

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes and Action Points

Date / Time: Tuesday 8th November 2022, 8.00pm

Location: Rushden Village Hall

Councillors Present: Steve Pettyfer (SP) - Chair, Graham Lamb (GL), Linda Hill (LH), Ian Roper (IR)

In attendance: Mark SG Hopley (MSGH) - Clerk, Michelle Hopley (MH) – Clerk
20nr. members of the public including Peter Romaniuk (architect for the Moon and Stars)

Apologies were received from Steve Jarvis, (District and County Councillor) and Mr Sedgewick (applicant for the Daisy Barn)

Item	Description	Status / Action
22/049	<p>Planning Application Ref: 22/02663/RM at Daisy Barn Treacle Lane Rushden SG9 OSL</p> <p>- Reserved Matters application for approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for outline application 21/02112/OP granted 28.01.2022 for one detached 4-bed dwelling</p> <p>The chair clarified the key characteristics of the proposed building, being a modern 4 bedroom detached dwelling, flat roof, 3 storeys, circa 8.75m tall, overall length and width both span 26m, with double garage. The building is cut into the slope, with 2.5 storeys being visible from Treacle Lane. The gross floor area of house is circa 509m². Various alternative materials for the external features are referenced on the planning drawings.</p> <p>The chair invited comments from the attendees.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Rushden resident (CH) considered the proposed appearance of the dwelling, its size and proposed materials, to be out of character and scale for the village. There would be a big visual impact looking from the road through Cumberlow Green. No buildings of this nature along Treacle Lane and it would alter the visual landscape of Treacle Lane and in turn adversely impact on the farm and the area.2) The residents who live in Field Cottage, opposite the proposed development (JF), shared the same views. The size, height and overall scale of the proposed building is out of keeping with the surrounding buildings and the rest of the village and would destroy their outlook. The intention to bring the hedge forward would also impact their outlook and impede on their natural light.3) Further points raised by the residents of Field Cottage included:	

Chairman's Signature:

Date:

Item	Description	Status / Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the matter of the proposed dwelling being built on an area greater than the registered title area of Daisy Barn. (The existing garden of Daisy Barn has been extended into the adjoining field, owned by the family). • concern about the turning circle, as currently fenced off, not providing the correct size for Field Cottage’s right of way. • since the hammerhead changes the number of bin lorries reversing down Treacle Lane has increased, as the hammerhead is not wide enough for large vehicles, such as bin lorries, fire engines and the like. <p>4) LH stated that if the size of the hammerhead does not comply with the agreed layout it is a matter for planning officers to enforce.</p> <p>5) SP pointed out that the hammerhead is not directly related to the reserved matters of the current application, albeit that it will impact on the landscaping/hardstanding areas.</p> <p>6) Further observations and concerns raised by residents Treacle Lane included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size and scale was intrusive and out of keeping for a village with conversion areas. • The proposed dwelling is not modest in scale, as indicated in the outline application. • Size of the property is not in keeping with the plot size. The outdoor space and garden size is too small for the proposed property and could result in requests for additional garden land at a later date. • Would a temporary road from Cumberlow be installed or would construction traffic be using Treacle Lane as access? • There is evidence that the hammerhead as currently fenced off is not practical. • There is no on-street parking in Treacle Lane and an additional property will naturally result in additional vehicles. The external landscaping / garages needs to accommodate the additional vehicles. <p>7) The Chair stated that the councillors will be objecting to the application. The response to NHDC planning will address the various concerns raised in the meeting, particularly around scale (3 storeys without any pitch roof); character; inappropriate materials being that the dwelling is adjacent to the conservation area; and concerns around the hammerhead design versus the reality of use. The Chair will review the matter of the proposed dwelling being built on an area greater than the registered title area of Daisy Barn with the resident of Field Cottage.</p>	<p>R&WPC</p> <p>SP</p>

Item	Description	Status / Action
22/050	<p>Planning Application Ref: 22/02481/FP, 22/02482/LBC and 22/02698/FP at Moon And Stars Mill End Rushden SG9 OTA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rear extension following demolition of existing rear outbuildings. Installation of 6 No. free standing self-contained camping pods and creation of overflow car park. - Rear extension following demolition of existing rear outbuildings. Internal and external alterations. - Installation of 120 photovoltaic solar panels. <p>The Chair stated that the three applications would be considered together.</p> <p>The applicant's agent and architect, Peter Romaniuk (PR), presented the applications.</p> <p>The chair invited comments from the attendees.</p> <p>The residents who live next door to the Moon and Stars pub (EM/DM) had the following observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They noted that the rear extension had no provision for air conditioning despite being a glass building facing South. This was confirmed by the architect. PR made the comment that windows and doors would be opened to cool the building as and when necessary. The resident then raised the concern about increased noise levels from the new extension when these windows and doors are opened. 2) The resident then made the observation that the 4 existing air conditioning units which are situated to the front of the pub do make a noise that can be heard from their property next door and their concern is that if air conditioning units are to be added where would they be located in order to minimize their noise impact. PR then commented that the units to the front of the pub can be acoustically shrouded / screened off more effectively to minimize the noise impact. 3) The Chair summarized that noise levels generally from the air conditioning, the new kitchen equipment, the increased number of customers and the glamping pods needed reviewing. PR agreed that an acoustic survey would be beneficial so that a 'before and after' impact can be assessed. 4) The same resident then queried potential light pollution from the glamping pods. PR confirmed that the pods would most likely be used all year round but would be powered by the PV cells or the Tesla battery packs. The resident then queried the lack of detail about lighting on the paths to and from the pods to the toilet and shower facilities in the pub. The resident would like to see more detail on this than is currently presented in the submission. 5) The position of the pods was also questioned. The resident asked if consideration had been made for moving the pods away from their property 	

Item	Description	Status / Action
	<p>boundary and more into the meadow / field. This would alleviate the possible light and sound pollution. PR replied that the proposed location was to attempt to screen the pods in the tree belt as much as possible.</p> <p>6) The resident commented that services had already been provided up to the proposed site of the pods when the applicant had tried to install glamping pods without permission a number of years ago. The resident had to raise a complaint to the council at that time and the council were forced to put a stop to those installations, however the services remain in situ. PR reconfirmed that there was no plan to have water and sewerage services to the pods. These services were to be provided for glampers in the new extension.</p> <p>7) The same resident then raised the issue about the protection of the wildlife on or around the glamping pods and the new dog walking path. Badgers and bats have been observed in both those areas. PR confirmed that the application had been screened for its impact on the local wildlife but due to the scale of the application a full ecological survey was not necessary.</p> <p>8) There was a request from the resident that given the new disabled access arrangements to the new extension and the fact that a new terrace is to be built alongside the rear extension to the South, that it could be possible to close off the front entrance to the pub and remove the decking to the front. This would allow additional parking to the front of the pub and alleviate a majority of the noise and light pollution coming from the front of the pub and affecting their property next door. It was noted that the original decking to the front was installed without any form of consent.</p> <p>9) A general observation was that the proposed car parking arrangements would not be sufficient for the anticipated numbers of staff and customers. If the new restaurant could take 55 covers and there are anticipated to be up to 15 staff and 6 glamping pods, then 18 car parking spaces for c.82 people appears insufficient. PR did suggest that more than 12 reinforced spaces could be made available in the meadow but it was a balancing act between maintaining the meadow and stopping cars from parking on the main road. At peak times the car parking provided by the pub needs to be sufficient such that customers do not need to park on the road or in front of residents' driveways or entrances. It was also noted that any additional car parking in the meadow should be shielded from view by trees or hedgerows so that the views down from Rushden are not spoilt by a car park.</p> <p>10) A question was raised as to how the smell and noise pollution from the new kitchen were to be dealt with as there was insufficient detail in the proposal. PR responded that the extraction would have to be via the roof but that modern extraction methods should remove the majority of issues. PR did comment that he anticipated that this would be one of the planning conditions and he fully expected to have to supply full extraction details as part of the planning approval. The Chair reiterated that the Parish Council would be</p>	

Item	Description	Status / Action
	<p>expecting a full noise survey of both before and after any works were carried out.</p> <p>11) A significant concern was raised about fire safety especially in relation to the thatched cottages in Mill End and the glamping pods. PR agreed that there would be restrictions on Bar-B-Q's and open fires at the pods and that normal hotel / hostel rules would apply about guest behavior. EM wanted to know who would be policing this at times that the pub was shut.</p> <p>12) It was noted that there was an omission of a door on the drawing 09 to the rear of the new extension. It is shown on the floor plan in drawing 06 as coming out into the garden from the new toilets and changing facilities but is missing from the rear elevation view in drawing 09. PR admitted this was an oversight that needed correcting.</p> <p>There were a number of observations about the intended energy provision for the pub including the ground source heat pump but more particularly the intention surrounding the 120 PV cells. PR stated that a separate planning application was requested by the planning authority and doing them separately was significantly cheaper than a combined application.</p> <p>PR commented that the current application for 120 PV cells was thought to be the maximum number that would get planning approval and they were intended as a trial to see if it could support the pub's energy needs but if 120 PV cells do not provide sufficient energy then a further application for more PV cells could be forthcoming.</p> <p>The Parish Council would like to see all the planning applications conditional on each other so that one cannot go ahead on its own without the other. There was support from the Parish Council towards alternative energy sources, albeit in a controlled and measured implementation.</p> <p>If further PV cells were required in the future, then a condition be applied that that they be intended for use by the pub alone. The exact number of additional PV cells should be supported by calculating the pub's total requirement once fully up and running. The 120 existing PV cells should have sufficient history to enable a calculation to work out exactly how many more PV cells would be required to make the pub self-sufficient.</p> <p>It was noted that the dog walking facility that has recently been provided in the meadow would require planning approval due to a change of use. This had been confirmed by NHDC to one of the residents. This needs formal clarification by the Parish Council.</p>	

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes and Action Points

Item	Description	Status / Action
	<p>The meeting concluded with the general consensus that it was a desire to keep the only remaining local pub open as a going concern and it was felt that the plans submitted were on the whole acceptable. As is always the case it was felt that more information was required on the points raised above and certain conditions would be required to ensure that the impact of these plans were ultimately acceptable by those residents most directly affected.</p> <p>The Chair stated that the Parish Council will be responding to NHDC planning regarding the matters raised at the meeting and reminded members of the public that the deadline for submitting any comments was 12 November. The Parish Council encouraged those members present to submit their comments as soon as possible.</p>	R&WPC
	The Chair thanked everyone for attending and the meeting adjourned at 9.40pm.	

Chairman's Signature:

Date: