



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



**Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 2nd October 2018 at
Rushmere Church Hall, The Street at 7.30pm**

CHAIRMAN: P Richings

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Miss A Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mr R Nunn, Mr M Shields, Mr P Richings, Mr R Whiting

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 9

APOLOGIES: Mr B Ward (another commitment), Mr J Wright (unwell), Mrs B Richardson-Todd (another commitment).

ABSENT (no apologies):

CLERK: Mrs S Stannard

1. APOLOGIES, APPROVAL OF ABSENCE, PROTOCOL & CONDUCT REMINDERS

The Chairman read out 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 Whiting proposed acceptance of reasons for councillor absence, seconded by Miss Cracknell with ALL in favour.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13th September 2018

The following corrections were made:

Add new item 6: ' **Any Other Planning Applications Received since Publication of this Agenda**
None'

Amend the numbering of item 6 to item 7; amend the numbering of item 7 to item 8; amend the numbering of item 8 to item 9.

Mr Francis proposed acceptance of the Minutes, seconded by Mr Whiting, with ALL in favour. The Minutes were duly signed by the Chairman as a correct record with the above-mentioned alterations.

3. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST

Mr Newton declared a local non-pecuniary interest 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 Nunn declared a private interest in application DC/18/3836/FUL, 833 Foxhall Road. He has an interest in the neighbouring property 835 Foxhall Road.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

Several members of the public were interested in DC/18/3598/FUL, 143 The Street. One member of the public was interested in DC/18/3836/FUL, 833 Foxhall Road. One member of the public was interested in planning application DC/18/3690/FUL, 5 Kentwell Close that was considered at a previous Planning and Development meeting.

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

5 Kentwell Close – A neighbour of 5 Kentwell Close stated that he was unaware that this application was discussed at the last Planning and Development meeting and that members of the public could attend Parish Council (Planning and Development) meetings. He requested that adjoining neighbours be made aware of Planning and Development meetings of the Parish Council and that a site notice be displayed to advertise these parish council meetings. The Chairman explained that Suffolk Coastal District Council is the planning authority in this instance and determines the planning application. The District Council sends a letter to adjoining neighbours and displays a site notice. The Parish Council is a statutory consultee and therefore comments on planning applications in the parish. Any member of the public can comment on any planning application and all comments (including statutory comments) are taken into consideration by Suffolk Coastal District Council before they make a decision on any particular planning application. The Parish Council advertise all Parish Council meetings on the eighteen noticeboards in the parish and on the Parish Council website. The Parish Council will look at including an article in the next Parish Newsletter about the planning process and planning and development committee meetings of the parish council.

Mr Francis queried the results of the appeal on 67 Holly Road. The Clerk indicated that the Parish Council has not been notified about the outcome and that she will follow this up.

Mr Nunn reported speeding motorbikes along the Mill Stream LNR.

5. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/18/3598/FUL	143 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DG	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2no. two storey dwellings. Formation of additional vehicular access.
----------------	---------------------------------------	---------	--

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

Outline planning application is for the matter of “access”.

No pre-application advice sought.

The following questions are answered “yes”:-

- “A proposed use that would be particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination” (see questionnaire & Enviroscreen certificate included with “Passed” appraisal)
- “New or altered vehicular access proposed to or from the public highway” (see Last & Tricker drawing no 4795/4)
- “Any trees or hedges on the proposed development site” (see Serv-aid ltd drawings 282/001/01 & 282/001/02)
- “Do plans incorporate areas to store and aid the collection of waste” (Answered “Bin presentation area close to roadside”)
- “Have arrangements been made for the separate storage and collection of recyclable waste” (Answered “Recycling bins in kitchen”)

Foul sewage to be disposed to sewer, surface water to soak-away.

“Market” houses on site – existing number 1 (no of bedrooms unknown), proposed 2 (no of bedrooms unknown).

Vehicle parking spaces proposed to increase from 3 to 8.

Plans – Site survey, site layout, contamination questionnaire & certificate documents provided.

Site layout shows the splitting of the existing site into two (front and back) plots. In the vicinity of the existing bungalow, a 2 storey house is indicated with an additional vehicular access from the highway with driveway / parking areas to front of site. Along the eastern border of the site, the driveway would be extended to an additional parking area where a second 2 storey house is indicated. This being an outline planning application for “access” only, the drive and house layouts should be considered indicative at this stage and would be subject to a further “reserved matter” application if the current application receives approval.

Informative - Suffolk Coastal District Council Development Plan Document

Approved in January 2017, the Site Allocations and Area Specific Policies document shows the Physical Limits Boundary for Rushmere St Andrew appearing to pass through the second (rear) house. The relevant policy SSP2 (Physical Limits Boundaries) is as follows:-

“In accordance with Core Strategy policy SP19 Settlement Hierarchy, physical limits boundaries have been drawn for all settlements listed as Major Centre, Town, Key and Local Service Centre. These are settlements which the Core Strategy has defined as sustainable. The physical limits boundaries identify the parts of those settlements to which new development, particularly new housing development is directed. Accordingly, in principle, proposals for development within the defined physical limits boundary will be acceptable, subject to other relevant policies in this Site Allocations Document, the Core Strategy and Neighbourhood Plans. Proposals for new residential development outside physical limits boundaries will be strictly controlled in accordance with national planning policy guidance and the strategy for the countryside as set out in Core Strategy policy SP29.”

Informative - Suffolk Coastal District Council Housing Land Supply Assessment 1st April 2018 – 31st March 2023
Local Authorities are obliged to show they have a housing land supply of at least 5 years.

Published in June 2018, following an appeal to the Planning Inspectorate this document indicates that the SCDC housing land supply was 9.3 years at that time. SCDC quote “This Housing Land Supply Assessment (HLSA) was scrutinised in detail in June 2018 within the Bell Lane, Kesgrave appeal public inquiry. This included detailed evidence on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which provides the most up to date Objectively Assessed Need for the HLSA. The Inspector fully endorsed both of these documents for the purpose of calculating the five year housing land supply. This appeal decision confirms the Council’s position that it has a 9.3 year Housing Land Supply.”

When the nearby controversial application at 155 The Street, which breached the Physical Limits Boundary, was approved following appeal, SCDC was only able to show they had a 4.3 year Housing Land Supply. In the intervening period, the major Brightwell Lakes development received approval which significantly increased the Housing Land Supply to the current level.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 03/10/18 (Site Notice)

Two residents spoke against the application; concerns mentioned included – the application would set a precedent for backland development; in-depth development without a road frontage is contrary to the pattern and spacing of development in the area; it would harm the character and appearance of development in the area; the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the local distinctiveness of the area; the proposals do not constitute good design; the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours; and visibility where the new access is proposed is limited and another access in this location would have an adverse impact on the situation.

Councillors considered the application carefully and debated the merits of the application.

Mr Whiting proposed a recommendation of refusal with regard to DM7 a), b), c); DM15; DM21; DM23; SP15; SP19 and SP29. Seconded by Miss Cracknell with ALL in favour.

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL of this application.

[Several members of the public left the meeting].

DC/18/3836/FUL	833 Foxhall Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5TJ	Proposed extension and reconstruction of roof to form living space
----------------	---	---------	--

Mr Richings moved this item forward on the agenda. Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.

Application form – None provided on web.

Plans – Plans incorporate a rear extension across full width of existing bungalow together with a total rebuild of roof with ridge running fully from south to north elevation & raised in height from existing. Existing garage has roof changed from flat to pitched style. Chimney stack raised in height.

This allows existing bungalow to be changed to two-storey with additional / revised accommodation on ground floor and additional accommodation on new first floor and boiler room above garage.

The south (front) elevation has bathroom windows included at first floor level. The east elevation incorporates two small skylights and the west elevation includes four small skylights plus a new side door. The north (rear) elevation has bi-fold doors plus windows at ground floor with a large window/door/Juliet balcony arrangement at first floor.

Observation

Planning application FP/91/0585/0 for "underpinning" was approved in 1991 for "underpinning".

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 11/10/18 (Standard & Neighbour Consultation)

A resident from a neighbouring property spoke against the application. He stated that Nr 835 Foxhall Road is located on a much lower level than Nr 833 Foxhall Road. He spoke about the impacts of the application and that this application will lead to the loss of light in the kitchen and dining room of 835 Foxhall Road.

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Newton proposed a recommendation of REFUSAL with regard to DM23 and the loss of light to the neighbouring property 835 Foxhall Road, seconded by Mr Shields. Resolved: three councillors voted for refusal of the application and three voted against refusal of the application. The chairman casted a deciding vote for the REFUSAL of the application. Mr Nunn abstained from voting.

Response: This PC recommends REFUSAL. Informative: The Parish Council would like to point out that the concern regarding loss of light can be overcome by an amended design for the extension for example by a hipped roof.

DC/18/3688/FUL	5 Pardoe Place, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5UH	Proposed alterations and rear extension
----------------	---------------------------------------	---------	---

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

Application form – None provided on web.

Plans – The proposal incorporates a part single / part two-storey extension to the rear of the property. Immediately behind the existing garage, a single storey extension is proposed to provide a utility room. This ground floor extension then extends across approximately 2/3 of the house to provide additional living accommodation. Fairly centrally positioned within the existing rear elevation of the house, an extension at 1st floor level is included where a bathroom / en-suite is proposed.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 11/10/18 (Site Notice)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Francis proposed a recommendation of APPROVAL seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved: with ALL in favour.

Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL.

DC/18/3810/TPO	16 Brendon Drive, Rushmere St Andrew		T1 Hawthorn on rear garden boundary – 20-30% reduction to allow more light to garden
----------------	---	--	---

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

Application form – A simple reasoning & description of works, together with a location plan, is included within this document.

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Whiting proposed a recommendation of APPROVAL seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved: with ALL in favour.

Response: This PC recommends APPROVAL.

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

None

7. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

DC/18/3134/FUL	46 Chatsworth Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5XD	Juliet balcony, upper floor, rear of house PC Recommended refusal on 22/08/2018
DC/18/3100/FUL	5 Woodbridge Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 1AH	1 ½ Storey Extension to dwelling and associated alterations PC Recommended refusal on 22/08/2018

8. TO NOTE PLANNING DECISIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING

The Clerk reported on planning decisions made by Suffolk Coastal District Council, which had been received since those reported at the last Planning & Development meeting.

DC/18/3229/TPO	132B The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	TPO No ESCC/55/00029 A1 – trees numbered as application and plan. Front garden. 1x Purple Norway Maple & 1 x Norway Maple – Reduce by up to 30% Reason: to let more light into garden and property 1x Tree of Heaven – fell. Reason – lean over highway and cavity in main trunk at 15 ft, can see from roadside. PC Planning and Development Committee 22/08/2018 – Recommend refusal Suffolk Coastal District Council - PLANNING PERMISSION
DC/18/3074/FUL	53 Chatsworth Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	Front Single Storey extension PC Planning and Development Committee 22/08/2018 – Recommend approval Suffolk Coastal District Council - PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS
DC/18/3372/FUL	12 Malvern Close, Rushmere St Andrew	Proposed single storey rear extension and internal alterations. Planning Committee 22/08/2018 – Recommend approval Suffolk Coastal District Council - PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS

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

The Clerk advised that the Suffolk Coastal District Council enforcement team is currently investigating whether extensions at 5 Brendon Drive and 12 Sandpit Close need planning permission; the authority is also investigating contravention of conditions of the approval for planning application DC/17/0480/FUL – 65 Beech Road; and contravention of **conditions** of the approval for planning application DC/17/4338/FUL 36-38 Woodbridge Road. Feedback for each of the cases are as follows:

- 5 Brendon Drive – site visit scheduled for 14/09/2018. Waiting for feedback.
- 65 Beech Road - planning officer advised Clerk that he has been liaising with his colleagues in Environmental Health. The planning officer requires detailed information from the site proprietor to justify the mechanical extract/ventilation equipment installed differing from what the council approved, so at the moment the premises is in operation in breach of the requirements of the planning permission. The officer is trying to address this as quickly as possible in the interest of local amenity.
- 36-38 Woodbridge Road – No update
- 12 Sandpit Close – Awaiting information

10. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

- The Clerk informed Councillors that the Environment Agency is currently reviewing the Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management National Strategy. They have requested feedback from interested parties regarding predicted increases in flooding and changes to the coast over the next

25 years. They are asking interested parties how this can be changed or managed. If anyone is interested in commenting please contact the Clerk. Councillors noted this.

- The Clerk informed Councillors that Ipswich Borough Council is currently consulting the public on Public Space Protection Orders in the Borough. All comments have to be submitted by 9th October 2018. It was agreed that the Clerk and the Chairman will consider this document and comment on behalf of the Parish Council.

11. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None

Mr Newton indicated that the Clerk could contact him regarding updates on the enforcement cases mentioned under item 9.

12. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 8.50 pm.