



# 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 26th September, 2017. at  
TOWER HALL Main Hall at 7.30pm**

CHAIRMAN: P Richings Esq.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Miss A Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Mr R Nunn, Mrs B Richardson-Todd, Mr P Richings

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 0  
Mrs S Stannard (Asst Clerk)

APOLOGIES: Mr M Newton (Holiday,) Mr B Ward (Family Engagement), Mr J Wright (unwell)

ABSENT (no apologies): Mr R Whiting

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 and accepted as detailed above.

Reasons for absence were not accepted at this meeting from: - Mr R Whiting.

## 2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30th August, 2017

Mr Nunn proposed acceptance of the Minutes, seconded by Miss Cracknell, with one abstention and the rest 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

There were no declarations made.

## 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

None

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

None

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

DC/17/3064/FUL	10 Bixley Lane	IP4 5UA	Replacement dwelling and detached garage/home office building ( <b>Amended Plans Submitted</b> )
----------------	----------------	---------	--

This application had a response date of 13/09/17. The Chairman and Clerk made a recommendation of refusal under delegated powers on 12/09/17.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council notes the amended plans for the garage/office block.

We have no issues with the proposed dwelling but **recommends REFUSAL** of the application owing to the

overbearing impact on No.6d Bixley Lane of the proposed garage/office which would contravene Policy DM23 (b) 'Outlook' and DM23 (e) 'The resulting physical relationship with other properties'.

This Parish Council would look more favourably on the application if the proposed garage/office were situated on the Eastern side of the site away from No.6d Bixley Lane.

Cllrs noted the response – but see item 8 below.

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

The following had been received and commented on:

DC/17/3734/FUL	55 Arundel Way	IP3 8QF	First storey side & single storey rear extension
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>Miss Cracknell proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mrs Richardson-Todd. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This PC recommends APPROVAL</p>			
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.
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>Mr Nunn proposed a recommendation of conditional approval, seconded by Miss Cracknell. Resolved: in favour on a majority decision.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This PC recommends APPROVAL on condition the brickwork style matches existing and replacement brick type is subject to approval by the Planning Officer.</p>			
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
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>Mr Francis proposed a recommendation of approval seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved: with ALL in favour</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This PC recommends APPROVAL.</p>			
DC/17/3944/TPO	3 Mere Gardens	IP4 5HU	T1 Pear tree - to be felled to allow garden access and replaced with apple tree. T2 Ash tree - remove lowest limb before it fails in high winds.
<p>Mr Wright had provided a situation report several days before this meeting and indicated that in all probability the application would proceed without any problems.</p> <p>Mrs Richardson-Todd proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Miss Cracknell. Resolved: with ALL in favour.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> 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/17/1435/OUT	Land South and East of Adastral Park, Martlesham Heath  <b>[Further Information Received] Response by 10<sup>th</sup> October</b>		Outline planning application for up to 2000 dwellings, an employment area of c0.6ha (use Class B1), primary local centre (comprising use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, C3, D1 and D2), secondary centre (comprising use Classes A1, A3 and A4), a school, green infrastructure (including Suitable Accessible Natural Greenspace (SANGs), outdoor play areas, sports ground and allotments/community orchards), public footpaths and cycleways, vehicle accesses and associated infrastructure.
It was noted that amendments had taken place to the Transport Strategy and as only the covering letter had been received from SCDC it was agreed that the response should be devolved to the Chairman and Clerk to formulate and send a response once they had examined the amendments.			
DC/17/3418/LBC	Hill Farm Barn, Lamberts Lane	IP5 1DS	Retrospective listed building consent for amendments made to application C/00/0884.
The Clerk gave a situation report following his examination of the documentation. Mrs Richardson-Todd proposed a recommendation of approval, seconded by Mr Richings. Resolved: with ALL in favour. <b>Response:</b> This PC recommends granting of listed building consent.			

#### 8. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

DC/17/3064/FUL	10 Bixley Lane	IP4 5UA	Replacement dwelling and detached garage/home office building. <b>(Referral under trigger point 1 and delegated response by the Clerk as stated below was made on 15/09/17)</b>
<p>Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council notes the amended plans for the garage/office block. We have no issues with the proposed dwelling but recommends REFUSAL of the application owing to the overbearing impact on No.6d Bixley Lane of the proposed garage/office which would contravene Policy DM23 (b) 'Outlook' and DM23 (e) 'The resulting physical relationship with other properties'.</p> <p>We note the effort by the applicant to lower the impact of the garage/office block by reducing its height, none-the-less by virtue of the large footprint it remains a significant intrusion on the amenity and outlook of No. 6d Bixley Lane.</p> <p>This Parish Council would look more favourably on the application if the proposed garage/office were situated on the Eastern side of the site away from No.6d Bixley Lane.</p> <p>However a Note from Joe Blackmore (SCDC Planning Officer) received today (26/09/17) stated:- .....<i>The item was addressed at the referral panel held this morning where the Committee Vice-Chair directed that, because of the compliance with relevant planning policies (DM21, DM22 and DM23), there were no matters that would warrant the application being referred to the Planning Committee for determination. Accordingly, authorisation was granted to the Head of Planning Services to issue a delegated decision on this application. If you wish to discuss further, feel free to call or email.</i></p>			
DC/17/0480/FUL	65 Beech Road	IP5 1AP	Change of use (A2) to takeaway food shop (A5) <b>(Referral under trigger point 1)</b>
<p><b>Original Response (not delegated) prior to Referral:</b> <i>Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL as:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The nature of a take-away outlet does not blend with the current businesses in this small retail parade situated in a quiet residential area.</i></li> <li><i>Anti-social opening hours will have a negative impact on the amenity of the area by way of additional noise and on-street parking. Although there is a small lay-by adjacent to the proposal site, in the evenings it is often full of local resident's vehicles (for overnight parking) at a time when the take-away is likely to be most</i></li> </ul>			

active.

- There are also concerns that odour from the food cooking operation will affect the amenity of local residents particularly those living in the flats located above the businesses in that small development.
- The noise from kitchen extractor fans and additional vehicle movement are also likely to be unacceptable to local residents.

That said, latest filed reports online indicate that Environmental Protection is happy with the proposal. The Planning Officer had also agreed with the applicant that the requested hours of operation at weekends should be reduced.

Given the latest online information it was felt there were insufficient reasons for a material objection and Mr Richings proposed that Referral of this application is not requested, seconded by Mrs Richardson-Todd with all in favour.

## 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/17/3059/TPO	132 The Street	IP5 1DH	T1 Leylandii in side garden to be felled. T2 Ash on roadside, low branch over garden to be removed <b>PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
DC/17/2437/FUL	67 Holly Road, Kesgrave	IP5 1HX	Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension (including reconstruction of roof to attic accommodation) - amended and reduced scheme that refused Planning Permission DC/17/1143/FUL <b>REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
DC/17/3395/FUL	3 The Maples	IP4 5RW	Construct new porch extension at front of property <b>PLANNING PERMISSION</b>
DC/17/3509/FUL	102 Woodbridge Road	IP4 5RA	The re-ordering of interior spaces with the addition of a small single storey extension to the rear, elevational treatment throughout and the erection of a two storey Cartlodge to the front of the property. <b>PLANNING PERMISSION + conditions</b>

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

Nothing to report.

## 11. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING – UPDATE - PARISH REVIEW DOCUMENT

A meeting between the Active Communities Team, Planning Policy Team and the Parish Council was held on 12th September at East Suffolk House, Melton.

The agreed opinion was that all the above items raised at the Parish Review fell outside the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan and were local issues which in most cases could be dealt with given sufficient funding by the next tier at County and District Council level or facilitated by the Parish Council. It was further acknowledged that there was little by way of potential development area in any parts of the parish which was not already covered by existing planning policies. The Planning Policy Officers further stated that strategic planning matters from HM Government would also override Neighbourhood Plans as would certain aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The conclusion was that the PC should run with the SCDC Local Plan Review process.

Mrs Richardson-Todd commented that at the recent SALC area meeting Martlesham PC said they had done Neighbourhood Plan work which was now out of the window owing to the Local Plan Review.

**12. TO CONSIDER RESPONSES TO THE SCDC & IPSWICH LOCAL PLAN REVIEW CONSULTATION**

There had been insufficient time to complete this and as Mr Wright was unwell any work started by him on the Ipswich Local Plan Review was not yet available. Closing date for submissions was 30<sup>th</sup> October so the Clerk and Chairman would complete the response before that date.

**13. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE**

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

**Tree Felling at the Land Adjacent 42 Woodbridge Road Site.**

The Clerk had received several copies of emails from residents to SCDC Planning regarding tree felling at the 42 Woodbridge Road site and on the boundary with the Foxwood Ceramics site in contravention of earlier planning conditions. The SCDC Planning Officer had responded stating that he would be visiting the site to check the allegations.

**Request for Bench on The Sandlings**

The Clerk had received a request for a bench to be donated and placed on the Sandlings near the five-a-side pitch with a plaque affixed in memory of a family dog. It was agreed that this would need to go before the PA&S for a decision as there had been problems in the past with ASB on the Sandlings.

**b. Dates to Note**

10<sup>th</sup> October – SCDC Planning Policy, Melton, 10am re Issues and Options Consultation (MB. PMR. SS)

10<sup>th</sup> October – Allotment Holders AGM, Village Hall, 7.30pm

12<sup>th</sup> October - GP&F meeting, Tower Hall, 7.30pm

26<sup>th</sup> October – Woodbridge ASB meeting, Police/Fire Station, 10.30am

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

Local Plan Review – P&D

Request for Bench on Sandlings – PA&S

**15. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.18pm