



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 1st October 2019 at the Village Hall at 7.30pm

CHAIRMAN: P Richings

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

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 1

APOLOGIES: Mrs B Richardson-Todd (family commitment), Ms C Evans (unwell)

CLERK: Mrs S Stannard

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

The Chairman reminded 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 received from Mrs Richardson-Todd and Ms Evans. Mr Westrup proposed acceptance of the apologies, seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved with ALL in favour.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12th September 2019

Miss Cracknell proposed acceptance of the minutes and seconded by Mr Westrup, subject to the following amendment:

'ALL' on page 3 to be replaced with 'MAJORITY'.

Resolved with ALL in favour

3. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST

Mr Whiting stated that as a member of Suffolk County Council he may be asked to reconsider any matter from this meeting at 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 County level before coming to a decision.

Mr Newton declared a local non-pecuniary interest as a member of East Suffolk 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.

No other declarations were 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

Mr Francis reported that Mr Phil West passed away and informed councillors of the funeral arrangements. Mr West was a Councillor of Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council for many years and was also Chairman of the Planning and Development Committee.

5. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/19/3563/FUL	1 Fellbrigg Avenue, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1NZ	Retrospective Application – Retention of a fence to replace an overgrown hedge that ran the length of the boundary of the house
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>Application form- No pre-application advice sought. Trees or hedges need to be removed question answered 'yes' – 'H1 – Hedge removed from within our boundary'. Materials – 'timber panels, concrete posts, concrete gravel boards'.</p> <p>Plans – A series of photographs provided post-installation, none provided pre-installation. Note the necessity to present waste bin on highway rather than from within curtilage. Fence materials document provided which quotes numbers and sizes of materials used, together with overall height (4'6") and length (78') of run. It would appear there are slight 'wrap-around' portions of fence either end of the long run. The net effect appears to be removed of foliage adjacent to the highway and replacement fencing leading to a 'double-wall' scenario.</p> <p>Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 11/10/19 (Site Notice)</p> <p>Councillors considered the application carefully.</p> <p>Mr Nunn proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Westrup but this was not carried. A majority voted for refusal of the application.</p> <p>Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL. Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL, the proposal will have an adverse impact on public amenity and detrimental impact on the character of the area particularly considering that when the Bixley farm developments were first approved public open space was incorporated as part of the design and a large number of applications like this one have been submitted. The application will have a detrimental impact on the openness of the area. The proposal does not accord with Policy DM8, DM21 and DM 23 b) of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan that expects developments to establish a strong sense of place and create attractive places to live, work and visit.</p>			
DC/19/3639/FUL	20 Euston Avenue, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5QY	The ability to relocate the fence to the boundary would be permissible without planning permission if the height were to be 1metre. I am therefore requesting planning permission for the fence to be 2 metres high with no access/egress as per existing. Given the fact that I can do this regardless if the height were to only be 1metre, and as No 18 has already had permission and completed a single story extension, then I see no reason that this application would or should have an adverse impact on public amenity or detrimental impact on the character or on the openness of the area. And given the fact that I could if I so chose, and opposite to me already has, then I hope that the proposal must therefore be in accord with Policy DM21 and DM 23 b) of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan and maintains what is a strong sense of place and an attractive place to live, work and visit

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

History- A previous application (DC/19/2645/FUL – Erection of new 2 metre high boundary wall closer to property boundary with no access/ egress as per existing) was submitted on 03/07/19 & withdrawn on 10/09/19.

The Parish Council's response was as follows:-

"Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL, the proposal will have an adverse impact on public amenity and detrimental impact on the character of the area particularly considering that when the Bixley farm developments were first approved public open space was incorporated as part of the design and a large number of applications like this one have been submitted. The application will have a detrimental impact on the openness of the area. The proposal does not accord with Policy DM21 and DM 23 b) of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan that expects developments to establish a strong sense of place and create attractive places to live, work and visit.

Application Form-

For description of works, please see long description detailed an agenda, which is not repeated here.

Trees or hedges need to be removed question answered "yes" – *"Shrubs/planting to be removed as indicated on Existing Plan but will be replaced on roadside of fence as indicated on Proposed Plan in keeping to that already completed by No 18 (previously approved under DC/16/4144/FUL Oct-16). There are NO trees"*.

Materials to be used *"Brick & fence - concrete gravel boards/posts & close board fence panels"*

Pre-application advice sought (DC/PREAPP/18/2067). Officer Advice dated 27/06/2018:-

"Pre-Application Enquiry - Looking to extend part of the garden wall closer to property boundary at a property in Rushmere St Andrew. The host property is a detached, two storey dwelling which is situated on the corner of Parnham Place and Euston Avenue. It would appear that the property has no history of previous extensions. The host property is a detached, two storey dwelling which is situated on the corner of Parnham Place and Euston Avenue. It would appear that the property has no history of previous extensions.

Planning permission will be required due the boundary of the property being within a metre of a highway. This means that any fencing used will need to be a metre maximum in height. Anything above a metre will require planning permission. Please refer to Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of The Town and Country Planning Order 2015 for more information.

Notwithstanding the requirement for planning permission to be obtained, given the presence of a similar instance immediately opposite the property, officers are of the opinion that a proposal could be accepted. It would be beneficial if some additional planting could be incorporated on the roadside of the boundary (only of the intention if for wooden fence as opposed to brick wall) to soften the relationship to the street.

Provided the application submitted complies with Development Management Policies DM21- Design Aesthetics and DM23-Residential Amenity, of the Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan, then there appears to be no reason why the application wouldn't be supported by Suffolk Coastal District Council.

As with all pre-application advice, the Council is not bound with regard to its final decision on any future application. Please note – this pre-application advice is given on the basis of National and Local Planning Policies applicable on the date the advice is given."

Plans – A series of "existing" photos included". Note the position of streetlight, highlighting the alignment of the highway. This is confirmed by statement from SCC, submitted to ESC. The plans show removal of existing hedgerow, together with majority of existing 1.8m wall to side of property & located remote from highway, with 2m high close-boarded "wrap-around" fence, mainly adjacent to the highway.

Reference is made to the planning application (DC/16/4144/FUL) made at no 18. This application was to add a single-storey side extension, necessitating partial removal of the existing wall surrounding the rear garden. Looking at these plans, it appears that the alignment was changed from the "as built" scenario, moving closer to the highway. However, retention of a "green" buffer space, within the curtilage of no 18, was incorporated & this has subsequently been replanted in hedge-fashion. It appears to be reasonably consistent with the approved plans.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 18/10/19 (Site Notice).

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Richings proposed refusal of the application, seconded by Miss Cracknell. Four Councillors voted for the refusal of the application and four Councillors voted for the approval of the application. The Chairman used his casting vote to resolve the refusal of the application.

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL, the proposal will have an adverse impact on public amenity and detrimental impact on the character of the area particularly considering that when the Bixley farm developments were first approved public open space was incorporated as part of the design and a large number of applications like this one have been submitted. The application will have a detrimental impact on the openness of the area. The proposal does not accord with Policy DM8, DM21 and DM 23 b) of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan that expects developments to establish a strong sense of place and create attractive places to live, work and visit.

DC/19/3691/TPO (Tree Preservation Order)	2 Rush Close, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5HH	Front garden - T1 Silver Birch: crown reduce by up to 30% to reduce honeydew discharge onto parked cars. Rear garden - T2 Gleditsia triacanthos Sunburst, and T3 Acer platanoides Crimson King: crown reduce by up to 30% to reduce overhang over neighbour's drive and to maintain healthy growth.
--	-------------------------------------	---------	---

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

Application form - Not available on ESC website.

Plans - Not available on ESC website.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 22/10/19 (Statutory)

The Clerk read out comments received from the Tree Warden, Mr Wright.

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Whiting proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour.

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

DC/19/3606/TPO (Tree Preservation Order)	24 Brookhill Way, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5UL	3no. silver birch trees in a group in the back garden of the property - to be crown reduced by 30%, reshape and thin through crowns. We'd like to REDUCE THE VOLUME of the trees by up to a third of their current size. It's been quite a while since they were last touched, and growth has been vigorous since then. They cast significant shade over our neighbours' gardens at #22 and #30. #22 gets almost no afternoon/evening sun at all when the trees are in leaf. The trees now have several branches growing at odd angles, and need a good re-shape, so that they don't become unsteady, or cause of concern/danger. I'm attaching a document to show the location and relative scale of the trees. I'll get quotes from tree surgeons once I know we can go ahead. Last time we had work done, we used J D Firman.
--	---	---------	--

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

Application form – “Condition of the tree(s) – e.g. it is diseased, or you have fears that it might break or fall” & “Alleged damage to property – e.g. subsidence or damage to drains or drives” questions answered “no”.

Plans - Not available on ESC website.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 22/10/19 (Standard Consultation)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

The Clerk read out comments received from the Tree Warden, Mr Wright.

Mr Richings proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour.

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

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

The Clerk/ Chairman advised that the following application had been received:

DC/19/3459/FUL	30 Elm Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AJ	Addition of attached single storey annex with pitched and tiled roof to side of property; Single storey extension to rear of property comprising dining room and utility area - pitched and tiled roof cut in to existing pitched roof maintaining roof line; Single storey extension to front of property to enlarge entrance hall - pitched and tiled roof cut in to existing pitched roof maintaining roof line; Replacement of remaining flat roofs with pitched and tiled equivalents in line with existing roof line.
----------------	---------------------------------	---------	---

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

Application form-

Pre-application advice sought with comment from ESC-

“There are two elements to consider in this instance, the first is that of the front and rear extension which would accommodate an entrance porch; dining room and utility for the main dwelling and the second is the annexe which would include a bedroom en-suite and living area. The material considerations for the extensions elements relate to design and amenity, local policies DM21 and DM23 are most relevant in this instance. Given that the property has already been extended it is important to consider the visual impact of an additional extension to the rear. The garden is large enough to accommodate it and given it is single storey officers do not consider that it would have a material impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The front extension is minimal in nature and the front of the property is able to accommodate an extension of this type. Given that the property is at the end of the street and the neighbouring property is set back from the streetscene it is not considered that this forward extension would impact negatively on the street scene. Overall officers consider that the property could accommodate the scale of extensions proposed with minimal impact on the character of the area or neighbouring properties”.

Annexe

Self contained annexes are the subject of Policy DM6 of the East Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies DPD 2013. This policy states: “The creation of self-contained annexes to existing dwellings in order to accommodate, for example, an elderly or disabled dependant, will be permitted in the following circumstances:

- (a) in the form of an extension, where the extension is capable of being incorporated into the existing dwelling when no longer required;*
- (b) in the form of the conversion of an outbuilding or construction of a new building within the curtilage where it is well-related to the existing dwelling.*

In both circumstances:

- i) *there must not be any significant adverse effect on residential or visual amenity;*
- ii) *in the Countryside there must not be a material impact on the landscape; and*
- iii) *conditions will be applied to limit occupation to prevent future use as a separate dwelling."*

In the case of the extension being used as an annexe officers consider from what you have stated that it would be an appropriate scale and be able to be accommodated back into the main property when no longer required. As already discussed above I consider the design/scale to be appropriate for this location and do not consider it to have a negative impact on residential or visual amenity. If an application was submitted along the lines set out officers could offer their support in line with the above. Your submission would need to include an application form, fee, site location plan; scaled floor plans and elevations both proposed and existing along with a block plan showing any trees on the site".

Materials to be used – Comprehensive details provided. Vehicle hard-standing area is to be revised & resurfaced to provide overall accommodation for 3-5 cars.

Plans – Series of "as existing" photos provided.

This is a major revamp of the existing dwelling.

Viewed from the front, the existing side extension is extended forward and the existing pitched roof is consequentially extended towards no 32. A front porch is added.

Viewed from the side, the roof profile is significantly changed and windows added. A new annexe is added both to the rear of the existing property & also at the side, utilising former drive space adjacent to no 32, retaining about 1m gap with boundary. Relative to no 28, the property is lengthened, using existing garden space. However, the elongated extension retains a similar gap of around 2.1m (reducing slightly due to the angle of plot) with the boundary with no 28.

No north elevation plans are provided.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 18/10/19 (Site Notice)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Miss Cracknell proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved with ALL in favour.

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

7. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

None

8. TO NOTE PLANNING DECISIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING

DC/19/2379/FUL	31 Beech Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of replacement bungalow and detached garage Planning Committee recommended approval 22/08/2019 East Suffolk Council - PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS 25/09/2019
DC/19/2730/TPO	15 Brookhill Way, Rushmere St Andrew	The four Oak trees in rear garden of 15 Brookhill Way significantly reduce sunlight into garden of 4 The Spinney where I live. To improve this I would like to perform a crown lift by up to 2m, and 10-15% crown thinning of branches and removal of deadwood to enable sunlight to pass through more easily. Also to reduce the overhang into the garden of The Spinney to remove risk of branches falling. Planning Committee recommended approval 22/08/2019 East Suffolk Council - PLANNING PERMISSION 25/09/2019
DC/19/3184/FUL	3 Broadlands Way, Rushmere St Andrew	Proposed single storey side extension Planning Committee recommended approval 22/08/2019

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

The Clerk advised that the following appeal decision was received:

Appeal Ref: APP/J3530/W/19/3225584; 143 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew, IP5 1DG. Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2no two storey dwellings. Formation of additional vehicular access. Appeal dismissed on 24 September 2019.

10. DISCUSSION REGARDING NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

A long discussion followed about neighbourhood planning. It was agreed to have a briefing session for councillors about neighbourhood plans and to invite representatives from Kesgrave Town Council, Melton Parish Council, Rendlesham Parish Council, East Suffolk Council and a consultant to the briefing session. A question and answer sheet will be distributed to Councillors. The Parish Council will then take a decision about neighbourhood planning.

11. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

The Clerk reported that she received invitations to the following:

Suffolk Local Authorities Parish Engagement on Tuesday, 10 October 2019; and
Electoral Review of Suffolk on Tuesday, 10 October 2019.

The Clerk reported that Ipswich Borough Council is currently consulting on their draft Suffolk Coast European Sites Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy SPD. Consultation ends on 23 October 2019. Clerk to review.

12. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None

13. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.18 pm.