



Rushmere St. Andrew Parish Council

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

"Seek The Common Good"



Minutes of the Planning & Development Committee meeting held on Thursday, 17th December 2020 via a virtual meeting at 7.00pm

CHAIRMAN: Mr P Richings

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

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public = 0

APOLOGIES:

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.

No apologies received.

2. TO SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12th November 2020

Miss Cracknell proposed acceptance of the minutes with one amendment:

Item 2: the amendment should read 'non-pecuniary' interest.

This was seconded by Mr Francis. 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.

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 tree that was unsafe along the Mill Stream path was removed and the path was left safe and clear. Councillors noted this. Mr Nunn informed Councillors that despite reporting the flooding at the Foxhall Road/ Bell Lane junction this issue has not been resolved. The Clerk confirmed that the Parish Council reported this issue. It was agreed to report the issue again and if nothing is done to contact Cllr Whiting regarding this with a copy of the correspondence to be sent to Kesgrave Town Council.

Mrs Richardson-Todd reported that the flooding problem at Nos 39/49 Playford Road has been resolved. Councillors noted this.

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

DC/20/4425/TPO	29 Birchwood Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1EB	T1 Beech - proposed crown reduction, T2 & 3 oak - [proposed removal. See below for further information T1 Beech: The species is relatively short-lived and is not resistant to decay. This tree is mature and in declining condition, with a sparse crown and poor extension growth, there is also some basal decay evident, with adaptive growth. The remaining contribution of the tree is limited and the basal decay, whilst not an immediate concern could become an issue given the condition of the crown and lack of vigour. Its amenity contribution is eroded by its sparse crown. It is proposed to reduce the crown spread by 1.5-2m on all sides and the height by 4m to encourage inner crown growth. T2 & T3 Oak: These are a pair of weather-damaged trees. T2 has lost its main leader and formed a very low, spreading crown, T3 has been stuck by lightning in the past and has very limited live canopy growth. Both trees have a battered appearance and neither makes a significant contribution to the surroundings. The trees dominate the site and the applicant would like to thin them to provide usable domestic space. It is proposed to remove the two oak. This should also favour the beech, by removing competition.
----------------	---	---------	---

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

History – DC/20/3690/TPO (TPO ESCC 1955 0029 T1 Beech: The species is relatively short-lived and is not resistant to decay. This tree is mature and in declining condition, with a sparse crown and poor extension growth, there is also some basal decay evident, with adaptive growth. The remaining contribution of the tree is limited and the basal decay, whilst not an immediate concern could become an issue given the condition of the crown and lack of vigour. Its amenity contribution is eroded by its sparse crown. T2 & T3 Oak: These are a pair of weather-damaged trees. T2 has lost its main leader and formed a very low, spreading crown, T3 has been stuck by lightning in the past and has very limited live canopy growth. Both trees have a battered appearance and neither makes a significant contribution to the surroundings. The trees dominate the site and the applicant would like to remove them to provide usable domestic space. It is proposed to plant three replacement trees on the edge of the site; 2 oak and one small leaf lime)) – Application withdrawn 02/11/2020

Parish Council had already responded “Rushmere St Andrew recommends refusal of this application due to the adverse visual impact on footpath users in the Fynn Valley area & residents in Birchwood Drive caused by the loss of these 3 significant trees. Whilst recognising the historic neglect to these trees, we recommend that alternative maintenance solutions should be considered for all 3 trees – for example via crown reduction, removal of dead & dying branches, together with removal of some lower branches”

Application form – None provided on web to review.

Plans – Site location plan showing position of trees within curtilage & 2 photographs of existing trees.

Consideration – The original application proposed removal of 3 trees in the centre plot & replacement with 3 on the edge of the site.

This application proposes retention of the northernmost tree (beech) & removal of the 2 oak trees located further south towards the existing dwelling. However, no replacement planting is proposed.

Our tree warden has reviewed the application and comments “The proposals are acceptable to remove both Oak Trees and carry out corrective treatment to the Beech Tree as per the application. Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council further proposes that replacement planting should take place to re-establish the boundary hedge along with specimen trees to compensate for the removed oak trees”

Delegated Response – Rushmere St Andrew recommends refusal of this application due to the adverse visual impact on footpath users in the Fynn Valley area & residents in Birchwood Drive caused by the loss of 2 of these 3 significant trees. Due to the apparent damage, the proposal to remove both Oak Trees and carry out corrective treatment to the Beech Tree as per the application is acceptable. However, the Parish Council would request that replacement planting should take place to re-establish the boundary hedge along with specimen trees to compensate for the removed oak trees, thus enabling the retention of the visual scenery as mentioned above.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 27/11/20 (Expiry)

Councillors noted this. Miss Cracknell expressed her disappointment regarding the proposal to remove the oak trees.

DC/20/3961/FUL	62 Blackdown Avenue, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AY	Single storey extension to the rear. Porch extension to the front (bigger than 3 square metres). Garage roof and wall repairs.
----------------	--	---------	--

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

Application form – No pre-application advice sought. Works already started without consent on 01/05/2020. Materials for red brick walls and white UPVC windows to match existing; roof to match existing for house changes with garage roof changed from bitumen to metal sheet; white UPVC doors to match existing except for porch which will be green.

Plans – The dwelling is a semi-detached bungalow (attached to no 64) with garage to rear, adjacent to one located at no 60. The proposed change to the garage is to amend the existing flat roof to gable style with low profile. A front porch, with gable roof is proposed adjacent to no 64's entrance. To the rear, a gable roof extension is proposed, inset from site boundary & with blank wall facing no 64. Windows face down garden, door & window face to side, albeit distant from no 60.

Consideration – The changes to the garage are minimal. It is located adjacent to, and hidden behind, existing one at no 60 which has a higher gable roof than the one proposed. It would not appear to affect the amenity of no 60's dwelling. Looking at the porch, it would be located adjacent to the entrance to no 64. However, a number of similar properties in the road have had porches constructed, so would not be “out of character”, nor of major impact on the amenity of no 64. The proposed rear extension would be distant from & mainly hidden from no 60. Relative to no 64, the proposal is inset from the boundary and has no apertures facing it. No 64 was granted permission for a wider rear extension, of similar style, inset from the boundary & also with blank wall facing no 62, via DC/17/1183/FUL, the Parish Council having recommended approval.

Delegated Response – Rushmere St Andrew recommends approval.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 16/12/20 (Expiry)

Councillors noted this.

DC/20/1802/ARM	Land North West Of Mill Farm Westerfield Road, Westerfield, Ipswich	IP6 9AA	Approval of Reserved Matters of DC/16/2592/OUT - Mixed use development comprising up to 1,100 residential dwellings (C3); a local centre inc. up to 250sqm (net) of convenience floor space (A1), up to 300sqm of comparison floorspace (A1), up to 250sqm in use classes A1-A5; and up to 500sqm community centre (D1); provision of land for a primary school (D1); provision of sports facilities, Country Park (including visitor centre D1) and open space (including amenity space/childrens play areas and allotments) and sustainable urban drainage systems; associated landscaping, infrastructure and engineering/earthworks; and the creation of 2No. new vehicular accesses from Henley Road, 1No. vehicular access from Westerfield Road (to serve Country Park only), pedestrian/cycle bridge over railway and vehicular bridge over railway (access only).
----------------	---	---------	--

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

History – Earlier this year, the Parish Council were advised of this application for reserved matters dealing with layout and access details of a proposed Country Park. This covered a very small portion of a large-scale development in Ipswich Borough Council's area which encroaches into the East Suffolk Council area of responsibility in Westerfield.

The Parish Council chose not to pass comment at this time.

Plans – Additional plans have now been submitted which cover details of planting, footpaths, benches & timber bridge.

Consideration – This site is distant from the Parish & covers further "cosmetic" aspects proposed for the development, which are of little consequence to us. It is felt that those with more intimate detail of the site would be more competent to comment on such items and, consequentially, no comment was made from Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council.

Councillors noted this.

DC/20/4705/FUL	4 Quantock Close, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1AS	Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension including internal alterations.
----------------	--------------------------------------	---------	--

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

Application form – No pre-application advice sought. Materials for roof and white upvc doors & windows to primary elevation to match existing; windows to single-storey rear extension grey powder-coated aluminium; walls existing "facing brickwork piers with painted render infill", proposed "cementitious weatherboarding infill panels, facing brickwork to match existing".

Plans – The dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached house (attached to no 3 located to the west). There is an existing single-storey extension to the rear, slightly inset from boundary with no 3 & running along remainder of dwelling. A detached garage is located to eastern side. The dwelling is situated on a corner of the close and the adjacent pair of semis (5/6) are set at an angle.

A front porch is proposed in right hand corner of existing dwelling. On the eastern elevation, a two storey side extension is proposed, necessitating removal of garage. To the rear, a single-storey extension is proposed which will extend to rear of proposed side extension.

Consideration – The addition of the porch, located away from any of the neighbouring properties, seems reasonable – indeed other similar examples can be seen within the Close. To the rear, the extension is relatively modest, especially in relationship to no 3 which has a slightly deeper extension – the proposals will bring both rear elevations more-or-less in line. Relative to no 5, the extension will be "tucked away" to the side of no 5's garage.

With regards to the side extension, the proposed footprint is set back slightly from the existing front elevation. The front corner is inset from the existing garage position. In consequence, the relative angling of the properties will marginally reduce the ground floor impact on no 5. With the properties relatively distant, the impact at front first floor level would be negligible & no 5's 1st floor side window view would likely not be affected. With regards to addition of a side extension, this has been successfully achieved at a number of similar properties in the Close.

Delegated Response – Rushmere St Andrew recommends approval.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 11/12/20 (Expiry)

Councillors noted this.

6. TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/20/4645/FUL	Tilers Cottage, 1 Seven Cottages Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DY	Retention of detached cart lodge/ stores outbuilding.
----------------	---	---------	---

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

History – C/12/2406 Proposed new dwelling adjacent to No 2 Seven Cottages - Revised scheme (C12/1193) – Application approved 16/01/2013. Plans subsequently amended via DC/15/1440/AME approved on 05/05/2015. No 1 is therefore a new-build (in the old style) replacing the original no 1 subject to a demolition order in 1959.

Application form – No pre-application advice sought. Works already started without consent on 01/10/2020 but not yet completed. Materials for walls part red brick plinth, part horizontal timber boarding; white UPVC windows & doors; slated roof.

Plans – No 1 is the southernmost dwelling in a terrace of 7 cottages. The proposal is to construct a cart-lodge to the rear of the curtilage of no 1 (height 3.65m, 5.64m long, 3.1m wide) with north-east elevation open end facing track behind no's 1-7, side door into garden & side window facing proposed laurel hedge & track leading to a few other cottages to the east.

With reference to Google Earth, currently all properties gain access to open parking areas located to the rear of each property via track around the side of no 1, curving around the back corner of no 1. The proposed cart-lodge would be located on this corner.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 18/12/20 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL. The building does not relate well to the surroundings in terms of its design, scale, mass and form and the Parish Council is concerned about the physical relationship of the garage with the cottages to the rear of the property. This is contrary to Policies DM21 and DM23 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan. The Parish Council is also concerned about the proximity of the building to the utility pole (streetlight, telecommunications & electricity). The garage is not described accurately as a 'cartlodge' in the application. A cartlodge is open on the sides.

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.
----------------	---	---------	--

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

History –

-E10337 - erect double garage – application approved 19/09/1967

-C/90/0143 - alterations to change existing flat roof and direction of ridge on annex – application approved 06/03/1990

-C/90/1326 - alterations to change existing flat roof on garage to pitch to provide storage space - application approved 24/10/1990

Application form – 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”.

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.”

The application form was signed on 12/10/20, and this, together with existing & proposed floor plans for ground & 1st floor, are dated on ESC website as received on 19/10/20. However, following communications between ESC & applicant, the application was not validated until 07/12/20 when supporting letter, site plan & amended existing & proposed ground floor plans were added. There are no elevation drawings provided, despite the fact north elevation (window added in shower room) & south elevation (left garage door replaced with window) changes are proposed.

Looking at the composite plans, the overall changes appear to be: -

-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 – 01/01/21 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

Response: Mr Francis proposed refusal of the application, seconded by Mr Whiting. Resolved with ALL in favour.

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends REFUSAL. The reason for this is that inadequate information such as elevational 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.

DC/20/4777/FUL	The Oaks, Playford Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DW	Full planning application seeking permission for a replacement dwelling and double garage at The Oaks Playford Lane, Rushmere St Andrew, IP5 1DW
----------------	---	---------	--

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

History –

- DC/19/4851/OUT - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of three new dwellings – application refused 24/02/2020; appeal (AP/20/0042/REFUSE ; APP/X3540/W/20/3249337) lodged 28/05/2020 – in progress.

Application form – No pre-application advice sought. Materials for walls (combination of render & brick); roof (sedum); windows & doors (aluminium). No changes to pedestrian & vehicle access, roads & rights of way. Vehicle parking 4 cars (as existing) plus 2 cycle spaces. Trees & hedges on site question answered “yes”. Foul sewage disposal “unknown”. Waste storage and collection “retention of current arrangements”

Plans – Comprehensive set of plans provided including: -

- Visual interpretations of proposed replacement dwelling
 - Existing & proposed site layout including property placements & associated access.
 - Planning, design & access statement
 - Existing dwelling elevations, floor plans & photographs
 - Proposed elevations, floor plans for both dwelling & garage
- Contaminated land assessment

The application site is located close to, but outside, the “RSA Village” Physical Limits Boundary. The proposal is to replace an existing chalet bungalow & garage with a replacement 2 storey flat roof dwelling, annex & garage. The existing dwelling is of indeterminate age (no record on ESL website but quoted as 1951-1965 within application), with current occupants having lived there around 40 years.

The proposed dwelling has an annex attached, both being accessed from a common entrance. The annex includes lounge, kitchen & shower room at ground level, with 2 bedrooms & wc at 1st floor level, and staircase. The host dwelling consists of lounge, kitchen / family room, dining room, tv room & study on the ground floor with 3 bedrooms (one with southwest facing balcony above ground floor), 2 bath/en-suite & wardrobe rooms at 1st floor, again with separate staircase.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 01/01/21 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

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

Mr Richings advised that the following application was received:

DC/20/4880/FUL	43 Hardwick Close, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5XB	Single storey rear extension and internal alterations.
----------------	--	---------	--

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

Application form – No pre-application advice sought. Proposed materials match existing. “Trees & hedges on site?” box ticked.

Plans – Full set of existing & proposed floor & elevations plan, together with site location plan, although no proposed front elevation plan is provided.

This is a detached bungalow, the last of a series of four similar ones, situated in corner of cul-de-sac. To the north, detached bungalow, no 41, has an existing conservatory to rear (see site location plan). To the south, semi-detached house, no 45, is positioned at right-angles to no 43, with pair of garages intervening.

The proposals entail a full width 7.435m rear extension extending the overall length of the dwelling by 7m. Internally, a full revamp of the existing accommodation is proposed. This includes changing the front room from living to bedroom accommodation, with a narrow side extension changing from utility into en-suite.

The proposed extension roof profile matches the existing one with the proposed new walls fully brickwork to north (no 41 side) & east (Bixley Drive property side) with south-facing one brick and 4-pane glazed bi-fold doors.

Latest Consultation Expiry Date – 07/01/21 (Expiry)

Councillors considered the application carefully.

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

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council recommends APPROVAL.

8. 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.

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.

DC/20/4085/FUL	836 Foxhall Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Rear single storey extension P&D recommended approval on 04/11/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 7th December 2020 with conditions
DC/20/4051/TPO	31 Holly Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	5 oak trees – crown lifting/ crown reduction by 3-4m. for conservation value, dead wooding, storm damaged branches, to increase light to the property and reduce path obstruction. P&D recommended approval on 04/11/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 23rd November 2020
DC/20/3869/FUL	16 Blackdown Avenue, Rushmere St Andrew	Proposed single storey front extension P&D recommended approval on 14/10/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 23rd November 2020 with conditions
DC/20/3823/FUL	92 Arundel Way, Rushmere St Andrew	New tiled pitched roof to front to replace flat roof & change materials. Garage conversion and single storey rear extension. P&D recommended approval on 14/10/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 7th December 2020 with conditions
DC/20/3317/OUT	The Cottage, 136 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew	Construction of a single dwelling on land to the west of 136 The Street, Rushmere St Andrew P&D recommended approval on 15/09/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 4th November 2020 with conditions
DC/20/3756/FUL	26 Woodbridge Road, Rushmere St Andrew	Construction of single storey rear extension P&D recommended approval on 14/10/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 6th November 2020 with conditions
DC/20/3800/FUL	2 Bixley Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	Side extension and loft conversion P&D recommended approval on 14/10/2020 East Suffolk Council – Planning permission granted on 13th November 2020 with conditions

9. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORKING GROUP

a. To Note the Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group – 03/11/2020

The minutes of the working group meeting held on 3rd November had not been distributed. Mr Whiting updated Councillors on progress with the neighbourhood plan.

b. Update and Questions from Councillors

Clerk to contact churches about distributing information regarding the questionnaires.

10. OTHER MATTERS & CORRESPONDENCE

The Clerk informed Councillors that East Suffolk Council is currently consulting the public on a Supplementary Planning Document for the Historic Environment.

11. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

None

12. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 20.42pm.