourhood Plan as the village wished to retain its identity and not be part of a continuation of Ipswich or Kesgrave.

The circulated flyer had been distributed by Mrs Richardson-Todd with her contact details included in the text and whilst not claiming to be associated with the Parish Council within the flyer she was a Parish Councillor.

There was some debate on the matter and Councillors expressed concern about the title of the document and that it implied Kesgrave were keen to influence the future of Rushmere Village. It was also questioned as to why paragraph 4 only mentioned Kesgrave and Tower Ward and if it was known to recipients that Mrs Richardson-Todd was a Councillor even though she had not declared as such on the flyer, there would be a perception of lack of impartiality as paragraph 6 urged recipients of the flyer to 'object'.

After careful consideration Mr Richings the Chairman of the Parish Council requested that the Clerk should review the letter circulated by Cllr Richardson-Todd with regard to any possible infringement under the Suffolk Code of Conduct.

With respect to the email from Mr MacGibbon, it went on to request a three way meeting of KTC, RSAPC and SCDC to discuss options ranging from withdrawal of the NP application to submitting a modified plan for only the KTC boundary area or possibly the KTC area with Tower Ward of RSA.

[Mrs Richardson-Todd joined the meeting at 8.35pm having previously given apologies as she had a work commitment]

Mr MacGibbon was suggesting two councillors from each of KTC and RSAPC attend the meeting. It was agreed that the preferred attendance from RSAPC was for Mr Wright and the Clerk to attend as they had most involvement and familiarity with the issues arising. The Clerk was requested to check with SCDC if an Officer of the PC could attend in lieu of a Councillor.

There were a number of comments from members with regard to both the email from SCDC and the letter distributed by Mrs Richardson-Todd.

Mr Francis stated this was a sad reflection on the fact that the parish has been split into two wards. The main comment appeared to be that this was a major misinterpretation of the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan.

11. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

a. To Note Matters Arising Since Publication of Agenda

Referral of planning application DC/16/3018/OUT 163 Playford Road – Trigger point 2 (At least three interested parties had raised material planning issues in support of the application). The PC declined to refer as the SCDC Planning Officer was minded to refuse and the PC had also recommended refusal.

Noted by Councillors.

Referral of planning application DC/16/3013/FUL 30 Salehurst Road – Trigger point 3 (An objection had been made raising material planning objections). The PC declined to refer as the SCDC Planning Officer was minded to approve and the PC had also recommended approval.

Noted by Councillors.

b. Dates to Note

15th September, 7.30pm, PA&S Meeting, Tower Hall

19th September, 7.00pm, Suffolk Coastal Area Meeting, Stratford St Andrew

19th September, 6.15pm, Traffic & Pedestrian WP, Kesgrave Town Council Offices

20th September, 7.30pm, Newsletter Editorial Meeting, Parish Office, Tower Hall

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

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

12. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

Neighbourhood Plan

13. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.44pm