

RUSHDEN TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 8th NOVEMBER 2022 AT RUSHDEN HALL, RUSHDEN, COMMENCING AT 6.30PM

Present: Chairman: Paul Harley
Councillors: Richard Lewis Kaye Rawlins
Tracey Smith Melanie Coleman
Marian Hollomon Adrian Winkle [Ex Officio]
Officers: Paul Wilcox

In Attendance: Cllr Tony Spooner

206/23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Tracey Smith declared a Bias Interest in application number NE/01228/FUL and left the meeting when this item was discussed and took no part in discussion and voting thereon.

Cllr Paul Harley declared a Bias Interest in application number NE/22/01228/FUL.

Cllr Melanie Coleman, declared an Other interest in application number NE/22/01298/PDE.

207/23 APOLOGIES

Apologies of absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs, Cameron Clarke, Cesare Marinaro, Carol Childs, David Jenney, Philip Humphrey, Vivienne Prodger.

208/23 MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Consultative Committee held on Tuesday 18th October 2022 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

209/24 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

That the following comments be submitted to North Northamptonshire Council:

Planning Application	Comments
Planning Application: NE/22/01228/FUL Applicant: Mr G Caushaj Planning Officer: Susie Russell Single storey rear extension at 6 Cedar Close, Rushden, Northamptonshire, NN10 9HE.	No Objection

<p>Planning Application: NE/22/01263/FUL Applicant: Mr Anthony Moye (Grand Union Housing Group Limited) Planning Officer: Chris Hill</p> <p>Single storey rear extension and internal alterations at 150 Highfield Road, Rushden, Northamptonshire, NN10 9QL.</p>	<p>Rushden Town Council has no objection to this application subject to Highways comments.</p>
<p>Planning Application: NE/22/01273/FUL Applicant: Mr Hassan Ali Planning Officer: Patrick Reid Responses Due: 13 November 2022</p> <p>Proposed detached dwelling and associated works at 27 Bradfield Close, Rushden, Northamptonshire, NN10 0EP.</p>	<p>The Town Council oppose this development and do not consider it represents good design sought by the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 126 of the Framework finds that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, whilst paragraph 134 states development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies or government guidance on design.</p> <p>The application forms state that the proposed dwelling constitutes a one-bedroom dwelling, although the submitted floor plans represent a dwelling which is tantamount to a two-bedroom dwelling. Whilst the floor plans show one bedroom with a separate study, it should be recognised that there is nothing to stop the study being functionally used as a secondary bedroom. In such scenarios the Town Council recognise that the dwelling house would be contrary to the Governments Technical housing standards (Nationally described space standard) which specify that a single bedroom should have a floor area of at least 7.5sqm and with a width of at least 2.15m. The standards also require a minimum of 70sqm gross internal floor area for a 2-bedroom, 3-person dwelling. The application forms, at Section 6, state the dwelling would provide 68sqm of gross internal floor area, which would be sub-standard if the dwelling were ever to be used as a two-bedroom dwelling.</p> <p>It is also recognised that the Council's Householder Extensions Supplementary Planning Document stipulates at paragraph 3.11 that <i>"(unless properties are already in closer proximity), any new windows at first floor level or above should respect the 'back to back' distance of at least 21 metres between rear facing windows which has become the accepted in the discipline of planning over the years as being sufficient to avoid unacceptable overlooking into the windows of properties to the rear"</i>.</p> <p>Applying this adopted design guidance against the proposal it can be found that the proposal fails to achieve such distances from its opposing neighbour located on Allen Road to the west, which is closer to the region of 17m distance away. The proposal would risk setting a harmful precedent for separation distances in this location, given it would be out of keeping with its</p>

	<p>surroundings. The Councils Householder Extensions SPD also sets out at paragraph 5.2 that it is recommended that the Council will typically seek at least 50sqm of garden space to be retained as a reasonable amount of useable amenity space, and that a typical garden is 10.5m long (which ties in with the 21m 'back to back' distance for separation standards). The proposal falls below these standards and thus does not represent good design in line with paragraph 134 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The proposal is also contrary to Policy 8(e) of the Core Strategy which requires acceptable levels of residential amenity to be achieved; and draft Policy EN13 of the Part 2 Local Plan which requires development proposal to relate well to and enhance the surrounding environment; achieving well designed amenity space of an adequate size for the property and serve the needs of all end users. The proposal is further contrary to the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan policy EN1 which requires development to preserve existing neighbouring amenity and should not appear overbearing.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal is contrary to the development plan, does not constitute good design, and should therefore be refused planning permission.</p>
<p>Planning Application: NE/22/01298/PDE Applicant: Cate Wainwright Planning Officer: Erika Davies Responses Due: 12th November 2022</p> <p>Single storey rear extension To extend 4.8 m beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse Maximum height 3.79 m Height at eaves 2.29m at 99 Hayway, Rushden, Northamptonshire, NN10 6AQ.</p>	<p>No Objection</p>

Chairman