

Minutes of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston

At 7.00pm on Wednesday 3rd August 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 Barbara Jenney	Councillor Lee Wilkes
Councillor Andy Mercer	

Officers

Amie Baxter (Principal Development Management Officer)
 Patrick Reid (Senior Development Management Officer)
 Ian Baish (Development Management Officer)
 Chris Spong (Planning Technician)
 Simon Aley (Planning Solicitor)
 Louise Tyers (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

23 Apologies for non-attendance

There were no apologies for non-attendance.

24 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
Bert Jackson	NE/22/00676/FUL 9 George Street, Higham Ferrers	Member of Higham Ferrers Town Council, who had objected to the application.		Yes (did not take part in the debate or vote on this application)

25 Informal Site Visits

Councillor Bert Jackson declared he had visited all the sites on the agenda.

26 Minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2022

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston held on 30 June 2022 be confirmed as a correct record and signed.

27 Applications for planning permission, listed building consent and appeal information

The Committee considered the planning application reports and noted any additional information on the applications included in the Committee Update Report.

(i) Planning Application NE/22/00676/FUL – 9 George Street, Higham Ferrers

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a rear Pergola extension and Garden Room Annex (retrospective).

The Planning Technician 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.

Requests to address the meeting had been received from Judith Couper, an objector; Councillor Pam Whiting on behalf of Higham Ferrers Town Council and Silviu Onica, the applicant and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Ms Couper addressed the Committee and stated that her property was adjacent to the application site. The report the Committee was being asked to consider was unsound and contained inaccurate information. The drawings were also incorrect. The application had sought to evade the correct planning procedures. The development was for an extension onto an extension and the structure would be an imposing eyesore and was not in keeping with other extensions in the area. The main sewer pipe ran along the rear of the properties. The structure had uncertified electrics which were a fire risk.

Councillor Whiting addressed the Committee and stated that the Town Council objected to the application and supported the residents' concerns. The description of the development did not meet the definition of a pergola. The report stated that the development would be concealed from the street scene, but it would have an impact on neighbouring properties. The structure reached the maximum width of the garden, when it was expected that there should be room allocated for maintenance of the boundaries. She had visited the neighbouring property and at 2.30pm, internal lighting was needed in the kitchen due to the structure.

Mr Onica addressed the Committee and stated that he had done the best that he could and had cooperated with his neighbour. He had also cooperated with the planning authority straight away. The previous application had been refused as the drawing was incorrect. The electrics in the pergola did have an electrics certificate. He had also cooperated with Anglian Water and they had

visited the site. He had improved the property, which he was now in the process of selling.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members highlighted the impact of the light from the pergola on the neighbours and asked whether the roof of the structure could be made lightproof. If the Committee were minded to grant the application, Condition 3 should be amended to include that the obscure glazing should also be maintained in perpetuity. It was questioned whether it would be possible to include a condition which maintained the western elevation as open to prevent it becoming a room in the future.

In response, officers advised that Condition 3 included the use of obscure glazing. With regards to the impact on the neighbouring properties, the officer confirmed that he had visited the property in the late afternoon and believed that the mitigating factors would not be a problem.

It was proposed by Councillor Andy Mercer and seconded by Councillor Lee Wilkes that planning permission be granted, subject to an amendment to the wording of Condition 3.

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 with the words 'to be maintained' added to the wording of Condition 3.

(ii) Planning Application NE/21/01742/OUT – 28 Wymington Road, Rushden

The Committee considered an outline planning application for the erection of a new dwelling on underutilised garden land, including access.

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.

Requests to address the meeting had been received from Councillor Paul Harley on behalf of Rushden Town Council and Steve Clark, the agent, and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Councillor Harley addressed the Committee and stated that the Town Council objected to the application as it could establish a precedence on garden access onto the road. The access would also come out onto zig zag lines and could not be accommodated due to the nearby zebra crossing. A definitive

answer from the Local Highways Authority (LHA) was needed as to whether this was acceptable.

Mr Clark addressed the Committee and stated that a previous planning appeal had allowed a similar application. The access would be using the existing vehicular access. The property had a triple wide plot compared to other dwellings and this would provide ample room for a dwelling and gardens for both properties. The zig zag lines could be changed through the highways process. The property had plenty of room for the proposed development.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members noted that there was an area of concrete at the rear of the site but there had been no indication as to what, if anything, was under it. If the Committee were minded to grant the application, then there should be a condition to satisfy the planning authority as to what was underneath that area at the reserved matters stage. The issue of precedent had been raised by the Town Council, but any future applications would have to be considered on their own merits. Members sought clarification as to what would happen to the application if the LHA refused the drop kerb.

In response, officers confirmed that there was no strong indication as to whether there were any issues under the concrete area, but a condition could be included that at reserved matters an investigative report be provided on the access. With regards to the drop kerb, if the LHA refused that application then the applicant could appeal or if no agreement could be reached the applicant may have to amend their plans, but it should be noted that the LHA had considered the application twice.

It was proposed by Councillor Lee Wilkes and seconded by Councillor Kirk Harrison that planning permission be granted, subject to the inclusion of an additional condition, amendments to the wording of Conditions 10 and 11 and the inclusion of an informative.

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 update sheet and the following amendments:

- Add condition to explore and remediate any issues with the concrete slab in the rear garden
- Condition 10 to refer to 'the dwelling'
- Condition 11 to refer to dwelling and not dwellings
- Information to highlight the zig zag lines so that the Local Highways Authority is aware at reserved matters stage.

(iii) Planning Application NE/21/01333/OUT – 113 Wellingborough Road, Rushden

The Committee considered an outline planning application for the erection of a

two-bedroom single storey detached bungalow. (All matters reserved except for access and parking).

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.

A request to address the meeting had been received from Councillor Paul Harley on behalf of Rushden Town Council and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Councillor Harley addressed the Committee and stated that the Town Council believed that the application was an overdevelopment of the site. There would be no amenity space and several trees would have to be removed. There would be an impact on parking as vehicles would have to either reverse out onto the road or reverse into the parking space. This was a very busy road. There would also be overlooking by the adjoining property.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members enquired as to whether a decision on whether it was overdevelopment was relevant at this stage. It was noted that Condition 5 detailed the hours of construction work, but Members felt that these should be amended to take into account school hours, as the site was close to two schools. With regards to Condition 14, Members questioned whether a skip and chute could be accommodated on the site. There was concern that this application was again for back land development. It was felt that this was an application which only just met the minimum requirements of everything.

In response, officers confirmed that whether the development was overdevelopment needed to be considered now as the principle of development needed to be agreed. With regards to Conditions 5 and 14, officers would look at the wording of the conditions.

It was proposed by Councillor Andy Mercer and seconded by Councillor Lee Wilkes that planning permission be granted, subject to the amendments to Conditions 5 and 14.

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

RESOLVED:-

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) and informatives set out in the committee report and update sheet and the following amendments:

- Amend wording of Condition 5 to refer to school opening times

- Remove reference to chute in Condition 14.

28 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