RUSHDEN AND WALLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

EXTRAORDINARY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING

Minutes and Action Points

Date / Time:	Thursday 6 th January 2022, 8.00pm
Location:	Wallington Village Hall
Councillors Present:	Graham Lamb (GL) - Chair, Kate Heath (KH), Steve Pettyfer (SP)
In attendance:	Mark SG Hopley (MSGH) - Clerk, Michelle Hopley (MH) - Clerk, Steve Jarvis (District and County Councillor), 10 members of the public.

Item	Description	Status / Action
-	The meeting was opened by the Chair at 8.00pm.	-
22/001	Planning Application Ref: 20/02983/FP, Former Poultry Farm, Redhill: Erection of three dwellings with associated parking, garaging and landscaping following demolition of existing commercial buildings. (Amended plans 09-Dec-21).	
	• GL addressed the meeting highlighting that the actual site is not within the Parish, but parishioners have raised concerns as the development of the site will impact them. The PC's concerns with the initial proposals for the site were summarised as follows:	
	 Access to the Site, both during the building and post completion - width of the access road, views and traffic levels in both directions as the road through Redhill is narrow and has no pavements. 	
	 Private waste collection proposal. 	1
	 Wider implications on utilities - the capacity to cope with additional usage. 	
	• The deadline for consultation responses is Friday 7 th January and the PC will respond accordingly after the meeting.	
	• The applicant, (represented by Tom Doughty (TD) and the planning consultant, Tim Waller (TW)) were present and given the opportunity to address the meeting.	
	 TW stated that the Highways Authority has confirmed they have no objections to the current proposal for 3 new dwellings on the site, having objected to the previous schemes with 9 and then 5 new dwellings. 	
	 TW acknowledged that the site has a narrow access. Cars and delivery vehicles were stated as being able to access the site. 	
	— This current proposal is for 3 new dwellings, which will have sprinkler systems to mitigate concerns regarding access for fire engines. In the event of a fire, the fire engine could pull up to the access road and run hoses down to the houses. TW stated that was why the design and position of the 3 houses were as they were, as this was the maximum distance the fire hoses	

Item	Description	Status / Action
	could reach. On this basis there was no objection to this proposal by the Fire Authority.	
	 The revised plans have been submitted to take into account the concerns raised regarding the number of houses in the original schemes. 	
	 Waste collection: TW stated that the plan is now for a private refuse collection service. 	
	 Impact on sewers: TW did not consider there would be any issues regarding surface water, with options available that would not have to use the existing sewerage system. Disposal of foul water from the domestic homes is not considered to make any material difference. 	
	• The Parish Councillors were given the opportunity to ask the applicant questions on the latest submission.	
	 KH requested clarification regarding there being no objection to the scheme by the Highways Authority. Having originally rejected the previous schemes, TW confirmed that on the NHDC planning portal there are further comments from Highways regarding the latest plans. 	
	 GL raised the concern that access for larger vehicles may only be achieved by encroaching on private land opposite the site entrance on the Wallington side of the road. 	
	 Although it is the applicant's position that larger vehicles can access the site (for which they have video evidence), it is KH's understanding that there are photographs showing that fire engines still cannot access the site. There is an email from the Fire Authority, on the NHDC planning portal, confirming that they cannot get a fire engine onto the site going forwards and were unable to try and access the site in reverse as it was unsafe to do so because of the road traffic. 	
	– KH asked whether the applicant had contacted Anglian Water, as stated they would do in the original planning submission (drainage strategy). The applicant confirmed that the drainage strategy sets out what will be done after planning in the detailed design stage. The applicant confirmed that they have communicated with all the water companies, but it is not public information as it doesn't need to be submitted at this planning stage.	
	 KH stated concerns regarding the private waste collection proposal and how sustainable it will be for residents. If arrangements were to breakdown, the councillor questioned how enforceable it would be? If that did happen would the existing council waste services have to step in to take over? 	
	 TD stated that the preferred route is to redevelop the site as per the planning application as currently presented, but if it does not get approval then there are opportunities to explore the commercial use, which will also bring the same questions over access, utilities etc. 	
	 Various concerns / questions were raised by SP. 	

Item	Description	Status / Action
	 Access concerns regarding both the narrowness for vehicles and pedestrians. In the scenario where a vehicle entering were to meet a vehicle exiting the site, how is that resolved? There was a feeling that a vehicle reversing back onto the road in that location would be extremely dangerous. How, when the width of the access road at its narrowest point is below the Highways design guide minimum carriageway width, is the site acceptable for development? How is the applicant proposing to construct, given the restrictive entrance to the site? 	
	TW stated that the scheme allows for cars to reverse and spoke about the Highway design guide re shared surfaces. TW confirmed that the latest Highways Authority response has confirmed that the site access is acceptable for 3 new dwellings. Their previous objection was on the basis of fire engines being unable to access the site. The latest plans remove this need as fire engine hoses can reach all the properties and the properties have fire suppressant systems built into their design. Construction access will be difficult, but the applicant stated that they take their obligations seriously. TD stated that there will be a planning condition for a construction management plan.	
	 The details behind various mitigation matters mentioned in the meeting were questioned and discussed, including sprinklers in the dwellings and drainage solutions on clay ground. 	
	 What are the plans for the rest of the site at the rear? The applicant's proposal at the moment is to demolish the rest of the site and lay it to lawn. They would welcome suggestions from residents on what happens to the rest of the site. 	
	 GL stated that he was pleased that the applicant had attended the meeting. The Rushden and Wallington Parish Councillors are looking to ensure that any development has the appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that no part of the Parish becomes adversely effected by any development. The councillors still have some reservations about whether the points raised previously have been adequately addressed. 	
	• Members of the Public were given the opportunity to ask the applicant questions. Concerns raised included the following.	
	 Access to the site was raised and how vehicles have trespassed on private land, causing damage. Although the revised scheme mitigates the issue around fire engine access, the ability of construction vehicles to enter the site remain a concern. A statement was made indicating that larger vehicles would not be able to access the site if they were approaching from the South. 	

ltem	Description	Status / Action
	 TD offered assurance that the developers would not trespass on anyones land. 	
	 Private weekly refuse collection will bring additional vehicles into the hamlet, which has an additional environmental impact. 	
	 Safety concerns for pedestrians down the lane, as there is no room to move out of way of oncoming vehicles. 	
	TD stated that the proposed residential use would have less impact than any commercial use of the existing units.	
	 The lack of enagement with the members of the hamlet throughout the process was raised. A resident stated he had reached out on several occasions and written to the applicant with no response. TD stated that he was prohibited from speaking for legal reasons, due to the conditions of purchasing the site. 	
	 The application was considered unclear. For example, there is no planning statement for the 3 new dwellings scheme. The Highways Authority have made the assumption that collection will be roadside but as stated in the meeting the intention is to be by private collection. 	
	 Other assumptions regarding storm water drainage were considered undefined and by only amending the plans rather than submitting a complete set of new documents it was generally felt that this has added confusion rather than clarified things. 	
	 The style and nature of the houses that are now proposed were questioned as 3 storey town houses are not considered in keeping with the hamlet and could set a precedent for future development. There is a high density of housing in one part of the plot, creating opportunity for future development on the remainder of the plot. In addition, it was pointed out that there was also a plot of land in front of the proposed houses which is not currently within the site of the application. 	
	The applicant stated that development is bound by the maximum length of the fire hoses, for fire safety reasons.	
	The applicant stated that they had explored the development of the rest of the site but it is not something they are now considering.	
	The applicant is proposing to take away the other buildings on the site and stated they will have to commit to any planning conditions including demolition of the existing commercial units.	Applicant
	The applicant committed to demolition of the existing units pre-construction and depending on what is decided re the land at the rear will lay it to lawn and fence off.	
	 Drainage strategy was put together for the 9 houses scheme, with a last resort solution of surface water connection into the foul water drainage 	

Item	Description	Status / Action
	system. Currently the hamlet suffers from smells from the sewers and any additional drainage will add to that problem.	A 11 1
	The applicant is now thinking about other options for the current plans, given that there is now more space to deal with this water on the remainder of the site.	Applicant
	The applicant has taken note of the comments from the meeting to investigate with the water authority the capacity of the systems.	
	 A resident stated that the application has made proposals to make changes to property which is not owned by the applicants. For example; 	
	 the access way, which commits the applicant to resurfacing it and laying services pipes under it 	
	 the boundary of land as shown on the planning application documents is disputed by a resident and as such proposals have been made to reduce trees to 3.5m that are not on the applicant's land 	
	 the Swept Path Analysis utilises land that it not the applicants land. 	Annelissent
	The applicant confirmed the Swept Path Analysis has been based on the Highways boundaries.	Applicant
	• GL closed the discussion with the statement that the applicant needs to take away the actions from this meeting and provide answers to the residents. For example a further traffic statement should be submitted.	R&WPC
	• The Chair of Rushden and Wallington Parish Council stated there are still concerns about traffic, access and safety for residents and the Parish Council will be a responding to NHDC accordingly.	
	• The applicant confirmed they will be attending the Sandon Parish Council meeting next week. Ian Dell, Sandon Parish Councillor, stated that NHDC will be accepting comments from Sandon Council until the 19 th January 2022.	
	• GL thanked the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting.	
22/002	Planning Application Ref: 21/03427/FPH, Long Pightle 40 The Street Wallington: Insertion of windows on all elevation at first floor level to facilitate loft conversion. Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear conservatory.	
	• The applicant, Nick and Diana Collingridge, provided a commentary on the application.	
	The property was built in the late 1980s as a 2-bedroom house to suit the requirements of a retiring farm worker. It was structurally designed at the time to enable the property to be extended. It is now vacant and the applicant is looking to update the property to provide more suitable accommodation for a current farm worker and his family, who are currently living in Wallington in a property that is no longer suitable for their family.	

Item	Description	Status / Action
	 It is a large site and no extension to the existing footprint is proposed. There is a garage and plenty of provision for car parking. The property is proposed to become a 4-bedroom house, with 3 bathrooms. 	
	 Main changes externally will include velux style roof windows, windows on west and east facing gables and a dormer. 	
	• One resident, who was unable to attend the meeting, has approached the Parish Councillors with reservations about the extent to which the proposed building would overlook other properties.	
	The applicant confirmed that they had looked into the matter and produced a plan at the meeting which illustrated the degree of potential overlook.	
	The planning officer should address this point as part of the planning process and the applicant stated that they would be willing to discuss mitigation measures, such as appropriately placed planting.	
	Next full Parish Council Meeting confirmed to be on 26 th January, 8pm, at Rushden Village Hall.	
	The meeting closed by the Chair at 9.30pm.	