



# Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

*"Seek The Common Good"*



## Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 19th June 2017 at TOWER HALL at 7.30pm

CHAIRMAN: P Richings Esq.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Miss A Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mr R Nunn, Mr P Richings, Mr B Ward, Mr J Wright

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 0,

APOLOGIES: Mrs B Richardson-Todd (SALC Meeting), Mr R Whiting (another meeting),  
Asst Clerk - Mrs S Stannard

CLERK: Mr M R Bentley

### 1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF THE P&D

Mr Francis proposed Mr Richings as Chairman of the P&D, seconded by Miss Cracknell. There were no other nominations. Mr Richings was duly elected as Chairman of the P&D with all in favour.

### 2. 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.

### 3. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9th May 2017

Mr Ward 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.

### 4. 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.

### 5. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

None identified

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

Miss Cracknell reported that No.20 Ickworth Crescent appeared to have taken the boundary fence down and removed all the peripheral shrubs. Mr Wright would check the property and report back to the Clerk.

### 6. TO NOTE P&D DELEGATED RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/17/1912/TPO	11 Brookhill Way	IP4 5UL	To crown reduce by up to 30% and remove deadwood in 7no. Oak trees within garden curtilage
----------------	------------------	---------	--

The response date for this application was 25/05/17. Mr Wright as Parish Tree Warden had visited the site and spoken to the applicant. He had then submitted a report to the Clerk. This report was then used as the basis for the response to SCDC and sent on 25/05/17.

**Response:** "The Parish Council Tree Warden Cllr James Wright had a site meeting with the applicant followed by a call to Mr Nicholas Newton the SCDC Tree Officer. This gave rise to the following email to the applicant which implied that a variation to the original application may be advisable.

The email to the applicant stated:-

*“Following our meeting yesterday I have today spoken with Nicholas Newton (Tree Officer for Suffolk Coastal District Council) on another matter and took the opportunity to raise the queries which you and I discussed.*

*Firstly the Silver Birch is covered by the "blanket" TPO order for the Brookhill Way development.*

*Secondly, without visiting the location, Mr Newton agreed with the idea of consideration of removing the small Oak Tree which is leaning towards your neighbour's property and is likely to present issues of continued maintenance. On this matter your Tree Surgeon would most likely be able to give the best advice.*

*Thirdly, the trees adjacent your property which occupy an area of "council-maintained" woodland are, as I suggested, managed by Suffolk Norse (on behalf of SCDC). Mr Newton suggests asking Suffolk Norse to visit. Providing they (Suffolk Norse) agree with your plans to cut back some of those trees and, as you indicated, at your expense by using the contractors whilst on-site, then the work would be able to proceed. Suffolk Norse are based at Ufford (phone number: 01394 444000)*

*Having said all the above there are two important considerations:*

*(i) If you wish to prune the Silver Birch and consider removal of the small Oak Tree this would require an amendment to your Planning Application which you could do by contacting SCDC Planning Dept quoting your application reference number before the matter reaches its decision date.*

*(ii) From an environmental point of view it is recommended that tree and hedge work should be avoided during the bird breeding season which current advice is from March to September.*

*As the Tree Warden for Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council all the above is given as advice. Once I have been requested to look at an application for a TPO I then pass on my comments to the Clerk of our Council and our Planning Committee makes a recommendation to SCDC. Thus I have copied in the Clerk to this e.mail.*

*If I can be of any further assistance please contact me by email or by phone on 07494447391.*

*Kind regards, Cllr. James Wright”*

*Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council therefore recommends the applicant seeks further advice from the SCDC Tree Officer.”*

**The response was noted and approved by members attending this meeting.**

DC/17/1775/FUL	35 Bladen Drive	IP4 5UE	Erection of picket fence
The response date for this application was 25/05/17. After consultation between the Clerk and Chairman the delegated response below was sent on 25/05/17. <b>Response:</b> <i>“Under normal circumstances, Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council would wish to recommend refusal on the basis that the Bixley Farm development has had permitted development rights revoked for such a proposal. However, we note that the applicant appears to have been poorly served by SCDC when making initial enquiries and we would recommend that SCDC reviews their procedures to avoid such an unfortunate scenario to recur.</i> <i>As such we reluctantly feel it would be appropriate not to recommend refusal on this particular occasion. We would not wish for any approval of this application to be used on a positive “custom &amp; practice” basis by any other applicant making a future similar application in this area.”</i> Noted by Councillors although some Councillors were not happy with this response, feeling that refusal would have been a better option.			
DC/17/2024/FUL	4 Hardwick Close	IP4 5XB	Two storey side extension with single storey front extension
The response date for this application was 04/06/17. After consultation between the Clerk and Chairman a delegated response of ‘recommend approval’ was sent to SCDC on 04/06/17. Mr Francis wished it recorded that he was not happy with general development of semi-detached dwellings. <b>Response:</b> This PC recommends APPROVAL Noted and approved by Councillors			
DC/17/1818/FUL	6 Lewes Close	IP3 8RX	Two storey side extension and single storey front extension
The response date for this application was 12/06/17. After consultation between the Clerk and Chairman a delegated response of ‘recommend approval’ was sent to SCDC on 12/06/17. <b>Response:</b> This PC recommends APPROVAL			

Noted and approved by Councillors

Mr Wright felt that Councillors or Officers should visit all planning application sites to assess the proposals and report back at the appropriate P&D meeting. He further stated that some Councillors were more than willing to visit sites and neighbours. The comment was noted by the Chairman and Clerk, with the Clerk apologising that the number of delegated responses at this meeting was unusual as he had suffered a recent family bereavement and had been away on family matters with little time to visit application sites or arrange an earlier P&D meeting.

**7. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/17/2168/FUL	Part rear garden 4 Playford Lane	IP5 1DW	New dwelling adjacent 4 Playford Lane, Rushmere - resubmission of Planning Refusal ref : DC/15/0595/FUL
<p>Mr Richings, the Clerk and Mr Wright gave situation reports following examination of the proposal documentation, SCC Highway reports plus the approved version of the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Document (January 2017).</p> <p>There was concern by Committee members that EITHER the line of the PLB (Physical Limits Boundary) had changed during the consultation period of the Site Allocation Policy Document without discussion by the Group assessing the document, OR a cartographic error in the placement of the PLB had been made, as this Council was unaware of this particular change to the PLB.</p> <p>Mr Francis proposed a recommendation of conditional approval, seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> We query whether there has been a cartographic error in the placement of the Physical Limits Boundary (PLB) in compiling the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies Document (January 2017) as this Council is unaware of the changes that appear to have been made to the line of the PLB at the rear of No.4 Playford Lane. We request clarification as to why and when the line of the PLB was changed.</p> <p>We note that SCC Highways are recommending a reduction of the hedgerow height to 0.9m above the carriageway along the frontage of the highway. We would seek a condition restricting this work to take place outside of the bird nesting season.</p> <p>This PC recommends APPROVAL of this application subject to the above hedgerow conditions and PLB queries being suitably addressed.</p>			

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

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/17/2386/FUL	11 Blackdown Avenue	IP5 1AZ	Erection of single storey rear extension
<p>The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>Mr Nunn proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Wright. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			
DC/17/2412/FUL	789 Foxhall Road	IP4 5TJ	Extension to existing dropped kerb
<p>Mr Francis commented on cars parking on the visibility splay in Foxhall Road to the east of the above dwelling.</p> <p>The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>Mr Ward proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This PC recommends APPROVAL.</p>			

**9. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED**

DC/17/1678/FUL	Rush Cottage, 60 Playford Road	IP4 5RG	Boundary wall and piers exceeding 1.00m fronting highway (Playford Road and Bent Lane)
----------------	--------------------------------	---------	--

The above application was referred under condition 3. 'Officer minded to approve when objections had been raised'.

The Clerk had responded to the referral as follows:- ‘The heights of the boundary wall piers are out of character with the local rural environment and there are concerns regarding sufficient splay visibility for traffic turning out of Bent Lane.’

A subsequent email from the SCDC Planning Officer stated: ‘I have been back to the applicant with the concerns raised about the height of the piers. I’ve suggested that I would only be mindful to approve the application if a condition was placed on the permission requiring that the piers fronting Playford Road are reduced to 1.2m in height. Can I ask if that alters the view of the Parish Council?’

The Clerk then responded with:- ‘Reducing the piers to 1.2m would be acceptable to the Parish Council and we would be happy for that to be imposed as a condition of approval.’

The responses were noted and approved by Councillors.

#### 10. 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/17/1199/TPO	White Cottage, 150 The Street	IP5 1DH	T1 - Horse Chestnut - Carry out crown reduction of 1.5m - 2m, remove dead wood and Ivy for general maintenance and to tidy up the tree. T2 - Robinia - Carry out crown reduction of 2m - 2.5m in places as the crown is becoming quite spreading, remove dead wood. For general maintenance and remove unnecessary weight from the canopy. T3 - Ash - Carry out crown reduction of 1.5m - 2m, remove dead wood and Ivy. For general maintenance, to trim canopy away from the church roof and to tidy up the tree. <b>PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
DC/17/1521/FUL	714 Foxhall Road	IP4 5TD	Alterations and extensions <b>PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
DC/17/1541/FUL	34 Beech Road	IP5 1AN	Demolition of garage, New single storey extension to the rear and two storey extension to the side and rear, new roof over existing bay and front entrance <b>PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions</b>
DC/17/1773/FUL	2 Playford Lane	IP5 1DW	To erect PVCU conservatory to side of property <b>PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
DC/17/1775/FUL	35 Bladen Drive	IP4 5UE	Erection of picket fence <b>PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
DC/17/1818/FUL	6 Lewes Close	IP3 8RX	Two storey side extension and single storey front extension <b>PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions</b>

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

Nothing to report

#### 12. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING – UPDATE (including final arrangements for ‘Village Review’ evening).

The Village Review evening was due to commence at 7.30pm in the Village Hall on 20<sup>th</sup> June. It was unknown how many parishioners would attend, nor was it known exactly how the meeting format would run as the evening was being hosted by Gillian Benjamin of the Active Communities Team at SCDC. The Clerk would be arranging refreshments for the evening.

#### 13. REPORT FROM Mr WRIGHT ON ‘2017 Site Allocations & Area Specific Policies’ Document

Mr Wright had examined the adopted SCDC Site Allocations Policies Document and produced a report of the areas within the document affecting this parish. The report was distributed to Councillors attending this meeting.

Mr Wright was thanked for examining the document and producing the report (*Copies of the report are available from the Clerk*).

Mr Wright pointed out that 'saved policies' relating to Foxhall Woods and Foxhall Stadium were to be replaced or deleted and it appeared to be up to any subsequent local Neighbourhood Plan to define the outcome of those areas.

Mr Newton pointed out a similar problem was now faced in Woodbridge as they had ceased production of their NP, but it had now left them without any defined policies in the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document.

**14. REPORT FROM Mrs RICHARDSON-TODD ON THE SPS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SEMINAR**

[Mrs Richardson-Todd was unable to be present to talk about the seminar as she was attending a SALC meeting this evening]. A copy of the documents handed out at the SPS seminar was distributed to Councillors attending this P&D meeting (*Further copies of the documents are available from the Clerk*).

The Chairman thanked Mrs Richardson-Todd for attending the event at Haughley Barn.

**15. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE**

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

**Ipswich Local Plan**

The Clerk had received notification from IBC of further consultation on the Ipswich Local plan plus a call for potential development sites (Responses by 10.45pm Wed 26<sup>th</sup> July 2017). Mr Wright noted that the documents stated that a green barrier was still required between Ipswich and Rushmere St Andrew. There was also much more focus on air quality (Responses on air quality by 11.45pm Wed 12<sup>th</sup> July 2017)

**b. Dates to Note**

20<sup>th</sup> June, 7.30pm, Village Hall, Parish Review hosted by SCDC

22<sup>nd</sup> June, 10.30am, Woodbridge Police/Fire Station, SCDC SNT ASB meeting.

13<sup>th</sup> July, 7.30pm, Village Hall, PC Meeting.

20<sup>th</sup> July, 7.30pm, Tower Hall, PA&S Meeting.

**16. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA**

Local Plan review workshops report back

Feedback from parish review meeting.

**17. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.27pm