

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 15 November 2017

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

Present: Councillors: Phillip Stearn Chairman  
 Gill Mercer Vice Chairman

John Farrar Anna Sauntson  
 Roger Glithero JP Geoff Shacklock  
 Marika Hillson Alex Smith  
 Helen Howell Robin Underwood  
 Barbara Jenney Peter Wathen  
 Andy Mercer Pam Whiting  
 Roger Powell

## 248. COUNCILLOR GLENN HARWOOD MBE

The Chairman referred to the sudden death of Councillor Glenn Harwood MBE, Deputy Leader of the Council, on 14 November. Members of the Committee observed one minutes silence in memory of Councillor Harwood.

## 249. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dudley Hughes JP and Ron Pinnock.

## 250. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 October 2017 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

## 251. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

| Councillor     | Application                                                         | Nature of Interest                                                                                  | DPI | Other Interest     |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------|
| Roger Glithero | 17/01428/FUL and 17/01483/LBC The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Bulwick | Knew the applicant, agent and affected neighbours. He also owned a strip of land close to the site. |     | Yes (left meeting) |
| Barbara Jenney | 17/01469/FUL Printing Workshop, Midland Road,                       | Had attended a Rushden Town Council meeting when                                                    |     | Yes                |

|                 |                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                             |  |                       |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
|                 | Rushden and<br>17/01720/FUL 34<br>Hayden Road,<br>Rushden and<br>17/01491/FUL<br>Barclays Bank<br>Chambers, College<br>Street, Rushden | the applications were<br>discussed.                                                                                                                         |  |                       |
| Andy Mercer     | 17/02206/NCC<br>Westwood A D Plant,<br>Bedford Road,<br>Rushden                                                                        | Was Vice Chairman of<br>the Northamptonshire<br>County Council<br>Development Control<br>Committee who may<br>make a decision on<br>the item in the future. |  | Yes (left<br>meeting) |
| Geoff Shacklock | 17/01077/FUL Land<br>Opposite Thorpe<br>Cottage, Aldwinckle<br>Road, Thorpe<br>Waterville                                              | Knew the applicant<br>and speaker.                                                                                                                          |  | Yes                   |

**(b) Informal Site Visits**

Councillor Geoff Shacklock declared that he had visited Land Opposite Thorpe Cottage, Aldwinckle Road, Thorpe Waterville (17/01077/FUL).

**252. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3**

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

**253. SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS – UPDATE**

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the progress of drafting 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 noted that the phasing plan had been circulated in respect of application 10/00857/OUT Irthlingborough West.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**254. 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.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**255. PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following person spoke on the item as indicated:

- **Mrs J Smith** – 17/01469/FUL – Printing Workshop, Midland Road, Rushden (Agent for the Applicant)
- **Mr C Hatfield** – 17/001720/FUL – 34 Hayden Road, Rushden (Applicant)
- **Mrs C Sharp** - 17/01077/FUL - Land Opposite Thorpe Cottage, Aldwincle Road, Thorpe Waterville (Supporter)
- **Councillor D Read** - 17/01847/FUL - A14 Service Station, Huntingdon Road, Thrapston (on behalf of Thrapston Town Council)
- **Mr J Nyakatawa** - 17/01847/FUL - A14 Service Station, Huntingdon Road, Thrapston (Objector)
- **Ms V Crossthwaite** - 17/01847/FUL - A14 Service Station, Huntingdon Road, Thrapston (Applicant)

**256. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered the planning applications report and representations made by public speakers at the meeting. It was noted that there was additional information on the applications included in the update sheet.

**(i) 17/01469/FUL – Printing Workshop, Midland Road, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the part demolition, part retention and conversion of former print works and the erection of new houses and flats to create thirteen new residential dwellings. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation as it was a major planning proposal.

Members noted that Rushden Town Council had objected to the application. Northamptonshire Highways had no objection to the proposed point of access but objected to the application on the grounds that it was to have a private drive serving more than five dwellings independently of their own direct highway frontage and that this would be a mixed development of housing and flats.

During debate on the application, Members welcomed bringing a heritage building back into use and the reduction of units. However, the tandem parking was of great concern and had been caused by the cramped development. Whilst not supporting the application in its current form, Members indicated that they would consider a scheme for fewer units and a reduction in the number of tandem spaces.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, there were 13 votes for, none against and one abstention, therefore the Committee **agreed to refuse** the application, contrary to officer advice, on the grounds that the proposal represents an over development of the site with the tandem parking layout being a symptom of this.

It was agreed to add an informative to the decision to inform the applicant that a less dense scheme and a reduction in tandem spaces would be more appropriate.

The Committee delegated authority to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and the Ward Member, to agree the wording for refusal.

**(ii) 17/01720/FUL – 34 Hayden Road, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two, three bedroomed detached residential dwellings. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of Councillor Barbara Jenney.

Members noted that Rushden Town Council had objected to the application and further noted that one letter objecting to the application had been received from a nearby resident. Northamptonshire Highways had no objections to the application but had advised that there was a street light at the point of the proposed access that would need to be moved as part of the development.

During debate on the application, Members noted that it was a telegraph pole and not a street light which was at the point of access and the Highways Authority had made their comments based on wrong assumptions. Members were minded to grant the application subject to additional consultation with the Highways Authority.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted, subject to further consultation with the Highways Authority. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report and subject to reconsultation with the Highways Authority on the siting of a telegraph pole at the point of access. If the Highways Authority has no objection then the decision can be delegated to the Head of Planning Services.

**(iii) 17/01077/FUL – Land Opposite Thorpe Cottage, Aldwincle Road, Thorpe Waterville**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a single dwelling and carport. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of Ward Councillor Geoff Shacklock.

Members noted that the Parish Council had no objection to the application but felt that imitation Collyweston Stone would be a more sympathetic roofing option and it also believed that the site fell outside of the village envelope. Comments had also been received from 11 interested parties who had all supported the application. Northamptonshire Highways had no objection, subject to the imposition of a condition.

Heritage England had objected to the application as the application site was located within an area of known historic settlement and to the west of the site was the site of Thorpe Castle. Given the proximity of the site to the castle there was the potential for remains of archaeological significance to survive on the site. The Council's Senior Conservation Officer had also objected to the application due to its proximity to a number of listed buildings as well as the scheduled ancient monument.

During debate on the application, Members noted that the village had supported the application and that the setting of the ancient monument was an empty field. Some Members highlighted concerns that the application could set a precedent to develop on further land around the site. The Planning Officer and Legal Adviser advised the Committee that the recommendation of refusal was clear, supported by the objections received from relevant statutory consultees. Members were further advised that case law required members to give considerable importance and weight to preserving the setting of listed buildings.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted as it was sufficiently distant from the ancient monument not to affect its setting. On being put to the vote, there were four votes for the motion, eight against and two abstentions, therefore the motion was lost.

It was further moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, there were nine votes for the motion, three against and two abstentions, therefore the Committee **agreed to refuse** the application for the following reasons:

- By virtue of its scale, character and location, the site fails to meet the definition of an infill site in relation to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Policy 11(2) and lies outside of the defined settlement boundary for Thorpe Waterville as identified in the Rural North Oundle and Thrapston Plan (RNOT). As such, the principle of development conflicts with JCS Policy 11(2) and RNOTP Policy 2.
- The Development would introduce a dwelling on a site which is undeveloped and contributes to the rural setting of the village and forms part of the setting of a group of heritage assets and is a designated open space. Extending beyond the natural form of the village the proposed would appear incongruous and out of character within the rural setting and character of this part of the village. The dwelling and garage would significantly alter the character of the site and would cause harm to the setting and in turn the significance of an important group of heritage assets and result in the loss of an area of open space. Contrary to JCS Policy 2a), 3, 7d), 8d(ii), Policy 15 of the RNOTP and NPPF para 61, 132, 133 and 134. This harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal and consequently the application should be refused.

**(iv) 17/01847/FUL – A14 Service Station, Huntingdon Road, Thrapston**

The Committee considered an application for the construction and operation of a Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) refuelling station, including compound, two dispensers and scheme of tree planting. The application had been brought before the Committee as Thrapston Town Council had objected to the application.

Members noted that Barratt David Wilson Northampton had also objected to the application as it failed to acknowledge or address the adjacent consented housing scheme. Members also noted that the Northamptonshire Highways had no objection to the application.

During debate on the application, Members stated that whilst they supported the use of LNG in principle, they had concerns at the height of the tanks and their impact on the visual amenity at a key entrance into Thrapston. There were also concerns on the impact on the residential development which had recently received planning permission. It was noted that there was a similar development in Daventry, but that was in an industrial area and not close to residential properties.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, there were 13 votes for, none against and one abstention, therefore the Committee **agreed to refuse** the application, contrary to officer advice, on the grounds that the proposed tanks would have a detrimental visual impact given their siting at a prominent gateway location and in close proximity to planned residential properties and that the benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the visual harm.

The Committee delegated authority to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and the Ward Member, to agree the wording for refusal.

**(v) 17/01491/FUL – Barclays Bank Chambers, College Street, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the renewal of planning permission EN10/01373/FUL to convert the first floor into two flats. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of Ward Member Councillor Barbara Jenney.

Members noted that Rushden Town Council had objected to the application. Northamptonshire Highways had no objection to the application on highways grounds, but recommended that the amenity issue for the flats be taken in consideration.

During debate on the application, Members raised concerns at the lack of parking and that the conversion to two flats represented an overdevelopment. It was noted that on-street parking in the area was of a premium and it would be difficult to park. Members were also concerned that the proposed bin storage would be accommodated on the ground floor below the staircase, which they felt could be a fire hazard.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, there were 13 votes for, none against and one abstention, therefore the Committee **agreed to refuse** the application, contrary to officer advice, on the grounds of lack of parking, inadequate bin storage and the rooms falling below national space standards.

The Committee delegated authority to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and the Ward Member, to agree the wording for refusal.

**257. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8**

At 8.50pm, the Chairman proposed the suspension of Council Procedure Rule 8 (Duration of Meeting) to enable the Committee to conclude the business on the agenda. On being put to the vote, it was

## **RESOLVED:**

That Council Procedure Rule 8 be suspended to enable the Committee to complete the business detailed on the agenda.

**Councillors Roger Glithero and John Farrar left the meeting for the following items and did not return.**

### **(vi) 17/01428/FUL – The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Bulwick**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of two existing Munition Dumps and the construction of a new single storey store. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of Ward Member Councillor Roger Glithero.

Members noted that Bulwick Parish Council had objected to the application and that comments had been received from a neighbouring property raising concerns over the size of the proposed floor plan. The Council's Senior Conservation Officer had no objections to the application.

During debate on the application, Members indicated that they had no objection to the demolition of the Munition Dumps but did have concerns at the size and siting of the proposed store, particularly in relation to a nearby building. Concern was raised that a future application could be made to turn the building into a residential property and if permission was granted Members would like to see a condition to ensure it remained ancillary to the residential use of the site.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were 11 votes for, none against and two abstentions, therefore the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report, update sheet and an additional condition to ensure that the building remains ancillary to the residential use of the site.

### **(vii) 17/01429/LBC – The Old Rectory, Church Lane, Bulwick**

The Committee considered a Listed Building application for the demolition of two existing Munition Dumps and the construction of a new single storey store.

Members noted that Bulwick Parish Council had objected to the application and that comments had been received from a neighbouring property raising concerns over the size of the proposed floor plan. The Council's Senior Conservation Officer had no objections to the application.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were 11 votes for, none against and two abstentions, therefore the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report.

**Councillor Andy Mercer left the meeting for the following item.**

**(viii) 17/02206/NCC – Westwood A D Plant, Bedford Road, Rushden**

The Committee considered a consultation from Northamptonshire County Council detailing a Variation of Condition 20 of planning consent 17/00011/WASVOC to allow for the relocation and inclusion of a new high temperature flare. The application had been brought before the Committee due to the location of the site in relation to the application site for 17/01328/FUL (proposed poultry farm) which was currently under consideration by East Northamptonshire Council.

**RESOLVED**

To submit the following comments to NCC:

*'East Northamptonshire Council (ENC) has no objection to the replacement of the existing flare with a high temperature flare in principle; however, it notes that trees on the existing bund within a 15m radius of the flare would need to be removed. The planted bund acts as visual mitigation for the AD plant and Northamptonshire Country Council (NCC) should satisfy itself that this proposal would not prejudice the mitigation scheme which was previously deemed to be necessary. If the application is to be granted, consideration should be given to whether replacement tree planting (i.e. on land to the north/north-east of the proposed flare and bund) would be appropriate to secure by way of a planning condition.*

*A condition to ensure the removal of the redundant flare should be considered to prevent unnecessary visual clutter at the site.*

*In terms of considering visual impact and any cumulative effect, NCC is advised to note that ENC is currently considering application 17/01328/FUL for a large scale poultry farm in the vicinity.'*

**Chairman**