

## **Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston**

At 7.00 pm on Monday 21st March, 2022

Held in the Council Chamber, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

### **Present:-**

#### Members

Councillor Jennie Bone (Chair)	Councillor Gill Mercer (Vice Chair)
Councillor Kirk Harrison	Councillor Dorothy Maxwell
Councillor Bert Jackson	Councillor Geoff Shacklock
Councillor Barbara Jenney	Councillor Lee Wilkes

#### Officers

Amie Baxter (Principal Development Management Officer)  
Dean Wishart (Principal Development Management Officer)  
Emma Granger (Senior Planning Lawyer)  
Troy Healy (Principal Planning Manager)  
Fiona Hubbard (Senior Democratic Services Officer)  
Louise Tyers (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

### **69 Apologies for non-attendance**

There were no apologies for non-attendance.

### **70 Members' Declarations of Interest**

The Chair invited those who wished to do so to declare interests in respect of items on the agenda.

No declarations were made.

### **71 Informal Site Visits**

Councillors Jennie Bone, Bert Jackson, Barbara Jenney, Dorothy Maxwell and Gill Mercer declared that they had visited 2 Bluebell Rise, Rushden (NE/21/01813/FUL) and 1 Woburn Court, Rushden (NE/21/01558/FUL).

### **72 Minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2021**

#### **RESOLVED:-**

That the minutes of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston held on 21 February 2022, be confirmed as a correct record and signed.

### **73 Change to Order of Agenda**

The Chair advised that agenda items 6 and 7 – Land at St Christopher's Drive, Oundle, would be considered first.

**74 Planning Application NE/21/01309/REM - Land at St Christopher's Drive, Oundle**

The application had been withdrawn and would be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

**75 Planning Application NE/21/01330/REM - Land at St Christopher's Drive, Oundle**

The application had been withdrawn and would be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

**76 Planning Application NE/21/01813/FUL - 2 Bluebell Rise, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the subdivision of land, proposed 2 storey dwelling and new access to Greenacre Drive.

The Principal Development Management Officer presented the report which detailed the proposal, description of the site, the planning history, relevant planning policies, outcome of consultations and an assessment of the proposal, providing full and comprehensive details.

It was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members raised concerns about the loss of public amenity space. Concerns were also raised about the proposed access onto Greenacre Drive, which was the main road of the estate. It was noted that a potential risk of contamination on the site had been identified and sought clarification as to what type of contamination this could be.

In response, officers clarified that Highways had not objected to the application with regards to the access. With reference to any contamination on the site, this would depend on the previous use of the site and was covered by several proposed conditions. The land was all within the ownership of the applicant and was amenity space for public benefit and not public open space.

It was proposed by Councillor Lee Wilkes and seconded by Councillor Kirk Harrison that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, there were 5 votes for the motion, 1 against and 1 abstention, therefore the motion for approval was carried.

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report and the additional condition detailed in the Committee Update Report.

**77 Planning Application NE/21/01558/FUL - 1 Woburn Court, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a one-bedroom dwelling and access.

The Principal Development Management Officer presented the report which detailed the proposal, description of the site, relevant planning history, relevant planning policies, outcome of consultations and an assessment of the proposal, providing full and comprehensive details.

It was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

A request to address the meeting had been received from Jenny McIntee, the agent and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Jenny McIntee addressed the Committee and stated that the proposed dwelling had been carefully designed and had been designed to look like an extension to the existing dwelling. The proposed parking and access met requirements and would be suitable for people with mobility problems and there had been no highways objections to the access. The dwelling would meet national space standards. It would not be an overdevelopment of the site and would be sympathetic to its surroundings.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members accepted that the proposed dwelling had been designed to look like an extension to the neighbouring property but believed that it would not blend in with neighbouring properties. Concerns were also raised about the space standards if two people were to live in the dwelling. It was suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, could there be an additional condition to remove permitted development rights to add an additional storey to the dwelling. Members were concerned that cramming an additional property into an existing garden would set a precedent in the future.

In response, officers confirmed that the dwelling would be subservient to the house it is attached to and would look like an extension to that property. With regards to space standards, the dwelling was proposed as a one-bedroom dwelling and it met those standards. If the homeowner wished to add another storey in the future that would require planning permission. Any future proposed developments like this would need to be assessed on their own merits so there would not be a precedent.

It was proposed by Councillor Kirk Harrison and seconded by Councillor Gill Mercer that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, there were 4 votes for the motion and 3 against, therefore the motion for approval was carried.

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report.

**78 Urgent Item**

The following item of business had been added to the published Agenda with the consent of the Chair in accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972 as a decision was required before the next scheduled meeting of the Committee.

**79 Exclusion of Press and Public**

**RESOLVED:**

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business because exempt information, as defined under paragraph 5 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, may be disclosed.

**80 Planning Appeal**

The Committee considered a report of the Principal Development Management Officer which gave notification of an appeal against the refusal of a planning application.

It was moved by Councillor Kirk Harrison and seconded by Councillor Geoff Shacklock that Option 4, as detailed in the Exempt report, be approved.

On being put to the vote, the motion to approve Option 4 was unanimously carried.

**RESOLVED:**

To approve Option 4, as detailed in the Exempt report.

**81 Close of Meeting**

The Chair thanked members, officers and the public for their attendance and closed the meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.45pm.

---

Chair

---

Date