

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes and Action Points

Date / Time:	Tuesday 5 th March 2024, 8.00pm
Location:	Rushden Village Hall
Councillors Present:	Steve Pettyfer (SP) (Chair), Sue Lewis (SL)
In attendance:	Michelle Hopley (MH) - Clerk, 4nr. members of the public
Apologies:	Graham Lamb (Parish Councillor), Kate Heath (Parish Councillor), Jenny Barlow (Parish Councillor), Mark Hopley (Clerk)

Item	Description	Status / Action
24/017	<p>Planning Application Ref: 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 (as a resubmission of planning application 22/02663/RM).</p> <p>The Chair clarified the key characteristics of the application, with particular reference to the previous application (22/02663/RM), which was refused as per NHDC decision notice dated 5th January 2023.</p> <p>The previous application was refused based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The proposed new dwelling, by reason of its large scale relative to the size of the site, would appear a contrived, visually excessive and poor form of development. This is exacerbated by its contemporary form and materials combined with its scale resulting in a form of development contrary to local context. Furthermore, the largely glazed, three-storey rear elevation would appear contrary to and harmful in the landscape when viewed from the lane to the west (from the A507) resulting in a form of development that would be to the detriment of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. The proposal is therefore deemed contrary to Policy D1 of the Local Plan and Sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF, especially paragraph 130 of the NPPF.</i> <p>SP noted that these Sections relate to size, scale in comparison to other dwellings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The proposal, by virtue of the incorporation of a side facing balcony and the set back nature of the dwelling relative to the host property, Daisy Barn, would allow for future occupants to step out and have a direct view into the rear fenestration of Daisy Barn approx. 20.0m away. This would have a materially adverse impact upon the amenities, reasonable living conditions and well-being of this neighbouring property, contrary to Policy D3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.</i> 	-

Chair's Signature:

Date:

Item	Description	Status / Action
	<p>SP stated that this particular point had been addressed by the new application. There are windows but no new balcony to the side elevation, although there is a balcony to the rear of the proposed dwelling.</p> <p>The rough calculation of developed floor area for both the applications is circa 730m²; with the height of new proposed dwelling, at 7.2m, being higher than the previous proposed dwelling. Overall, the proposed dwelling is considerably larger than an average 4 bed house.</p> <p>The proposed materials were considered to be more appropriate for the location. The rear elevation still consists of large areas of glazing.</p> <p>The observations and concerns raised by the members of the public are summarised below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Access Area / Hammerhead - The proposed access is not in line with the outline planning permission was raised – the gravel and open area is now fenced off. • Windows to the side elevation. • Roofs - appearance of the roof was not being in keeping with other properties in the vicinity. • Parking Spaces, Garage size. • Scale, size of property - Height, depth of property. • Boundaries - hard boundaries large sliding gate rather than the hedges. <p>SP concluded that as it is difficult to conclude that the new proposal fits within the planning policies as highlighted in the previous refusal notice, i.e., appropriate scale, size and overall form compared to adjacent / other buildings in the village.</p> <p>It was agreed that the Parish Council would submit a response to NHDC, objecting to the proposal, along the lines that the original refusal point 1 had not been addressed, and noting the objections of the parishioners including the access arrangements.</p>	
-	Meeting adjourned at 8.50pm.	-