# Parish Council
# Rushmere St Andrew

www.rushmerestandrew.onesuffolk.net

**Minutes of the Planning & Transportation Committee meeting held on Thursday, 20th August 2026 at St Andrew's Church Hall at 7.30pm**

---

| | |
|---|---|
| CHAIRMAN: | Cllr R Whiting |
| COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: | Cllr R Whiting, Cllr M Odam, Cllr Wright, Cllr R Nunn, Cllr B Ward, Cllr Francis, Cllr P Phillpot, Cllr M Newton |
| APOLOGIES: | Cllr A Jeffreys, Cllr S Taylor |
| OTHER ATTENDEES: | 5 Members of the public |
| CLERK: | Mrs S Stannard (Clerk) |

1. **APOLOGIES, APPROVAL OF ABSENCE, PROTOCOL & CONDUCT REMINDERS**
   RESOLVED: To approve apologies as above.

2. **DECLARATIONS OF COUNCILLOR INTEREST**
   None.

3. **TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16th JULY 2026**
   RESOLVED: To approve the minutes of the meeting and the minutes were signed by the Chairman as a true record and accurate 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**

   Cllr Newton expressed concern about the activities of the Ipswich Town Football Club at the training ground. During the week a very large HGV parked across the footpath and road at the 'maintenance entrance'. These vehicle movements and parking around the training ground is damaging the pavements and footpaths. Clerk to write to ITFC and to enquiring about the parking of HGV at the maintenance entrance and complaining about these vehicles blocking and damaging the pavements and footpaths around the training ground.

5. **TO CONSIDER AND AGREE RESPONSES ON THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| DC/26/2407/VOC | 155 The Street Rushmere St Andrew Suffolk | Variation of Condition Nos. 3, 4, 5, 9, 18, 19, 21 of DC/19/3916/OUT - Development Comprising of 14 No. dwellings, 25 No. retirement apartments & a 75 bed care home - 3: Approved Drawings, 4: Access Compliance, 5: Frontage Footway, 9: Visibility Splays, 18: Details Of Installed Suds, 19: Contamination Compliance, 21: Protective Fencing. |
| Cllr Whiting provided a situation report following the examination of the proposal and documentation.<br>RESOLVED: OBJECTION to the application. The Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed variation of conditions for the following reasons:<br>The Parish Council notes that the submitted proposal would result in the removal of the existing mature hedgerow. Earlier proposals appeared to retain more of this important frontage feature; however, the current proposal would remove all of the mature and significant indigenous hedgerow which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of The Street, the entrance to the village, and the setting of the Parish Church. | | |

Although replacement planting is proposed, the Council does not consider that this would adequately mitigate the harm. A replacement hedge would take a significant period of time to establish and, even if successfully established, is unlikely to match the quality, maturity, biodiversity value, height, screening function, or contribution to local character provided by the existing hedgerow.

The Parish Council is concerned that the loss of the hedgerow would conflict with the objectives and policies of the East Suffolk Council Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, including Policy SCLP7.1 in relation to highway safety and movement, Policy SCLP10.1 in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity, Policy SCLP10.4 in relation to landscape character, Policy SCLP11.1 in relation to design quality, and Policy SCLP11.3 in relation to the historic environment. The Parish Council also considers the proposal to be contrary to the Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan, which forms part of the development plan and has full weight in planning decisions, including Policy RS8 in relation to the Special Character Area, together with the Plan's wider objectives for protecting local character, important green infrastructure, village approaches and locally distinctive landscape features.

The existing hedgerow also provides an important visual screen for residents on the opposite side of The Street, particularly in relation to lights, vehicle movements, and the overall visual impact of the care home. Its removal would increase the prominence of the development in this sensitive location and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

The Parish Council remains concerned that insufficient visibility is provided for along The Street. A number of existing dwellings already experience considerable difficulty when emerging onto The Street, and the Council asks the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the highway safety implications of the proposal are fully assessed before any decision is made.

The Parish Council remains strongly opposed to the care home proposal and its appearance and effect on the character of the area. The Council has reviewed the elevations carefully. If the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve the scheme, the Parish Council asks that the attached design amendments be considered, as these would at least improve the visual appearance of the care home to some degree.




The Parish Council is also extremely concerned that works are currently taking place on site and that no protective fencing appears to be in place, despite conditions requiring such protection. The Council requests that the Local Planning Authority urgently investigates compliance with the relevant conditions, including Condition 21, and takes urgent appropriate enforcement or compliance action if necessary.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| DC/26/2679/FUL | 698 Foxhall Road<br>Rushmere St<br>Andrew Ipswich<br>Suffolk IP3 8NQ | Single storey front/side extension to the ground floor commercial to extend the ground floor commercial property |

Cllr Whiting provided a situation report following the examination of the proposal and documentation. Cllr Whiting reported that the adjoining neighbour submitted their objections to East Suffolk Council and wrote to the parish council setting out their objections. This was considered by the Committee.

RESOLVED: OBJECTION to the application. The Parish Council strongly objects to the application for the following reasons:
The Parish Council notes that the application form states proposed trading hours of Monday to Sunday, 7.00am to 10.00pm whereas the decision notice for DC/24/4338/FUL included a condition for trading hours Monday to Friday 7am to 9pm, Saturday 8am to 9pm and Sunday 8am to 6pm and additional restrictions for deliveries and waste removal.

The site is located within a predominantly residential area, with residential properties adjoining, behind and above the shop. The Parish Council considers that these hours would have an unacceptable and detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity, including by reason of noise, disturbance, customer activity, comings and goings, lighting and general activity late into the evening.

The Parish Council is also concerned that the description of development refers only to a single storey front/side extension to the ground floor commercial property and does not clearly identify any proposed extension or intensification of trading hours. The Council considers this to be misleading, as the proposed operating hours are a material planning consideration and should be clearly identified so that neighbours and consultees can properly understand and comment on the full effects of the proposal.

The Parish Council considers that the proposal would conflict with the East Suffolk Council Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, including Policy SCLP11.2 in relation to protecting residential amenity, Policy SCLP11.1 in relation to design quality and ensuring development responds appropriately to its context, Policy SCLP7.1 in relation to sustainable transport and safe movement, and Policy SCLP7.2 in relation to parking proposals and standards.

The Parish Council also considers the proposal to be contrary to the Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan, which forms part of the development plan and has full weight in planning decisions. In particular, the proposal conflicts with Policy RSA9 in relation to design considerations and the need for development to respond positively to local character and neighbouring amenity, and Policy RSA12 in relation to highways and travel, where development should avoid creating highway safety, parking or access problems.
The Council also asks the Local Planning Authority to have regard to the Rushmere St Andrew Design Guidelines and Codes, including guidance on car parking and development that is sympathetic to the existing built environment.

The Parish Council objects to the proposed reduction in on-site parking from four spaces to two spaces. Foxhall Road is an extremely busy road and the reduction in available parking would be likely to increase pressure for parking and manoeuvring in an already constrained location. The Council is concerned that this would cause highway safety problems, including impacts on visibility and safe access to and from the site.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| DC/26/2638/FUL | 51 Claverton Way<br>Rushmere St<br>Andrew Ipswich<br>Suffolk IP4 5XF | Side extension and changes to existing rear elevation |

Cllr Whiting provided a situation report following the examination of the proposal and documentation.

RESOLVED: NO OBJECTION to the application.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| DC/26/2665/VOC | Sports Ground 2<br>Playford Road<br>Rushmere St<br>Andrew Suffolk | Variation of Condition Nos. 10, 11 and 14 of DC/24/4102/FUL - The proposed redevelopment of Ipswich Town Football Club's (ITFC) Training Ground site and facilities. The application includes a new First Team building, extended Academy facilities, a Groundskeeper maintenance building, improved |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | entrance arrangements and associated landscaping and site improvements. The applicant therefore respectfully requests that Conditions 10, 11 and 14 be varied to require compliance within three months of the first occupation of the First Team Building, or as otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority. Should any unforeseen delays occur, a longer period may need to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority as necessary to accommodate the statutory highway programme. |
| Cllr Whiting provided a situation report following the examination of the proposal and documentation.<br>RESOLVED: NO OBJECTION to the application. | | |

**6. ANY OTHER PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED SINCE PUBLICATION OF AGENDA**
None

**7. DETERMINATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA**
None

**8. CLOSE OF MEETING**
The Chairman closed the meeting at 20.06pm.