



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on Thursday, 22nd August 2019 at the Tower Hall at 7.30pm

CHAIRMAN: P Richings

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Miss A Cracknell, Mr D Francis, Ms C Evans, Mr M Newton, Mr R Nunn, Mrs B Richardson-Todd, Mr P Richings, Mr B Ward, Mr J Westrup

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 0

APOLOGIES: Mr R Whiting (another commitment)

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 received from Mr Whiting. Miss Cracknell proposed acceptance of the apologies, seconded by Mrs Richardson-Todd. Resolved with ALL in favour.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1st August 2019

Mr Nunn proposed acceptance of the minutes and seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour.

3. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST

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.

Councillors declared that they know Mr Whiting, applicant for planning application DC/ 19/3092/FUL. Mr Newton informed councillors that East Suffolk Council has asked for legal advice about lobbying. Councillors noted this information.

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 stated that a member of the public complained about the footpath at Gwendoline Close that is overgrown. Clerk to report to Suffolk County Council, Rights of Way and Chater Land Holdings Ltd. Mr Ward was approached by a resident that has not received a parish council newsletter. Mr Ward to email the Clerk regarding this. The Assistant Clerk to follow this up with the distribution company. Clerk to reserve seats for all councillors for the public meeting on 2 September. Councillors to contact Clerk if they are unable to attend the public meeting on 2 September.

5. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/19/2379/FUL	31 Beech Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AN	Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of replacement bungalow and detached garage
----------------	--------------------------------------	---------	--

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

Application form: No pre-application advice sought. No proposed alterations to pedestrian/vehicle access, roads or rights of way. Bin presentation area provided. Materials – red brick plinth, white coloured render, light brown cedar boarding, smooth grey tiles, dark grey double-glazed windows and doors. Vehicle access & hard-standing proposed is gravel. Foul sewage to mains sewer, surface water to soak-away. Proposed use that would be particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination is stated. Whilst trees and hedges are on site, none affect the proposed development.

Plans: Contaminated land certificate shows “passed”. CIL form claims “self-build exemption” for relief and overall reduction in gross internal floor-space of 24 sq. m. (117-93). The block plan shows the existing irregularly shaped property straddling the complete width of the site (see dashed lines). The new proposal shows 2 rectangular buildings (dwelling & detached garage) with the perimeter fenced on 3 sides (1.8m) with existing access & 600mm picket fence to front. Attention is drawn to the details regarding attic truss construction with possible future staircase for potential use of 1st floor. Seemingly contradicting the application form information, the parking/turning area is shown as utilising pale grey pavers. A design & access statement is provided which states existing property is in poor condition, having a desire to have a replacement facing the road & Beech Road is a mix of 2-storey/bungalow properties.

Observation: *Within Beech Road, the existing detached bungalow design is a bit of an oddity in style being located within a long alignment of semi-detached bungalows to either side.*

Latest Consultation Expiry Date: 28/08/19 (Site Notice)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mrs Richardson-Todd proposed approval of the application, seconded by Miss Cracknell. Resolved with ALL in favour.

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

DC/19/2370/TPO	15 Brookhill Way, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5UL	The four Oak trees in the 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 4 The Spinney to remove risk of branches falling.
----------------	---	---------	---

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

Application form: The applicant is located at an adjacent property (4 The Spinney) and quotes “*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, some thinning of branches and removal of deadwood to enable sunlight to pass through more easily. I would also like a reduction in the overhang into the garden of 4 The Spinney to remove risk of branches falling onto pets and children. Expectation is that a combination of these works will be carried out to the four trees. The proposed work will ensure the overall look and shape of trees to be cut is maintained and will not impact surrounding trees. The owner of the trees fully supports this proposed work*”. No alleged damaged to property from trees in question.

Plans: A simple diagram showing position of trees relative to surrounding properties.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date: 27/08/19 (Standard Consultation)

The Tree Warden, Mr James Wright recommended approval of the application. Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

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

DC/19/3092/FUL	105 Playford Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5QR	1 ½ storey and single storey rear extensions internal and elevational alterations.
----------------	--	---------	--

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

Application form: No pre-application advice sought. Existing & proposed material quote reference to plans which appear to be to “match existing”.

Plans: An existing bungalow, the main change is to add a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension. Looking at the existing bungalow, various internal changes are proposed. Externally, a western elevation window opening is in-filled where a wet-room is proposed, although no proposal is made to the glazing of a south-facing window to this room. On the eastern elevation, an existing window is widened & replaced with French doors & top-lights. An existing shed adjacent to this elevation is removed. The rear extension is made up of a single-storey (approx. 3.2m wide, 4.3m depth) pitched roof portion (with 2 roof lights) to provide a kitchen. This then extends into another pitched roof extension, this time two-storey and deeper (building being 7.8m wide, 6.3m depth), with dormer window to western side – partially hidden by the single-storey pitched roof. The roof then extends back a further 1.5m to be supported by oak posts. The two-storey extension northern elevation has 5.4m of glazing (bi-fold doors at ground-floor, windows & doors with Juliet balcony at first floor), plus a single roof light on eastern elevation. Two sheds are removed to facilitate this rear extension.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date: 06/09/19 (Advertisement)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mrs Richardson-Todd proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved with ALL in favour.

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

DC/19/3005/FUL	679 Foxhall Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5TA	Proposed detached dwelling (as extant permission DC/16/3174/FUL)
----------------	---	---------	--

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

History –

- 13/06/1952 – E2149 – Erect two buildings (rear of 675-679 Foxhall Road) – application permitted
- 18/02/2016 – DC/15/5042/FUL – Erection of dwelling – application permitted
- 21/09/2016 – DC/16/3174/FUL – Proposed detached dwelling (amended design and siting to that approved DC/15/5042/FUL) to part rear garden – application permitted

Utilising the proposed same shared driveway, the following refer to the adjacent land to the rear of 681 Foxhall Road

- 27/10/2014 – DC/14/1859/FUL – Erection of new two-storey dwelling with access drive and ancillary works – application permitted
- 28/10/2017 – DC/17/3814/DRC – Discharge of Condition No.6 of DC/14/1859/FUL – application permitted

Application form: No pre-application advice sought. Attention is drawn to the fact that works associated with DC/14/1859/FUL have commenced (and subsequently inspected & approved) via the installation of the shared driveway sub-base & drainage connection. All materials proposed are as per DC/16/3174/FUL.

Plans: DC/16/3174/FUL was permitted based on plans 2016062/01, 2016062/02 rev B & 2016062/03 rev B and this application proffers these versions on the web. However, the application form refers to 2016062/01 **rev A** with the other 2 the same. This time, a contaminated land assessment is included which shows a “pass” certificate.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date: 229/08/19 (Neighbour & Standard Consultation)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

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

DC/19/3053/FUL	81 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DE	Construction of a single storey side extension and double garage (outbuilding)
----------------	--------------------------------------	---------	--

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

Application form: – No pre-application advice sought. Proposed materials are to match existing.

Plans: An existing corner-plot bungalow, located on the corner of The Street/ Chestnut Close, the proposals are to provide a single-storey 4 room extension to the north of the existing. Additionally a double garage (“outbuilding”) is added to the rear of the plot, utilising an existing access onto Chestnut Close.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date: 29/08/19 (Neighbour & Standard Consultation)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Francis proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Westrup. Resolved with ALL in favour.

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

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

Mr Richings advised Councillors that the following application had been received.

DC/19/3184/FUL	3 Broadlands Way, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5SU	Proposed single storey side extension
----------------	---	---------	---------------------------------------

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

Planning History: DC/14/3393/FUL – Proposed part two-storey/part single-storey extension & alterations. Application permitted.

DC/15/1441/AME – Bi-fold doors indicated to rear elevation in extension. Roof over proposed lobby now indicated as pitched roof as opposed to previously a flat roof. Application permitted.

Clearly never carried out, the ground floor overall footprint for the current proposals appears to be very similar to that of the current application. The original application appears to have been one providing self-contained “granny annex” style accommodation with separate stairs & single ground floor connecting door to main dwelling.

Application form: – No pre-application advice sought. Materials proposed – walls facing brickwork to match existing; felt flat roof; windows powdered coated aluminium/UPVC; doors powder coated aluminium.

Plans: An existing detached dwelling with separate double garage (at approx. 45 degree angle to dwelling), the proposed flat roof extension (with 2 large lantern roof lights) will infill the space between both to provide new entrance lobby, study and sitting room accommodation. Bi-fold doors are provided to the rear.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date: 09/09/19 (Site Notice)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

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

7. TO CONSIDER THE SIZEWELL C, STAGE 4 CONSULTATION

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

This is the 4th and final stage in the Sizewell C consultation phase, prior to submission of an application for development consent, Planning Inspectorate examination and finally decision by the Secretary of State. The comments detailed below are based mainly on the content of the 21 page Consultation Summary Document as opposed to the huge formal document.

Q1 SIZEWELL C PROPOSALS - What are your views on EDF Energy's proposals to build a new nuclear power station, Sizewell C, and associated development?

"Please note that the principle of the need for new nuclear power stations and the choice of Sizewell as a potentially suitable site have already been determined by Parliament. Therefore, these issues are outside the scope of this consultation".

In reality, this question is probably looking towards the aesthetics of design and layout of the power station, road/rail infrastructure changes, provision of park & ride facilities and construction worker accommodation facilities. From RSAPC's point of view, the main issues will be that of transport (people & goods) movements which can be dealt with in later questions.

Q2 MAIN DEVELOPMENT SITE – Please provide comments on any or all of the changes proposed to the main development site.

From RSAPC's point of view, we are rather remote from the site.

Q3 SIZEWELL C PYLON OPTIONS – At stage 3 we proposed 4 pylons to export electricity to the National Grid. We have developed 2 options for minimising the visual effect.

Previously 4 tall pylons were proposed in close proximity to the site. Option 1 (1 tall, 3 short pylons) or option 2 (5 short pylons) are proffered.

From RSAPC's point of view, we are rather remote from the site.

Q4 FREIGHT MANAGEMENT FACILITY – Please provide comments on the changes proposed to the two potential sites for the freight transport facility

Two sites (Nacton - Seven Hills & Trimley - Innocence Farm) are still under consideration to serve as holding areas for HGV's en-route to Sizewell. Each would have 150 parking spaces for HGV's. Stage 4 makes some adjustments to layout etc. but generically they remain similar to Stage 3.

The local impact for both is probably going to be similar from the RSAPC perspective. In reality, we are not in the immediate vicinity of either but this facility does not appear to be needed for all modes of transport movements of freight.

As such RSAPC may have an interest.

Q5 TRANSPORT MOVEMENT OF FREIGHT – The construction of Sizewell C would require large volumes of bulk and other materials to be delivered to the main development site. We are considering 3 options for supporting the movement of construction materials to the main development site. For each, do you think the strategy is appropriate/inappropriate/don't know?

HGV operational hours are quoted as 0700-2300, with a caveat for extended hours.

All proposals include the following:-

- Sizewell Halt or rail siding or spur (Land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate)
- Saxmundham to Leiston branch line upgrades & level crossing works
- A12 Two village bypass
- A12/B1122 Yoxford roundabout
- Other minor road improvements
- Beach landing facility (to remove the need for particularly heavy and oversized loads to be taken off the road network)

Then for each option, the following would additionally occur / be required:-

Option A Rail-led strategy

- Green rail route to the temporary construction area
- East Suffolk line upgrades and level crossing works
- Theberton bypass

HGV vehicle movements per day $2 \times 225 = 450$ (typical), $2 \times 350 = 700$ (busiest); trains per day up to $2 \times 5 = 10$ movements.

Option B Road-led strategy

- Theberton bypass / Sizewell link road (A12 (Yoxford) to Theberton)
- Freight management facility (Seven Hills or Innocence Lane)

HGV vehicle movements per day $2 \times 375 = 750$ (typical), $2 \times 575 = 1150$ (busiest); trains per day up to $2 \times 2 = 4$ movements.

Option C Integrated strategy

- Green rail route to the temporary construction area
- Theberton bypass / Sizewell link road Theberton bypass / Sizewell link road (A12 (Yoxford) to Theberton)
- Freight management facility (Seven Hills or Innocence Lane)

HGV vehicle movements per day $2 \times 325 = 650$ (typical), $2 \times 500 = 1000$ (busiest); trains movements per day up to $2 \times 3 = 6$.

RSAPC need to look carefully at the 3 options to assess the impact of each in our area.

Q6 TRANSPORT: SIZEWELL LINK ROAD AND THEBERTON BYPASS – Please provide your views on whether some or all of Sizewell linkroad / Therberton bypass should be removed and the land restored once Sizewell C is operational.

From RSAPC's point of view, we are rather remote from this area.

Q7 ROAD IMPROVEMENTS – Please provide comments on the changes to any or all of our proposed improvements, including the A12 two village bypass & others

- New A12 bypass south of Stratford St Andrew / Farnham
- New A12/B1222 Yoxford roundabout
- Minor changes A140/B1078 west of Coddensham
- Minor changes A12/A144 south of Bramfield
- Minor changes A12/B1119 junction at Saxmundham
- Minor changes A1094/B1069 south of Knodishall

Stage 3 proposed changes to B1078/B1079 east of Otley College & A12/A1094 Friday Street north of Farnham remain unchanged.

From RSAPC's point of view, we are fairly remote from these areas.

Q8 SIZEWELL HALT OR RAIL SIDING OR SPUR (LAND EAST OF EASTLANDS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE)

This looks at 3 options to deal with rail traffic at Sizewell.

From RSAPC's point of view, we are rather remote from the site.

Q9 PARK AND RIDE – What are your views on the amended proposals for the park & ride sites?

Stage 3 proposed 2 "Park & Ride" facilities, each for 1250 cars / 80 motorcycles / 10 minibuses/buses/vans, at Darsham & Wickham Market. Stage 4 makes some minor changes to these facilities.

From RSAPC's point of view, we are rather remote from these areas but it does give an indicative number of personal vehicle movements.

Q10 CONSULTATION PROCESS – Please let us know if you have any comments about the consultation process

Q11 STAGE 3 PROPOSALS – Please provide any comments you wish to make about stage 3 in the box

Councillors considered the consultation carefully.

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council's preference is a rail led strategy to minimise HGV movements on an already congested road system. This would be an environmentally friendly option and would cause least pollution.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council is very much against a road led strategy as this will add significant pressure to an already congested road system in and around Ipswich.

The Parish Council would recommend that a beach landing facility be developed.

8. TO NOTE ANY PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRALS RECEIVED

None

9. TO NOTE PLANNING DECISIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING

DC/19/2401/VOC Variation of Condition	65 Beech Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Variation of Conditions 2,3,4 of DC/17/0480/FUL – Change of Use office (A2) to takeaway food shop (A5). Revised extract and odour control system & variation to signage – drawing 3698 02 A to be replaced with 3698 02 and 3698 01 B to be replaced with 3698 01 A. Planning Committee recommended approval 17/07/2019 East Suffolk Council - PLANNING PERMISSION WITH CONDITIONS 14/08/2019
---	--------------------------------------	--

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

The Clerk advised that the East Suffolk Council enforcement team is currently investigating the following cases:

- Clerk reported shed in garden of 53 Playford Road, Rushmere St Andrew to the Enforcement Team. Planning officer advised that permissible development. No action needed.
- The Clerk queried whether a fence in Fellbrigg Avenue needs planning permission and who the land belongs to. Planning officer advised that the owner is in breach of condition 5 of application C/94/0727 removing their permitted development rights for the erection of fencing. The planning officer has sent a letter to the owner requesting either the submission of an application or the removal of the new fencing and returning the site to its original appearance. The owner has 28 days to respond.

Clerk reported that the caravan parked at Euston Avenue forms part of the curtilage of the dwelling and therefore it will not be referred to the enforcement team. Councillors noted this.

11. ANY OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

- a. Update regarding Ipswich Northern Route consultation

The Clerk provided Councillors with an update regarding the public meeting scheduled for 2 September 2019 at the Ipswich School Sports Centre. Councillors noted this.

- b. Any other matters and correspondence

- The Clerk reported that she received correspondence from a resident regarding public participation at Parish Council meetings; Playford Road Traffic Calming Scheme; and publication of email addresses. Councillors noted this.
- The Clerk informed Councillors that she received a request for recycling of glass at One Stop Shop. Clerk to refer this to the agents of the owners of the Plaza.
- The Clerk informed Councillors that Oak Tree Farm will have an open day on 21 September 10am – 4pm. Councillors noted this.
- The Clerk informed Councillors that Mr Andrew Joliffe, Communities Officer at East Suffolk has emailed her information about County Lines, if anyone is interested please contact the Clerk. Councillors noted this.

12. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None

13. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 9.05 pm.