



Parish Council
Rushmere St Andrew
www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

Minutes of the Planning & Transportation Committee meeting held on Thursday, 6th March 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 K Barber, 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 above. Cllr Nunn proposed that the apologies be accepted, seconded by Cllr Newton. Resolved with ALL in favour.

2. DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST

No declarations were made.

3. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30th JANUARY 2025

Cllr Nunn proposed acceptance of the minutes with no amendments. Seconded by Cllr Wright. 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/24/4243/TPO	War Memorial, St Andrews Church, The Street, Rushmere St Andrew		A1 of TPO No.29/1955 1no. Oak (T32 on plan) – Reduce lower and middle branches over car park by up to 4 metres
Delegated Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council has no objection to the planning application.			
Decision: East Suffolk Council approved the application on 16 January 2025			
DC/24/4183/FUL	34 Sandling Crescent, Rushmere St Andrew	IP4 5TW	Single Storey Rear Extension
Delegated Response: Rushmere St Andrew Parish Council has no objection to the planning application.			

Councillors considered this matter carefully.

Cllr Wright proposed that the previous comments be reiterated to the Planning Inspector with the addition of the following comments:

- Point 5: Design concerns. Make additional reference to the flat roofed design that is not in keeping with the existing street scene. The surrounding properties predominantly feature pitched or gabled roofs, contributing to the established architectural style of the area. Flat roofs present long-term management concerns, including increased maintenance costs and potential water drainage issues, which may lead to degradation over time.

The Street is characterised by low density development set back within properties with established trees and hedgerows. The application proposes a large, dominant building on the frontage of the site with little green frontage. This would not be in keeping with the character of the area. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 12 (Achieving Well-Designed Places) emphasizes the need for developments to be sympathetic to local character and history while maintaining a strong sense of place. The proposed design fails to adhere to this principle.

- Point 7: Traffic volume and highway safety. The current plans do not sufficiently account for the anticipated increase in traffic volume. The development will lead to a significant rise in vehicular movements along The Street, potentially exacerbating congestion and safety issues. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) stresses the importance of designing safe, sustainable transport infrastructure that minimizes conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. The current proposal does not adequately address these requirements, and we urge the Planning Authority to require substantial revisions before approval. Suffolk County Council's Highways Authority has expressed reservations regarding this development's impact on traffic, pedestrian safety, and sustainable transport options. Their concerns align with ours, particularly regarding site access, pedestrian safety, and interconnectivity with the local highway network. Improvements must be made to mitigate these impacts, including:
 - Introduction of a 20 mph speed zone to enhance pedestrian and resident safety.
 - Potential implementation of yellow lines from the Humber Doucy Lane roundabout to manage on-street parking and prevent obstruction.
 - Formal pedestrian crossings to ensure safe passage across The Street, particularly for elderly residents and children.
 - A pavement is required to ensure safe pedestrian access, particularly given the demographic of future residents and the increased traffic volume.
- Point 2 and Point 4. Hedgerow and biodiversity impact. Any damage or removal of the existing hedgerow would cause significant environmental harm. This natural feature serves as essential screening, contributing to biodiversity and acting as a habitat for local wildlife. The hedgerow is crucial for maintaining the rural character of the area, aligning with the principles set out in the Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan (2023), which highlights the importance of green infrastructure in development planning. Under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997, certain hedgerows are protected, and their removal could contravene local and national environmental policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 15 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment) states that planning decisions should minimize the impact on biodiversity and provide net gains where possible. The current plans fail to uphold these principles.

Seconded by Cllr Taylor. Resolved with ALL in favour.

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

[Cllr B Ward joined the meeting at 19:23]

DC/25/0418/FUL	21 Playford Lane, Rushmere St Andrew	IP5 1DW	Installation of a Daikin 468Kw heat pump at the front of the property to the side of the porch
Cllr Whiting provided a situation report following the examination of the proposal and documentation. The application was considered carefully.			

Response: Cllr Newton proposed that the application be refused owing to the impact on the appearance of the building. This is against policy SCLP11.1 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan. Seconded by Cllr Wright. Resolved with MAJORITY in favour.

7. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

No matters arising

8. CLOSE OF MEETING

The Chairman closed the meeting at 19:23 pm.