



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on 25th October 2017 at TOWER HALL- Main Hall at 7.30pm

CHAIRMAN:	P Richings Esq.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mr R Nunn, Mrs B Richardson-Todd, Mr P Richings, Mr B Ward, Mr R Whiting gave apologies several days before the meeting but arrived during item 4 on the agenda.
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Members of the public = 0,
APOLOGIES:	Miss A Cracknell (Another commitment), Mr J Wright (unwell) Mrs S Stannard (Clerk)
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 Nunn 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 26th September 2017

Mr Nunn 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

None identified

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

Mr Francis stated that an item in the Evening Star had said that the proposed Bell Lane development had been turned down by the Appeals Inspector.

Mr Francis also raised a query regarding the planning status of 787 Foxhall Road which had originally been turned down for a Certificate of Lawful Development in respect of two car ports. The Clerk said he had further information on this under item 9 Planning Decisions.

[Mr Whiting arrived at this point in the meeting]

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

DC/17/4118/TPO	87 Playford Road	IP4 5RQ	To fell 2 no. Corsican Pines because of root damage in driveway
<p>This application had a response date of 17/10/17 hence the Clerk and Chairman made a delegated response to SCDC on 14/10/17 under the 'simple' application policy</p> <p>Response: We note that there has been no technical report submitted in section 10 of the application and there may be alternative remedial work available to avoid removal of the Corsican pine trees. Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council would prefer to see the trees remain in place and thus recommends REFUSAL of this application.</p> <p>Councillors noted and approved the response.</p>			

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

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/17/3850/FUL	26 Brookhill Way	IP4 5UL	Single storey rear extension
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his visit examination of the proposal documentation. Mr Francis proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mrs Richardson-Todd. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p>Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			
DC/17/4155/FUL	35 Bixley Drive	IP4 5TX	Proposed alterations and front extensions
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. Mr Whiting proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p>Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			
DC/17/4112/FUL	7 Sandling Crescent	IP4 5TW	Demolition of rear conservatory and erection of single storey sun-room to rear elevation
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p>Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL.</p>			
DC/17/4338/FUL	36-38 Woodbridge Road	IP5 1BH	Erection of a new treatment building to be used in association with the existing physiotherapy and sports injury clinic
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. It was noted that this was a revision of the original approved application in order to relocate the building to avoid below ground obstructions existing from the former site use.</p> <p>Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Whiting. 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

None received.

8. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

None 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/17/0480/FUL	65 Beech Road	IP5 1AP	Change of use (A2) to takeaway food shop (A5) PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/17/3064/FUL	10 Bixley Lane	IP4 5UA	Replacement dwelling and detached garage/home office building (Amended Plans Submitted) PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/17/3734/FUL	55 Arundel Way	IP3 8QF	First storey side & single storey rear extension PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/17/3666/FUL	1 Bladen Drive	IP4 5UE	Relocate side garden wall/fence to run closer to the footpath on Broadlands Way; In line with my Neighbours existing fence, that runs by the same foot path. PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions
DC/17/3921/FUL	33 Claverton Way	IP4 5XE	Proposed single storey side pitched roof extension and continuation of new pitched roof over existing single storey flat roof PLANNING PERMISSION
DC/17/2704/CLE	787 Foxhall Road	IP4 5TJ	Certificate of Lawfulness-existing (side roller shutter doors with proposed car ports behind) CERTIFICATE of LAWFULNESS GRANTED

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

Nothing to report.

11. ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATIONS

a. To Formulate and Agree a Response to the Suffolk Coastal District Council Consultation

Taking agenda items 11a and 11b together, the Chairman, and both Clerks had met on 17/10/17 to create a draft response after reading through the documents sent by SCDC and IBC. The draft response was distributed to Councillors along with the agenda for this meeting. It was deemed that not all questions required an answer as they were outside the scope of this Council.

b. To Formulate and Agree a Response to the Ipswich Borough Council Consultation

Following a number of minor amendments suggested by members of the P&D, Mr Francis proposed acceptance of the SCDC and the IBC consultation responses, seconded by Mr Nunn with ALL in favour. The full text of the response to SCDC and IBC is attached to these minutes at Appendix A.

12. TO RECOMMEND A 2018/19 P&D BUDGET TO THE GP&F COMMITTEE

It was normal to set a notional annual budget amount to cover costs of any maps etc required. Amount set last year was £250.

Mr Francis recommended a budget of £250 to cover any expenses for maps or other items should be forwarded to the GP&F for building into the overall PC budget, seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved: with all in favour.

13. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

a. To Note Matters Arising Since Publication of Agenda

- i. **Fire at 155 The Street** – There had been a serious fire at 'Redecroft', 155 The Street the previous evening with over 50 firefighters in attendance. The Clerk passed photos around the meeting that had appeared in the local papers plus several pictures that Mrs Richardson-Todd had taken the morning after the fire.
- ii. **Emergency Road Closure at 135 The Street** – An emergency road closure notice for The Street had been issued for 25th to 27th October 'to enable repairs to be undertaken to leaking communication pipes' at 135 The Street.

- iii. **Adastral Park report from SCC Principal Highway Engineer** – Letter received just before this meeting from Luke Barber, SCC Principal Highway Engineer regarding the highway infrastructure proposals to cater for the Adastral Park, 2000 dwelling development. Mr Barber had written to SCDC in response to the outline planning application for the roads infrastructure requirements for the development. SCDC had apparently not placed his response on their Public Access planning database so he was sending it to individual councils for distribution. The Clerk agreed to copy to all Councillors and our District Cllrs would raise a query with the SCDC Planning Department.
- iv. **Beech Road/A1214 Junction Improvements** – The Clerk had received enquiries asking why the Beech Rd/A1214 junction improvements had not been carried out in accordance with the flyer that had been sent to local residents by SCC Highways, specifically with respect to the proposed footpath and cycleway widths. Mr Whiting (as our County Cllr) felt that there just simply not been room to fit the extra width on the foot/cycle path, but was unable to explain why plans had been issued stating that the changes would be made. He did, however, explain that there were a number of improvements, with new traffic lights linked to the traffic management system, new road surfacing and layout.

b. Dates to Note

9th Nov, 7.30pm, PC Meeting, Village Hall
11th Nov, 10.45am, Remembrance Service, St Andrews Church
16th Nov, 7.30pm, PA&S Meeting, Tower Hall
23rd Nov, 10.30am, SNT Meeting, Woodbridge Fire/Police Station

14. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None identified.

15. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.30pm.

Appendix A:

The Parish Council response to SCDC and IBC regarding the 2017 Local Plan Review, Issues and Options consultation: -

27th October 2017

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council wishes to make the following comments on the *Issues and Options for the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Review* consultation: -

Not all questions have been answered as some were deemed to be outside the scope of this Parish Council. This response approved by the Parish Council Planning & Development Committee on 25/10/2017.

Part 1 – Strategic/Cross Boundary Issues for IBC and SCDC

Q02: What are the advantages of your area that should be protected through local plans?

Answer Q02: If we consider RSA as two areas with separate identifies. Dealing with the north of the A1214 first then we consider it is essential to retain the rural aspect of the Village area along with the existing sports grounds and associated facilities together with the open corridor separating from Ipswich and Kesgrave. With respect to the south of the parish although largely urban we consider the existing LNRs of Sandlings and Mill stream are essential open spaces both from wild life point of view and the enjoyment of local residents with well-defined walks. Rushmere Common is a long standing common area and should remain as a feature with its flora and wildlife typical of the Suffolk Sandlings. Part of the common is owned by Rushmere Golf Club and their land forms part of the continuous strip of Sandlings land.

Q04: What are the key priorities you would like to be addressed by 2036 – in the places across Ipswich and Suffolk Coastal where you live, work or study?

Answer Q04: Infrastructure enhancements should be carried out before any development takes place - sustainability leading up to the year 2036 is likely to be a major problem. Existing infrastructure also needs a major review and overhaul before any future development takes place. This includes repair of roads and junctions.

Q06: Which growth scenario should we plan for across the Ipswich Housing Market area?

Answer Q06: Scenario A.

Q07: Do you have evidence to suggest that the housing and/or jobs targets should be different from the forecasts or scenarios outline above – either higher or lower?

Answer Q07: No

Q08: Would communities be prepared to accept more growth if that growth meant that significant new or enhanced infrastructure could be provided?

Answer Q08: Possibly, depends on what is offered.

Q09: What key pieces of transport infrastructure should be sought? Would it be roads such as an Ipswich norther route, or sustainable transport infrastructure (public transport, park and ride, cycling), or both?

Answer Q09: Both. Before considering additional development in the northern area, the Ipswich Northern route should be constructed.

Q10: Should the Local Plan Review seek to address the issue of temporary closure of the Orwell Bridge by planning for a scale of development that can help to deliver infrastructure?

Answer Q10: No

Q13: Which distribution options do you think would be most appropriate to take forward?

Answer Q13:

Option 1 – first priority

Option 2 – Would be heavily resisted by the Parish Council

Option 3 – Should be limited to Brown Field sites only

Least preferred options are 5 & 6

Q17: Should the policy approach of maintaining the physical separation of villages from Ipswich be continued or should infill in gaps between settlements be considered a source of housing land?

Answer Q17: Absolutely yes. Continue with policy of physical separation.

Q18: If development cannot be accommodated within Ipswich, should it be focused within the communities close to Ipswich or distributed within the larger Ipswich Housing Market Area? What criteria should guide its location?

Answer Q18: Should be distributed within the larger Ipswich HMA.

Q19: Should Ipswich switch employment land to housing use, even though the Borough has a high jobs target? Where should the Council prioritise protecting employment land?

Answer Q19: Yes - Should be seriously considered.

Q20: Is there other land within Ipswich Borough which should be considered for residential development? Is the approach to protecting open space the right one?

Answer Q20: Open space should be protected. Brownfield sites within the Borough should be seriously considered.

Q21: Where do you think the most appropriate locations are to meet this need (Gypsies, Travellers, Travelling Show People and Boat Dweller)?

Answer Q21: Extension of West Meadows could be considered.

Q29: What infrastructure is currently required in your area and what additional infrastructure do you think would be needed, and where, to support the future distribution and levels of growth outlined?

Answer Q29: Foul water disposal in the Rushmere St Andrew Village, examples are Mendip Drive, Woodbridge Road, The Maples – over the years they have experienced infrastructure problems.

Q30: How can the strategic transport connections be enhanced and improved?

Answer Q30: Bus services in the evenings and weekends.

Part 2 – Suffolk Coastal Issues and Options

Q34: What makes a successful community in Suffolk Coastal?

Answer Q34: Pride in the local environment and provision of activities.

Q35: What services/facilities/developments are needed to make a community successful?

Answer Q35: Provision of meeting places (community halls), pubs, shops, pharmacies, restaurants, community engagement, proximity of employment opportunities, open space provision, religious meeting places.

Q36: What is your vision for your local community?

Answer Q36: Retention of the village environment and the small community.

Q38: Are the existing policy approaches and planning policies operating appropriately in relation to affordable housing?

Answer Q38: We are unaware of any specific demand for affordable housing in this local area.

Q39: Is the existing affordable housing policy coverage and scope sufficient? Do you have any suggestions for what else might be included in a comprehensive approach to affordable housing?

Answer Q39: Existing policies are OK.

Q40: Where provision for affordable housing on an 'exception site' is supported by, and can be shown to meet the needs of, that land community should planning policy be sufficiently flexible to allow for this?

Answer Q40: It should be based on LPA providing proof of local need.

Q46: Should we continue with the current policy approach to housing size or take a more flexible approach that reflects the site location and characteristics?

Answer Q46: Flexible approach to good design with appropriate local facilities.

Q47: How can the Local Plan promote an increase in smaller units to meet specific needs?

Answer Q47: We don't know, but it needs to be addressed.

Q48: What more could be done to help ensure that more housing is provided specifically to meet the needs of older people, or those with specialist care needs?

Answer Q48: Downsizing, close to bus routes, close to shops, bungalows, close to general facilities.

Q49: Should starter homes be part of the type and mix of units required?

Answer Q49: Yes

Q50: Should the Council encourage greater use of modular construction to provide a range of residential accommodation?

Answer Q50: Yes, providing it is of good quality and sustainable.

Q51: Should specialist housing be delivered on specific sites or alongside other forms of residential development?

Answer Q51: Alongside other forms and it should be integrated.

Q53: The district contains a small number of houseboats. Existing planning policies limit the areas within which houseboats are permitted and the number of houseboats within those areas. Do you think this type of approach remains appropriate?

Answer Q53: Yes, existing approach.

Q54: Should the physical limits boundaries be tightly defined around existing built development or more loosely defined to allow for small scale development in communities?

Answer Q54: Should remain tightly defined.

Q55: Can criteria based policies more appropriately deal with growth in the rural areas than physical limits boundaries?

Answer Q55: No, extremely difficult to generate suitable and robust criteria that would apply across the district.

Q56: Do all settlements require physical limits boundaries?

Answer Q56: Physical Limits Boundary should be in place for sustainable villages.

Q57: Do you think the current policy approach to development in housing clusters is working successfully or does it need to be amended?

Answer Q57: Yes

Q58: How should the Council consider application for the re-use of redundant buildings in the countryside?

Answer Q58: Favourably, as a well-designed refurbishment is better than a derelict building.

Q59: Should the Council introduce a sequential approach to the re-use of redundant buildings with priority given to, for example employment or tourism use?

Answer Q59: Yes, sequential approach with priority to employment use, tourism use and residential use.

Q60: Should we continue to identify both strategic and general employment areas?

Answer Q60: yes

Q61: Should we continue to stipulate the uses on sites allocated for employment or should policies be more flexible to allow a wider variety of uses.

Answer Q61: It should be more flexible to allow better use of sites but still allow employment opportunities to be created.

Q62: Should planning policies take a flexible approach to new employment development where there is an identified need by allowing development outside of allocated sites and physical limits boundaries?

Answer Q62: It should be a very specific need and biased towards the agricultural as opposed to industrial.

Q63: Should the Local Plan allocate more land than is required for employment uses or should we only allocate what is needed?

Answer Q63: It should be no more than 10% over allocation.

Q68: Are the existing boundaries of town centres, primary shopping areas, primary shopping frontages and secondary shopping frontages still appropriate?

Answer Q68: Yes

Q71: Should the Local Plan continue to protect retail provision within district and local centres?

Answer Q71: yes

Q72: What uses are appropriate within district and local centre?

Answer Q72: Retail - shops, cafes, public houses, restaurants, takeaways, community & leisure.

Q73: What areas or locations should be considered for inclusion or exclusion from a district or local centre?

Answer Q73: Sufficient facilities should be provided to serve the local community.

Q77: *Where is the best place for new retail development to meet the needs of areas east of Ipswich?*

Answer Q77: Martlesham, Warren Heath, Futura Park.

Q78: *Does out of town retail at Martlesham affect your town centre or local area? If so how?*

Answer Q78: No, indeed it forms part of our local area.

Q88: *Are the current SCC parking standards appropriate in the context of Suffolk Coastal? If not, what changes would you wish to see and why?*

Answer Q88: Sufficient off-road parking should be provided to inhibit on-street parking.

Q89: *Is the need for and the importance of, vehicle parking sufficiently reflected in existing planning policies?*

Answer Q89: Parking requirements should be addressed at the development stage.

Q90: *Should we continue to protect all existing community services and facilities?*

Answer Q90: Yes

Q92: *Where it is not possible to retain the existing community use should we require an alternative community use to be investigated prior to allowing redevelopment?*

Answer Q92: Yes, redevelopment should be a last resort.

Q93: *Which areas lack appropriate provision of community facilities?*

Answer Q93: Rural

Q94: *Should the Council continue to use CIL or section 106 agreements or a mixture of both?*

Answer Q94: CIL

Q95: *Should specific sites be allocated for community use?*

Answer Q95: Yes

Q96: *Should future Local Plan policies provide greater protection for facilities identified as assets of community value?*

Answer Q96: Yes

Q100: *Should we continue with the existing standards, or should the provision of new open space and play space be guided by the deficiencies identified in the Leisure Strategy?*

Answer Q100: Yes, the open space policies seem to work well. Continue with the existing.

Q101: *What type of facilities/ provision should be considered as Open Space?*

Answer Q101: Playing fields, allotments, village greens, public rights of way, parks and gardens, LNR, Common Land.

Q102: *Under what circumstances may it be acceptable to allow the loss of open space to development?*

Answer Q102: For enabling purposes to provide a quality leisure facility. Any loss should be compensated by an equivalent gain in the near vicinity.

Q103: *What type or size of development should provide new on-site Open Space?*

Answer Q103: Large sustainable developments. E.g. 1000 houses must develop new open spaces proportional to the size of the development. Anything smaller must consider the suitability and size of existing local facilities.

Q105: *How can the Local Plan Review further promote the provision of high speed broadband and communication networks across the district?*

Answer Q105: All new major development should have HS Broadband facilities as part of building specifications (Building Regulation requirements?).

Q106: *How can the Local Plan Review create safe and accessible communities which do not undermine the quality of life across the district?*

Answer Q106: Ensure police are consulted on significant developments.

Q119: *How can we improve the design and quality of estate scale development?*

Answer Q119: Generally, all development should be to a defined quality level with design appropriate to the local area and individuality should be incorporated in designs.

Q120: *How can we improve design quality through planning policy?*

Answer Q120: Ensure new development has local characteristics and is of good design quality.

Q121: *How do we promote locally distinctive design?*

Answer Q121: By having suitable design policies in place.

Q122: *Is it possible to secure high quality design which is locally distinctive through factory build development?*

Answer Q122: Yes, define appropriate specifications at the tendering process.

Q123: *Should large scale developments be required to follow the 'Garden City' principles?*

Answer Q123: Yes

Q124: Should the principles of 'Building for Life 12' be used as a tool to improve the design quality of new development?

Answer Q124: Yes

Q125: Should local housing densities be set for new developments?

Answer Q125: Yes

Q126: Should different design principles be applied to housing developments at high/low densities? For example, avoid using detached housing at higher densities in order to maintain sufficient space between buildings?

Answer Q126: Yes

Q127: When would development of residential gardens be inappropriate?

Answer Q127: Where it impacts on the relationship with other properties.

Q128: Should the Council adopt additional optional standards in respect of accessibility, internal space and water efficiency?

Answer Q128: Yes

Q129: What should be included in a positive strategy for the protection of heritage assets across the district?

Answer Q129: To give suitable protection for Non-Designated Heritage Assets as defined by the local community.

Q130: What does the Council need to include a positive strategy for the protection and enhancement of heritage assets?

Answer Q130: See above.

Q131: What level of protection should be given to non-designated heritage assets and locally listed buildings?

Answer Q131: Full protection.

Q132: Is the Landscape Character approach to considering the impact of development on the landscape preferable to retaining Special Landscape Areas for this purpose?

Answer Q132: If Landscape Character Assessments are used then there should be very specific criteria and guidelines to safeguard particular landscapes. Until this is the case, Special Landscape Areas should remain in place. In Rushmere St Andrew special protection should be given to the Fynn Valley, Mill Stream, Sandlings and Rushmere Common and existing playing field areas.

Q134: Should areas of tranquillity be identified and protected and if so, which areas should be considered?

Answer Q134: Local Nature Reserves such as the Sandlings & Mill Stream, Fynn Valley and Rushmere Common.

Q135: In which areas should development be resisted to avoid settlement coalescence?

Answer Q135: Ipswich to Rushmere St Andrew Village

Rushmere St Andrew Village to Kesgrave

Rushmere St Andrew Village to the Fynn Valley

Q137: Do breaks and gaps in-between buildings need to be given specific protection against development?

Answer Q137: Existing breaks and gaps should be maintained.

Q139: Should the Council explore further options to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and Natural England to determine a consistent policy approach to biodiversity?

Answer Q139: Yes

Q140: What level of protection should be given to locally designated sites of biodiversity value?

Answer Q140: Yes, full protection.

Q141: Do you have any suggestions for Local Plan policies to support biodiversity retention and enhancement?

Answer Q141: The retention and enhancement of biodiversity should be supported in particular at the Rushmere Common, Sandlings LNR, Mill Stream LNR and Fynn Valley.

Q143: Which sites do you consider appropriate for further consideration by the Council?

Answer Q143: Please find below our thoughts on the various sites, whether they are appropriate or not. The Parish Council considers sites 474 and 88 could be potentially acceptable sites but please refer to the more detailed comments below about access regarding site 88.

Comments about the various sites within or just outside Rushmere St Andrew

Site No.	Comment
522	Not to be developed owing to massive loss of Woodlands and open areas and loss of sporting facility. The road is not sustainable for development.
520	Recently been rejected on appeal. Sustainability of traffic along Foxhall Road, feeder into Ipswich.
870	Potential massive development which would have a detrimental impact on traffic and would lose the village outlook.
353	As owners of site 353 we have no intention to develop the site and wish to retain it as a sporting facility

	currently under the tenure of the Ipswich School Sports Centre. It has already been partly developed at Eaton Place (as an enabling development to finance refurbishment of the site facilities).
953,1060, 1085	Must be retained as sporting facilities for the community.
1084, 1085, 1089	Development of these sites would be contrary to SSP36 of the existing Local Plan.
332	Already has planning permission.
994	Site is outside the PLB and access along Playford Lane would be unrealistic..
1087	Unsustainable development – would be a massive extension to the Rushmere St Andrew village and require massive infrastructure uplift with no links to existing feeder roads – Also outside the PLB. We draw attention to the fact that this site currently includes part of the Rushmere St Andrew Lawn Cemetery and would thus not be available anyway. We would also like to designate/ remove the land between the Lawn Cemetery and the Rushmere St Andrew Village Hall as reserved for future cemetery expansion.
182	Unsustainable – poor infrastructure (Lamberts Lane) – single track and separate from the main village.
183	Unsustainable. Same as above.
1082	In isolation. It has extremely poor access.
474	Potentially acceptable site.
88	Natural extension of Brookhill Park – acceptable providing no direct access onto Foxhall Road at the bend/hill top. Alternative access may be further along Foxhall Road.

For information this Parish Council only responded to the following question from the Ipswich Borough Council Consultation Part 2.

Q37 – *Land is allocated in the Borough as countryside. Should we re-allocate countryside sites to housing? If not, why not? If yes, which areas? (see map to the right for details of current countryside areas).*

Answer Q37: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council consider the areas annotated H, I, J, K & L should remain as countryside in order to preserve the very long standing (1997) policy of maintaining the separation of RSA village from the town in order to maintain its own identity. We are concerned about additional traffic that would be generated around the north Ipswich to Martlesham rat run corridor (Humber Doucy Lane, The Street, Playford Road) that would be generated by any further development in the north/north-east corner of Ipswich.

Mel Bentley – Clerk, Rushmere St Andrew PC