

RUSHDEN AND WALLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Extraordinary meeting of Rushden and Wallington Parish Council

Held on Tuesday 19th July 2022 at 8.00pm at Rushden Village Hall

Councillors in attendance – Steve Pettyfer (Chair), Linda Hill, Ian Roper

The meeting was called to discuss Planning Application Ref: 22/01662/FP at Land Between Field Cottage and Rainbow End

Members of the public were in attendance including Mr and Mrs McNally (applicants for planning permission reference 22/01662/FP)

Minutes and action points:

1. The chair invited comments from attendees. Mr McNally spoke and gave some background to his family ties to the village and the application.
2. Mr and Mrs McNally plan to retire to the village and are happy to fit in with everyone and accommodate villagers' concerns.
3. Graham Coltman asked if access to his home (The Oaks) would be maintained, and this was confirmed by The McNally's.
4. Mr and Mrs Fairly asked whether the proposed dwelling would be fenced off and that they would rather a hedge were planted if the application is successful. The McNally's agreed to this
5. Councillors weren't certain whether the footpath, that shares the track, is on the definitive footpath map. **ACTION Ian Roper (IR) to investigate (IR BELIEVES THIS IS FOOTPATH 5)**
6. Steve Pettyfer (SP) mentioned that as part of the application the boundaries will require clarification and that the PC will make comment. **ACTION SP add to PC comments**
7. SP read an extract from the planning decision report for the application to build a dwelling in the garden of Daisy Barn also on Treacle Lane, emphasising the part specifically about building on an existing garden.
8. In application 22/01662/FP, the proposed land is not a garden, so the PC will refer to the fact that the land is not a garden, it is beyond green belt/open countryside. **ACTION SP add to PC comments**
9. The PC will also comment that the proposed dwelling is not in the built core of the village. **ACTION SP add to PC comments**
10. Mrs McNally commented that the current field is an eye saw and that a house would be much better. She also stated that a shed had been on the land for years.
11. SP raised the question about infill and whether the gap between Rainbow End and Field Cottage would be considered infill or not. **ACTION SP add to PC comments**
12. Furthermore, on the subject of special housing, the proposed dwelling is a home rather than for example low-cost housing. **ACTION SP add to PC comments**
13. The subject of road access, turning circles and the width and levels of the proposed dwelling entrance were all discussed. It was stated that these would be added to the PC comments. **ACTION SP add to PC comments**

14. Linda Hill (LH) raised the following points over which the application would likely be considered. Some of these matters will be addressed in the PC comments. **ACTION SP add to PC comments**
- a. Sustainability
 - b. Any harm to the village, e.g. social, traffic etc
 - c. Infill
 - d. NPPF and the push to build extra homes
 - e. Non-residential land for the proposed dwelling
15. Mrs McNally stated that obviously the village was growing and that an extra house is appropriate. LH stated that the village population has remained around 200 for many decades.
16. SP raised some questions regarding the building application:
- a. Conflict between written application and drawing between slate or red clay tiles on the roof. Mr McNally confirmed slate.
 - b. The application specifies light grey brick walls. Mrs McNally confirmed that this would be inappropriate and something like black weatherboarding would be likely
 - c. The garage didn't have floorplans but shows a rooflight. The McNallys confirmed no accommodation/upper floor would be in the garage.
 - d. It was asked how surface water and flooding would be dealt with as Treacle Lane has suffered floods recently.
 - e. **THE ABOVE POINTS WILL BE ADDED TO PC COMMENTS. ACTION SP add to PC comments**
17. Graham Coltman asked for clarification regarding how much of the track will be tarmac from the road. It was agreed that Graham would raise his questions directly on the NHCC planning website

The chair thanked everyone for attending and the meeting adjourned at 8.45pm