

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 29 March 2017

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

<p>Present:</p>	<p>Councillors: Phillip Stearn Gill Mercer</p> <p>Roger Glithero JP Helen Harrison Marika Hillson Helen Howell Dudley Hughes JP Barbara Jenney Lance Jones Andy Mercer</p>	<p>Chairman Vice-Chairman</p> <p>Ron Pinnock Anna Sauntson Geoff Shacklock Alex Smith Robin Underwood Peter Wathen Pam Whiting</p>
-----------------	--	--

482. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Richard Gell.

483. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 8 March 2017 were approved as a true and correct record of proceedings.

484. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

16/02119/FUL Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds

Councillor	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
All Committee Members	Knew some of the speakers and people in the public gallery.		Yes
Helen Howell	(i) Was a member of the Planning Committee for Raunds Town Council; (ii) Knows one of the landowners, who is a councillor on Hargrave Parish Council.		Yes
Lance Jones	(i) Has spoken to David Prangle, an objector, on three occasions; (ii) Has met with Rob Fenwick, applicant, on three occasions; (iii) On 5 December 2016 at the invitation of the ENC Chief Executive, along with three other district		Yes

	councillors for Raunds, was invited to meet with executives of Roxhill, Howdens and Redbourne, including Mr Fenwick. Councillors were asked how better Roxhill and Howdens could foster local support and responded by saying that there was nothing contentious about their business proposals, just their site. They did not want to talk about the site, they wanted advice about communicating with local people and councillors suggested they meet and deal with advertisements in the usual way.		
Geoff Shacklock	Knows one of the applicants		Yes
Peter Wathen	On 5 December 2016 at the invitation of the ENC Chief Executive, along with three other district councillors for Raunds, was invited to meet with executives of Roxhill, Howdens and Redbourne, including Mr Fenwick. Councillors were asked how better Roxhill and Howdens could foster local support and said there was nothing contentious about the business proposals, just their site. They did not want to talk about the site, they wanted advice about communicating with local people and councillors suggested they meet and deal with advertisements in the usual way. Councillor Wathen expressed no opinion at that meeting.		Yes

(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Barbara Jenney declared that she had visited Scalley Way, Raunds (16/02119/FUL).

485. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

486. SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS – UPDATE

The Planning Development Manager submitted an update report which detailed progress on the drafting of S106 Agreements in respect of matters where the Committee had previously resolved to grant planning permission, subject to the prior finalisation of such an agreement. Members considered a request by the Planning Development Manager for an extension of time in respect of application 16/00864/VAR Darsdale, Raunds until the end of April 2017.

RESOLVED: That

- i) the report be noted.
- ii) the extension in respect of application 16/00864/VAR Darsdale, Raunds be approved.

487. DELEGATIONS TO HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

The Committee received a report which provided an update on applications where actions had been delegated to the Head of Planning Services.

The Planning Development Manager advised that the draft conditions for application 15/00119/VAR Priors Hall were still in progress and the revised conditions for application 16/01662/FUL Rushden Lakes had been agreed and were ready to be referred to the Secretary of State.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

488. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- **Cllr Glenvil Greenwood-Smith** - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (Ward Member)
- **Cllr Sylvia Hughes** - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (On behalf of Raunds Town Council)
- **Cllr Dave Munday** - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (On behalf of Stanwick Parish Council)
- **Anne Dagen** - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (Objector)
- **June Longhurst** - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (Objector)
- **David Prangle** - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (Objector)
- **Rob Fenwick** (Howdens) - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (Applicant)
- **Steve Harley** (Oxalis) - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (Applicant)
- **Simon Williams** (Roxhill) - 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds (Applicant)

489. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the planning application report, with updated information of the application, and representations made by public speakers at the meeting.

(i) 16/602119/FUL - Land End of Scalley Way, Raunds

The Committee considered an application for the development of two distribution buildings containing B8 warehousing space with ancillary office, B1 office and research and development space (B1c); together with vehicular access from Warth Park Way and London Road, earthworks and landscaping including the creation of drainage features with green infrastructure and landscaping provision including along Meadow Lane. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation.

Members noted that Raunds Town Council had objected to the application. Members further noted that 95 letters objecting to the application had been received from local residents. A petition with 567 signatures had also been received.

It was noted that the emerging Raunds Neighbourhood Plan sought to protect the application site through its designation as “protected open space”. In assessing the weight that should be given to this part of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan, legal advice had been sought and it was Counsel’s view that the Town Council’s position was unlikely to be approved by the Neighbourhood Plan Inspector when it came to be examined.

During the debate on the application, Members raised concerns at the possible noise impact of the application, particularly in relation to the number of proposed vehicle movements, and how this would have an impact on air quality. The Council’s Senior Environmental Protection Officer had confirmed that provided an acoustic barrier was installed, they had no objection to the proposed development on the grounds of noise. Concerns were also raised about the impact on the landscape and vista of the surrounding area, including from Stanwick Lakes and the actual number of jobs that would be created by the development and not just those jobs which would be transferring from other locations. Members particularly highlighted that the people of Raunds and Stanwick had very clearly indicated that they did not want the development but wanted the site to remain as open countryside as it was the only bit left around the Town.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 8, it was moved, seconded and agreed to extend the meeting to enable the business on the agenda to be completed.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.4, Councillor Dudley Hughes requested a recorded vote and the result was as follows:

FOR THE MOTION

Councillors Glithero, Jenney B, Mercer A, Mercer G, Pinnock R, Sauntson, Smith, Stearn, Underwood, Wathen and Whiting (11)

AGAINST THE MOTION

Councillors Harrison, Hillson, Howell, Hughes D, Jones and Shacklock (6)

ABSTENSIONS

None

The motion was thereupon declared **CARRIED** and it was

RESOLVED:

To **grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer’s report and update sheet and the completion of a S106 agreement in respect of developer contributions.

Chairman

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 05 April 2017

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

Present: Councillors: Phillip Stearn Chairman
Gill Mercer Vice-Chairman

Richard Gell
Roger Glithero JP
Helen Howell
Dudley Hughes JP
Barbara Jenney
Lance Jones
Andy Mercer

Ron Pinnock
Geoff Shacklock
Alex Smith
Robin Underwood
Peter Wathen
Pam Whiting

498. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Helen Harrison, Marika Hillson and Anna Sauntson. An apology was also received for the late arrival of Councillor Roger Glithero.

499. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Helen Howell	17/001111/FUL 21 Oakleigh Close, Raunds	Was a member of the Planning Committee of Raunds Town Council		Yes
Geoff Shacklock	16/02185/REM Sports Hall, Milton Road, Oundle	Visited the site regularly		Yes

(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Dudley Hughes declared that he had visited Andrews Quarry, Sulehay Road, Yarwell (16/01849/FUL).

500. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

501. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- **Harry O'Hare** - 16/02185/REM - Sports Hall, Milton Road, Oundle (Applicant)
- **Lorraine Hedges** - 16/02185/REM - Sports Hall, Milton Road, Oundle (Objector)
- **Nicholas Willock** - 16/01849/FUL - Andrews Quarry, Sulehay Road, Yarwell (Agent for the Applicant)

502. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the planning applications report, with updated information of the applications, and representations made by public speakers at the meeting.

(i) 17/00111/FUL – 21 Oakleigh Close, Raunds

At the Planning Management Committee meeting held on 8 March 2017, the Committee considered an application for the subdivision of land, demolition of a garage and the erection of a new dwelling. The Committee had agreed to defer the application to enable a site visit to be held to assess the access, impact on the street scene and possible overdevelopment.

The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of Councillor Peter Wathen as Raunds Town Council had objected to the application. Several letters objecting to the application had also been received from nearby residents. Northamptonshire Highways had no objections to the submitted proposals.

During debate on the application, Members stated that they still had concerns at the lack of amenity space, for both the existing dwelling and the new dwelling. Concerns were also raised at the closeness of the new dwelling to a hedgerow and requested that if permission was granted that a condition be added to ensure the hedgerow remained undamaged. Members also requested a condition be added to ensure that future occupiers of the dwelling were obliged to maintain the bin collection area.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were 11 votes for the motion, two against and no abstentions.

The Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report, update sheet and two additional conditions to cover tree protection measures and the retention of the bin collection area.

(ii) 16/02186/REM – Sports Hall, Milton Road, Oundle

The Committee considered a reserved matters application for access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping pursuant to outline planning permission 14/00875/OUT. The application had been brought before the Committee as it was a reserved matters application submitted pursuant to a major outline planning application.

Members noted that 14 letters/representations had been made by seven residents objecting to the application. Members further noted that Oundle Town Council did not object to the application but had concerns regarding the lack of parking for coaches. Northamptonshire Highways had no objections to the submitted proposals.

During debate on the application, Members sought clarification of the arrangements for coaches arriving at the site. Officers confirmed that there would be five coach parking bays to enable dropping off and picking up but they could be used longer if the school wished. Concerns were also raised about the proposed materials on the buildings and the possible interference with local television reception signals and it was suggested that an additional condition be added to cover this issue.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report, update sheet and an additional condition to cover television reception.

Councillor Roger Glithero joined the meeting.

(iii) 16/01849/FUL – Andrews Quarry, Sulehay Road, Yarwell

The Committee considered an application for a change of use to an outdoor activity park and operational development to include formation of activity courses and tracks, embankments, fencing, entrance gates, vehicle wash area and tank, siting of containers, cabins and associated works. The application had been brought before the Committee as it was a major application.

Members noted that Yarwell Parish Council, Nassington Parish Council and Wansford Parish Council had all strongly objected to the application. Members further noted that Peterborough City Council had also objected to the application. Approximately 1800 letters had been received in support of the application, most of which comprised of letter sets, which had been forwarded by the applicant/agent. Northamptonshire Highways did not object to the application, subject to conditions.

The agent requested that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a number of issues which they had raised to be considered. In response, officers advised that they believed that the Committee had been provided with all of the relevant information needed to enable a decision to be made at the meeting.

During debate on the application, some Members highlighted that the development would create a number of jobs in the rural economy. Members sought clarification from the Legal Advisor as to the weight that should be given to objections and support from outside of the area as a large number of the letters of support had been received from outside of the district, including overseas. In response, the Legal Advisor advised that the real weight should be given to the effect on the amenity of local residents.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, there were seven votes for the motion, three against and three abstentions.

The Committee **agreed to refuse** the application for the following reason:-

- The proposal sought to create a leisure/recreational facility, which would lie within proximity of some occupied residential properties, the main village of Yarwell, along a route frequently used by members of the local community and surrounded by wildlife sites and special protection areas i.e. SSSI. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not give rise to significant adverse noise effects and the proposal would be detrimental to the amenity of the surrounding residential occupiers as well as the character and amenity of the local area. The proposal, therefore, is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (Paragraphs 17 – Item 4,

28; Item 3 and Paragraph 123), and Policies 3, 8 e) i) and 25 of the adopted North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 2016 which seeks to avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse effects and to protect residential amenity and areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed.

503. INCIDENT AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

At the closure of the meeting, one of the public speakers gained access to the Council Chamber floor to confront an officer in an aggressive manner. The incident would be reported to the Council's Monitoring Officer to consider what action should be taken.

Chairman