



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 19th January 2017 at TOWER HALL- Main Hall at 6.15pm

CHAIRMAN:	P Richings Esq.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:	Miss Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mrs B Richardson-Todd, Mr P Richings, Mr B Ward, Mr J Withey.
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Members of the public = 9
APOLOGIES:	Mr R Whiting (Domestic Emergency), Mr J Wright (conflict of interest).
ABSENT (no apologies):	None
CLERK:	Mr M R Bentley, Mrs S Stannard (Asst Clerk).

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 Withey proposed acceptance of reasons for councillor absence, seconded by Mr Newton with all in favour.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4TH JANUARY, 2017

Mr Francis proposed acceptance of the Minutes, seconded by Mrs Richardson-Todd, 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.

Members of the public requested time to speak regarding planning application DC/16/5151/OUT.

There was also a member of the public observing regarding planning application DC/16/5291/FUL.

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

Nothing identified.

5. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following had been received and commented on: (Mr Richings adjusted the order of discussion of the planning applications in order to aid the members of the public present at the meeting.)

DC/16/5151/OUT	Land to rear of 671 and 673 Foxhall Road	IP3 8NF	Separation of rear gardens of 671 & 673 Foxhall Road Ipswich IP3 8NF to form building plot for new 3 bedroom chalet bungalow with associated parking and access from end of turning head off Claverton Way
----------------	--	---------	--

Mr Richings gave a situation report following his and the Clerks visit to the area of the proposal. This included calling at 10 local dwellings *[with limited success as some residents were not at home]*. The Planning Officer had been consulted as to the scope of this outline application and it had been confirmed that only the 'access' should be considered as a reserved matter.

Several members of the public made statements to the meeting and the Clerk had received five letters objecting to the proposal. The applicant made a statement in support of the application.

It was noted that the applicant was the brother of Parish Councillor Mr J Wright and many of the public present at the meeting were concerned about there being a conflict of interest. The Clerk and Mr Newton explained to the public how the Suffolk Code of Conduct worked and that other Councils members were unaware of this application prior to the papers being received several days ago.

From comments made at this meeting and letters received by the Clerk there were major concerns locally for pedestrian safety through the walkway to Foxhall Road as the number of pedestrian movements per day far exceeded the number given in the Planning Statement owing to the proximity of Broke Hall Primary School.

After a lengthy discussion, Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of refusal based on retained policy AP28 and Development Management Policy DM23 (g), seconded by Miss Cracknell. Resolved: with ALL in favour.

Response: This PC recommends REFUSAL as:- a) saved policy AP28 would be contravened as the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the area. b) There are safety concerns given the daily footfall at this location which is close to Broke Hall Primary School. The submitted planning statement would appear to have underestimated the school term time pedestrian traffic. Measurements carried out by local residents indicate in excess of 400 pedestrian movements per day during school term periods. Development Management Policy DM23 (g) applies.

DC/16/5291/FUL	The Oak Tree Low Carbon Farm, Playford Lane	IP4 4HD	Farm Community Café and Training Centre
----------------	---	---------	---

Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal. There was some discussion regarding the potential for an increase in vehicular movements in Playford Lane. Mr Withey proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mrs Richardson-Todd, Resolved: with ALL in favour

Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL provided there is no significant increase in traffic movements resulting from the additional facilities.

[Miss Cracknell left the meeting at this point as she had another engagement]

DC/16/5072/FUL	Mulberry Corner, Tuddenham Lane	IP5 1DU	Erection of 1.95m fence set back 1.3m from the highway, external alterations to dwelling and erection of gates and pillars.
----------------	---------------------------------	---------	---

Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.

Mr Withey proposed a recommendation of refusal, seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved: with ALL in favour.

Response: The erection of a long length of wooden fencing at 1.94m high, adjacent to a country lane in this rural setting is overbearing and out of character with the area. The proposed set back of the fence by 1.3m does little to alleviate the situation. Development Management Policy DM21 Applies.

The planting of laurel hedging is again out of character as laurel is not a native species, Hornbeam would be a more appropriate choice.
Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council thus recommends REFUSAL. This Parish Council does, however, offer no objection to the building changes involving render/cladding sizes & colour.

DC/16/5417/FUL	6 Kentwell Close	IP4 5BQ	Proposed single storey rear extension and alterations
----------------	------------------	---------	---

Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.
Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved: with ALL in favour
Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL

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

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/16/4634/FUL	37 Brookhill Way	IP4 5UL	Proposed Annexe
----------------	------------------	---------	-----------------

The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal.
This was a further consultation following submission by the applicant of a modified design changing the proposed annexe into a single floor construction (roofline now 2 metres lower), plus removal of a T1 tree and replacing with a new tree in a revised location.

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

Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL after noting the revised design of the proposed annexe and removal/replacement of tree T1.

7. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

None to report

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/16/4144/FUL	18 Euston Avenue	IP4 5QY	Proposed single storey side extension PLANNING PERMISSION
DC/16/4894/TCA	36 The Limes	IP5 1EA	In front garden- 1no. Beech - to remove large limb overhanging garage. 1no. Sycamore - Fell, self seeded sapling in unsuitable position. 1no. Plum - Fell, tree leaning over garage. 1no. Turkey Oak - prune back overhanging branches from house roof by 2m. In back garden- 3no. Sycamore - to be felled because of leaning and overcrowding by Oaks. PLANNING PERMISSION

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

a. 2 Haughley Drive (ENF/2016/0096/DEV),

An original enquiry from a resident to SCDC had started in June 2016 and was with regard to a high, solid fence that has been erected at the side/front of the property at 2 Haughley Drive, which the complainant believed to be of a significant and negative impact to the local street scene. It transpired that planning permission was never sought or obtained but should have been.

A recent response from the planning department implied it was possible that the matter would not be pursued if the owner simply doesn't respond to the letter and/or submit an application. The parishioner was therefore

extremely concerned by this approach from SCDC not least because ignoring the situation would set a precedent for similar works to take place.

Agreed that the Clerk would monitor SCDC to see what if any action would take place in the coming weeks.

10. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING - UPDATE

Meeting with SCDC Planning Policy team took place on Mon 16th Jan. Outcome was neither in favour nor against a NP. What was emerging however was that we should test the water by sending out an invitation to every household inviting them to a one-night consultation i.e. a mini-plan to try and get parishioners involved and see if sufficient interest could be generated to move forward with a NP.

A template of the papers could be supplied by Gillian Benjamin (SCDC Active Communities Team).

Other options relating to the Local Plan were for SCDC to carry out a review in this parish and maybe invite Kesgrave Town Council and Martlesham to attend and share the event.

11. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

a. To Note Matters Arising Since Publication of Agenda

1. Re planning app DC/16/4762 Land Adjacent 42 Woodbridge Road

Concern had been expressed by the Clerk and several residents that the SCC Highways report for the above application voiced no objection to the proposal whereas previous applications for the same site had been deemed "detrimental to highway safety" by SCC Highways. The Clerk had informed Mr Whiting (SCC Cllr) and the reply had been thus:-

"I have reviewed this with SCC officers and their system had linked the two cases so they were aware of the historic application for the same location

I can appreciate that the two responses appear inconsistent, and as you have identified little has physically changed on site in the interim. However the one thing that has changed is the National Planning situation, which has put a far greater emphasis on supporting applications and general housing growth, unless a 'severe harm' is judged to be likely to occur, in highways terms

As the access is existing, and the degree of intensification is relatively low it was officers judgement that they could not demonstrate that a severe harm was likely to occur. If the district council opposed the site on highway grounds SCC would, in all likelihood, have to defend its reasoning at a planning appeal, and it's likely that the decision would be overturned"

The response from Mr Whiting on behalf of SCC Officers was noted by Councillors

b. Dates to Note

9th February, GP&F Meeting, 7.30pm, Village Hall

23rd February, 12PT Meeting, 10am, Kesgrave RBL Hall. (Mr Richings & Mr Francis to note).

12. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

Next P&D - Formal reporting of notes from NP meeting held on 16th January

13. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.42pm