



# 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 Wednesday, 5<sup>th</sup> August 2020 via a virtual meeting at 7.00pm**

---

CHAIRMAN: Mr P Richings

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr D Francis, Ms C Evans, Mr M Newton, Mr P Richings, Mr J Westrup, Mr R Whiting, Mr B Ward.

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 0

APOLOGIES: Miss A Cracknell (unable to join virtual meeting), Mr R Nunn (unable to join virtual meeting). Mrs B Richardson-Todd apologised after the meeting she had an urgent family commitment to attend to.

CLERK: Mrs S Stannard

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

The Chairman reminded Councillors of 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 Nunn and Miss Cracknell. Mr Whiting proposed that the apologies be accepted, seconded by Mr Newton. Resolved with ALL in favour.

## **2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020**

Mr Francis proposed acceptance of the minutes with no amendments. This was seconded by Mr Westrup. Resolved with ALL in favour. The minutes was duly signed by the Chairman.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST**

Mr Whiting declared a non-pecuniary interest 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 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.

Mr Newton declared that a resident contacted him about the fence at 23 Salehurst Road and Mr Newton recommended that the resident submit a planning application.

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

None

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

DC/20/2555/AME	Plots 3 – 7 Broadlands Way, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5SU	Non Material Amendment on Applications C/12/0237 (Erection of 63 dwellings with associated car parking, to consist of 23 bungalows (phase 6), 24 detached houses (phase 7) and 16 affordable dwelling (site A)).
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p><b>Application form</b> – Pre-application advice quotes “The application will need to provide sufficient detail of the variations and will be dealt with by the DM South Team”. Non-material amendment sought stated as “Amendments to parking arrangements on Plots 3 and 4, garage orientation at plot 5 and house-type variations at plots 6 and 7”</p> <p><b>Plans</b> – The plots concerned are actually located on the land currently used as Chater Homes site compound at the western end of Shrublands Drive / northern end of Bladen Drive, rather than Broadlands Way.</p> <p><b>Latest Consultation Expiry Date</b> – None quoted (although determination deadline 06/08/20)</p> <p><b>Consideration</b> – There would appear to be a very short window for comment, prior to determination deadline. The main change is to change the types of the proposed houses for plots 6 &amp; 7 – they are, however, typical of the standard “Chater” portfolio, and although bespoke, are typical. There are minor changes to the positioning, due to the differences in footprints of the different house types. Changes are also made to the parking arrangements for plots 3, 4 &amp; 5. None of these factors appear to be material enough to cause concern from a planning viewpoint on this area allocated, and with existing permission, for new-builds.</p> <p><b>Response</b> – The intention was to use delegated powers with a proposed response of “Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommend approval”. However, this application was withdrawn on 30/07/20 prior to submission of comment.</p> <p><b>Councillors noted this.</b></p>			

#### 6. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/20/2415/FUL	Broke Hall CP School, Chatsworth Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5XD	We are replacing 3 external doors. This will be a ‘like for like’ basis, other than the fact we will be replacing the current wooden frames with aluminium frames.
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p><b>Application form</b> – No pre-application advice sought. Replacement of existing “glazed wooden frames painted black” with “glazed aluminium frames painted black”.</p> <p><b>Plans</b> – Couple of existing photos provided. Doors located on front (south) elevation, side (west) elevation &amp; rear elevation (doors actually facing west)</p>			

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 07/08/20 (Expiry)**

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Westrup proposed approval of the application. The proposal was seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

DC/20/2506/FUL	9 Quantock Close, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AS	Proposed two storey side extension with new porch and store to the front
----------------	---	---------	--

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

**Application form** – No pre-application advice sought. Materials all to match except "vehicle access & hardstanding" changed from "concrete" to "paviours".

**Plans** – This is the left-hand of a pair of semi-detached houses, with small toilet & garage to the side. To the left are located another pair of semi-detached houses, located further back and angled such that the forward direction of the right hand edge of no 8 is broadly in line with the left hand edge of no 9's garage. The proposal is to replace the garage / toilet with a full length two storey extension, with blank wall (except ground floor side door) to face no 8. To the rear, bi-fold is included at ground floor level with Juliet balcony at 1st floor level. To the front, a small sloping roof single-storey extension is added with a garage-style door access to small store area. An enclosed porch is also added to the front door, in lieu of existing flat canopy.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 07/08/20 (Expiry)**

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Westrup proposed approval of the application. The proposal was seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved with ALL in favour.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

DC/20/2658/VOC	Land South of Ditchingham Grove and Land South of Magingley Crescent and Land to South of Shrublands Drive and Adjacent to Broadlands Way, Rushmere St Andrew		Variation of condition No 2 of C/12/0237 – Erection of 63 new dwellings with associated car parking, to consist of 23 bungalow (phase 6), 24 detached houses (phase 7) and 16 affordable dwellings (site A) – To amend position of rear garden boundary wall to Plot 20 by 1.4m east. Condition numbers(s): condition no 2 Phase 7: 7030 100 D01. Conditions(s) Removal: to amend position of rear garden boundary wall to Plot 20 by 1.4m East. Change condition no 2 Substituting drawing 7030 100 D01 for drawing 7030 100 D02.
----------------	---	--	--

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

**History**

14/11/12 C/12/0237 was a large application covering several areas of the Bixley Farm development and was granted permission. Condition 2 simply refers to a long list of drawing numbers for which the permission was granted for the avoidance of doubt.

14/01/2020 DC/20/0121/AME application (Plot 20 boundary wall to Broadlands Way to move approximately 6m to the north/2.5m to the east to allow approximately 53m<sup>2</sup> to be included within plot 20's ownership. The wall to remain within the visibility splay - To increase plot 20's rear garden area and reduce unallocated area) was refused permission on the ground "The site forms part of a larger development located in a primarily residential area. The boundary line of Plot 20, as approved, respects the character of the area to the south which has a wide grass verge bordering the highway. This space creates an attractive route through a relatively large residential area and the remainder of this development site also has many open frontages with 'green' space adjacent to the highway which respects this character. Although the proposed change only affects one property, it is immediately adjacent to the

existing grass verge to the south and the relocation of the boundary wall in much closer proximity to the highway would have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the wider area. The proposal is therefore not considered to be non-material"

Subsequent to this, a wall has actually been constructed & it would appear this application is a belated "post construction" one.

**Application form** –Pre-application advice sought – "Phone call conversation between Philip Golding and Rachel Smith, advice given to submit application via Variation of Condition". This application requests the replacement of approved drawing ref 7030 100 revision D01 with 7030 100 revision D02.

**Plans** – The approved plan 7030 100 D01 shows the wall coming out a very short distance from the eastern side elevation, starting just north of the southern rear elevation alignment & running southwards parallel to the highway to the rear of the plot.

Proposed drawing 7030 100 D02 shows the wall coming out at right-angles from the midpoint of the eastern elevation of the dwelling and running southwards, parallel to, but rather closer to the highway. In consequence it has been moved both further north & east from the approved drawing.

With it having already been constructed, the actual "lie of the land" can be reviewed as it slopes significantly down to the highway. In consequence, the wall is much deeper in that location than that of the original proposal. The no of courses of bricks above ground level is about 40 (roughly 24 equates to 6 feet).

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date** – 11/08/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Richings proposed refusal of the application. The proposal was seconded by Ms Evans. Resolved with ALL in favour. The reason for the refusal is the detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL.

DC/20/2681/FUL	17 Quantock Close, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AS	Proposed part two storey side extension, part single storey front/ rear extension and alterations
----------------	--	---------	---

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

**Application form** – No pre-application advice sought. Material to match existing.

**Plans** – The right hand of a pair of semi-detached houses, with detached garage to side, the proposal includes the construction of a two-storey side extension, eliminating the garage. Additionally, a single-storey front extension is proposed, partly across the existing property. To the rear, an existing conservatory is removed and replaced with a single-storey extension across the full width of the house.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date** – 12/08/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Westrup proposed approval of the application. The proposal was seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved with ALL in favour.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

DC/20/2515/FUL	23 Salehurst Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP3 8YR	Erection of a fence, including removal of existing hedge
----------------	--	---------	--

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

**Application form** – Pre-application advice sought (Philip Ridley – Planning permission will be required to replace hedge with 6' fence). "Hedge is 80% dead, is being used as drop off point for drugs & is taking up too much of pavement; tree in hedge is dead" "Sent many photos to planning already" – none are included on website application details. Length of hedgerow to be removed – 110'. "Hedgerow less than 30 years old" question answered "no".

**Plans** – The hedgerow is located just inside the RSA boundary and is located on the southern side of the corner property & abuts Wadhurst Road. There is also an existing (inset from boundary) rear panel fence, & the proposal replaces this with one 3' outwards to the property rear boundary line & extends 27'. The proposal removes the existing hedge running along the southern (Wadhurst Road) boundary for approx. 90' which then runs into an existing 6' high fence (3 panels) fronting a telecommunications box (typically used for drug drop off point). This then turns at right-angles to another 3 panels & gate to the side of the house. There does seem to be an inconsistency in lengths quoted – application form 110' vs plan 90' hedge removal in plan – c20' of 3 panel existing fence renewed? Google Earth shows the hedge approx. 12' high, with tree behind hedge in rear garden. A matching hedge, albeit approx. 8' high, is located on the opposite side of Wadhurst Road. A viewing on 03/08/2020 shows a very brown hedge which has been cut back to about 6' high & in line with highway alignment. The hedge on the opposite side has been removed sometime & replaced with a panelled fence set back a short distance from highway, with planted border intervening.

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Whiting proposed refusal of the application. The proposal was seconded by Mr Francis. One councillor abstained. Resolved with by a MAJORITY. The reason for the refusal was that the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL.

DC/20/2569/FUL	131 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DG	Annex to existing property, situation in enclosed rear garden of existing property. Proposed building will be sectional, above ground level and transportable, built of timber throughout with a low pitched roof. All utilities will be connected to the existing dwelling and the sole access (pedestrians only) will be through the existing house.
----------------	---------------------------------------	---------	--

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

#### **History –**

DC/20/0942/CLP (Certificate Of Lawful Use (Proposed) - Stationing a mobile home at this property)  
Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council would like to make the following comments: Whilst not proposing any specific recommendation for granting this legality request or not, we feel it would be prudent to draw East Suffolk Council's attention (a reminder) to the physical limits boundary in this area and to ensure the following policies are adhered to: -DM6 Residential Annexes (especially point (ii) reference to Countryside) -DM18 Static Holiday Caravans, Cabins & Chalets  
ESC decision letter 29/05/2020 - I refer to your application for a Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Use or Development validated by the Council on 9th March 2020. The area of land to which your application ('the Application Site') relates is shown edged red on the attached plan. The application seeks confirmation of the lawfulness of the stationing of a mobile home ("Timber Lodge") within the curtilage of the Application Site for living accommodation incidental to 131 The Street Rushmere St Andrew Ipswich Suffolk IP5 1DG ("the Property"). The application is made on the basis that the Timber Lodge would be used by members of the household or guests, only as an integral part of the use of the Property as single dwelling house and for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the Property. In order to consider this application, it is necessary for you to describe the proposed use sufficiently clearly and precisely so that the Council can understand exactly what your application is for. I note that Part 8 "Description of Proposal" of the application form appears to have been completed incorrectly and therefore the proposed use has been taken from your Statutory Declaration. It is your responsibility, as the applicant, to provide sufficient evidence to support your application and if the Council is provided with information satisfying them that the use or operations would be lawful if instituted or begun at the time of the application, they shall issue a Certificate to that effect. The application is supported by your Statutory Declaration which states that the Timber Lodge would, "share services, facilities, and access with the Property and that it would not be used as a separate dwelling". Upon receipt the Council considered that there was insufficient information supporting your application for a decision to be made. Therefore, the Planning Officer wrote to you confirming our position and asked for further information to be provided within a stipulated deadline so that a decision could be made, otherwise the application would be determined on the information originally provided with the application. As a result of this request you submitted further information consisting of a floor plan of the Timber Lodge (without any annotation) and so in response to an



enquiry made by the Planning Officer you confirmed that the rooms were living/kitchen area, bedrooms and bathroom facilities. A plan showing the repositioning of the Timber Lodge and two 3D drawings of the Timber Lodge were also provided. Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 ("the Order") grants permitted development rights for any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse (subject to certain conditions and limitations). It is well established law that in considering proposals under Class E of the Order, the critical test to be applied is firstly whether the proposed Timber Lodge is intended to be and would remain incidental to the enjoyment of the Property for the domestic needs or personal enjoyment of the occupants of the Property. A purpose incidental to a house would not cover normal residential uses, such as separate self-contained accommodation, nor the use of an outbuilding for primary living accommodation such as a bedroom, bathroom, or kitchen. For an outbuilding to be considered Permitted Development under Class E of the Order it must be used and reasonably required for a purpose that is incidental to the enjoyment of the Property and not as a separate primary residential use. Your covering letter states that the Timber Lodge would not be used as a separate dwelling, you also state that, "the use would be an integral part of the main use of the planning unit as a single dwellinghouse in single family occupation and, therefore, would not involve a material change of use of the land". The Council considers that for an outbuilding of the size, appearance and position of the Timber Lodge, and in addition to the description of the proposed use, the evidence does not clearly show that the Timber Lodge would be used in a particular way for incidental activities. It is apparent that the stated intention is for the Timber Lodge to provide additional residential accommodation for family members and guests, and as such it would not be incidental to the Property. The application is therefore refused.

**Application form** – Pre-application advice sought (Jamie Behling – advised that an annex proposal would best serve our needs). Proposed materials quoted (all dark grey - walls timber or cement board cladding, roof clay or similar tiles, UPVC windows & doors) 2m high timber fence. Pedestrian access only, vehicle parking to front of existing dwelling.

**Plans** – Series of photographs are provided showing the proposed site area & that of a similar lodge dwelling. Room layout and elevation diagrams are also provided.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date** – 17/08/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Ms Evans proposed refusal of the application based on the previous refusal including the impact on neighbouring properties and the character of the area. The site is also situated outside the physical limits. The proposal was seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL.

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

DC/20/2815/FUL	4 Lawford Place, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5QR	Relocation of garden fence.
----------------	--	---------	-----------------------------

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

### History –

DC/20/0203/FUL (Relocation of fence)

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. 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.

ESC Decision letter (22/02/2020) - The reason for the decision to refuse permission is:

The application site is located on prominent sweeping bend in the road characterised by open spaces and greenery. The property is located within a small cul-de-sac which has wide verges between the pathway and the garden walls/fences. The proposed fence encroaches up to the path which is out of character with the otherwise green spaces and results in a prominent and dominant addition to the streetscene to the detriment of the character of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM21 of the East Suffolk Council - Suffolk Coastal District

Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document Policy DM21 (Design) which requires the appearance of developments to be sympathetic to the character of the surrounding environment. Application form – No pre-application advice sought. Proposed materials close boarded fence with concrete posts and gravel boards.

**Plans** – Covering letter advises this is a revised application as the previous version was “refused by the Parish Council”. The proposal incorporates removal of existing brick wall & fence, located away from the highway & replacement with a close-boarded panel fence 1m away from, & parallel to, the highway, with 1m high hedge along border. The fence then angles across from highway edge to side of dwelling with gate provided adjacent to dwelling. The remaining stretch, adjacent to the highway, running from this angled fence to the front corner of plot, to be provided with loop top metal fencing to match existing properties.

Relative to the previous application: -

- the fence parallel to the highway has been extended from 8m to 10.8m in length, with gate removed in south west corner & appears to be slightly further from highway
- hedging has replaced slate chippings in border between fence & highway
- the angled fence has been extended to highway boundary, and is located approx. 2.8m further north, with gate provided adjacent to dwelling.
- A proposed flower bed, adjacent to angled fence / dwelling has been removed

Geographic Information System (GIS)

The East Suffolk GIS link highlights a green area contained within the area lined in “red” on the site location plan. Unlike the area immediately to the south of the adjacent substation, it is not edged in “black” which would indicate it was “in East Suffolk Council ownership”.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date** – 19/08/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Whiting proposed refusal of the application due to the detrimental impact on the character of the area. The proposal was seconded by Mr Francis. Resolved with ALL in favour.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL.

DC/20/2830/AME	21 Shrubland Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5SX	Non Material Amendment of C/12/0237 – Erection of 63 new dwellings with associated car parking, to consist of 23 bungalows (phase 6), 24 detached houses (phase 7) and 16 affordable dwellings (site A). Amendment to plot 6. Amendments to the internal layout and conversion of attached garage to create space and a layout suitable to allow purchasers elderly parents to reside with the family.
----------------	---	---------	--

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

**History** –

C/12/0237 – approved with house type H5 in plot 6

DC/20/2555/AME (see above) – proposed change to different house type H6. This application was subsequently withdrawn.

This application – proposed house type reverts to house type H5 - “customised version”

**Application form** – None on website

**Plans** – Relative to C/12/0237: -

- Double garage turned into “annex” living accommodation and extended further back to match main dwelling rear elevation alignment
- Garage doors replaced with 2 windows, one 3 panel, one 1 panel
- Patio doors to rear
- Consequential loss of 2 parking spaces, 2 at front to remain off shared driveway

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – None quoted (although determination deadline 24/08/20)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Whiting proposed approval of the application. The proposal was seconded by Mr Westrup. Resolved with ALL in favour.

**Response:** Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

#### 8. TO NOTE PLANNING DECISIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING

DC/20/1840/TPO	122 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	TPO ESCC 1955 0029 Lime Tree (T1) at the front of the property; 30% reduction and a deadwood clearout. Also, a 4-meter crown lift to give better visibility when pulling away in car from the drive. The 30% reduction would mean that if the tree was to fall, it would fall short of the property Delegated approval noted by P&D on 09/06/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Planning permission approved on 9 July 2020</b>
DC/20/2048/FUL	Hill Farm House, Lamberts Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Erection of timber summerhouse in garden Delegated approval noted by P&D on 02/0/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 10 July 2020</b>
DC/20/2140/FUL	4 Sandling Crescent, Rushmere St Andrew	Construction of single storey side and rear extensions in association with conversion of attached garage to facilitate DFG work. P&D recommended approval on 02/07/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 17 July 2020</b>
DC/20/2181/FUL	5 Quantock Close, Rushmere St Andrew	Demolition of existing garage and construction of a two storey extension P&D recommended approval on 02/07/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 22 July 2020</b>
DC/20/2024/TPO	15 The Limes, Rushmere St Andrew	T1 Sycamore Tree is located on western boundary of the property next to gate on Lamberts Lane. To fell the tree due to extensive heartwood decay. A cavity is visible at 6 m. on the east side of the trunk. The cavity has an opening of 50cm by 20cm. An aerial inspection of the tree has been carried out which shows that due to heart wood decay only 40% of the overall diameter of trunk remains. The trunk is hollow for at least 80cm above the cavity, but the level of discharge coming from the cavity would indicate that the decay is linking to other cavities higher up on the trunk. The tree is now considered hazardous and is in close proximity to both a road and properties, removal is the only option to mitigate potential liability for the land owner P&D recommended approval on 09/06/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 24 July 2020</b>
DC/20/2073/TPO	2 Brendon Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	T1 Oak 25% reduction because of encroachment over applicant's and neighbour's garden. T2 Oak on adjacent footpath; crown lift over garden and reduce back to reduce garden overhang. Delegated approval noted by P&D on 02/07/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 29 July 2020</b>
DC/20/2555/AME	Plots 3-7 Broadlands Way, Rushmere St Andrew	Non Material Amendment on Application C/12/0237 (Erection of 63 new dwellings with associated car parking, to consist of



		23 bungalows (phase 6), 24 detached houses (phase 7) and 16 affordable dwellings (site A)) <b>Application withdrawn 30 July 2020</b>
--	--	---

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

Fence at Nr 6 Butterfly Gardens were reported to Enforcement at East Suffolk Council and the Parish Council received feedback from East Suffolk Council. Mr Newton has queried the response from East Suffolk Council and whether permitted development rights have been removed at the property. Awaiting response from East Suffolk Council.

#### **10. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP**

The minutes of the working group meeting held in July were distributed with the agenda for the planning and development committee meeting. Mr Whiting provided the committee with an update of the working group meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> August. Mr Whiting informed councillors that the scope for the report were agreed by the working group; projects were identified that members of the working group will be focussing on including drafting a household questionnaire; finalising a communication strategy; and looking at involving the youth in the engagement process. A Locality Funding application is currently being finalised and will be submitted in due course. The Clerk added that part of the locality funding will be to appoint a consultant to complete a Landscape Character Assessment. This recommendation will be taken to the Parish Council meeting later in August. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group is also keen to complete design codes for inclusion in the neighbourhood plan and technical support will be sought for this as part of the Locality Funding application.

#### **11. OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE**

None

#### **12. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA**

None

#### **13. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 20.30 pm.