



# 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 Tuesday, 09<sup>th</sup> February 2021 via a virtual meeting at 7.00pm

CHAIRMAN: Mr P Richings

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr R Nunn, Mr P Richings, Mr B Ward, Ms Evans, Mr Newton, Mr Whiting, Mr J Westrup, Mrs B Richardson-Todd, Mr K Driver

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 1; District Cllr Colin Hedgley

APOLOGIES: Miss A Cracknell (unable to join virtual meeting), Mr Francis (unable to join virtual meeting)

CLERK: Mrs S Stannard, Mrs S Jenkins. Mrs Stannard clerked the meeting.

## 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 Miss Cracknell and Mr Francis. Mr Westrup proposed that the apologies be accepted, seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved with ALL in favour.

## 2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14<sup>th</sup> January 2021

This item was deferred to the next meeting as the correct minutes were not available for councillors to view on the website.

## 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 also asked to be absent during the meeting of the discussion on 6 Butterfly Gardens as he has sent correspondence to SCC regarding this.

Mr Driver declared a pecuniary interest in planning application DC/20/4153/FUL, 6 Butterfly Gardens. He will leave the meeting when this application is discussed and wait in a virtual waiting room.

#### 4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

A member of the public wished to participate on item DC/20/4153/FUL, 6 Butterfly Gardens. District Councillor Colin Hedgley was interested in observing the discussion on DC/21/0288/FUL, Land adjacent to 29 Birchwood Drive, Rushmere St Andrew.

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

Mr Nunn reported that Coastal Norse removed the carcass of a fox on the Mill Stream. Mr Ward asked about the work at Nr 155 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew. No correspondence received regarding this and application not determined. A discussion followed regarding the site.

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

DC/20/4176/FUL	675 Foxhall Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP3 8NF	Internal walls to make shower room. Brick up one garage door & place window. Brick up inside of other garage door, leaving the garage door intact visually from front. Use of outbuilding as an annexe.
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p><b>History –</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- E10337 - erect double garage – application approved 19/09/1967</li><li>- C/90/0143 - alterations to change existing flat roof and direction of ridge on annex – application approved 06/03/1990</li><li>- C/90/1326 - alterations to change existing flat roof on garage to pitch to provide storage space - application approved 24/10/1990</li><li>- DC/20/4176/FUL - Internal walls to make shower room. Brick up one garage door &amp; place window. Brick up inside of other garage door, leaving the garage door intact visually from front – “17/12/2020 - Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL. The reason for this is that inadequate information such as appropriate elevation drawings and floor plans were provided with the application. It is also unclear whether the intended use of the building is for an annexe or not. If the intention is to use the building as an annexe this should form part of the application”.</li><li>- The current short-notice re-consideration is taking place following submission of additional information.</li></ul> <p><b>Application form –</b> Pre-application advice sought – “I telephoned to ask if we needed permission for an annexe and was informed to go through this process due to change of us from garage to annexe. He also informed me that I may commence work.” “Has the work already been started without consent?” answered “no”. Materials for windows changed (existing “garage door”, proposed “white pvc window”); walls (existing “walls”, proposed “Thermal Blocks, Wall cladding Cream”.</p> <p>Plans – Covering letter seems to contradict application form, regarding “work started”, as it states “We have made a start due to the last lockdown and working from home for the foreseeable future, I was informed that it wouldn’t be a problem to go ahead whilst going through this process if required.”</p> <p>The application form was signed on 12/10/20, and this, together with existing &amp; proposed floor plans for ground &amp; 1st floor, are dated on ESC website as received on 19/10/20. However, following communications between ESC &amp; applicant, the application was not validated until 07/12/20 when supporting letter, site plan &amp; amended existing &amp; proposed ground floor plans were added. There are no elevation drawings provided, despite the fact north elevation (window added in shower room) &amp; south elevation (left garage door replaced with window) changes are proposed. The recently submitted additional documents provide a photograph of the partially completed left-hand garage door infill (in-situ new window with building block infill of remainder of former opening. A supplementary letter advises this will be finished with cream cladding.</p> <p>Looking at the composite plans, the overall changes appear to be: -</p>			

- ground floor – existing toilet changed to cupboard; creation of shower / toilet room in north west corner with window added to north elevation; left hand garage door bricked up with smaller window replacement; right hand garage door to remain but possibly bricked up behind (dependent upon which plans are viewed)
- 1st floor – no obvious changes spotted.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date** – 12/01/21 (Expiry); 31/01/21 (Determination Deadline) – requested for RSAPC to make comment by this date on adjusted set of plans.

**Consideration** – Reviewing the December 2020 application history, no mention is made of “Use of the outbuilding as an annexe” on correspondence from ESC, nor application form, on the original DC/20/4176/FUL application form. It appears to have been added to the ESC website sometime in December 2020 between initial receipt of application details from ESC & RSAPC making comment. It is therefore presumed this was changed by negotiation / clarification. As such, consideration is being made on the basis of changes both to the fabric of the building plus the use of building as an annexe.

It is disappointing to note no elevation plans have still not been forthcoming. However, the submitted photograph, & supplementary letter, gives a satisfactory idea as to what is proposed. With regards to the addition of the north elevation shower room window, it is probably not going to be particularly obtrusive nor prove to be of great material interest, subject to provision of obscured glass.

In consequence, the proposed material changes to the building fabric are not considered to be unreasonable, or out of character for the local area.

With regards to the use of “the outbuilding as an annexe”, the proposal does not appear to deviate from the requirements as detailed within Policy SCLP5.13 “Residential Annexes” of the Local Plan.

#### **Delegated Response –**

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends approval of the application subject to the following conditions being applied: -

- Obscure glass being fitted to the proposed north elevation window.

Standard conditions / planning obligations, as detailed in Local Plan Policy SCLP5.13 (Residential Annexes), being included

Councillors noted this.

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

DC/20/4153/FUL	6 Butterfly Gardens, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5TF	Replace existing 1.8m fence and gate to back garden due to fence posts and fence being rotten, aligning fence to house edge to create extra space for recycle bins etc to be hidden from road. Replace 0.7m chain link fence bordering no 8 with a 1.8m solid timber fence, decreasing at stages (approx every 3.6m) to 1m stopping 1.6m from road side. The fence is topped with open curved diamond and is supported by concrete posts and gravel boards. The front fence is a common style mimicking most back fences in the area and with the trellis at the front it is similar with another boundary fence in the cul de sac. We plan to do more planting to soften the edges with climbing plants (e.g. honeysuckle and clematis) which will flower to attract birds, bees and other wildlife.
----------------	--	---------	---

Mr Newton left the meeting and waited in the virtual waiting room.

A member of the public spoke about his concerns regarding the application. Mr Driver spoke in support of the application. Mr Driver left the meeting and waited in the virtual waiting room.

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

**Applicant** – The applicant has been a Member of Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council since Co-option as a Member on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

**History** – Following neighbourhood complaints to RSAPC & ESC Ward Councillor, starting around 28th May 2020, ESC Planning Enforcement was accordingly advised of a potential breach of planning.

RSAPC were advised on 2nd June 2020 by ESC that they had initiated a planning enforcement investigation – Ref. ENF/20/0173/DEV (Possible Breach of Control: Large fence to the front of the property).

On 7th September 2020, ESC advised: -

"I have now concluded my investigation into the above breach. From the evidence I have gathered following a review of the original approved plans it has been determined that there is a breach of control. It has been confirmed that permitted development rights were removed for the area therefore any wall, fence or form of boundary enclosure would require planning permission. I apologise for the delay I was awaiting confirmation that the property in question was in the area where the permitted development rights had been removed, this has now been confirmed.

Therefore the owner has been given a period of time to either remove the fence or submit a planning application to retain the fence.

I apologise for any inconvenience and distress this investigation may have caused you."

The current application was submitted to ESC on 19th October 2020, but was not formally validated, for whatever reason, until 18th January 2021. ESC website refers to some of the documentation being annotated as "amended" which may explain this.

**Application form** – Pre-application advice sought dated 22nd May 2020 – "No planning permission required. Existing fencing can be replaced as long as it is less than 2m and not adjacent to a highway. After the fence was erected the planning team checked and requested the first panel to be lowered to 1m as it was adjacent to the highway (Dominic Starkey) which has been done. The contractor who erected the fence was under the impression that the trellis didn't form part of the fence hence the miss-understanding. All other aspects of the fence were deemed to be within planning guidelines."

"Has the work already been started without consent?" answered "yes" and quotes "started 25th May 2020", "completed 28th May 2020".

Existing materials (Rear fence and gate - painted wood with wood posts, Boundary fence - painted wooden posts with plastic chain links"); proposed materials "Rear fence - natural wood with concrete posts, Boundary fence - natural wood with concrete posts".

The Description of Proposed Works states "As detailed in application heading, quoted above, continuing with ..... The design of the fence with the step down and trellis was agreed with our neighbours at number 4 and 8. This will provide added privacy and security, screening no 8 proposed outside lights and expanded driveway/hard landscaping. Our neighbour at number 8 is a hardworking taxi driver, and restaurateur who will return home late, often early hours of the morning, thus reducing the impact and disturbance to our front bedrooms. They also have a young family so a more solid fence will allow the children to play in more secure safe space, shielded from the road.

This will also benefit our grandchildren when visiting. The fencing will also reduce leaves from our tree from entering neighbouring properties and allow for ease of maintenance. The space at the back of the property will be used, in addition to hiding recycle/waste bins from road (which previously were stored at the front and had been commented on by a neighbour to us), for housing water butts, potential for a small green house, composting area and allow an area to be turned over for vegetable growing. This also provides a more secure space for the rescue dogs we foster

for a charity on a part time basis. The original fence was also over 25 years old with rotten posts and broken chains providing a run down and unmaintained look to the area.”

**Plans** – The plans include some photographs of original fence & the in-situ replacement fence, the subject of this application.

Starting 1.6m from the highway, the front garden boundary fence shows the height & quantity of each fence panel & trellis which range from 0.7m+0.3m to 1.4m+0.4m thus leading to a “1m-1.8m step up” of the fence. The rear garden boundary fence is quoted as 1.8m with no trellis.

Comparison of the original positioning, versus replacement, shows a realignment forward of the fence leading across from the corner of the dwelling to the no 6 / 8 boundary line – the net effect being a loss of front garden space / increase of side/rear garden space. This fence is quoted as “6m long - 1.8m high fence – solid wooden fence with curved trellis and gate (0.9m wide). Unfortunately, the measurement information provided for this fence is not as clear as that provided for the boundary fence. It does not explicitly advise whether the 1.8m height includes the trellis or not.

Very close inspection of the application (lower right-hand photograph) may clarify this matter. The tiny view, just to the left of the tree, shows this fence is rather higher than the total height of the boundary fence at this point. As such, it is would appear this fence could be 1.8m plus 0.4m trellis – a possible total of 2.2m high.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date** – 12/02/21 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

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

DC/21/0130/FUL	13 Elm Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AJ	Erection of detached garage with domestic storage space above (existing building to be taken down).
----------------	------------------------------------	---------	---

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

**History** – DC/18/1244/FUL - Construction of a one and a half storey side extension, single storey front extension and associated works – permission granted by ESC on 25th April 2018

**Application form** – No pre-application advice sought. Proposed materials walls smooth render; roof red terracotta concrete pantiles; windows & doors white UPVC; vehicle hard-standing porous tarmac.

**Plans** – The proposal entails removal of an existing garage located towards the front of the curtilage & replacement with a larger garage, and associated turning area, with storage above, located 2m from the Elm Road boundary, 0.6m from no 11's boundary. The dimensions of the building are length 8.4m, width 6.3m & height 2.45m to eaves & 6.2m to ridge. A double-size garage door, with window above, will face towards the host semi-detached bungalow, which is located at a slightly higher elevation due to the slope of the land. For reference, the site location plan shows a similarly positioned triple garage at no 17 – this was granted permission in 2016 – with dimension length 9.5m, width 5.84m & height 2.6m to eaves & 4.675m to ridge.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date** – 11/02/21 (Expiry).

Councillors considered the application carefully.

**Response:** Mr Whiting proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved with ALL in favour.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL subject to the use of the building being restricted to incidental to the dwelling and not to be used for trade or business.

DC/21/0147/FUL	29 Cuckfield Avenue, Rushmere St Andrew	IP3 8RZ	First floor side extension and single storey front extension to provide porch and enlarged garage
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p><b>History</b> – None</p> <p><b>Application form</b> – No pre-application advice sought. Materials to match existing.</p> <p><b>Plans</b> – This is a detached property, the middle one of a series of similar style properties. At ground floor level, the proposal entails adding a porch and extend the garage to the front-elevation. The major change is at 1st floor level, where a full-length side extension is added, replacing a part-length flat-roof dormer-style extension. The proposed extension faces no 31 which has no facing 1st floor windows The resulting street scene will then have a modified no 29, sandwiched by 4 same-style properties (2 left-handed &amp; 2 right-handed).</p> <p><b>Latest Consultation Expiry Date</b> – 11/02/21 (Expiry).</p> <p>Councillors considered the application carefully.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Mr Westrup proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Driver. Resolved with ALL in favour.</p> <p>Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.</p>			
DC/21/0288/FUL	Land Adjacent To 29 Birchwood Drive, Rushmere St Andrew		Dwelling, part single storey and part two storey.
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>The Clerk made Councillors aware of correspondence received from members of the public regarding this application.</p> <p><b>History</b> – DC/20/4425/TPO – T1 Beech - proposed crown reduction, T2 &amp; 3 oak - proposed removal – Application approved 21/12/2020 with condition “It is a Condition of consent to fell the 2no. Oaks that 2no. replacement trees be planted on the northern site boundary. These should be Oak or Lime which should be planted in accordance with best horticultural practice and maintained until fully established. The applicant should note that the work hereby granted consent shall be carried out and completed within a two-year period from the date of this consent unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority”.</p> <p>The Adopted Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (page 613) shows the site is located within the Rushmere St Andrew (Village) Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>The East Suffolk Council Geographic Information System shows the site coloured in green.</p> <p><b>Application form</b> – No pre-application advice sought. Site area 674 sq. m. Existing use of land “undeveloped rough ground, overgrown surrounded by dwellings and private gardens to east, south and west and fields to the north”.</p> <p>The following questions are answered “yes” –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A proposed use that would be particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination</li> <li>- Is a new or altered vehicular access proposed to or from the public highway?</li> <li>- Is a new or altered pedestrian access proposed to or from the public highway?</li> <li>- Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site?</li> </ul> <p><b>Materials</b> – see form for fully detailed list. Parking for 3 cars &amp; 2 cycles proposed. Disposal of surface water to “soakaway”, foul sewage to “mains sewer. Proposed “self-build” 3 bed dwelling.</p> <p><b>Plans</b> – A contaminated land assessment, and associated questionnaire, is provided with result of “passed”. A “design &amp; access” statement is provided.</p> <p>It is proposed that the dwelling foundations will be provided via a “screw pile” method &amp; a site plan, and associated leaflet, is provided.</p> <p>The site / location plan shows the proposed dwelling positioned immediately to the north of the no 29 bungalow, west of the garage of no 50 bungalow &amp; east of no 20 The Limes bungalow. To the north of the site is farmland. The plan mentions “existing vehicular access retained” as compared to application form question answers. The proposal shows a predominately single-storey dwelling, with a pitched roof first floor “popping up” in the middle part of the</p>			



building. The first floor accommodation comprises 2 bedrooms plus store room with proposed windows on the south, west & north elevations. At ground floor level, the central / western part of the building contains living / dining / kitchen / utility / sitting / garage accommodation under a flat roof & partially under the 1st floor accommodation. Set back from this, and on the east side, is located a sloping roof element containing a self-contained bedroom / dressing room / en-suite with separate cloakroom toilet.

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 22/02/21 (Expiry).**

Councillors considered the application carefully.

**Response:** Mr Richings proposed refusal of the application, seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved with MAJORITY in favour.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL. The reasons for this are:

Against Policies 11.1 and 11.2 of the Suffolk Local Plan

Overdevelopment and cramped form of development

Relationship with bungalows 29 and 50 Birchwood Drive and 50 The Limes.

Access to 29 Birchwood unsatisfactory.

Curtilage too small and out of place.

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

Mr Richings advised that the following application was received:

DC/21/0300/FUL	14 Meadowside Gardens, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5RD	Proposed alterations and extensions
----------------	---	---------	-------------------------------------

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

**History** – None

**Application form** – No pre-application advice sought. The following question is answered “yes” –

- Are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development?

**Materials** – see form for fully detailed list but note all proposed are different to existing.

**Plans** – A “design & access” statement is provided which includes a series of “as is” photographs. Attention is drawn to the final (rear / north elevation) photograph whose caption (possibly the word “additional” is missing) appears to contradict the proposed north elevation diagram. Details are included relating to the need for the proposal. A “shadow study” is provided which shows the shadowing effect of the proposed property at 3 hourly times at the summer & winter solstice. Comprehensive existing & proposed elevation, ground floor & 1st floor plans are provided.

Looking at the existing dwelling, the front (south) elevation sees the removal of a chimney stack. At 1st floor level, a single 2 pane windowed dormer is replaced with a larger dormer with a pair of 2 pane windows.

At ground floor level, the building is extended forward with lean-to roof incorporating 3 sets of roof-lights to provide extended living accommodation & toilet. To the rear (north) elevation, a small width dormer is replaced with a much larger width dormer, both having a single bathroom window combination.

The main part of the proposal comprises a two-storey pitch roof extension at the eastern end of the existing dwelling. At ground floor level, a gym & toilet is proposed; at 1st floor level, a bedroom & accessible shower room is provided. A lift is provided for access between the 2 floors. An additional front door is provided at the join of original & new parts of the proposed dwelling

**Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 25/02/21 (Expiry)**

Councillors considered the application carefully.

**Response:** Mr Whiting proposed approval of the application, seconded by Mr Nunn. Resolved with MAJORITY in favour.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

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

The Clerk advised that the following decisions were received since the meeting in December.

DC/20/4176/FUL	675 Foxhall Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Creation of internal walls to make shower room. Brick up one garage door & replace with window. Brick up inside of other garage door, leaving the garage door intact visually from the front. Use of the outbuilding as annexe. Delegated approval. P&D noted on 09/02/2021. <b>East Suffolk Council – Granted planning permission with conditions on 1 February 2021.</b>
DC/20/4645/FUL	Tilers Cottage, 1 Seven Cottages Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	Retention of detached cartlodge/ stores outbuilding. P&D recommended refusal on 17/12/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Granted planning permission with conditions on 26 January 2021</b>
DC/20/3946/FUL	12 Elm Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Retrospective change, converting a 3rd of our garage into a Babershop P&D recommended refusal on 14/10/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Granted planning permission with conditions on 27 January 2021</b>
DC/20/5273/FUL	26 Elm Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Alterations and Rear Extension to Existing Single Storey Dwelling P&D recommended approval on 14/01/21 <b>East Suffolk Council – Granted planning permission with conditions on 1 February 2021.</b>
DC/20/4880/FUL	43 Hardwick Close, Rushmere St Andrew	Single storey rear extension and internal alterations. P&D recommended approval on 17/12/2020 <b>East Suffolk Council – Granted planning permission with conditions on 1 February 2021</b>
DC/20/5292/VOC	20 Elm Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Variation of Condition 2 of DC/19/0361/FUL 9 (Proposed replacement dwelling and erection of detached garage/studio). P&D recommended approval on 14/01/2021 <b>East Suffolk Council – Granted planning permission with conditions on 5 February 2021</b>
DC/20/5016/FUL	125 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	Proposed replacement dwelling including outdoor swimming pool, pool house and new garaging. P&D recommended approval on 14/01/2021 <b>East Suffolk Council – Granted planning permission with conditions on 8 February 2021</b>



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

The Clerk asked to be kept up to date on progress regarding 81 The Street, raised by a resident in the parish with East Suffolk Council and a copy of the correspondence was forwarded to the Parish Council.

Mr Whiting queried the size of the garage and whether this has been raised with enforcement. Clerk raised with Enforcement. Awaiting response. Enforcement has responded regarding the large hardstanding driveway that was not included in the planning application – it was determined that there is currently no breach of control. He is investigating whether the garage is in accordance with the approved drawings.

The Parish Council queried whether the building work at 42 Woodbridge Road is being carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. Awaiting feedback from East Suffolk Council.

The Parish Council queried whether a shed at 17 The Limes, Rushmere St Andrew needs planning permission. Informed needs permission and enforcement is following this up.

The Parish Council approached East Suffolk Council and the Environment Agency to check whether Chater Land Holdings requires permission for the intended use on the site at Bladen Drive/ Gwendoline Close. The Environment Agency indicated that permission is not required at present. Awaiting feedback from East Suffolk Council.

## **10. UPDATE ON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

The draft Landscape Character Assessment, draft Design Codes and results from the questionnaires are now available. The Working Group is making good progress. It is likely that as a result of the latest lockdown that Zoom meetings will be held and a summary leaflet will be distributed to consult residents.

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

The Clerk reported that she received correspondence from a resident regarding public participation at Council meetings and Playford Road Traffic Calming Scheme. The Parish Council has responded to this in the past and no new issues were raised.

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

None

## **13. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The Chairman closed the meeting at 20.59pm.