



Parish Council Rushmere St Andrew

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

Minutes of the Planning & Transportation Committee meeting held on Thursday, 3rd April 2025 at St Andrew's Church Hall at 7.00pm

CHAIRMAN: Cllr R Whiting

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Cllr K Driver, Cllr R Whiting, Cllr M Newton, Cllr M Odam, Cllr S Taylor, Cllr P Phillpot, Cllr J Wright, Cllr R Nunn, Cllr B Ward

OTHER ATTENDEES: Members of the public: 0.

APOLOGIES: Cllr D Francis (unwell) Cllr J Westrup (unwell)

OTHER APOLOGIES:

CLERK: Mr P Massey (Clerk). Mrs S Stannard (Assistant Clerk)
Minutes taken by Mrs 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 and the protocol for face-to-face meetings. Apologies were received as listed above. Cllr Nunn proposed that the apologies be accepted, seconded by Cllr Taylor. Resolved with ALL in favour.

2. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST

No declarations were made.

3. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6th MARCH 2025

Cllr Nunn proposed acceptance of the minutes with no amendments. Seconded by Cllr Newton. Resolved with ALL in favour.

The minutes were duly signed as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- a. **Public Forum – Members of the Public/ Parish Councillors may raise items relating to this agenda or any matter concerning the parish**

No matters arising

5. TO NOTE DELEGATED RESPONSES ON THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/25/0467/FUL	3 Wood Cottages, Seven Cottages Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DX	Removal of existing conservatory and erection of single storey extension
Delegated Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council has no objection to the planning application.			
Decision: Awaiting Decision			

Councillors noted this.

[Cllr Phillpot joined the meeting at 7:02 pm]

6. TO CONSIDER AND AGREE RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING PLANNING APPLICATION

DC/25/1263/TPO	37 Brookhill Way, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5UL	W1 of TPO no. 100/1997 1no. Sycamore (T1 on plan) - Fell
<p>Cllr Whiting provided a situation report following the examination of the proposal and documentation. The application was considered carefully.</p> <p>Response: Cllr Wright proposed that OBJECTIONS to application be made, and the following comments are submitted:</p> <p>Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council strongly objects to the proposal to fell the tree located in the rear garden of 37 Brookhill Way, which is currently protected under a Tree Preservation Order (TPO).</p> <p>Upon inspection, the tree in question appears to be healthy, well-balanced, and structurally sound, likely belonging to the Sycamore family. Its location on the garden boundary does not cause overshadowing or loss of amenity to the applicant's property or any neighbouring dwellings. The application appears to cite the replacement of an adjacent fence as the primary justification for felling the tree. However, the Parish Council is firmly of the view that the fence could be renewed or replaced without requiring the removal of this established and healthy tree. The Parish Council notes that the reasons stated in the application concerning the condition and impact of the tree are not supported by the physical evidence observed on site and appear to be exaggerated to support the case for removal.</p> <p>The proposal contravenes several adopted planning policies which aim to safeguard the natural environment, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy RSA 4 of the Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan which requires that development proposals should avoid the loss of distinctive trees unless the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the impacts. In this case, no such benefit has been demonstrated. Furthermore, no mitigation has been proposed that would achieve the measurable biodiversity net gain required under this policy. 2. Policy SCLP10.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, which emphasizes a hierarchy of avoiding, mitigating, and only as a last resort, compensating for harm to biodiversity and geodiversity. This tree contributes to the local green infrastructure and wildlife corridor network. Felling it would result in a loss of habitat and biodiversity value without adequate justification or compensation measures. 3. Policy SCLP10.4 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (Landscape Character), which supports development that conserves and enhances the landscape character. The tree contributes positively to the visual and environmental quality of the area and plays a part in defining the green and mature character of Brookhill Way. <p>Furthermore, the Neighbourhood Plan highlights the importance of protecting specimen trees throughout the parish for their aesthetic, ecological, and character-forming value. The Parish Council is also actively engaged in rewilding initiatives and the preservation of veteran and ancient trees, with aspirations to plant thousands of trees over the coming years. Permitting the removal of a healthy, protected tree in this context would run counter to these community goals.</p> <p>Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council respectfully requests that this application be refused.</p> <p>Seconded by Cllr Nunn. Resolved with ALL in favour.</p>			

DC/24/4209/FUL	49 Glemham Drive, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5BH	Construction of an annexe for ancillary use to the main dwellinghouse
<p>Cllr Whiting provided a situation report following the examination of the proposal and documentation. The application was considered carefully.</p> <p>Response: Cllr Driver proposed that OBJECTIONS to application be made, and the following comments are submitted:</p>			

Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council strongly objects to the above planning application. While we acknowledge that the proposal has been amended to marginally reduce the size of the structure, we do not believe this addresses the substantive concerns previously raised.

The proposed development is contrary to the following policies of the *Suffolk Coastal Local Plan*:

- Policy SCLP5.7 (Infill and Garden Development) and Policy SCLP5.13 (Residential Amenity): The significant scale and siting of the proposed dwelling, located in the rear garden of the existing property, result in a form of development that is poorly related to the host dwelling and its neighbouring properties.
- Policy SCLP11.1 (Design Quality) and Policy SCLP11.2 (Residential Amenity): The proposal fails to respect or respond positively to the local context, including the form, scale, and character of surrounding buildings. The resulting impact will be overbearing on neighbouring properties, leading to a loss of outlook and privacy, and an increase in overlooking.

Furthermore, the proposal is also contrary to Policy RSA9 of the Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan, which requires new development to reflect local characteristics and contribute to a high-quality environment. The construction of a new dwelling in the rear garden of an existing property undermines the character of the area and risks setting an undesirable precedent for similar forms of back land development.

In conclusion, Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council considers the proposal to be fundamentally at odds with the strategic aims and design principles of both the *Suffolk Coastal Local Plan* and the *Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan*. The adverse impacts on the character of the area, the established street scene, and the amenity of neighbouring properties render this application unacceptable.

We therefore strongly urge the Local Planning Authority to refuse this application.

Seconded by Cllr Odam. Resolved with ALL in favour.

7. TO CONSIDER ACTIONS RELATING TO BEECH TREE AT 136A THE STREET

Officers were made aware of potential unauthorised tree works on a Beech Tree which could be subject to a TPO. Clarification from the principal landscape and arboriculture officer at East Suffolk has reassured the works were carried out on a 5-day notice of exemption from the need to make a usual tree works application because of its poor condition.

Councillors noted this.

8. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

No matters arising

9. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7:16 pm.