



# Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

[www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net](http://www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net)

*"Seek The Common Good"*



## Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 22nd November 2016 at TOWER HALL Main Hall at 7.30pm

---

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| CHAIRMAN:                     | P Richings Esq.  |
| COMMITTEE MEMBERS<br>PRESENT: | Miss A Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mr P Richings,<br>Mr M Sones, Mr B Ward, Mr R Whiting, Mr J Withey, Mr J Wright |
| OTHER ATTENDEES:              | Members of the public = 17   |
| APOLOGIES:                    | Mrs B Richardson-Todd (Holiday)  |
| 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 Wright proposed acceptance of reasons for councillor absence, seconded by Mr Ward with all in favour.

### 2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2nd November 2016

Mr Richings pointed out that Mr Sones was shown as both absent and present in the minutes. He was in fact absent. Mr Withey proposed acceptance of the Minutes with the correction made, seconded by Mr Newton, with ALL in favour. The Minutes were duly signed by the Chairman with 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 Newton declared a LNPI in planning applications DC/16/4551, DC/16/4552 & DC/16/4593 as a member of the British Horse Society.

Mr Francis declared a LNPI in DC/16/4582 as he was an immediate neighbour of the development site.

Mr Wright declared a Pecuniary Interest in planning application DC/16/4478 as he was the brother-in-law of the applicant.

### 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

Members of the public requested time to speak on planning applications DC/16/4551/4552 (Pound Meadow) and DC/16/4582 (Clovelly Close).

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

Mr Wright reported that he had been to see Stanley Chambers, ex-chairman of the PC who was 100 years old yesterday. He still lived in the Parish. Mr Wright took a small gift for Mr Chambers on behalf of the Parish Council. The Chairman thanked Mr Wright for taking the trouble to go and see Mr Chambers.

#### 5. TO NOTE RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

None to report.

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

The following had been received and commented on:

|   |   |         |   |
|---|---|---------|---|
| DC/16/4552/FUL  | Pound Meadow, Humber Doucy Lane             | IP5 1DY | Proposed new hay/bedding store and stables. Relocation of saved stable  |
| <p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. The applicant read out a statement explaining the history of the site, the need for changes and better security. Mr Newton could not think of any policy which would prevent the moving of the stable. Mr Whiting stated that the committee need to consider this on its own and not in conjunction with anything else. Mr Whiting proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Withey. Resolved: with ALL in favour.<br/> <b>Response:</b> Rushmere St Andrew PC recommends APPROVAL</p> <p><i>[One member of public left the meeting at this point.]</i></p>   |   |         |   |
| <p>It was agreed to bring planning application DC/16/4551/FUL forward to this point in the agenda as it was directly related to the application above.</p>  |   |         |   |
| DC/16/4551/FUL  | Pound Meadow, Humber Doucy Lane             | IP5 1DY | Demolition of old iron pole barn and replacing with managers residential accommodation, to include office, staff room, staff bathroom and clients overnight emergency accommodation |
| <p>The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. Councillors commented on the difficulties of reconciling the requirements of DM3 against the requirements of NPPF-55 and applying them to this case. It was noted there would be no impact on sustainability. Mr Whiting proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Withey. Resolved in favour of refusal on a majority vote.<br/> <b>Response:</b> The challenges of Development Management Policy DM3 and NPPF Policy 55 would tend to contradict each other and if applying those policies in this particular case, the proposal fails policy NPPF-55 as the development cannot be classed as re-use of a redundant or disused building. On the other hand it cannot be considered to comply with policy DM3 as the application 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 since the proposal is outside the PLB. Whilst Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council has some sympathy for the applicant in trying to improve their business facilities and the ensuing dichotomy of relevant planning policies, as a consultee we must run with the policies as currently defined and recommend REFUSAL. We do, however, suggest that the application is called in for full debate by the SDCD Planning Committee in the event that the Planning Officer recommends refusal.</p> |   |         |   |
| DC/16/4582/FUL  | Land West of Clovelly Close, Clovelly Close | IP4 5UF | Residential Development for 6 dwellings and garages   |
| <p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. Several members of public commented on the application and one letter had been received by the Clerk. Main comments highlighted concerns regarding housing density, the three storey dwelling not in keeping with the area, increased traffic/parking in Clovelly Close and loss of natural drainage areas. Councillors commented on concerns over the 3 storey dwelling, density and the point was made that all houses were 'market value' houses with no 'affordable' dwellings.</p> <p>Mr Whiting recommended approval with a condition that the 3-storey dwelling be redesigned as a 2-storey dwelling seconded by Mr Sones. Resolution failed with a majority voting against the proposal. There was one abstention.</p> <p>Mr Wright proposed a recommendation of refusal based on DM21 design aesthetics, seconded by Mr Withey,</p>  |   |         |   |

Resolved in favour of refusal on a majority vote with 1 abstention.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew PC recommends REFUSAL as there are concerns that the application fails to meet the requirements of Development Management policy DM21 section (a) "Proposals should relate well to the scale and character of their surroundings particularly in terms of their siting, height, massing and form"; in particular that the proposed 3-storey dwelling is out of keeping with the surrounding street scene.

*[The Remaining members of the public left the meeting]*

|                |                  |         |   |
|----------------|------------------|---------|---|
| DC/16/4478/FUL | 702 Foxhall Road | IP4 5PD | One and a half storey rear extension, new detached garage to rear and changes to vehicular access |
|----------------|------------------|---------|---|

*[Having declared a pecuniary interest Mr Wright left the room for this item]*

Miss Cracknell proposed a recommendation of approval seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved: with ALL in favour

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew PC recommends APPROVAL

*[Mr Wright returned to the meeting]*

|                |                 |         |  |
|----------------|-----------------|---------|--|
| DC/16/4489/FUL | 14 Mendip Drive | IP5 1AU | Proposed alterations and single storey front extension |
|----------------|-----------------|---------|--|

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

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew PC recommends APPROVAL

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

The following had been received and commented on:

Planning application DC/16/4551/FUL was moved forward for discussion under item 6

|                |                            |         |   |
|----------------|----------------------------|---------|---|
| DC/16/4593/PN3 | Villa Farm, Tuddenham Lane | IP5 1DT | Change of use from agricultural storage to dwelling |
|----------------|----------------------------|---------|---|

The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation..

As this was a PN3 type application a recommendation to approve or refuse was not required.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew PC supports this PN3 notification as we can identify no significant harm being created to the surrounding area by the implementation of the proposal.

|                |                  |         |                                       |
|----------------|------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|
| DC/16/4144/FUL | 18 Euston Avenue | IP4 5QY | Proposed single storey side extension |
|----------------|------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|

The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.

Mr Richings proposed a recommendation of approval seconded by Mr Withey Resolved: with ALL in favour.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew PC recommends APPROVAL subject to the side extension not encroaching onto the highway boundary which may be ill-defined at that point in Parnham Place.

## 8. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

|                 |  |         |   |
|-----------------|--|---------|---|
| DC/16/4106/FUL  | 12 Chatsworth Drive<br>PC recommended refusal.<br>Officer was minded to approve. Trigger point 3                   | IP4 5XA | Two storey side/rear extension<br>Referral 21/11/16<br>PC confirmed referral and restated material objections   |
| DC//16/3978/FUL | 28 Beech Road<br>PC Recommended refusal –<br>Officer was minded to approve. Trigger point 3 –<br>However see below | IP5 1AN | Shed at the bottom right hand side of the garden. Single storey. Made from box profile PVC coated sheets in grey. To store things.<br>Referral 08/11/16 |

The above referral notification for 28 Beech Road had incorrect data apparently pulled from the planning database. The reference number of C/01/1252 dates from 16 years ago and although the address (28 Beech Road) is for a recent application the descriptor for the proposal is all wrong. Referral stated 'erection of rear extension' as well as incorrect reference number. Hence Clerk had written to SCDC Planning Admin querying the referral details – no further response received.

## 9. 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/16/3737 | Mulberry Corner, Tuddenham Lane | IP5 1DU | Reduction of height of existing boundary fence & external alterations<br><b>PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions</b>   |
| 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<br><b>REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION</b> |
| DC/16/3843 | 54 Woodbridge Road              | IP5 1BQ | Proposed two-storey side extension and alterations<br><b>PLANNING PERMISSION</b>   |

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

Mulberry Corner – The clerk reported that enforcement action was now suspended as Planning Approval had been granted for a 1.25m fence subject to conditions.

Mr Newton reported that SCDC were currently evaluating proposal to give Planning Officers delegated powers to serve some enforcement notices. This would reduce time delays as currently notices cannot be served until matters have been approved by the full planning committee.

## 11. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING – UPDATE

Confirmation received from Kesgrave Town Council on 18<sup>th</sup> November that they had resolved at the council meeting of 14<sup>th</sup> November to accept the revised NP boundary line to encompass Kesgrave Town only. Accordingly their Chairman had signed the agreement with SCDC.

In order to aid this councils decision on whether to create a Neighbourhood Plan, a request has been sent to Hilary Hanslip and Andy MacGibbon (SCDC Planning Policy Team) for them to give a presentation in January on Neighbourhood Planning and the forthcoming Local Plan Review.

*[Mr Sones, Mr Withey and Mr Whiting withdrew from the meeting with apologies at this point].*

## 12. IPSWICH LOCAL PLAN – TO APPROVE A CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Mr Wright had visited the recent exhibition at Ipswich Town Hall regarding modification to the Ipswich Local Plan. A report by Mr Wright had been distributed with the agenda for this meeting.

Based on that report it was agreed that Mr Wright and The Clerk would submit a response using the proforma that Mr Wright had picked up at the exhibition. Closing date for responses: 11.45pm 1<sup>st</sup> December 2016.

## 13. TO CONSIDER THE 2017/18 P&D BUDGET FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE GP&F COMMITTEE

As in previous years a token budget of £250 was suggested - Proposed by Mr Francis, seconded by Mr Ward, with ALL in favour. The recommendation would be taken forward to the GP&F budget build at the December 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## 14. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

### a. To Note Matters Arising Since Publication of Agenda

None arising

### b. Dates to Note

24<sup>th</sup> Nov, 10.30am SNT ASB Meeting, Woodbridge Police Station

28<sup>th</sup> Nov, 6,30pm Town & Parish Liaison Meeting SCDC Melton

8<sup>th</sup> Dec, 7.30pm, GP&F Meeting, Village Hall

## 15. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None identified

## 16. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.50pm.