

## **Daventry Local Area Planning Committee**

Minutes of a meeting of the Daventry Local Area Planning Committee held at The Forum, Moat Lane, Towcester, NN12 6AD on Wednesday 10 May 2023 at 6.00 pm.

### **Present:**

Councillor Kevin Parker (Chair)  
Councillor Alan Chantler (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Rupert Frost  
Councillor Rosie Humphreys  
Councillor Cecile Irving-Swift  
Councillor David James  
Councillor Peter Matten

### **Apologies for Absence:**

Councillor Daniel Cribbin

### **Officers:**

James Rodger, Development Management Manager  
Tim Cantwell, Planning Officer  
Sarah Hall, Deputy Monitoring Officer  
Jeverly Findlay, Committee Officer

#### **87. Declarations of Interest**

None advised.

#### **88. Minutes**

##### **RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the Daventry Local Area Planning Committee of 5 April 2023 be approved and signed as a correct record.

#### **89. Chair's Announcements**

The Chair announced that the meeting would be the last Daventry Area Planning Committee meeting and thanked Members for their contributions over the years.

#### **90. Planning applications**

Consideration was given to the report detailing the planning applications which had been previously circulated.

##### **RESOLVED:**

That, subject to the variations set out below, the advice set out in the report now submitted be agreed.

**WND/2021/0923 - Land to Rear of 31, Kilsby Road, Barby, Northamptonshire, CV23 8TU - Reserved matters application (appearance, landscaping and scale) for construction of dwelling (access from Almond Close).**

The Planning Officer advised that there were two references to the new planning application prefix of WND and these were for the previous planning application and therefore should have the old prefix of DA.

Members' attention was drawn to the list of late representations and the concerns raised by the Landscape Officer. If Members were minded to approve the application, a revised condition 3 was proposed to be added, in order to minimise biodiversity loss. The condition being that: All tree removal shall be as per the Arboricultural Impact Assessment provided by Arbtech Consulting Limited, and a tree protection plan for all trees that may be negatively impacted by the development shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA before any works commence.

The Planning Officer outlined the application for the reserved matters application for a dwelling at the end of a cul-de-sac, there was no passing traffic on such a road and the Highway Authority had not raised any concerns. The dwelling would be detached with off road parking to the side. The principle of the development had already been established as outline planning approval had been given. The development was considered to be infill. The scale, design and materials of the building were in keeping with the street scene. The ridge line was subservient to adjacent dwellings and the dwelling would be on lower ground than them. Unfortunately, there would be a loss of 4 small trees at the front of the site; however the larger trees to the rear would be protected with the proposed condition. There was a 20 metre separation between the rear of the house to 31 Kilsby Road. The rear dormer and roof lights would be obscure glazed. The dormer window would be on restricted hinges and the roof lights from the floor height would be 1.7 metres high to prevent overlooking. There would be limited views from the side window. Members were shown a site plan and the drawings of the buildings.

Mr Henson spoke against the application and raised concerns that the new dwelling would be overbearing and cause overlooking. Residential amenity would be adversely affected for a number of residents. The boundary had been re-drawn by the developer. The Deputy Monitoring Officer advised that the authority did not get involved in boundary disputes. The Development Management Manager noted that the boundary had been moved further away from the speaker's property.

Faith Gorman spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and reported that the parish council considered the application was contrary to the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposed dwelling would overshadow the neighbours and adversely affect their amenity. The loss of green space would change the rural outlook and there was inadequate parking on the close.

Further to enquiries, the Planning Officer confirmed that the outline application had been received in March 2021 and the consultation had taken place that same month.

Any objections to the application were received after vesting day when West Northants Council had been established and followed the new planning procedures for that authority.

Councillor Alan Chantler proposed that the application be approved, as the design of the dwelling was in keeping with the area and the landscaping issue had been addressed with the proposed additional condition, this was seconded by Councillor Cecile Irving-Swift. On being put to the meeting, the proposition was declared carried with 5 voting in favour and 2 against.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be approved, as set out in the report, with the following additional condition:

All tree removal shall be as per the Arboricultural Impact Assessment provided by Arbtech Consulting Limited, and a tree protection plan for all trees that may be negatively impacted by the development shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA before any works commence.

**WND/2022/1102 - Glebe House, 46 Church Street, Byfield - Construction of first floor side extension and installation of disabled access lift**

The Planning Officer advised that there was an error in the report as the parish council had objected to the application for one reason, namely overlooking, not a number of reasons as stated. The first floor extension was proposed over an existing pitched roof. It would be wholly in keeping with the existing dwelling in terms of materials and design and the chimney would be reinstated. The extension was modest in size and would be subservient to the main dwelling as it would be lower than the main ridge height. The existing single storey element was visible from the street scene and it was considered that the extension would have a minimal impact. With regard to the potential for overlooking, the side window at the gable end would be obscure glazed with restricted opening. The sole purpose of the window was to let light and ventilation into the en-suite. The extension would be 9 metres from Byfield House at its nearest point. There was a long boundary wall between the two properties. It was pointed out the installation of the disabled lift did not need planning permission.

Mr Gray spoke against the application and pointed out that the separation distance of 12 metres in the Supplementary Planning Document had not been met as there would only be 8 metres distance. He considered that the extension would be overbearing in terms of its scale and massing and that it was contrary to policy.

Mr Thompson spoke against the application and considered that it would have an unacceptable impact on 6 habitable rooms of Byfield House. The proposed first floor extension would be overbearing, create overlooking and a potential loss of light.

The Development Management Manager advised that there would be a 2.2 metre increase in height as a result of the extension. Glebe House and Byfield House were not aligned and therefore the extension was only 8 metres at its closest point, the

impact was reduced because the houses were at an oblique angle to each other and this reduced the amount of overlooking. It was highlighted that the 12 metres separation distance was Supplementary Planning Guidance and not policy.

Mrs Moody, the Agent, addressed the Committee and advised that a shadow analysis had been carried out on a CAD system. The proposed new bedroom window would overlook less of Byfield House compared to the view from the current rooflight. The extension would ensure that the occupants could remain in the house for the future.

Further to enquiries, the Planning Officer reiterated that the side window had a restricted opening and was obscure glazed, but the restricted view from it would be towards the road, not Byfield House.

Members raised concerns regarding the potential for overlooking. The Planning Officer advised that there was already a view from the current rooflight and the view from the proposed extension would be more or less the same.

Further to discussion, Councillor David James proposed that the application be approved, this was seconded by Councillor Alan Chantler and on being put to the meeting, was declared carried with 5 voting in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be approved as set out in the report.

The meeting closed at 7.40 pm

Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_