



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on Tuesday, 15th September 2020 via a virtual meeting at 7.00pm

CHAIRMAN:	Mr P Richings
COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mr D Francis, Mr M Newton, Mr R Nunn, Mr P Richings, Mr J Westrup, Mr B Ward, Ms Evans.
OTHER ATTENDEES:	Members of the public = 0
APOLOGIES:	Mr R Whiting (family commitment), Miss Cracknell (unable to join virtual meeting), Mrs Richardson-Todd (unwell)
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 Miss Cracknell, Mr Whiting and Mrs Richardson-Todd. Mr Westrup proposed that the apologies be accepted, seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20th August 2020

Mr Francis proposed acceptance of the minutes without any amendments. This was seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour. The minutes was duly signed by the Chairman.

3. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST

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.

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 Nunn reported that the Jubilee Walk marker posts at the entrance from Brendon Drive towards the pumping station have been pulled out/ damaged. He also reported that the path needs a clearing. Mr

Richings reported that the wooden chicane at the entrance to the Mill Stream LNR at Foxhall Road/ Nuffield Hospital is leaning against the fence. The Clerk to report this to Mr Baker/ Mr Ross.

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

DC/20/1771/AME	80 Woodbridge Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5RA	Construction of side and rear extension with render finish and tiled pitch roof to match existing dwelling – removal of floor to roof line window to side extension and re modelling of interior
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p>History – DC/18/3577/FUL approved by SCDC in November 2018, subject to typical conditions, for plans - GCAD 116-A-0100 (Existing), GCAD 116-A-0101 Revision P05 (Proposed) & GCAD 116-A-0102 Revision P01 (Site plan). RSAPC had recommended approval.</p> <p>Application form – Pre-application advice details not filled in. The non-material amendment sought is for “removal of floor to side window to side extension & remodelling of interior”, via replacement of plan GCAD 116-A-0101 “Revision P05” with GCAD 116-A-0101 “Revision P06”.</p> <p>Plans – The revised plan shows significant internal adjustments, leading to the removal of a “ground to eaves” 800mm window configuration, which would have faced the adjacent Woodbridge Road to Playford Road footpath.</p> <p>Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 14/09/20 (Determination)</p> <p>Consideration – It is unusual for the PC to review “AME” applications. The approved application version showed a ground floor window plus a “dead end” internal hallway passage at 1st floor level terminating at the window configuration. The proposed internal changes remove these phenomena. Overall, the proposed change was considered very minor with no obvious need for the PC to make comment.</p> <p>Councillors noted this.</p>			

[Mr Nunn left the meeting].

6. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/20/3199/FUL	66 Broadlands Way, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5SU	Erection of single storey front & rear extensions & extension of existing front driveway
<p>Mr Richings gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation.</p> <p><i>[Mr Nunn joined the meeting].</i></p> <p>Application Form - No pre-application advice sought. All materials match existing.</p> <p>Plans – A detached house, the proposal replaces an existing conservatory to the rear with a full-width single-storey extension with sloped roof & four roof windows. To the front, a gable roof porch is added in front of the existing front door, alongside the boundary with no 11. Access to the porch entrance is via steps on the northern side & via a long ramp on the southern side. The existing driveway to the front of the building is extended to the southern boundary of the plot to align with the bottom of the ramp.</p> <p>Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 15/09/20 (Expiry)</p> <p>Councillors considered the application carefully.</p> <p>Mr Newton proposed approval of the application. The proposal was seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with MAJORITY in favour.</p>			

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

DC/20/3317/OUT	The Cottage, 136 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DH	Construction of single dwelling on land to the west of 136 The Street
----------------	---	---------	---

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

History – C/98/1055 (Application Permitted) – Change of use from agricultural land to residential curtilage. *No details on website, but possibly explains the unusual shape / size of the existing curtilage of no 136.*

A check of the ESC GIS system shows the site is included in the 1955 “Area Tree Protection Order”, covering trees in existence at that point in time.

Application form – No pre-application advice sought. The proposal requests the only matter sought is for “access”, with a “new or altered vehicular access” from the highway for one 4+ bedroom “Market Housing” dwelling with 2 car parking spaces proposed. Foul sewage disposal to sewer & package treatment plant. “Any trees and hedges on site” box is ticked.

Plans – Contaminated land assessment provided with “passed certificate”. A Design & Access statement is provided which shows the indicative positioning of the proposed dwelling (plus cart lodge). A widened access point is proposed to be shared with no 136. Reference is also made to other “infill” applications in the village. An independent ecology report is provided. A tree survey is provided showing proposals for tree retention or removal (annotated T5 & G1) to facilitate the development. The block plan shows both a proposed “street view” plus the proposed separation of the site into two plots – *an existing swimming pool is included in the new proposal site which probably explains the unusual separation line of the plots.*

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 22/09/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Mr Nunn 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.

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

DC/20/3522/FUL	24 Ditchingham Grove, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1WE	Front and rear extensions
----------------	--	---------	---------------------------

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

Application Form – No pre-application advice sought. Brickwork & rendering to match existing; artificial slate roof & upvc windows /doors for rear extension; flat felt roof for front extension with reuse of existing roof tiles for revised roof profile above garage.

Plans – A detached house, the proposal replaces an existing conservatory to the rear with a full-width single-storey extension with sloped roof & five roof windows. A set of bi-fold doors & 3 pane window are proposed to rear elevation, with door to north elevation & 2 pane bi-fold window to south elevation. To the front, in the north-west corner, a flat roof extension is proposed at 1st floor level, with revised profile of roof above existing garage

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 02/10/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

DC/20/3276/FUL	5 Woodbridge Road, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AH	Insertion of flat roof dormer window to north-west elevation in lieu of two velux rooflights, as an amendment to planning approval reference DC/18/3100/FUL
----------------	--	---------	---

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

History - DC/18/3100/FUL (1 1/2 Storey Extension to dwelling and associated alterations) was granted approval on 12/10/2018.

Application Form – No pre-application advice sought. Proposed materials – walls grey horizontal boarding; roof felt roof; windows white upvc.

Plans - This is a semi-detached property, originally one of a pair of bungalows. Relative to the approved plans, the proposal replaces two roof-light windows with a dormer window situated above the garage on the north-west (front) elevation

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 05/10/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

8. TO NOTE PLANNING DECISIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE LAST MEETING

DC/20/2515/FUL	23 Salehurst Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Erection of a fence including removal of existing hedge. P&D recommended refusal on 05/08/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission with conditions approved on 25 Aug 2020
DC/20/1771/AME	80 Woodbridge Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Construction of side and rear extension with render finish and tiled pitch roof to match existing dwelling – removal of floor to roof line window to side extension and re modelling of interior. No comment. P&D noted 15/09/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission with conditions approved on 8 Sept 2020
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. P&D recommended refusal on 05/08/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission with conditions approved on 9 Sept 2020
DC/20/2910/FUL	708 Foxhall Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Proposed single storey rear extension and alterations P&D recommended approval on 20/08/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission with conditions approved on 14 Sept 2020

DC/20/2569/FUL	131 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	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. P&D recommended refusal on 05/08/2020 East Suffolk Council – Refuse planning permission on 14 Sept 2020
DC/20/2686/FUL	Land to the north of 868A Foxhall Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Erection of a detached dwelling P&D recommended refusal on 20/08/2020 East Suffolk Council – Refuse planning permission on 28 Sept 2020

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. East Suffolk Council indicated that permitted development rights have been removed and that there is a breach of control. The owner has been given a period of time to either remove the fence or submit a planning application to retain the fence.

10. TO COMMENT ON THE SIZEWELL C NUCLEAR POWER STATION ORDER

The Clerk informed Councillors that she received correspondence regarding an application for a Development Consent Order under the Planning Act of 2008 has been made to the Planning Inspectorate for the proposed Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station. The Parish Council has been invited to make a representation should they wish to about the application by 30 September 2020.

Mr Westrup gave a situation report following his examination of the proposal documentation. The application was carefully considered.

Ms Evans proposed that Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council will make the following response:

As the main development is well distant from our area of interest our concern is mainly of Freight Management.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council note that a facility is proposed located to the South-East of the A12 and A14 junction South-East of Ipswich, it would include parking for 154 HGVs.

SZCs figures for HGV movements depend as to Rail LED or Road LED but to take a integrated figure a typical day at peak would consist of 325 HGVs (650 movements) and on busiest days this increases to 500 HGVs (1000 movements)

Whilst accepting that not all of the HGV traffic will use the A12/A14 route's most are likely to as there are few suitable alternatives.

Traffic from Felixstowe docks is expected to increase substantially post Brexit amongst other commercial considerations. Adding the proposed Freight Management Park we could well see an additional load on the Orwell Bridge of anything between 500-1000 HGV's daily.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council is concerned as to the capacity of this bridge and its maintenance periods.

Moving on to Martlesham, most of the heavy traffic will use the A12 route through there, this route at peak times is very busy, adding this additional HGV traffic plus the domestic traffic using the rapidly expanding retail park, plus the 2000 homes still to be built nearby then in our view gridlock is very possible in that area.

It is concerning that with an additional 8000 people needing local services, extra strain will be placed on the Police, Fire Services and Medical Services.

The proposal was seconded by Mr Ward. It was resolved with ALL in favour.

11. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP

a. To approve an updated working group member list

The Clerk informed Councillors that a number of volunteers have resigned as members of the working group. In the Terms of Reference it is states that the working group will from time to time provide a full list to the Planning and Development Committee. There is now 17 members on the list. 7 councillors and 10 volunteers. Nine of the members represent the Village Ward, six Tower Ward and two Beech Ward.

Mr Westrup proposed that the updated working group member list be approved. Seconded by Mr Ward. Resolved with ALL in favour.

b. To Approve the Project Timetable

The Clerk informed Councillors that Project Timetables have been approved by the working group. This has been referred for approval by Planning and Development Committee. One project timetable is if housing sites are not included in the Neighbourhood Plan and the other if housing sites are included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Working Group has not given consideration to whether they would recommend that housing sites be included or not.

A discussion followed about the project timetables.

Mr Ward proposed that the project timetables be approved. Seconded by Mr Westrup. Resolved with ALL in favour.

c. To Approve the Communication Strategy

The Clerk informed Councillors that the Communication Strategy has been approved by the working group. This has been referred for approval by Planning and Development Committee.

The communication strategy sets out the methods of communication including the techniques that will be used to provide information to residents about the neighbourhood plan and to collect information from residents that can be used to shape the neighbourhood plan. It also details the four key stages in the preparation of a neighbourhood plan and details what communication is anticipated during these stages and what type of communications recommended during these stages.

There are four key stages in the preparation of a neighbourhood plan namely:

Information gathering – collecting information to inform the content of the plan. Of particular importance is the opinion of residents. Use of surveys, exhibitions/ drop-in events to provide information and gain feedback. Provide residents with information about what is neighbourhood plans and how they can get involved.

Draft Plan consultation – consultation undertaken to meet minimum requirements of government regulations. Notify residents and businesses of plan, how can view and comment and deadline for comments. Minimum 6 weeks. Use range of methods including leaflets and making paper and electronic copies of plan available. Enable comments to be made.

Submission to East Suffolk and Plan Examination – District Council responsible for this. Use local publicity to ensure residents and business are aware of consultation. Keep residents informed.

Referendum – If plan successful at examination then District Council call and organise referendum. Post information about referendum.

Councillors queried whether administrative support for the neighbourhood plan other than parish council officers have been secured. The Clerk indicated that extra administrative support has not been secured yet. This will be referred to the next neighbourhood plan working group meeting.

Mr Newton proposed that the communication strategy be approved. Seconded by Mr Richings. Resolved with MAJORITY in favour.

d. To Approve Policy Document for Facebook Page for Neighbourhood Plan

The Clerk informed Councillors that the Parish Council approved setting up of a Facebook page for the Neighbourhood Plan. It is recommended that a Terms of Reference be approved for the Facebook page prior to setting this up. The document sets out the principles, roles and responsibilities and guidelines for the management of Facebook.

Important points to note include:

- The document provides guidance about what will be posted on the page
- Provides guidance on who will be moderator, post and monitor content, who will set up page, guidance for councillors and working group members about posting comments
- It provides guidance in terms of what online comments are allowed and what would not be allowed.

Mr Richings proposed that the terms of reference be amended to exclude references to parish officers managing the Facebook Page other than vetting of posts, etc and referred to the next Planning and Development Committee for consideration. Seconded by Mr Westrup. Resolved with MAJORITY in favour.

12. OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

The Clerk informed Councillors that she received correspondence from a resident regarding water run-off and damage to the verge at 81 The Street. The resident has asked East Suffolk Council if planning permission is needed and asked the Parish Council to monitor the situation. It was agreed that the Clerk will follow up the issue raised with East Suffolk Council, Enforcement.

The Clerk reported that she received correspondence from Woodbridge Town Council regarding the development order consent that was submitted for Sizewell C. The Town Council asked whether the Parish Council would like to join an interest group against the application. It was agreed not to join the group but to forward the parish council response under item 10 to Woodbridge Town Council.

The Clerk reported that it is anticipated that the Suffolk Coastal Plan will be adopted in due course following the publication of the Inspector's report on the plan. It was agreed that it may not be necessary to purchase paper copies of the Coastal Plan as this is all available online.

13. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None

14. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 20.58 pm.