

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

At 7.00 pm on Wednesday 8th June, 2022

Held in the Council Chamber, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

### Present:-

#### Members

Councillor Jennie Bone (Chair)      Councillor Gill Mercer (Vice Chair)  
 Councillor Kirk Harrison              Councillor Roger Powell  
 Councillor Bert Jackson                Councillor Geoff Shacklock  
 Councillor Dorothy Maxwell

#### Officers

Carolyn Tait (Planning Development Manager)  
 Dean Wishart (Principal Development Management Officer)  
 Peter Baish (Senior Development Management Officer)  
 Jacqui Colbourne (Development Management Officer)  
 Jamie Parsons (Senior Planning Lawyer)  
 Troy Healy (Principal Planning Manager)  
 Louise Tyers (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

### 1 Apologies for absence

Apologies for non-attendance were received from Councillors Barbara Jenney and Lee Wilkes.

### 2 Members' Declarations of Interest

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

Councillors	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
All Committee Members	NE/22/00184/FUL Wilanow, Berrister Place, Raunds	Applicant was a North Northamptonshire Councillor		Yes
Geoff Shacklock	NE/22/00238/FUL The Samuel Pepys, Slipton Lane, Slipton	The applicant and one of the speakers were known to him		Yes (left meeting for item)
	NE/21/01767/FUL Blackthorn Lake, Station Road, Ringstead	The agent acted on his behalf		Yes (left meeting for item)

### 3 Informal Site Visits

Councillors Jennie Bone, Bert Jackson and Dorothy Maxwell declared that they had visited all of the sites on the agenda.

Councillor Gill Mercer declared that she had visited 142 Westfield Avenue, Rushden (NE/21/01774/FUL).

**4 Minutes of the meeting held on 3 May 2022**

**RESOLVED:-**

That the minutes of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston held on 3 May 2022 be confirmed as a correct record and signed.

**5 Planning Application NE/22/00184/FUL - Wilanow, Berrister Place, Raunds**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a proposed annex to create a home office and partial conversion of a double garage to form a utility room.

The Senior 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.

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

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was unanimously carried.

**RESOLVED:-**

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

**6 Planning Application NE/21/01774/FUL - 142 Westfield Avenue, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for a plot division to allow for the construction of two new semi-detached two-bedroom dwellings adjacent to the existing dwelling.

The Senior 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.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members noted that there would be no parking for the two proposed dwellings. Also, new building regulations required all new homes to have electric vehicle charging points installed. It was also highlighted that the site was cramped for two dwellings.

In response, officers clarified that the new building regulations did not take effect until later this month. Houses could be built without parking when it was justified and Highways had not objected to the application on parking grounds. A Parking Beat Survey had been undertaken which supported the development and we would need evidence to contradict that view, which we did not have.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Geoff Shacklock that planning permission be granted.

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

**RESOLVED:-**

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

**7 Planning Application NE/21/01843/FUL - Middlefield Farm Site, Church Street, Ringstead**

The Committee considered an application for the removal of an existing agricultural building and replace it with a single residential dwelling.

The Senior 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.

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

Mr Fulton addressed the Committee and stated that the reason for the application was because the applicants wanted a single residential dwelling for themselves. There had been discussions around the conversion of the barn, but they wished to have the highest energy standards which would not be possible with a conversion. The Parish Council had not been willing to discuss the application and their objection. The development would be smaller and more attractive than the extant permission.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Roger Powell and seconded by Councillor Bert Jackson that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was unanimously carried.

## **RESOLVED:-**

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

**Councillor Geoff Shacklock left the meeting for the following two applications and did not return.**

### **8 Planning Application NE22/00238/FUL - The Samuel Pepys, Slipton Lane, Slipton**

The Committee considered an application for the partial demolition and conversion of a public house to a single residential dwelling with associated development including garage, access, parking and landscaping.

The Principal Development Management Officer presented the report which detailed the proposal, description of the site, relevant planning history, relevant planning policies 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.

Requests to address the meeting had been received from John Beaty, an objector and Mark Harris, the agent for the applicant and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Mr Beaty addressed the Committee and stated that planning permission in 2021 had been refused as the applicant had failed to prove that the loss of a community facility was acceptable. It was not correct to say that no offer had been made by the community for the pub. The owner had been approached but had refused access to himself or a valuer as they were not willing to sell the premises as a pub. The pub was the main place people socialised in the village and needed to be kept. If the application was approved, it would be the loss of a pub which had been there for nearly 100 years.

Mr Harris addressed the Committee and stated that the applicants had purchased the pub in 2016. It was not trading at that time and the plan was to reopen it and a tenant was in place in 2017. Unfortunately, the business failed in 2019 and the lease surrendered. The pub has been marketed ever since, with only one recorded viewing. The Asset of Community Value (ACV) process had not led to a bid, despite being listed twice, and it was his belief that the process was being used as a delaying tactic. The refusal of access was inaccurate as the community had been asked to approach the agents and this had not been done. The proposed development was an improvement as it was bringing an empty premise into use.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

To assist the Committee, the Senior Planning Lawyer explained the ACV process. He confirmed that this application did not stop an application to bid from the Friends being made.

Members sought clarification as to what the differences were with this application compared to the last one which was refused in 2021. In relation to the Joint Core Strategy (JCS), it could be argued that not all of the criteria had been met as there

was evidence of a desire to keep the asset. Some Members felt that the community should be given a chance to pursue the opportunity to make a bid for the pub.

In response, officers clarified that the difference with this application compared to the previous one was the situation with the ACV and viability. There had been several earlier applications which were for more dwellings. Policy 7 of JCS had now been met regarding community services and facilities as whilst there was a desire to keep the pub, no bid had made which demonstrated that there was no need. This was the second time that the pub had been listed as an ACV and due process had been followed by the landowner.

It was proposed by Councillor Kirk Harrison and seconded by Councillor Bert Jackson that planning permission be granted, subject to an additional condition.

On being put to the vote, there were two votes for the motion, two against and one abstention. The Chair used her casting vote and voted for the motion and therefore the motion for approval was carried.

#### **RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report and an additional condition in relation to sustainability measures for the new building:

- An electric vehicle charging point;
- The use of gas fired boilers; and
- Measures to encourage use to no more than 105 litres/person/day and external water use of no more than 5 litres/person/day.

#### **9 Planning Application NE/21/01767/FUL - Blackthorn Lake, Station Road Ringstead**

The Committee considered an application for the replacement of an existing site manager's office/accommodation with a new site manager's cabin.

The 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 noted that no electric vehicle charging point had been included and it was suggested that this be included as a condition.

It was proposed by Councillor Dorothy Maxwell and seconded by Councillor Bert Jackson that planning permission be granted, subject to an additional condition.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was unanimously carried.

**RESOLVED:-**

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report and an additional condition in relation to sustainability measures for the new building:

- An electric vehicle charging point;
- For gas fired boilers; and
- Measures to encourage use to no more than 105 litres/person/day and external water use of no more than 5 litres/person/day.

**10 Close of meeting**

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

The meeting closed at 8.58pm.

---

Chair

---

Date