# APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

**PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - 15 August 2018**

## INDEX OF APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recom.</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17/02426/OUT</td>
<td>OP0512 TL0097 Blatherwycke Road Kings Cliffe Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outline</strong>: Proposed residential development, of up to 20 affordable homes and 10 market homes, allotments and landscaping (all matters reserved except access).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01136/REM</td>
<td>55 Rushmere Way Rushden Northamptonshire NN10 6YB</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reserved matters</strong>: pursuant to planning application 16/01774/OUT: Outline application; Erection of single storey dwelling (all matters reserved except access) dated 17.11.2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01269/FUL</td>
<td>225 Avenue Road Rushden Northamptonshire NN10 0SN</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Erection of Pre fabricated wooden garage in front garden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/00656/VAR</td>
<td>Darsdale Farm Site Chelveston Road Raunds Northamptonshire NN9 6DA</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Variation of condition 1 (approved plans) to allow variation of house types and layout amendments pursuant to planning application 17/01680/VAR pursuant to application 16/00864/VAR variation of 07/02238/OUT and 13/01604/REM Residential development for up to 460 dwellings dated 07.03.2018 (Part Retrospective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/01189/FUL</td>
<td>108 Harborough Road Rushden Northamptonshire NN10 0LP</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rear and side extension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicative Site Plan
This application is brought before the Planning Management Committee because it falls outside the Scheme of Delegation in Part 3.2 of the Council's Constitution.

1. Update to Original Committee Report

1.1 The application was deferred at the PMC committee on 13th June 2018 to allow for additional information to be considered (see report at appendix 1). A meeting was held on 05.07.18 between the Applicant, his representatives and the relevant Officers to discuss the reasons for refusal and to clarify the position regarding local housing need. It was agreed at the meeting that some of the refusal reasons noted in the committee report could possibly be overcome through the submission of additional details. However, the applicant has not submitted any additional information for consideration since the meeting.

1.2 It was highlighted that a Housing Needs Survey is being carried out by the Local Neighbourhood Planning Group and that the results of the survey will be available in Autumn 2018. This will inform of any housing need that is specific to Kings Cliffe and better inform the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

1.3 During the site visit, members noted the possibility that adders may be present on the site and that this should be a consideration in the determination process. The Case Officer has consulted with the Ecologist at Northamptonshire Country Council who confirms that there are numerous adder records within 2km of the application site, so it is possible that adders might use the site on occasions. However, the ecologist has confirmed that adders receive the same legal protection as most other reptiles, so their presence wouldn't involve any special consideration and also, that the Reptile Mitigation Strategy that has been submitted demonstrates that the site can be cleared without risk to reptiles, provided the stated methods are followed. Overall, the information already submitted is sufficient to cover the periodic presence of adders.

2. NPPF

2.1 Since the last committee report was written, a new NPPF has been published. Whilst the sentiment behind all of the relevant policy remains the same in relation to the proposed development, reference to paragraphs 186 and 187 in informative number 2 shall now read as reference to paragraph 38.

3. Recommendation:

3.1 That planning permission be REFUSED for the reasons set out at 10.0 of the
Committee report at Appendix 1.

APPENDIX 1

1.  Summary of Recommendation

1.1  That planning permission be REFUSED.

2.  The Site and its Context

2.1  The site extends to approximately 2.4 hectares and is roughly square in shape. It is generally level with a gentle fall to the south. There is a row of tall trees part way along the road frontage (north boundary), a dense tree screen along the southern boundary and a hedge along the west boundary. The eastern boundary is a mix of fencing and sparse hedging. The site itself is used partly for the storage of agricultural related machinery/trailers, storage containers and other agricultural paraphernalia. The remainder of the site is clear and appears as grazing land.

2.2  To the north west of the site is Meadow Farm, a poultry farm, and an area of open countryside directly opposite the site. There is a row of semi detached dwellings directly to the east and behind the dwellings and adjoining the eastern boundary of the site is an allotment. To the south and west is open countryside. There is a public right of way (NE14) along the southern boundary of the site.

2.3  There is an existing vehicular access at the north eastern corner of the site which is outside of the 30mph zone associated with the main built up part of the village.

2.4  The site is not in a conservation area but falls within the Kings Cliffe Limestone Protection Area as defined in the NCC Minerals and Waste Local Plan (MWLP).

3.  The Proposal

3.1  This outline planning application proposes up to 30 dwellings with all matters reserved for later consideration, except for access. The proposed dwellings would consist of:
   o  6 x 2 bed open market dwellings
   o  4 x 3 bed open market dwellings
   o  12 x 2 bed affordable dwellings (including 3 bungalows)
   o  8 x 3 bed affordable dwellings

3.2  Not all of the site would be developed; the south west portion of the site would remain as it currently is or it is suggested that some of the land could be used as allotments or progressed as woodland. The submitted indicative site plan shows that the dwellings would be arranged on the north eastern part of the site as semi's or terraces with an area of open space and parking for each property. No indication is given as to the height of the dwellings (other than the bungalows).

3.3  The existing vehicular access would be upgraded to provide improved access for the scheme, and the applicant proposes to relocate the 30mph sigh to incorporate the site access within it.

4.  Information

4.1  During the course of the application, the following additional documents have been submitted for consideration:
   - Archaeological report;
- Viability Information;
- Speed Survey;
- Ecological Method Statement;
- Flood Risk Assessment.

5. Policy Considerations

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

5.2 North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011 - 2031 (JCS):
Policy 1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy 3 - Landscape Character
Policy 4 - Biodiversity & Geodiversity
Policy 5 - Water Environment, Resources and Flood Risk Management
Policy 7 - Community Services and Facilities
Policy 8 - North Northamptonshire Place Shaping Principles
Policy 9 - Sustainable Buildings & Allowable Solutions
Policy 10 - Provision of Infrastructure
Policy 11 - The Network of Urban & Rural Areas
Policy 13 - Rural Exceptions
Policy 15 - Well Connected Towns, Villages and Neighbourhoods
Policy 16 - Connecting the Network of Settlements
Policy 19 - The Delivery of Green Infrastructure
Policy 28 - Housing Requirements
Policy 29 - Distribution of New Homes
Policy 30 - Housing Mix and Tenure

5.3 Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan 2011 (RNOTP):

5.4 Supplementary Planning Documents:
Northamptonshire Parking Standards 2016 (NCC)
Local Highway Authority Standing Advice 2016 (NCC)
Sustainable Design (NNJPU)
Planning Out Crime in Northamptonshire (NCC)
Trees and Landscape (WBC and ENC)
North Northamptonshire Biodiversity SPD (NNJPU)
Developer Contributions SPD 2006 (ENC)
Open Space 2011 (ENC)

5.5 Other Documents:
Delivering Affordable Rural Housing on Exception sites (ENC Guidance Note)

6. Relevant Planning History:

6.1 None relevant to this application.

7. Consultations and Representations:

7.1 Neighbours:

7.1.1 Objections have been received from 20 local residents and include the following concerns:
- The site is outside the settlement boundary and any approval would set an undesirable precedent for future expansion of the village. Further clarification of boundary lines would be required.
• Traffic is a current issue in Kings Cliffe, particularly speeding, and the development will compound this. The developers should fund traffic calming measures in the village, if approved.

• The council should widen and straighten the lane that runs from Blatherwycke Park Farm to the A43 to reduce the impact of the proposed development.

• Design/visual impact.

• In the survey of villagers carried out for the development of the Kings Cliffe Neighbourhood Plan, 67% of responders agreed that the number of new houses built in the village during the time frame of the KCNP (up to 2035) should be less than 50 and should be achieved with small scale developments within the existing settlement boundary. This application is for 30 houses and is outside the settlement boundary. The village survey clearly shows that this proposed development on the land south of Blatherwycke Rd. is unwanted by the local residents and goes against the emerging KCNP.

• The development of Sovereign Grange / Oak Lane in Kings Cliffe fulfilled any requirement from ENDC or NCC for the village. It is understandable that the old middle school site may be developed and that the old Endowed school site may be converted into housing. These two sites alone more than cater for local need.

• The KCNP also required new housing developments to be of similar character and density to the existing village. This application is for unsuitably dense housing.

• Local services such as the doctor's surgery, primary school, nursery school can not accept the increase in population this development will bring.

• This site has already been considered and rejected in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

• There is a mistake on the planning application itself which states that there are currently 20 existing residential units and a total of 10 proposed residential units.

• The sewerage system in the village is already struggling.

• The ecological impact of the proposal would be significant and would pollute Willow Brook.

• More than 30 houses will eventually be planned for this site.

• Impact on horse rider safety.

• The council has not helped residents negate the impact of traffic from the Sovereign Grange development.

• The new residents of the development will complain of smells and flies from the chicken farm opposite the site during the summer.

7.1.2 10 Letters of support have been received, 2 from Peterborough residents, noting the following points:

• It would be nice to be able to rent or buy an affordable property in the village.

• The site is in a great location on the edge of the village so will not cause congestion.

• Some people do not understand that there is a real need for housing.

• The housing will fulfil a local need and allow people to remain in the village.

• People in the village find it hard to find housing.

• Houses in the village will support local businesses.

• The proposed dwellings on the Oak Lane and Old School site provide for the few, not the many who wish to remain in the village.

• The development would tidy up a dilapidated site.

• Repositioning the 30mph sign will make the village safer.

7.2 Kings Cliffe Parish Council: Object. Concerns include:

• Previous recent developments have fulfilled Kings Cliffe's housing requirements.

• There are already significant traffic issues in the village and the development would add to this.

• Amenities would be overstretched.

• It would be difficult to assimilate a 'satellite community' on the edge of the village.

• Further development is likely to come forward on this site. 30 dwellings is just 'the thin end of the wedge'.
The proposal would set a precedent for development outside the settlement boundary.
- The site is close to Willow Brook.
- The density of the proposal bears no resemblance to the adjacent dwellings.
- The site has already been rejected for the KCNP because:
  - It lies outside the existing (RNOT), and proposed (KCNP), settlement boundary.
  - It would create a 'satellite community' outside the main built area of the village.
  - It would create a sprawl along the Blatherwycke Rd, and extend the village into open countryside.
  - The site would allow for more development than was required, or desired, under the KCNP.
- The KCNP has allocated two other sites for housing:
  - Land off Daleswood Rise for up to 10 houses ('predominantly affordable' - Policy SA3).
  - The western half of the old Middle School site for up to 70 housing units, including up to 40% affordable. While these are aimed at older people, they would still free up existing affordable (and market) housing to fulfil any need. The KCNP is therefore already fulfilling the recognised need for affordable/social housing without recourse to the application site.
- The Village Survey (2016), which gathered information for the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, asked how many new houses villagers were willing to see built during the period up to 2037. 67% of villagers responding chose the option of 'up to 50'. The developments planned for Daleswood Rise and the old Middle School site in the Neighbourhood Plan will easily fulfil this figure, and will be added to by windfall infill developments that are likely to emerge over the next decade. The addition of up to 30 houses in this application, on top of the developments already planned, will not have the support of villagers.
- The development does not accord with the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.
- Inaccuracies in the submitted documents.

7.3 ENC Tree and Landscaping Officer: No objection subject to a condition requiring an Arboricultural Management Plan and a landscaping plan.

7.4 NCC Archaeological Advisor: No objection subject to a condition requiring an Archaeological Programme of Works.

7.5 NCC Highways: No Objection, subject to conditions and provision of a bus stop within 400m of the application site.

7.6 NCC Minerals and Waste: No objection. Further clarification offered by the applicant and initial reservations have been withdrawn.

7.7 NCC Lead Local Flood Authority: No objection subject to standard conditions.

7.8 Environment Agency: No objection subject to a condition requesting further drainage details.

7.9 Natural England: No comments to make.

7.10 North Northants Badger Group: No objection subject to a condition requiring further badger monitoring and a pre-commencement check for protected species.

7.11 NCC Ecological Advisor: No objection subject to a condition stipulating that the development be carried out in accordance with the submitted ecology method statement.

7.12 ENC Environmental Health: No objection subject to conditions regarding working hours, mud, location of the site compound and burning of waste on site.

7.13 ENC Environmental Health (Noise/Odour relating to poultry farm): Having spoken to the operator they run a free range system with the birds having free access to the outside and
poultry sheds. This type of poultry rearing usually does not have the same levels of environmental problems as would be associated with more intensive poultry units. As it is a constraint this should have been more prominent and given due consideration by the applicant and their agent(s).

Notwithstanding the above, the operator of the poultry farm has rightly raised concerns with respect to the introduction of sensitive development closer to the farm. The nearest residential property to the poultry farm at present is some 175m to the east. I have checked our records and we have not received any complaints to date with respect to flies, noise or odour associated with the poultry farm. However, this does not mean that introducing new housing would not result in complaints being made.

Whilst I can find no specific section in the NPPF it would not be unreasonable to apply the same principles as that laid out in section 123 of the NPPF which relates to noise in that planning decisions should aim to: 'recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established'.

Therefore, consideration should be given to whether allowing residential properties to be constructed closer to the poultry farm could result in complaints and the operator having to take action to mitigate against any adverse environmental impact. I do not believe the applicant has clearly demonstrated there will be no adverse impact at this time.

- The site is outside the confines of the settlement boundary.
- The proposed site has been assessed for the KCNP but rejected.
- The KCNP steering group has undertaken a village housing questionnaire.
- No evidence that the proposed affordable housing is required to satisfy a need within the village.
- Without evidence of clear need, policy objections relating to the site proposal and a lack of support for the proposal from the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, it is recommended that the application should be refused.

8. Evaluation:

8.1 The following considerations are relevant to the determination of this application:

8.2 Principle of Development:

8.3 Policy Context and The Development Plan

8.4 In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), planning applications must be considered against the provisions of the adopted Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan in this case consists of the Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan (no policies relevant to this application) and the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. A very limited amount of weight can be given to the Kings Cliffe Neighbourhood Plan which is currently in its first draft (Regulation 14) stage.

8.5 The North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy
8.6 The site lies outside the defined settlement boundary for Kings Cliffe (as defined in the adopted Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan 2011) and generally new housing outside settlement boundaries would be considered contrary to the development plan. Policy 11 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (NNJCS) states that development will be distributed to strengthen the network of settlements and the special mixed urban and rural character of the plan area with its distinctive and separate settlements will be maintained to avoid coalescence.

8.7 In the rural areas, development will be limited to that required to support a locally arising need which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement (2(a)). Part 2(b) states that Neighbourhood Plans may identify sites within or adjoining villages to help meet locally identified needs. 2(c) continues by noting that Local and Neighbourhood Plans will identify sites within or adjoining villages to meet rural housing requirements and any other type of development, other than small scale infilling and rural exceptions schemes, will be resisted.

8.8 Policy 13 (1) of the NNJCS deals specifically with rural exception schemes and permits, in principle, affordable housing, but subject to the following criteria:

a) The form and scale of the development should be clearly justified by evidence that it meets an identified need arising within a village or network of villages through a local needs survey;
b) Sites should be well related to a settlement that offers services and employment to meet the day to day needs of occupants of the development;
c) Development should enable access to local services and facilities by foot, cycle or public transport;
d) The scale and nature of the development will not exceed identified needs and must be appropriate to the surroundings, minimise impacts on the environment and be supported by existing or new infrastructure. Rural exceptions housing schemes should be purely affordable housing unless an element of market housing is essential to enable the delivery of the development. In such cases, the scale of market housing will be the minimum necessary to make the scheme viable and should be tailored to meeting specific locally identified housing needs; and
e) Occupation of affordable units within the development will be controlled through a legal agreement or conditions to ensure that it remains available and affordable in perpetuity to meet local needs.

8.9 The Draft Kings Cliffe Neighbourhood Plan and Housing Need Figures

8.10 The King’s Cliffe Neighbourhood Plan was subject to pre-submission public consultation during July to September 2017 (through regulation 14).

8.11 The Neighbourhood Plan contains a clear objective to provide homes to meet the needs of local people (Objective 1) and has undertaken a village survey to better understand such needs, which in turn has assisted policy drafting.

8.12 Policy H2 (Affordable Housing Need) identifies a perceived need to provide for smaller properties alongside social and starter homes. Site allocations are proposed in the Plan to meet this perceived need.

8.13 A number of sites have been assessed for suitability by the steering group, based on a list of criteria, which has resulted in the proposed allocation of a site at Daleswood Rise (Policy SA3) to accommodate future social housing, starter homes and smaller open market development to help meet local need. In addition further affordable housing provision is identified through the proposed site allocation (SA1) Old Middle School.

8.14 In respect of the proposal itself it can be argued that the steering group have assessed a number of sites in determining the suitability for providing for future affordable housing
need. The proposed site was assessed as part of this exercise and rejected as it was considered to create a satellite community, separate from the main built area of the village. Despite the limited weight that can be given to the Neighbourhood Plan at this stage, no clear evidence has been otherwise provided by the applicant to justify the proposal in terms of need, which would satisfy policy requirements.

8.15 Following the pre consultation (Reg 14) some limited weight can be given to the Neighbourhood Plan, particularly where clear support can be demonstrated. However, the consultation has resulted in a number of representations to the Plan, including representations from the District Council, which require amendments to proposed policy wording in order to overcome objections. This impacts on the weight that can be given to the Plan at this stage in its production.

8.16 Demonstrating Housing Need

8.17 With regards to part (a) of Policy 13 (1) the applicant would be required to demonstrate that the proposed development meets a locally arising need for affordable housing in the local area. The applicant has not submitted a Housing Needs Survey or any other up to date housing needs data in support of the application. Instead, the applicant relies upon the councils own Housing Needs Survey (Kings Forest Ward Housing Needs and Mix Requirements Assessment) undertaken in 2007 and updated in March 2016. The applicant also relies heavily upon conclusions made by the Kings Cliffe Neighbourhood Plan Group in the draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan.

8.18 However, the Neighbourhood Plan Group also considered data based on the Kings Forest Ward Housing Needs Assessment (updated 2016) in assessing affordable housing need, and this was supplemented by a general village survey which identified general support for the provision of social/affordable housing and homes for the elderly. No specific affordable housing need surveys were undertaken.

8.19 Whilst the above evidence provides some assessment of need and support for provision of affordable housing, there is no up to date Housing Needs Survey (HNS) relevant to Kings Cliffe. A HNS should therefore be undertaken to determine the level of affordable housing need that exists within the Parish.

8.20 The Councils Housing Enabling Officer has been consulted on the application and objects in principle. Aside from the point that the applicant has not provided any evidence in support of the proposal, the evidence that is available to the council suggest that Kings Cliffe has already had a significant delivery of affordable units in recent years. The Sovereign Grange development provided 30 units of family accommodation, consisting of 15 rented homes and 15 shared ownership units during the period of 2012-2014, giving Kings Cliffe the second highest level of affordable housing for all of the villages in the District. Housing Strategy is of the opinion that the Sovereign Grange development satisfied the immediate local need for affordable housing for families.

8.21 The current planning application does not provide any evidence to justify the need/type of affordable housing required to meet any existing or perceived future demand within the Parish. Without such evidence the proposal to support a rural exception site in Kings Cliffe cannot be supported.

8.22 Viability
8.23 The principle of having some market housing to facilitate the affordable housing element of a rural exceptions scheme is supported by paragraph 54 of the NPPF which states that "Local planning authorities should be responsive to local circumstances and plan housing development to reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing, including through rural exception sites where appropriate. Local planning authorities should in particular consider whether allowing some market housing would facilitate the provision of significant additional affordable housing to meet local needs".

8.24 The applicant has not submitted a viability appraisal to demonstrate that an element of market housing is required to support the viability of the affordable units, or to demonstrate a requirement for the proposed number of market units. The applicant has submitted an email from a social housing provider noting their interest in the proposed scheme, but this is grossly inadequate if the intention is that this email could be submitted in lieu of a viability report. The applicant has then failed to comply with criteria d) of NNJCS Policy 13 (1) through the lack of satisfactory viability information.

8.25 Conclusion

8.26 For the reasons set out above, the applicant has failed to evidence that there is a genuine local need for the proposed affordable housing, that the market housing is essential in order to provide that affordable housing, or that criteria a - d of NNJCS Policy 13 (1) can be met. In addition, the proposal would not accord with criteria a), b) or c) of Policy 11(2) of the same plan. As such, the proposed development would not be considered acceptable in principle and it is recommended that outline planning permission is refused.

8.27 Further, to consider a scheme that includes market housing the Council will expect, in addition to evidence of demand, to see:
  - A financial appraisal that demonstrates that any market housing is essential to enable the delivery of the affordable housing.
  - More than half of the development is affordable housing.
  - That the market housing like the affordable housing reflects local need and is integrated in scale and design.

8.28 Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area/Countryside:

8.29 The application site is located on the edge of the village and is surrounded by open countryside to the north, south and west. Although the site is somewhat unsightly at present, it retains a semi-rural feel and acts as a transitional zone between the built form of the village and the open countryside beyond.

8.30 In addition to this, it is clear that the density of the existing built form reduces at the edge of the settlement and the single row of semi-detached properties adjacent to the site and fronting onto the site is testament to this. The established character for the limited amount of residential development in the immediate area is low density, linear in layout and all with a frontage to the road.

8.31 The proposed development would introduce a high density residential development with small housing estate like qualities and the design principles behind the indicative plan are far removed from what would be considered an acceptable design rational for this site if the principle of development were considered to be acceptable. The indicative site plan does not show dwellings with a layout to mirror the character of the adjacent linear development, and the proposal would instead increase the density of development on the periphery of the village, rather than follow the pattern of development by creating a reduction in density towards the openness of the countryside. This would also result in a development that would appear 'tacked on' with limited physical assimilation with the built form.
8.32 The proposal would undoubtedly have an adverse impact on the rural character of the site and, although the sheds and other paraphernalia currently on part of the site are somewhat unsightly, the site does retain a semi-rural feel which would be lost as a result of this development.

8.33 Furthermore, there is no evidence provided by the applicant to demonstrate that the need for a development of affordable units is so great that it would outweigh the detrimental impact that the proposed development would cause and similarly, there is no justification for a development of this scale.

8.34 House Design and Layout- specific comments

8.35 Whilst the design and layout of the development is indicative at this stage, sufficient information should be provided to illustrate whether an acceptable form of development could be accommodated at the reserved matters stage.

8.36 The applicant has provided a very basic indicative site plan, which shows the position of the proposed dwellings, gardens and parking alongside the access routes throughout the site and an area of open space. However, the plan is flawed in that it shows in excess of the proposed 30 dwellings and also includes a block of 1 bed flats (shown as house type D), which is not included as part of the proposal when examining the written details on the application form. As such, the indicative plan fails to give an accurate demonstration of the principles behind the proposed scheme.

8.37 Nevertheless, it is clear that the full application site could accommodate 30 dwellings with appropriate parking and amenity space which is essentially one of the key considerations for this outline application. The design, layout and scale for the proposed scheme can be considered in full detail at a reserved matters stage.

8.38 Highways:

8.39 The proposed access point would fall approximately 50 metres outside the 30 mph speed zone and therefore exits directly onto a road with a speed limit of 60 mph. However, the Local Highway Authority (LHA) has confirmed that the NCC Speed Review Panel has recently agreed to extend the 30 mph speed zone, which will then include and extend beyond the access point for the proposed development.

8.40 Given that the access point will shortly fall within a 30 mph limit zone, the LHA has confirmed that the proposed 2.4m x 43m visibility splays would be sufficient to serve the development. The applicant has submitted amended drawings demonstrating that the required visibility splays can be achieved and a condition could be used to secure the splays in perpetuity if the recommendation were to be positive.

8.41 The Local Highway Authority has also commented that the applicant would need to commit to providing a bus stop within 400m of the site given the peripheral location of the development and in order to mitigate against the less sustainable village location. The applicant has not provided any details of a bus stop in response to the LHA comments. Therefore, until this information is provided, there is still uncertainty as to whether the infrastructure directly required for this development would be provided, and as such, a refusal reason is recommended on this basis.

8.42 The main access routes within the site would need to be constructed to adoptable standards. This could be secured by condition and ensured throughout the reserved matters stage.
8.43 A number of representations received including the Parish Council comments are concerned with Highway Safety issues, including road layout, existing speeding problems and history of accidents. The Highway Authority has been consulted on the proposal and initially objected on the grounds that the application did not demonstrate that it would not adversely affect Highway Safety. The applicant has addressed the initial concerns of the Highway Officer through the amended plans. E.g. detailing visibility splays and access width etc. and it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant highway safety issues such that the refusal of the application on these grounds could be justified. The proposed access is considered to meet all of the required standards, subject to standard conditions.

8.44 Impact on Residential Amenity:

8.45 As this application is in outline, with all matters (except access) reserved for later consideration, it is not possible to fully assess the impact on residential amenity at this point. The site abuts existing residential development at the north/north eastern end and careful consideration would need to be given at the detailed design stage to ensure the residential amenity of those existing residents is not harmed. At this stage, it is clear that there is sufficient space on the site, such that the new dwellings could be satisfactorily accommodated.

8.46 There is no indication that the new dwellings could not be constructed to comply with the standards set out in Policy 30 (e.g. space and accessibility standards), or relate acceptably to one another. The indicative plan does not fully define the gardens of all of the individual dwellings shown and for some plots it is not clear whether a usable size garden is to be provided. Nevertheless, it is considered that there is sufficient scope for this to be addressed at reserved matters stage.

8.47 Conditions regarding construction times, mud and the need for a construction management plan would be requested if the application was recommended for approval, as requested by the Council's Environmental Protection Team.

8.48 The application site is positioned to the south east of an established free range poultry farm. The applicant has not acknowledged the existence of this farm and has failed to explore or address any impact that could be experienced through the introduction of a residential development in such close proximity to the farm, in terms of flies, noise and odour. The nearest residential properties to the farm are currently 175 metres away and the proposed development would be closer. Whilst there are no records of any complaints with regard to flies, noise and odour associated with the poultry farm, this does not mean that the proposed housing would also exist without issue, particularly as it would lie within closer proximity.

8.49 In addition, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not only be acceptable subject to unreasonable restrictions being put on the existing business carried out at the established poultry farm in order to limit the impact on the proposed dwellings. As such, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on the occupiers of the proposed development and/or the existing business at the nearby poultry farm and therefore the proposed development does not comply with paragraph 123 of the NPPF and Policy 1 and 8 e) i and ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

8.50 Trees and Landscaping:
8.51 The proposal would result in the loss of a substantial number of trees along the site frontage, however the Council's Senior Tree and Landscape Officer has not raised any objection to the loss of the trees. It would be important that a suitable hard and soft landscaping scheme is agreed by planning condition if approved to ensure appropriate tree and shrub planting to the site frontage to soften the development and to retain and supplement the boundary hedge to the west of the site as this forms the boundary with the countryside.

8.52 Sustainability:

8.53 NNJCS Policy 13 (1) c) expects that for a rural exception scheme to be acceptable, the village concerned has at least a basic range of services appropriate to the form of housing provided, and there are no more sustainable locations available.

8.54 Kings Cliffe currently has a School, village shop, post office, bakery and a public house and this is considered to meet the above requirement.

8.55 Although the site is on the periphery, the majority of the facilities in the village would be within a reasonable walking distance (usually considered to be 800m) of the site and footpath access is available.

8.56 Whilst it could be argued that there are other more sustainable sites elsewhere (such as larger villages or towns), these would not meet the local need for affordable housing, if that need is found to be present.

8.57 Ecology:

8.58 The application is accompanied by a Biodiversity Report. This has been considered by the Wildlife Advisor at Northamptonshire County Council, who confirms she is satisfied with the report and recommends that the mitigation measures and method strategy outlined in the report are secured by a suitably worded planning condition. In addition, The Northants Badger Group is satisfied with the proposal subject to a condition requesting further badger monitoring, with further details submitted for approval if badgers are found. Subject to these conditions, it is not considered that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on important habitats or protected species.

8.59 Developer Contributions:

8.60 The NPPF paragraph 204 states:
'Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.'

8.61 These tests are taken from the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended) Regulation 122. The NPPF then goes on to state that obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition.
8.62 Developer contributions for Primary education and Libraries have been requested by Northamptonshire County Council. No Secondary education contribution is required. These contributions would have been secured by S106 agreement had the recommendation been favourable, provided that the viability of the scheme would allow. The applicant has not submitted a Heads of Terms and has not provided any confirmation to date that they will be willing to deliver the contributions and would be providing a legal agreement. Therefore, until this information is provided, there is still uncertainty as to whether the infrastructure directly required for this development would be provided, and as such, a refusal reason is recommended on this basis.

8.63 Renewable Energy and Efficiency Measures:

8.64 NNJCS Policy 9 requires the incorporation of energy efficiency and sustainable construction measures, provision for waste reduction/recycling, water efficiency and water recycling. A condition could be used to agree satisfactory details in accordance with Policy 9.

9. Other Issues:

9.1 Drainage: The Environment Agency does not object to the proposed development subject to a condition to secure a phasing scheme for the provision of foul water drainage.

9.2 Flooding: The site lies within Flood Zone 1 so is at relatively low risk of flood. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment and a SuDS is proposed in order to inform the indicative design principles (for further consideration at reserved matters stage) to deal with any surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority has been consulted on additional information submitted by the applicant and comments will be reported on the update sheet if necessary.

9.3 Archaeology: If the recommendation was favourable, a planning condition would have been recommended to ensure that a programme of works, consisting of a geophysical survey and trial trenching, is undertaken.

9.4 Horse Rider Safety: The LHA has confirmed that the proposed access would have appropriate visibility splays and that the development would not have a detrimental impact upon highway safety; thus, the development would not have a specific detrimental impact on horse rider safety to a degree which would warrant the refusal of this application.

10. Recommendation:

10.1 That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

11 Conditions/Reasons -

1. The proposal would result in part affordable, part market housing development on unallocated Greenfield land outside the defined settlement boundary and on a site which does not relate well to the built form of the village. The applicant states that the proposal is to be considered as a rural exception site but has not submitted or referred the Local Planning Authority to any robust evidence in the form of a Housing Needs Assessment in order to demonstrate that there is a local housing need, or that the proposed development would satisfy locally identified housing needs. Given that the applicant has not put forward a convincing case in favour of the development, the proposal does not accord with Policy 11 2 a), b) and c), and Policy 13 1 a) and d) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and Paragraph 7 of the NPPF.

2. The proposed development is not purely for affordable housing and the applicant has failed to provide any supporting evidence to demonstrate that an element of market housing is essential to enable the delivery of the development, or the workings to
demonstrate the basis on which the proposed number of market units has been reached, in order that the scale of the market housing is the minimum necessary to make the scheme viable as required by Policy 13 (1) (d) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and Paragraphs 7 and 54 of the NPPF.

3. The proposed development by reasons of its scale, density and peripheral location would detract from the linear and more diffuse built form along Blatherwycke Road, which is a key transitional area between the very dense built form of the village and the sparsely populated open countryside. The proposal, therefore, would fail to conserve and enhance the existing landscape character and the character and appearance of the village. The proposed development would be contrary to paragraphs 17 and 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and Policy 1, Policy 3 a),b) and d), Policy 8 d) and Policy 13 (1) b) and d) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 and Paragraphs 9 and 64 of the NPPF.

4. In the absence of a satisfactory unilateral undertaking or any other form of Section 106 legal agreement, the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that the infrastructure directly required for the proposed development will be provided and as such the proposal would be contrary to Policy 10 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 and the adopted East Northamptonshire Council Developer Contributions SPD 2006.

5. The applicant has not acknowledged the existence of the free range poultry farm to the north west of the application site and has failed to explore or address any impact that could be experienced through the introduction of a residential development in such close proximity to the farm, in terms of flies, noise and odour. In addition, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not only be acceptable subject to unreasonable restrictions being put on the existing business carried out at the farm in order to limit the impact on the proposed dwellings. As such, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on the occupiers of the proposed development and/or the existing business at the farm and therefore the proposed development does not comply with paragraph 123 of the NPPF and Policy 1 and 8 e) i and ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

Informatives

1. This decision relates to the following drawings:
   BL0001
   Received: 28/11/17
   OS0001
   Received: 28/11/17
   OS0002
   Received: 28/11/17
   OS0003
   Received: 28/11/17
   00011 A01
   Received: 09/01/18
   0004 A02
   Received: 21/05/18
   IND0001
   Received: 11/01/18

2. In reaching this decision the Council has implemented the requirement in the NPPF to deliver sustainable development in a proactive and positive way in accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187. Whilst the Council has considered the planning merits of the proposal as set out in the application, these do not outweigh the harm identified in terms of conflict with the development plan, viability, provision of a legal agreement to secure the necessary infrastructure, environmental impact, and landscape impact. The key issues have been clearly set out in this decision notice and in the committee report and a copy of these documents can be viewed on the Council’s website.
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Ward Rushden Spencer
Parish Rushden

Applicant Mrs A Jardine - Redhouse Plans Limited

Agent None

Location 55 Rushmere Way Rushden Northamptonshire NN10 6YB

Proposal Reserved matters: pursuant to planning application 16/01774/OUT: Outline application; Erection of single storey dwelling (all matters reserved except access) dated 17.11.2016

This application is brought before the Committee at the request of Councillor Barbara Jenney.

1 Summary of Recommendation

1.1 That Reserved Matters Approval is GRANTED.

2 Proposed Development

2.1 The application seeks to agree the detail of a single storey dwelling following the granting of Outline Planning Permission.

3 The Site and Surroundings

3.1 The application site is part of a rear garden of a detached property in Rushmere Way. It is to be accessed from Larkhill which runs alongside the side of the property. There are a variety of designs of dwellings in the surrounding area which are all of a similar age.

4 Policy Considerations

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework

4.2 North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011 to 2031 - Policies 1, 8, 11 and 30.

4.3 The Rushden Neighbourhood Plan.

4.4 Highway Authority Standing Advice and Countywide Parking Standards.

5 Planning History

5.1 16/01774/OUT – Outline application for a single storey dwelling – approved.
6 Consultations and Representations

6.1 Rushden Town Council - No objections.

6.2 County Highway Authority – Summary of final views on receipt of amended drawings – The pedestrian visibility splays are acceptable.

6.3 Neighbours - Letters sent to 4, 21, 22 and 23 Larkhill plus 53 Rushmere Way.

6.4 A site notice was put up on 26th June 2018.

6.5 In response, an objection has been received from a neighbouring property to the South. This points out they are in an elevated position compared to the proposed dwelling. As a result, they consider there may be overlooking between their first floor windows and those proposed for the side elevation of the property facing their house. In addition, they request that permitted development rights are removed for the dwelling to prevent further works to it, including ones to the roof, in the event that planning permission is granted.

6.6 Another adjacent resident raises, in summary, the following objections:

- The slope of the site is too severe to develop and building on it will cause subsidence in the surroundings.
- The services in the area are insufficient to cope with this extra dwelling.
- The house will have inadequate mean of disabled access.
- The development will impact on adjacent privacy.
- The estate where it be located was laid out in the past to accommodate a specific number of dwellings and any extra ones are contrary to wording in the deeds.

6.7 A further objection has been received which also considers the development to be contrary to the density and privacy principles when the estate was first developed and that the design is out of keeping with surrounding properties.

6.8 Finally, there is an objection from another nearby resident which advises:

The development at 55 Rushmere Way is totally out of keeping with the existing properties for the following reasons -

- Larkhill has 2 unique house designs (not seen elsewhere in Rushden) – this proposal has a totally different design and elevations
- Larkhill are all 2 storey properties – this proposal is single storey
- Larkhill have 4 bedroom plus detached properties – this proposal has 2 small bedrooms plus a bedroom/study (no bed shown)
- Most Larkhill properties have been extended and are now 4 to 6 bedroom properties – this proposal is not attached to a property and sets a precedence for future small separated developments
- Larkhill has a density of approx. 25 properties to the hectare – this proposal is at a density of approximately 90 to the hectare
- Most Larkhill properties have a garage and many have double garages – this proposal has no garage and no potential for building one
- Larkhill have good sized front and rear gardens i.e. amenity and family space – this one has no frontage (basically parking) and a very small rear garden.
- This is in essence back land development but there just happens to be a side exit – passing the proposal will set a precedent and open the door for squeezing anything in anywhere in Larkhill.
- There is ample space to integrally extend 55 Rushmere Way without building a separate dwelling.
• The recently adopted Rushden Neighbourhood Plan states in 3.1 - ‘Aside from housing need, the vision for the plan is to ensure that where new houses are built they are appropriate in size and designed so that they integrate acceptably with the existing settlement’. I consider this proposal is at complete variance with this requirement of the Neighbourhood Plan.

• ENC has a responsibility to maintain the character of older existing sites such as Larkhill, and not to populate them with out of keeping dwellings.

• I would like to repeat (as mentioned in my objection to the outline planning application) that an original application for development of this site in 2010 was rejected by ENC Planning due to ‘being at odds with the built form’.

7 Evaluation

7.1 National guidance contained within the 2018 NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment as good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

7.2 In brief, the NPPF promotes a presumption in favour of development within the established built up areas of a town, provided that all other material considerations can be satisfied. In addition, Criterion d of Paragraph 122 of the NPPF points to the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens).

7.3 Policy 1 of the JCS seeks to secure sustainable development and Policy 11 identifies the hierarchy of preferred locations. In the context of Policy 11, Rushden is recognised as a growth town which is to be a focus for new development including housing.

7.4 As Outline Planning Permission has already been granted, the principle of a single storey dwelling on this site has been established. In response to concerns about the ability of the services and infrastructure in the area being able to cope with extra development, in connection with this previous application, it was accepted that the developer will have to ensure the dwelling has adequate arrangements in terms of items such as drainage and water supply to serve the site. These are separate matters to the determination of this application. The purpose of this application is therefore just to assess the detail of the proposal.

7.5 In such cases, Policy 8 of the JCS is relevant. This requires for development to be in keeping with the character of an area, to be of an acceptable design, to have acceptable access and parking arrangements and not to have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbours.

7.6 In addition, Policy EN1 of Rushden Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure a high quality of design including having materials which respect those in the vicinity of the application site and not having an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

7.7 In terms of the size of the proposed dwelling and the density of development compared to the principles when the estate was originally laid out, the proposed footprint allows for it to have a rear garden which is similar to a number of properties nearby including 7 and 14 Larkhill plus 16 and 18 Martin Close. In addition, in response to the request from a neighbour for permitted development rights to be removed, a condition is already included on the Outline Planning Permission removing the usual rights for items such as extensions and sheds as a control on the plot becoming over developed. This remains in force. On this basis, the size of the dwelling that is proposed in this case is considered acceptable in the context of the surroundings.

7.8 It is noted that an objector advises an extra dwelling such as this is contrary to the deeds of the properties on the estate. This is a separate legal matter to the determination of this planning application and, in any event, Outline Planning Permission has already been granted which allows for a single storey dwelling on the site.
7.9 Following concerns about the steepness of the site, a drawing has also been submitted which shows how the dwelling will fit in with adjacent land levels and this is also considered acceptable. The separate application in relation to the Building Regulations will need to secure acceptable foundations to address issues such as possible subsidence.

7.10 In terms of the size of the dwelling and the internal accommodation, Criterion b) of Policy 30 of the JCS requires dwellings to meet the National Space Standards. These require a 3 bedroomed, 5 person bungalow such as this to have an internal floor space of at least 86m2. In response to this, the applicant's agent has advised the internal floor space will be 88m2. The bedrooms are also acceptable in terms of the minimum sizes quoted in the Standards. In view of this, it meets the Space Standards and therefore provides living accommodation of an acceptable size.

7.11 In terms of design, there are a variety of dwelling types in the immediate surroundings including ones with at least some of the first floor in the roof space. From some directions, this gives an appearance that is not unlike a bungalow. These include number 55 Rushmere Way. In this context, a single storey dwelling, as is proposed in this case, is not considered out of keeping with the surroundings. Indeed this has been accepted by the outline planning permission which is for a single storey dwelling, and the design principles of the new property – including horizontal boarding to the front elevation such as that found at No. 22 Larkhill – echo those found in the locality. In addition, the proposed dwelling is set back from the frontage of the site in a similar way that other houses on the development are. On the basis of all these points, it is considered that the design is acceptable.

7.12 The materials will comprise Kimbolton Red bricks and slate grey mini stonewold tiles. The brick colour is considered acceptable and the Council's records show the proposed tiles have been used in the vicinity, for example at 19 Larkhill. They are therefore also acceptable.

7.13 In relation to possible impacts on adjacent dwellings in amenity terms, it is noted that the adjacent property to the South is concerned about overlooking between three windows that are proposed for the side elevation facing their property and first floor windows in the side of their dwelling and in particular in relation to a proposed study window. In response to this, these windows will be set in only 2m from the boundary and the side elevation of the adjacent property is approximately 12m away from this boundary. This distance plus the presence of the boundary treatment (the drawings confirmed this is a 1.8m high fence) is considered sufficient to ensure any overlooking between these windows is insufficient to justify refusing planning permission.

7.14 The bungalow will also have windows facing the front and rear. These are not considered to give rise to any significant overlooking implications.

7.15 In addition, as the property is only to be single storey, it is considered that adjacent dwellings are far enough away so that it will not significantly impact on the amount of light they receive.

7.16 In relation to concerns about parking provision, the proposal includes a double access with allows enough space within the site for two cars to park side by side off the highway. In accordance with the current adopted Countywide parking standards, this amount of parking provision is considered acceptable for a property such as this which will have 3 bedrooms.

7.17 The point of access was accepted as part of the Outline Planning Application and remains the same. The drawings submitted with the application show this achieves the necessary 2.4m x 2.4m in both direction required by the Outline Planning Permission. These have been accepted by the County Highway Authority. The Outline Permission also contains other detailed requirements that the access and parking areas will need to comply with. These comprise the following:
- The minimum width of the access shall be at least 6.0 metres for the first 5.5 metres from the highway boundary and no gates shall be installed across it.
- The access gradient, between the correct level at the highway boundary (back of footway) and a point of 5m back, shall not exceed 1 in 15, in the positive or negative direction and shall be hard paved.
- The development shall include a positive means of drainage to ensure that surface water from the property or access does not discharge onto the highway or neighbouring properties.

In response to these, there is enough space on the submitted drawings to achieve the 6m width and 5.5m depth. The other items will need to be complied with when this area is laid out.

7.18 On this basis, the proposal is considered acceptable on access and parking grounds.

7.19 In terms of landscaping, the site is not considered to be of sufficient size to justify asking for a full landscape scheme. Any planting which takes place in the front and rear garden will serve this purpose.

7.20 In addition to the existing rear boundary and the side boundary with number 4 Larkhill, a new 2m high timber fence is proposed where the plot is to be split off from the garden of 55 Rushmere Way. This is considered acceptable.

7.21 Overall, it is considered that the proposed design would be in keeping with the surroundings and are considered to be no reasons relating to impact on neighbours to justify refusing the application.

8 Other Issues

8.1 The site is within 3km of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area (SPA). In accordance with Policy 4 of the JCS, applications for dwellings in this area have to make a financial contribution to help mitigate against the impact on this SPA. This requirement was, however, not been adopted at the time the Outline Planning Permission was granted and therefore cannot be considered as part of this application, which is only to agree the detail of the proposed dwelling.

9 Recommendation

9.1 That Reserved Matters Approval is granted.

10. Conditions/Reasons –

1. The Application shall be carried out strictly in accordance with drawings 18-017-01F and 18-017-02E.
   Reason: In order to clarify the terms of the Planning Permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted.

Informatives

1. Reason for Decision

In reaching this decision, this Council has implemented the requirement in the NPPF to deliver sustainable development in a proactive and positive way in accordance with paragraph 38.
Plan of front Garden area with proposed garage showing hedges & trees - NONE to be removed.
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Parish: Rushden

Applicant: Mr J and Mrs M Lee
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Location: 225 Avenue Road, Rushden, Northamptonshire, NN10 0SN
Proposal: Erection of Pre fabricated wooden garage in front garden

This application has been called in to be determined by the Council's Planning Management Committee by Councillor David Jenney following an objection from Rushden Town Council.

1. Summary of Recommendation

1.1 That permission is GRANTED subject to Conditions.

2. The Proposal

2.1 The application involves the construction of a new single garage at the front of the property.

3. The Site and Surroundings

3.1 The proposal is located in a ribbon development of houses extending out of Rushden.

4. Policy Considerations

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework.

4.2 Policies 1 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

4.3 The Rushden Neighbourhood Plan

4.4 Other documents - Northamptonshire Highway Standing Advice plus Countywide Parking Standards.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 None

6. Consultations and Representations

6.1 Rushden Town Council – Objects to the above application for the following reasons:

- The proposed building extends beyond the existing building line.
- The proposed building is out of character with the neighbouring properties and the construction and materials are out of keeping with existing buildings.
6.2 County Highway Authority – Has no comments to make.

6.3 Neighbour Notification – Letters were sent to 194, 196, 196A, 223 and 227 Avenue Road.

6.4 Site notice put up on 3rd July 2018.

7. Evaluation

7.1 Design, materials, impact on neighbouring amenity and parking provision/highway safety are relevant to the determination of this application.

7.2 National guidance contained within the NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment as good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

7.3 Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy seeks to secure sustainable development and Policy 8 requires new development to comply with a number of sustainable principles including being of a high standard of design, having adequate parking provision, being safe from a highway point of view and not having an impact on the amenities of neighbours.

7.4 In addition, the Policy EN1 of emerging Rushden Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure a high quality of design including having materials which respect those in the vicinity of the application site, not having an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity and making provision for an appropriate amount of outdoor space.

7.5 The proposal involves the construction of a single garage at the front of the property. It was originally to be 4.8m long by 3.05m wide. The Countywide parking standards specify that, to be acceptable for parking purposes, single garages need to be at least 6.0m long by 3.3m wide. In response to this, the applicant has advised the purpose of the garage is to keep his sports car in. This is smaller than a more modern car. He has slightly increased the width and length of the garage but it is still of insufficient size to be suitable for general parking purposes. In such a situation, the applicant has to prove that there is enough parking provision elsewhere on the property without the need to rely on this garage. The number of parking spaces is dependant on the number of bedrooms it has. The applicant has confirmed this is a three bedroomed dwelling. Such properties need two off road parking spaces. Each space needs to be 3m wide by 5.5m long. A drawing has been submitted which shows enough room for three such spaces without having to rely on the garage. This point has therefore been addressed.

7.6 In addition, as the garage is to be used for keeping a vehicle in, there needs to be enough space to manoeuvre in and out of it. Usually, 6m is expected to allow vehicles to reverse out and turn that is clear of obstacles. A drawing has been submitted which shows this is achieved in this case.

7.7 The access to the property is not to be altered as a result of the works and it is noted that the County Highway Authority has no comments to make on the application.

7.8 In view of the above, it is not considered justified to refuse the application on parking or highway grounds.

7.9 The garage will be located to one side at the front of the property. The frontage of the dwelling will therefore still be visible when it is in place. It is noted that the Town Council object to the application as they consider it to be forward of the building line. However, it is not unusual to see garages in such a location along this road. As an example, a recent permission (14/01553/FUL) at 180 Avenue Road for two dwellings involves both of these having a garage on the frontage. There is also planning permission at number 184 (17/00954/FUL) for another one in a similar location and another has been approved under reference 17/02541/FUL at number 183. Furthermore, the dwellings at numbers 198 and 200
which are diagonally opposite the property subject to this application both have a garage which extends to the front of the property. Finally, there is also a garage at the front of number 221 in a similar location to the one proposed in this case. On this basis, the principle of having a garage at the front of the property in this position is considered acceptable in visual terms.

7.10 In terms of the specific design, the garage will have gabled ends and a shallow pitched roof. It is noted that Rushden Town Council's second ground of objection is that they consider the design is out of character with the surroundings and the proposed material (timber is proposed) is out of keeping with existing buildings. In response to the comments about the character of the area, Avenue Road has a variety of house and building types and so there is no uniform character. In relation to the materials, it is accepted that most of the other garages quoted above are all of brick construction. However, the one proposed in this case is smaller in scale than them all apart from the one at number 221 (which is constructed of corrugated metal). A garage of the proposed type of design is common in gardens and timber is acceptable for such a building. On this basis, it is considered acceptable in terms of appearance. This material can be secured via planning condition. It is also considered appropriate to ask for the wood to be stained dark brown to help it blend in with the surroundings. The applicant has agreed to this.

7.11 In terms of height, the garage will be a maximum of 2.5m tall with a height of 1.96m at the eaves. This is not considered excessive. The front garden is also surrounded by trees. These are shown on the submitted drawings as to be retained. As the garage is to be of timber construction, it will not have any significant foundations. The development can therefore take place without a significant impact on these. Their retention can be secured via planning condition during construction works and will provide some screening for the garage. The garage is considered acceptable in this context and in terms of impact on the surroundings and street scene.

7.12 In terms of impact of the garage on neighbouring amenity, the closest dwelling on the side of the property where it is to be built is number 227. The driveway for that property is on the opposite side of the boundary to where the garage is to go. This offers a degree of separation from the dwelling at number 227. The boundary treatment also comprises a significant hedge. The degree of separation, hedge and relatively low height of the garage are considered to be sufficient to ensure any impact from the garage on the amount of light received in the front windows of number 227 is insufficient to justify refusing planning permission.

7.13 All of the other adjacent properties are further away and so will be impacted on to a lesser extent.

7.14 The garage is also considered to be too small to justify imposing a planning condition restricting the use of it to ones ancillary to the dwelling.

7.15 In terms of potential for overlooking, the garage will have no accommodation in the roof space. As a result, it will result in no issues of overlooking towards adjacent properties.

7.16 Overall, the proposal is considered to be of an acceptable design which does not have a significant impact on neighbouring amenity. The property will have the maximum amount of parking provision that the countywide parking standards specify. On this basis, planning permission should be granted.

8. Recommendation

8.1 That permission is GRANTED subject to the following Conditions:
9. Conditions/Reasons -

1. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
   Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development shall be finished in materials as described in the application and the timber shall be stained dark brown. These materials and colour shall be retained in perpetuity thereafter.
   Reason: To achieve a satisfactory elevational appearance for the development.

3. The trees marked as 1 to 6 on the revised 1:100 scale site layout plan showing the garage with a width at 3.3m shall be protected during the course of construction works in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction.
   Reason: To ensure a reasonable standard of development and visual amenity for the area.

4. Except where otherwise stipulated by condition, the application shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the revised 1:100 scale site layout drawing and the revised 1:50 scale plan and elevation drawings all showing the garage with a width at 3.3m plus the 1:1250 scale site location plan.
   Reason: In order to clarify the terms of the Planning Permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted.

Informatives

1. Reason for Decision.

In reaching this decision, this Council has implemented the requirement in the NPPF to deliver sustainable development in a proactive and positive way in accordance with paragraph 38.
Darsdale Farm, Raunds
This application is reported to the Planning Management Committee because it falls outside the Scheme of Delegation in Part 3.2 of the Council's Constitution 2017, as it seeks to vary a major planning proposal.

1. Summary of Recommendation

1.1 That the variation be APPROVED subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to secure S106 financial contributions and subject to conditions.

2. Background and the Proposal

2.1 Outline planning permission was granted for the construction of up to 460 dwellings under ref: 07/02238/OUT and reserved matters approval was given for 381 dwellings under ref: 13/01604/REM. The planning permission was varied to increase the number of dwellings by one plot (to a total of 382 dwellings) and to include other changes to the layout and elevations under reference 16/00864/VAR and an application was more recently submitted to vary the Code for Sustainable Home levels under reference: 17/01680/VAR.

2.2 The southern area of the site adjacent to Chelveston Road (Phase 1 - comprising of approximately 165 dwellings) will be implemented mostly in accordance with the original approval. The currently submitted application seeks to re-plan the remainder of the development area to the north and west comprising of 217 dwellings. The application seeks permission for changes to the mix of housing, replacement of some of the approved house types with alternative house types, and to alter the parking provision/ layout for some of the plots and the relationship of the buildings to spaces. The proposed substitution of house types apply to the market units Plots 1-58, 71-106, 111-114, 253-327, 355-359 and 366-381. Some changes are also proposed to the layout of the affordable housing plots, including Plots 59-70, 107-110, 115-121, 328-354 and 360-365, although the house types for the affordable units remain the same.

2.3 The total number of residential units remains unchanged for the site at 382 dwellings and the number of affordable houses (77) and market units (305) will be the same.

2.4 A non-material amendment was submitted under ref: 17/02578/AMD to substitute the house types for various plots and to alter the parking and space layouts across the site. This application was refused as the changes, in accumulation, would affect a significant proportion of the development and as the changes would have highway, urban design and other implications, the proposals were not considered to be non-material in nature. The agent/
applicant was advised that a formal planning application would be required to allow these matters to be considered and hence the submission of the current application.

2.5 Amended plans were received during the course of the application to address the concerns put forward by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) and re-consultations were carried out with the LHA and Northamptonshire Police.

3. The Site and Surroundings

3.1 The application site comprises 17.28 hectares of land on the southern edge of Raunds. To the west of the site is Chelveston Road, and to the north Wellington Road and Whitney Close. The site is bounded by residential development along the west and northern boundaries and is surrounded by open countryside to the east. The site has mainly been in agricultural use and the farm buildings of Darsdale Farm are situated towards the south of the site.

3.2 The town centre of Raunds is situated approximately 1 mile to the north. Stanwick village lies to the south west of the application site.

3.3 Levels vary across the site and comprise of two plateaus (to the north and south).

3.4 There are a number of footpaths in and around the site, notably on the south-eastern boundary linking Chelveston Road with the town centre.

3.5 At the time of the receipt of the planning application, housing development is already underway near the Chelveston Road area (southwest of the site) and the off-site highway improvement works along Chelveston Road, which includes traffic calming and the provision of a mini roundabout are being completed.

4. Policy Considerations

4.1 National Planning Policy Guidance:
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 2018

4.2 North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 2016
Policy 1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy 3 - Landscape Character
Policy 8 - Place Shaping Principles
Policy 11 - Network of Urban & Rural Areas
Policy 29 - Distribution of New Homes
Policy 30 - Housing Mix & Tenure

4.3 Raunds Neighbourhood Plan 2017
Policy R1 - Ensuring an Appropriate Range of Sizes and Types of Houses
Policy R2 - Promoting Good Design
Policy R3 - Flexibility and Adaptability in New Housing Design
Policy R4 - Car Parking in New Housing Development

4.4 Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance:
Sustainable Design SPD 2009
Trees & Landscape SPD 2013
Planning Out Crime in Northamptonshire SPG 2003
Recreational Open Space Design Guide SPG 1999
Domestic Waste SPD 2012
4.5 Other Documents:
Local Highway Authority's Standing Advice 2016
Northamptonshire Parking Standards 2016
Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard 2015

5. Other Planning History

5.1 17/02542/AMD, Non-material amendment submitted and approved to alter the facing materials for Plots 149, 150, 160 and Plots 151-154, 157-159, 161-163, 171-179, 188-190, to substitute the previously approved 'Worcester Red Multi' brick with 'Fulwood Red Multi'.

5.2 17/01793/AMD, Non-material amendment submitted and approved to alter the facing materials for Plots 211, 213 to 216 and 192 to 195, to substitute the previously approved 'Worcester Red Multi' brick with 'Fulwood Red Multi'.

5.3 14/00871/VAR, Variation submitted to alter the alignment of the street between the Chevelston Road access at Rushmere through to Plots 271/272 pursuant to the reserved matters, and was approved.

5.4 14/01605/VAR, Application submitted and approved for changes to the Code of Sustainable Homes. The code level requirements were subsequently reviewed and altered under the more recent application submitted under ref: 17/01660/VAR.

6. Consultations and Representations

6.1 Raunds Town Council: Has raised concerns for the following reasons: "This effects over 200 houses including the affordable housing. With the lack of information for the Town Council to understand we refer this to ENC for their consideration".

6.2 ENC Housing Strategy: Objection raised. The Council's Housing Strategy team have requested for an affordable detached four bedroom bungalow to be included within the replan, as this would contribute towards the mix for the site and the range of affordable properties available.

6.3 Local Highway Authority requested for the following information in their initial email responses dated 24.04.2018 and 18.05.2018:

- Clarification on the overall number of residential units that would be provided on the site and if the number of bedrooms for the individual units would be increased, "It is acknowledged that the approved layout may be approved before the new NCC parking standards were introduced";
- "There is a change from tandem parking to side by side or highway frontage parking for Plots 59-66, 68-73 and Plot 110. This is an improvement over the previous layout";
- "Plot 111 has an additional parking space which is welcomed";
- "The parking at 45 degrees to the highway (Plots 34-134) should be at 90 degrees as it is difficult to see behind when reversing out. It is not known whether this has already been approved or is new to this application?";
- "Trees should be located 2.5 metres from the highway boundary... The hedge at the entrance gateway is shown right up to the footway and this should be set back 1 metre to prevent overgrowing onto the footway".

Taylor Wimpey subsequently provided further information and revised plans in response to concerns raised by the LHA: "We have considered the comments of the local highways authority and relocated trees within the areas affected by this application so that they are 3 metres from the highway (footpath) boundary. As you have discussed with Kevin Bendall of Taylor Wimpey, it is not practical to relocate trees within Phase 1 of the development, where development is completed and occupied, and in any case those areas are outside the scope of changes sought by this application. Nevertheless, trees have been set back from the
highway in Phase 1 where practicable and some of the plants that appear to be trees on
plan are in fact shrubs. The hedge at the entrance gateway has been set back to prevent
overgrowing onto the footway. The parking at 45 degrees to the highway (adjacent to plots
34-134) has been amended so that it is positioned at 90 degrees to the highway."

The LHA in the latest comments received on 29.06.2018 do not object to the proposals and
have no further comments to offer.

6.4 Senior Tree & Landscape Officer: "I have no objections to the revised landscaping
proposals as there are minimal differences and will not impact on the visual amenity of
the site."

6.5 Crime Prevention Officer: Has made the following comments/ observations:
- Considers the revised parking, house types and change in orientation of the dwellings
  (including the corner plots) to be acceptable;
- But has concerns about bins being left on the street making them vulnerable to ASB/
  arson and anti-social behaviour, as it appears that there are no bin collection areas for
  Plots 59-66 and 68-73 (12 plots in total), and also certain plots have some distance to wheel
  their refuse bins out i.e. Plots 63, 69, 72, 78, 79, 80.

7. Evaluation

7.1 The submitted application mainly seeks permission for changes to the mix of housing,
replacement of the previously approved house types with alternative house types, to alter
the parking layout of some of the plots and the relationship between buildings and spaces.
Therefore, the following considerations are relevant to the determination of this application:

7.2 Mix of Housing Types & Tenure

7.3 Policies R1 and R2 of the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan seek to ensure that an
appropriate range of sizes and types of houses be provided and to ensure good design. The
table below sets out the previously approved and now proposed mix of housing for the entire
site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Houses</th>
<th>As approved</th>
<th>Now proposed</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>3636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>146138</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>111118</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bed</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>6666</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.4 A small increase is proposed to the number of four bedroom properties (increase by 7
properties), however, a balanced mix of property sizes would be maintained across the site.
As part of the change in house types, it could be noted that various detached plots have
been reconfigured with semi-detached houses (i.e. Plots 270, 271, 309, 310, 324, 325, 357,
358) and groups of three terraces have been replaced with semi-detached houses (i.e. Plots
299 and 300). It is considered that such changes would contribute towards the mix of
property types that would be provided around the individual residential areas i.e. where there
have been previously too many detached houses consented along one street, and would add
interest to the street scene. The proposed change of house types, overall, would continue to
provide a range of detached, semi-detached and terraced house types across the site.

7.5 Design, Visual Impact/ Character and Appearance

7.6 The principal roads and general layout and arrangement of houses in relation to the
roads/ side streets remain generally the same. Changes are proposed to the house types,
parking and garden layout of a number of individual plots across the site, however, the resultant impact on the street scene and the overall 'sense of place' that would be created would remain similar to that originally consented. The proposal will provide a modern residential scheme comprising mainly of two storey houses, with also some 2.5 storeys tall buildings. 18 x 2.5 Storeys houses were previously approved for the site and the revised scheme proposes a further 9 more houses (giving 27 x 2.5 storey houses in total). However, as these would be evenly distributed across the site, no significant visual impact would result from these changes. Moreover, the proportion of open spaces, natural landscaped and water featured areas would remain the same and the materials to be used for the elevational treatments (as illustrated in the submitted materials schedules) would match and harmoniously contrast with those which have already been consented. Therefore, there would be no significant impact from the proposed changes on the wider landscape.

7.7 Highway Impact

7.8 A 'landscaped island' incorporating on-street parking bays was previously consented towards the north eastern area of the development. Changes are proposed in this application to allow the parking spaces to be aligned 90 degrees to the main street and to replace a number of tandem parking spaces (i.e. for approved Plots 67 to 74) with frontage parking. These proposals would improve accessibility into the parking spaces and visibility for users, and would adhere with the Local Highway Authority's recommendations.

7.9 The small increase in the number of four bedroom properties (by 7 houses) would not significantly increase the parking requirement for the development. The Local Highway Authority's Parking Standards (2016 document) was not in force at the time of the originally approved reserved matters and it would not be possible to insist on these standards as the original development was consented back in 2013. Nevertheless, the majority of the houses on the site would have on-plot parking on average of 2 spaces and for the four bedroom houses, the majority of these would have two parking spaces, in addition to a garage. Overall, it is considered that there would be no more parking impact arising from the proposed changes in comparison with the scheme previously approved.

7.10 The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have been re-consulted on the proposals and revised plans were received to address the concerns raised by the LHA about the positioning of some of the landscaping (in particular trees) due to their proximity to the road and impact on visibility.

7.11 Various footpath links which provide access within the site and which connect the site to the wider area were previously consented and these would remain un-affected by the layout changes proposed in the current application. The layout of the access roads remains principally similar to the original consented scheme; therefore, access and turning for refuse and emergency vehicles would be as per the original approval.

7.12 Crime & Disorder

7.13 The application seeks to replace some of the previously approved corner-plot house types with an alternative house type (i.e. house type P with PA49) and to change the orientation and design of the houses situated on many of the corner plots (i.e. Plots 86, 95, 270, 271, 293, 294, 319, 376). Such changes would still enable adequate surveillance to be provided to the open space and more secluded public footpath areas, as well as provide an 'active frontage' to the main publically visible areas.

7.14 The Crime Prevention Design Officer (Northamptonshire Police) has raised concerns about bins being left on the street making them vulnerable to ASB/ arson and anti-social behaviour, as it appears that there are no bin collection areas for Plots 59-66 and 68-73, and certain plots have some distance to wheel their refuse bins out i.e. Plots 63, 69, 72, 78, 79, 80. Amended plans have been received identifying the location of bins/ collection areas for these plots. However, it would be extremely difficult to insist on the provision of suitable bins
storage for all of the units, as the originally consented scheme did not identify provision for all
of the plots. Furthermore, it is likely that a proportion of the occupiers would store their bins
within their own curtilage/rear garden for the convenience of transferring daily waste direct to
the bins. Therefore, on balance, it is not considered that there would be any more anti-social
issues arising from the bin storage arrangements proposed in this application than the
scheme previously approved and a refusal of planning permission for these reasons would
be extremely difficult to justify.

7.15 Residential Amenity/ National Space Standards (NSS)

7.16 The agent has provided a letter to advise that the proposed house types do not comply
with the National Space Standards and this was the same for the original house types
approved back in 2013: "The original reserved matters approval pre-dates the adoption of the
North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS 2016) and the proposal makes no change
to the number of units. As such, the introduction of a requirement at this stage to meet the
National Space Standards under Policy 30 of the JCS would be unjustified". As there is no
net increase in the total number of proposed dwellings in this application, it would not be
reasonable for the Council to apply the National Space Standards to the proposed change in
house types (in particular, in relation to the storage requirements). Nevertheless, the majority
of the plots would provide reasonable sized accommodation and gardens for the future
occupiers, and on balance, the overall scheme would be extremely difficult to refuse on
residential amenity grounds. Furthermore, while there would be a small increase in number
of four bedroom properties, the internal floor areas of these larger units are generally
compliant with the Standards.

8. Other Issues

8.1 Housing Strategy’s Request for Bungalows - Since the determination of the original
application, Policy 30 a) of the adopted North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016
identifies the need for house types to accommodate smaller households, including "dwellings
designed for older people" and Objective 1 and Policy R1 of the adopted Raunds
Neighbourhood Plan 2017 seek to ensure a "suitable range of tenures, types and sizes so
that local people of all ages can continue to live in the town in a suitable home". The
Council’s Housing Strategy team has requested that an affordable detached four bedroom
bungalow to be included within the re-plan, as this would contribute toward the mix for the
site and the range of affordable properties available. This matter was referred to the applicant
for consideration and the agent responded with the following comments: "The 4-bed
bungalow would have a floor area of 100sqm and would take up the site area of 3no AA21
affordable houses, so the substitution of one bungalow for two dwellings would not be
possible. Notwithstanding this, the difficulty with providing a bungalow is that, due to the land
levels within the Phase 2 area, it is impractical to provide a bungalow to the appropriate
accessibility standards within the Building Regulations. All of the affordable housing blocks
proposed within Phase 2 would have stepped access. Therefore we must decline this
request to provide a bungalow." As the originally approved affordable housing scheme did
not include bungalows and given the agent’s response above, the view could be taken that a
bungalow would be difficult to insist.

9. Recommendation

9.1 That the variation be APPROVED subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to
secure S106 financial contributions and subject to the following condition(s):

10. Conditions/Reasons -

1. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, the development shall be carried out in accordance
with the approved drawings and documents as submitted for outline planning application
07/02238/OUT) and the following plans submitted for 16/00864/VAR:
TWY024-01 Rev D Planning Layout - Sheet 1 of 3

Planning Management Committee
15 August 2018
Reason: To ensure that the development is implemented in accordance with the planning permission.

2. No more than 80% of the Open Market Units in any Phase shall be occupied until the Affordable Housing Units in that Phase have been completed and transferred to the Registered Provider unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
   Reason: To meet the aim of creating a balanced and sustainable community

3. The access road from Chelveston Road through the site of "Rushmere", as shown on plan submitted by applicant on 23rd April 2012, shall not have any new residential units along its length, within the site edged red unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.
   Reason: To protect the residential amenity of the existing properties adjacent to the access road.

4. The development permitted by this permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (dated October 2007) the FRA Addendum (dated March 2009) and the FRA Addendum (dated July 2010) ref Rev B Issue 2.
   Reason: To reduce the risk and impact of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants, surrounding area and third parties.

5. Construction works which may cause noise that is in excess of the background levels, when measured as a 15 min LAeq at the boundary of the site or at any other place as may be agreed by the Local Planning Authority shall be carried out only between the hours of 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 09.00 - 13.00 hours on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays. This includes deliveries to the site and any work by contractors or sub contractors.
   Reason: To maintain the amenities of the area.

6. The demolition of the residential property (and associated buildings) known as "Rushmere" on Chelveston Road shall not be undertaken before the submission of, and approval of, a plan of works showing how the works will be undertaken and how the security of the adjacent properties is to be safeguarded.
   Reason: To maintain the security and amenities of the adjacent residential properties and to ensure that subsidence does not occur to adjoining properties.

7. Prior to the approval of any of the reserved matters applications, a comprehensive Phase 2 intrusive geo-environmental and geo-technical investigation must be submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority including:
   - an initial trial pit to confirm the general geology of the site and allow recovery of soil samples for analytical testing;
- a geotechnical investigation to inform design of both foundations and infrastructure and determine the availability of material suitable for reuse;
- additional Physiologically based Extraction tests for arsenic
  Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and safe form of development

8. Development shall not commence until a phasing plan linked to infrastructure provision for the development hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall not take place other than in accordance with the approved phasing plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
  Reason: To ensure an appropriate form of development which is satisfactorily served by infrastructure.

9. There will be no occupancy of any dwelling until such time as the appropriate drainage works have been completed in accordance with the drainage proposals approved by the Local Planning Authority as phased within Condition 8.
  Reason: To reduce the risk of potential flooding and pollution incidents.

10. Prior to the submission of reserved matters a detailed Development Phasing Plan showing how the development will be built out and when facilities and uses within the site along with the access points will be available for use shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Development Phasing Plan shall ensure that no more than 200 dwellings of any nature or tenure are occupied without two full, linked and operational points of vehicular access are available and such streets shall be available to accommodate the enhanced public transport services. The development shall thereafter be built out in accordance with the approved Development Phasing Plan.
  Reasons: In the interests of highway safety.

11. Reserved matters applications pursuant to this development hereby permitted shall be accompanied by a quality audit which shall consider the function, use and practicality of the proposed layout. The audit shall include:
  - visual quality audit
  - review of how the streets will be used by the community
  - a road safety audit including risk assessment
  - access audit
  - walking audit and cycle audit
  - non-motorised audit, and place check audit
  - public transport accessibility, permeability and infrastructure provision within the site. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
  Reason: In the interests of highway safety

12. The proposed development shall follow a Design Code linked to infrastructure provision which follows the design objectives set out in the Design and Access Statement and 6 Parameter Plans that accompanied the application. The Design Code shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the approval of any reserved matters application. The Design Code shall set out the design principles and objectives for the development and the reserved matters application shall be submitted in accordance with the approved Design Code.
  Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and safe form of development which is satisfactorily served by infrastructure.

13.
  a) The development hereby approved shall achieve the following technical standards:
     i. A site wide average 19% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions against the dwellings combined Target Emissions Rate (TER) as determined by part L1A of building regulations 2013 (using SAP 2012)
     ii. Achievement of an internal water efficiency calculation of no more than 105L/person/day as calculated by the national water efficiency calculation tool.
b) Within 3 months from the date of this planning approval, the following details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval:

i. Details of photovoltaic panels required to achieve the target emission rates as set out above and in line with the approved Sustainability Statement (JSP - July 2017) including the specification of the photovoltaic panels and on which dwellings the panels will be located.

ii. Details of the as designed dwelling SAP ratings demonstrating all dwellings achieve the Building regulations target emissions rate through fabric efficiency alone prior to any solar contribution

iii. A schedule of dwelling specific water consumption calculations demonstrating all dwellings achieve the detailed water efficiency standard

c) A verification report will be submitted following the completion of each phase of development to demonstrate that the approved photovoltaic panels and water efficiency measures have been incorporated into the development.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In the interest of environmental sustainability, in-line with national and local planning policies.

14. Prior to the approval of any reserved matters applications a hazardous materials survey must be undertaken of the Darsdale Farmstead area and a report including mitigating measures must be submitted to and approved by the Local planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory and safe form of development

15. Prior to the approval of any of the reserved matter applications, a Landscape Strategy Plan (in accordance with the approved Landscape and Visual Appraisal) for the site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include the positions of all areas of open space (including allotments) within the site together with details of the existing and proposed contours of the land, hard and soft landscaping, use of materials, street furniture, fencing and lighting. The reserved matters applications shall be designed and subsequently implemented in accordance with the approved Landscape Strategy Plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development which is satisfactorily served by green infrastructure.

16. Prior to the approval of any reserved matters application, a repeat phase 1 habitat survey should be undertaken, to establish whether there has been any change in the extent or nature of the use of the site by protected species. This survey shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority. The results of the survey will be used to inform a working design, methods statement and timetable of works to mitigate any undue adverse effects to species. This information shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. No development shall be carried out except in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In order to safeguard the protected species identified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and to ensure that any loss of existing habitat is successfully mitigated for.

17. Prior to the approval of any reserved matters application, an Ecological Management Plan (in accordance with the approved Ecological Assessment) for enhancement and creation of biodiversity, including long-term design objectives, protection of existing species, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas, other than small, privately-owned domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The management plan shall be carried out as approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to ensure a net gain in green infrastructure and safeguard the protected species identified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and to ensure that any loss of existing habitat is successfully mitigated for.

18. Prior to the submission of any of the reserved matter applications, a detailed scheme for the provision, implementation, ownership and maintenance of the surface water drainage for the site in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (dated October 2007), the FRA Addendum (dated March 2009) and the FRA Addendum (dated July 2010) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The detailed scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is occupied.
   Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

19. No development shall commence until full engineering, drainage, street lighting and other constructional details of the off site highway works to form all of the site accesses (including vehicular, pedestrian, cycle, public transport and emergency vehicle) pedestrian/cycle improvements to Chelveston Road and into the town centre, signalisation of the Red Lion Roundabout and Traffic calming of Stanwick Road have been submitted to and approved by Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be laid out and constructed in accordance with such approved details and be completed prior to the first occupation of the first residential unit of the development.
   Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

20. Details of all hard and soft landscaping works for each phase of development shall be carried out in accordance with the details that have first been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development within that phase. Within each phase, the works shall be carried out in accordance with the programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of five years from the date of planting, any trees or plants or any replacement planting is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, replacement trees and plants of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted in the next planting season, in the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
   Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development which is satisfactorily served by green infrastructure.

21. Reserved matters applications shall be accompanied by a Sustainability Report that demonstrates how environmental sustainability issues have been addressed during the design process and sets out the way in which the Zero Carbon energy target will be achieved based on the actual design of the residential units in the particular development phase.
   Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development.

22. Details of photovoltaic panels or other on-site energy generation technologies and how these will generate 10% of the sites energy requirement shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval within 3 months from the date of this planning approval. The submitted details shall include the specification of the photovoltaic panels and on which dwellings the panels will be located. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
   Reason: In the interest of environmental sustainability, in-line with national and local planning policies.
23. No development shall take place until a Travel plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Travel Plan shall include details of implementation throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the A45 Trunk Road continues to serve its purpose as part of the national system of routes from through traffic in accordance with Section 10(2) of the Highways Act 1980 by minimising disruption on the Trunk Road resulting from traffic entering and emerging from the application site and in the interests of road safety.

24. Details of secure bicycle parking for each phase of development shall be submitted concurrently with the reserved matters applications and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development within that phase. The approved facilities shall be made available for use before the development in each phase is occupied and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose, unless otherwise agreed in writing.

Reason: To ensure that adequate cycle facilities are provided to serve the development.

25. Pedestrian visibility splays of at least 2.4m x 2.4m (2m x 2m where there is turning space within the site) shall be provided on each side of the vehicular access. These measurements are taken along and to the rear of the highway boundary within the curtilage of the site. The areas of land forward of these splays shall be reduced to and maintained at a height no exceeding 0.6m above carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

26. Vehicular visibility splays of 2.4m (measured from the carriageway channel along the centre line of the access/street) by at least 33.0m in both directions (measured from the centre of the access /junction along the carriageway edge). Any features within the resultant triangular areas should not exceed 0.9m above the carriageway level.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

27. All single drives shall be a minimum of 3.0m wide, whilst shared private drives should be a minimum of 4.5m wide for the first 10m from the highway (existing or proposed). The area shall be hard paved with no loose surfacing material and have a maximum gradient of 1 in 15 and be maintained as such.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

28. Prior to first use or occupation the proposed access, parking and turning facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for the purpose.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

29. Prior to first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted a positive means of access drainage shall be installed to ensure that surface water from the access or private land does not discharge onto the highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

30. Any gates at the point of access shall be hung to open inwards into the site only.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

31. Details of boundary treatments for each phase of development shall be submitted concurrently with the reserved matters applications and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development within that phase. The scheme shall show the type and height of the means of enclosure and the approved boundary treatment associated with each building in a phase shall be provided before the building is occupied.

Reason: To ensure that the boundaries of the site are properly treated so as to secure a satisfactory standard of development.
32. Before development commences a working design, methods statement and timetable of works to mitigate any undue adverse effects to bats shall be submitted to approved in writing by the LPA. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.
   Reason: In order to safeguard the protected species identified under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and to ensure that any loss of existing habitat is successfully mitigated for.

33. Details of the finished floor levels for each phase of development shall be submitted concurrently with the reserved matters applications and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development within that phase and shall include full details of finished floor levels for each building and finished site levels (for all hard surfaced and landscaped areas) in relation to existing site levels. The development shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved level details unless otherwise agreed in writing.
   Reason: To ensure that construction is carried out at suitable levels having regard to drainage, access and the appearance of the development.

34. Details of storage of refuse and materials for recycling for each phase of development shall be submitted concurrently with the reserved matters applications and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development within that phase. The approved facilities shall be made available for use before the development in each phase is occupied and those areas shall not thereafter be used for any other purpose, unless otherwise agreed in writing.
   Reason: In the interests of amenity and to secure a satisfactory standard of development.

35. Details of the access roads, footways, cycle ways and connections within the site to the existing highway, footpath and cycle way network for each phase of development shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development within any phase. The internal roads shall be designed to allow efficient circulation of buses through the site and the future provision of bus stops within the site. The access roads, footways, cycle ways and all connections shall be designed to adoptable standards and laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any building in each phase.
   Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development.

36. The Reserved Matters applications shall take account of community safety objectives set out in "Safer Places" and shall be accompanied by a report which demonstrates the way in which the scheme has been developed to address community safety objectives and which shall be implemented concurrently with the development.
   Reason: In the interests of community safety.

37. The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of a comprehensive contaminated land investigation has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and until the scope of works approved therein have been implemented. The assessment shall include the following measures unless the Local Planning Authority dispenses with any such requirements in writing:
   A site investigation shall be carried out to fully and effectively characterise the nature and extent of any land contamination and/or pollution of controlled waters. It shall specifically include a risk assessment that adopts the Source-Pathway-Receptor principle and takes into account the sites existing status and proposed new use. Two full copies of the site investigation and findings shall be forwarded to the Local Planning Authority.
   Reason: To ensure potential risks arising from previous site uses have been fully assessed.
38. Where the risk assessment (undertaken as part of condition 37) identifies any unacceptable risk or risks, a detailed remedial strategy to deal with land contamination and/or pollution of controlled waters affecting the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. No works, other than investigative works, shall be carried out on the site prior to receipt and written approval of the preferred remedial strategy by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the proposed remediation plan is appropriate.

39. Remediation of the site shall be carried out in accordance with the approved remedial strategy. No deviation shall be made from this scheme without the express written agreement of the Local planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure site remediation is carried out to the agreed protocol.

40. On completion of remediation, two copies of a closure report shall be submitted to the LPA. The report shall provide validation and certification that the required works regarding contamination have been carried out in accordance with the approved Method Statement(s). Post remediation sampling and monitoring results shall be included in the closure report.

Reason: To provide verification that the required remediation has been carried out to the required standards.

41. If, during development, contamination not previously considered is identified, then the Local Planning Authority shall be notified immediately and no further work shall be carried out until a method statement detailing a scheme for dealing with the suspect contamination has been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that any unsuspected contamination encountered during development is appropriately dealt with.

42. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme, including phasing, for the provision of foul water drainage on and off site, incorporating pollution control shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans and specification at such time(s) as may be specified in the approved scheme. No dwelling in a phase shall be occupied until the works for foul water drainage associated with that phase have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of pollution to the water environment.

43. Prior to the commencement of works affecting an existing public right of way, full details of any enhancement, improvement, diversion or closure shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of users of public rights of way and in the interests of securing a sustainable development.

44. Prior to the commencement of any phase of development, an Arboricultural Method Statement showing all existing trees and hedgerows affected by that phase of development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Method Statement shall include details of all the trees and hedgerows to be removed and those to be retained and the method of protection of the retained trees and hedgerows during the course of the development. The Method Statement shall be prepared having regard to the approved Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The tree and hedgerow retention and protection shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To safeguard as many natural features of the site as is reasonable for the development proposed.

45. No development shall take place until there has been an intrusive archaeological evaluation and the implementation of a mitigation scheme, or a programme of
archaeological work and publication in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which has been submitted in respect of the area of archaeological significance and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and Northamptonshire County Council's Archaeological Officer.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological matters are adequately considered in each phase of the development.

46. Prior to the commencement of development, a scheme for the location of fire hydrants shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of fire safety.

47. Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, temporary vehicle wheel cleansing facilities shall be submitted to an agreed by the Local Planning Authority. These facilities shall be used by all vehicles leaving the site during each phase of construction and shall be permanently maintained in working order throughout construction of each phase of development.

Reason: To ensure that construction works do not prejudice the conditions of safety and cleanliness along the neighbouring highway.

48. Prior to the commencement of development a Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMP shall include and specify the provision to be made for site procedures to be adopted during the course of construction, including:

- overall strategy for managing environmental impacts which arise;
- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt,
- control of noise emanating from the site
- hours of construction work
- contractors compounds, material storage and other storage arrangements, cranes, and plant, equipment and related temporary infrastructure
- designation, layout and design of construction access and egress points to minimise disruption or access for existing residents and new residents of the development internal site circulation routes
- directional signage(on and off site)
- provision for emergency vehicles
- provision for all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles loading and unloading plant and material
- provision for all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles for parking and turning within the site during the construction period
- details of measures to prevent mud and other such material migrating onto the highway from construction vehicles.
- routeing agreement for construction traffic and limits on deliveries to the site during peak school times
- storage of plant and materials used in construction
- enclosure of phase or development parcel development sites and the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- waste audit and scheme for waste minimisation and recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- soil stockpiling and material crushing and sorting, control of dust and other emissions, construction noise and vibration from the development.

The provisions of the CEMP shall cause minimum disturbance in the surrounding area. Construction of development shall proceed in accordance with the CEMP.

Reason: To maintain the amenities of the area in accordance with the NPPF.
49. Details of the lighting scheme for any parking courtyards for each phase of
development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to
the commencement of that phase of development and shall be fully implemented prior to
the first occupation of the units served by each parking court.
Reason: In the interests of safety and amenity.

50. Prior to the occupation of any dwellings in a particular phase, the applicant shall submit
for approval a management and maintenance schedule for any children's play areas in
that phase of development.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development which incorporates
appropriately managed and maintained play areas.

51. Prior to the occupation of any dwellings in a particular phase, the applicant shall submit
for approval a management and maintenance schedule for areas of open space (including
any SUDS) in that phase of development.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and in order to ensure that the
scheme flood alleviation measures are implemented.

Informatives

Your attention is drawn to the following notes:

1. In reaching this decision the Council has implemented the requirement in the NPPF
to deliver sustainable development in a proactive and positive way in accordance
with paragraph 38. The applicant/agent was provided with the opportunity to address
the concerns raised by the Local Highway Authority, Northamptonshire Police and
the Council's Housing Strategy Officer and was given the opportunity to provide
further information/ revised plan in support of the application.

2. The following additional information was taken into consideration in reaching this
decision:
Chave Planning letter dated 27.03.2018 ref: 1151.L04
Chave Planning letter dated 03.05.2018 ref: 1151.L05
Schedule of Approved and Updated Drawings dated 26.06.2018
Application Forms
Emails received from Chave Planning during course of application

3. Please be advised that any conditions discharged as part of outline planning
permission 07/02238/OUT and 13/01604/REM, 14/00871/VAR, 16/00864/VAR and
17/01680/VAR would subsist and would not require discharge under this new
planning permission.

4. No works affecting any existing public right of way may commence without the
express written permission of the Highway Authority's Rights of Way team.

5. The applicant is reminded of the need to inform East Northamptonshire Council's
Environmental Protection team if at any time a stone crusher is bought on to the site
in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2007.

6. The applicant's attention is drawn to the document entitled: "Contaminated Land - A
guide for developers and their advisors". This can be obtained from East
Northamptonshire Council's web site or directly from Environmental Protection.
7. Erection of flow control structures or any culverting of a watercourse requires the prior written approval of the Environment Agency under S23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 or S 109 of the Water Resources Act 1991. The Environment Agency resists culverting on nature conservation and other grounds and consent for such works will not normally be granted except for access crossings.

8. The implementation of off site highway works or any works that may affect the existing highway requires the explicit written permission of the Local Highway Authority. Such permission would be issued subject to the completion of an agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980, as amended. Full engineering, drainage, street lighting and other related constructional details would need to be submitted for the approval of the Local Highway Authority. The details would be the subject from the approval of the Local Highway Authority. The details would be subject to a full technical and safety audit which may result in changes or amendments to the details shown indicatively on the planning approved details.
The application is brought before the Committee as the applicant is an employee of East Northamptonshire Council.

1. Summary of Recommendation

1.1 That permission is GRANTED subject to conditions.

2. The Proposal

2.1 The proposal seeks to erect a rear and side extension around an existing rear projecting kitchen.

3. The Site and Surroundings

3.1 The application relates to a semi detached property in an area of dwellings constructed in similar style.

4. Policy Considerations

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework.

4.2 Policies 1 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011 to 2031.

4.3 The Rushden Neighbourhood Plan.

4.4 Other documents - Northamptonshire Highway Standing Advice plus Countywide parking standards.

5. Relevant Planning History

5.1 None
6. Consultations and Representations

6.1 Neighbours: Letters sent to 51 and 53 Oakpits Way plus 85, 87, 106 and 110 Harborough Road

6.2 A Site Notice was also put up on 26th June 2018.

6.3 Rushden Town Council – No objections.

7. Evaluation

7.1 Visual impact and impact on the amenities of neighbours are relevant considerations to the determination of this application.

7.2 National guidance contained within the NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment as good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

7.3 Policy 1 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy seeks to secure sustainable development and Policy 8 of the same document requires new development to be of a high standard of design which does not impact on the amenities of neighbours. In addition, Policy EN1 of Rushden Neighbourhood Plan seeks to ensure a high quality of design including having materials which respect those in the vicinity of the application site and not having an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity.

7.4 This proposal involves wrapping a single storey extension around an existing rear projection at the property. It will have a concrete tile roof and be constructed of reclaimed bricks. It is not considered excessive in size compared to the existing property and sufficient rear garden will remain behind it. The design is considered acceptable.

7.5 The proposed materials are to comprise imperial Wellingborough reclaimed bricks and Redland Renown Red roof tiles to match those on the existing property and this can be secured via planning condition.

7.6 The works will not change the current situation in terms of parking and vehicular access arrangements at the property. These comprise parking in the highway at the front and an access at the end of the rear garden.

7.7 In terms of impact on light, numbers 110 and 106 Harborough Road are potentially the most affected.

7.8 Number 110 adjoins the applicant’s property but the extension will only be built out as far as a ‘lean to’ building attached to the rear of that dwelling. It will therefore not impact on the light at that property.

7.9 To the other side, there will be a small gap of approximately 1m to the boundary and then there is a gap that is wider than a single garage and pedestrian gateway at number 106 which will separate the proposed extension from that dwelling. As has been noted, the extension is only to be single storey. It will also only be 2.8m tall at the closest point with the boundary to number 106. In view of these points, it is considered that the separation offered by this gap plus the boundary treatment within it, is enough to ensure any impact on side and rear facing ground floor windows at number 106 is insufficient to justify refusing planning permission.

7.10 In addition, the fact that the extension is only single storey and is set in from the boundary means it is not going to be overbearing in relation the garden of number 106.
7.11 The extension will have rear facing bifold doors and a side facing single door and window. The bifold doors will look down a long rear garden and the side facing door and window will have views towards number 106 interrupted by the boundary fence. There will therefore be no significant overlooking issues from it.

7.12 Overall, the proposal is considered to be of an acceptable design and there is no impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties or the surroundings to the extent which would justify refusing the Application.

8. Other issues

8.1 None.

9. Recommendation

9.1 That permission is GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

10. Conditions/Reasons -

1. The development permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
   Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be finished externally in materials to match the existing building. The approved materials should be retained in perpetuity thereafter.
   Reason: To achieve a satisfactory elevational appearance for the development.

3. Except where otherwise stipulated by Condition, the application shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the 1:1250 scale location plan, the 1:200 scale block plan plus the 1:100 scale proposed elevations and floor plans.
   Reason: In order to clarify the terms of the Planning Permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted.

Informatives

1. Reason for Decision

In reaching this decision this Council has implemented the requirement in the NPPF to deliver sustainable development in a proactive and positive way in accordance with paragraph 38.
Committee Update Report
Planning Management Committee – 15th August 2018
Index of Applications for Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Ref. No. and Page No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Officers Rec.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 2</td>
<td>Blatherwycke Road, Kings Cliffe</td>
<td>Refuse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Update**

**New NPPF:**

References to NPPF paragraphs to be amended as follows:

- Refusal reason 1 - remove reference to NPPF paragraph 7 and replace with paragraph 2
- Refusal reason 2 - remove reference to NPPF paragraphs 7 and 54 and replace with paragraphs 2 and 77
- Refusal reason 3 - remove reference to paragraphs 9 and 64 and replace with paragraph 127
- Refusal reason 4 - no change
- Refusal reason 5 - remove reference to paragraph 123 and replace with 170 and 182.

An assessment has been carried out comparing the relevant sections of the recent NPPF with the previous version. Whilst the detailed wording has changed, the sentiment behind each of the relevant paragraphs has remained consistent. The guidance contained within the new NPPF would still guide officers towards a refusal for this particular application, for the same reasons as stated in the case officers report, and as amended below in relation to environmental impact.

**Refusal Reason 1 - Housing Need:**

In response to refusal reason 1, the applicant submitted the following statement on 07.08.18 to justify the need for the proposed development:

*Kingscliffe is a small village in the northern part of East Northants the closest large town being Peterborough. There is not a great deal of employment in the rural area therefore there is a need for affordable rented housing.*

*We need to keep a stock of affordable housing in the area in order to retain the newly formed households and let the village grow. Having properties with gardens & parking maintains the general standard of the village and reduces any parking clutter in already over parked streets*
The Councils Housing Enabling Officer responds to the Applicants statement as follows:

I don’t think the comment from Longhurst provides any statistical information or detail to substantiate that there is a housing need that indicates that an exception site of 30 units (20 affordable and 10 open market) on the periphery of the village should be developed. Exception site schemes are specifically for applicants with a local connection to the village. A recent 3 bedroom vacancy in the village attracted 9 bids none of these were from local applicants. This property is not on an exception site and is considered to be District stock so was allocated to an applicant from outside the village. The lack of local applicants suggests that there isn’t a significant local demand or certainly not for older style properties.

The submitted statement does not alter Officers view of the proposal in relation to the relevant national and local policy and refusal reason 1 still stands.

Refusal Reason 2- Viability:

The applicant submitted viability information (consisting of an Excel spreadsheet with figures) to the council on 10.08.18. The applicant has submitted this information late in the process and the council has not been given enough time to obtain a view from an independent viability assessor on the suitability of the information submitted. However, from an initial assessment by officers, it is clear that there is no accompanying report to explain and justify the submitted figures, so it is unlikely that the viability information would be adequate. As such, refusal reason 2 remains in place.

Refusal Reason 5- Neighbouring Poultry Farm:

The applicant has submitted an environmental report which relies on the observations carried out by the ecologist whilst on site between May and July. Environmental Protection responds as follows:

In reference to the application for 30 houses at Kings Cliffe, Environmental Protection has received additional but basic report findings in relation to our concerns of noise, odour and flies etc. from the existing poultry farm potentially affecting the proposed development. The poultry farm whilst small in size is well established and to date we have not received any complaints from neighbouring residents. Notwithstanding this the information provided by the applicant is limited and solely based on observations of an ecologist during site visits in May and July. During this time the weather was generally hot and dry and not generally representative of the weather we usually experience. The report is not detailed enough to satisfy Environmental Protection that the poultry farm will not have an effect on the proposed development. We recommend a more detailed assessment is undertaken from a suitably qualified consultant in the areas of noise, odour and flies.

Refusal reason 5 is therefore amended to read as follows:

The applicant has failed to adequately explore or, if necessary, address the full impact of the free range poultry farm to the north west of the application site, including any impact that could be experienced through the introduction of a residential development in such close proximity to the farm, in terms of flies and odour. In addition, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not only be acceptable subject to unreasonable
restrictions being put on the existing business carried out at the farm in order to limit the impact on the proposed dwellings. As such, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on the occupiers of the proposed development and/or the existing business at the farm and therefore the proposed development does not comply with paragraph 170 and 182 of the NPPF and Policy 1 and 8 e) i and ii) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

Other comments:

Ecology - An updated ecology report submitted on 07.08.18 confirms that the site has low populations of both common lizard and slow worm. As recommended in section 4.3 of the report, the reptiles would need to be captured and translocated to a suitable site nearby. The condition originally recommended by the NCC Ecologist covering mitigation measures, method strategies and badger monitoring would deal with the ecology on site appropriately and would have been attached to the planning permission if the recommendation had been positive.

Comments from Applicant: The applicant states in comments dated 08.08.18 that the update report to committee is incorrect regarding discussions at the meeting held on 05.07.18 as Officers said that they would wait until the Housing Need Survey was done before taking the application to committee. Officers disagree that this is what was agreed.

---

18/01136/REM 55 Rushmere Way, Rushden

Update

Following queries raised at the members site visit on 10th August, further details have been received of the proposed levels of the site. These show a stone gabion wall of a maximum of approximately 1.2m tall to be constructed along the side boundary with the property at 55 Rushmere Way. The proposed boundary fence will then be placed on top of this. A slide showing this wall will be in the presentation to Committee.

In addition, as an additional safeguard against the possibility of overlooking towards the garden of number 53 to the rear, the applicant has agreed to install an additional fence in front of the existing one which will be 2.5m tall. This is shown on an amended drawing which has been received.

Officer Response

These arrangements are considered acceptable. Accordingly, Condition 1 of the recommended Reserved Matters Approval should be updated as follows to include reference to this detail so that it is secured as part of any permission:

1. The Application shall be carried out strictly in accordance with drawings 18-017-01G, 18-017-02E and 18-017-03B.

Reason: In order to clarify the terms of the Planning Permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as
permitted.

Condition 6 on the Outline Planning Permission (16/01774/OUT) then requires that any fencing is implemented prior to the occupation of the dwelling and maintained in perpetuity.

**Page 21**

18/01269/FUL 225 Avenue Road, Rushden

Update

None

**Page 25**

Darsdale Farm, Raunds

Update

*Table in 7.3 of Committee Report* – Showing the approved and proposed housing mix is replicated below for clarity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Houses</th>
<th>As approved</th>
<th>Now proposed</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENC Housing Strategy:** Further comments received to explain their request for a four bedroom bungalow: “Under planning permission 07/02238/OUT Darsdale Farm is scheduled to deliver 77 affordable homes which represents 20% of the development (current policy is 30%). The 77 units comprise of 66 two bedroom houses and 11 three bedroom houses. This is an unusual mix in that majority of the affordable dwellings are small houses. On other large developments the developer will provide a range of affordable dwellings from 1 bedroom apartments through to 4 bedroom houses. Since 2016 Housing Strategy have been discussing with Taylor Wimpey the possibility of the scheme providing a 4 bedroom bungalow to meet the specific needs of a family with multiple disabilities. In recognition that the land take of a bungalow is considerable, Housing Strategy have agreed to take a reduction in the affordable two beds from 66 to 63 reducing the overall delivery from 77 to 74 units. Taylor Wimpey have agreed to consider this and it was anticipated that this would form part of the current re plan proposal. Unfortunately the variation does not address this issue but does amend open market properties so that the number of 4/5 properties are increased. When raised as part of Housing Strategy’s concerns about the variation request, the applicant has suggested that the bungalow can not be accommodated due to a fall in the land which would prevent providing level
access to a bungalow. The overall site is of a significant size, planning permission was granted for up to 460 units and currently 381 units are planned. The bungalow can be provided anywhere on the site it does not need to be within the affordable area, indeed policy actively encourages the pepper potting of affordable housing.

Housing Strategy are keen to seek a resolution to this matter. There is a small need throughout the District for 4 bedroom bungalows to assist with the rehousing of families with disabled members. Most of these applicants are living in totally inappropriate accommodation, some of them are privately renting and are worried that they will be given a S21 Notice to leave which may result in them having to reside in Bed and Breakfast accommodation. Housing Strategy are hoping that this major development in Raunds will assist with the rehousing of one of the families who need a 4 bedroom bungalow.”

Information from Applicant: Following queries raised at the members site visit on 10th August, the applicant has confirmed the following:

- ‘I can confirm that the overall number of units proposed remains the same as previously approved. Drawing no TWY024-01.3 (Overall Site Layout) shows that there are 217 houses in the part of the site proposed to be re-planned by this application. There are 165 houses in the remaining part of the site, not included in this re-plan application. Therefore there is an unchanged total of 382 houses, falling within the terms of the original grant of permission for up to 460 dwellings.’
- The application has been submitted as Taylor Wimpey are responding to the current sales market following their experiences on phase 1.
- The plots shaded brown on site plan TWY024-01.3D are those being amended and those not shaded brown remain as approved.
- 51 plots are completed on the development with 49 of those occupied.
- The number of parking spaces on the landscaped ‘island’ is 40 on the proposed plan, compared with 38 on the approved plan.
- ‘The hedge line extended across the ‘island’ on the approved plans, but due to the requirement of the local highway authority to have the parking spaces at 90 degrees to the highway, this section of hedge has been removed from the proposed plans.’

The applicant has also confirmed the following in terms of consented and proposed parking arrangements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consented Scheme</th>
<th>Proposed Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Comments: It can be seen from the above table that additional parking facilities (22 no. spaces) are being proposed in comparison with the approved plan. This is over and above the additional requirements resulting from the small increase in the number of bedrooms on the development overall (9 bedrooms). In addition, the proposal reduces the percentage of parking spaces that are garages. As garages are often not used for parking, this is...
considered a benefit.

It is noted that a small section of hedge line is to be removed where this crosses the ‘island’. The applicant has advised that this is to accommodate the Highway Authority request for parking spaces to be aligned at 90 degrees to the Highway. Whilst it would have been desirable to retain this section of the hedgerow, it is not considered that this matter would justify the refusal of the application, particularly when balanced with the benefit of re-aligning the parking spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18/01189/FUL 108 Harborough Road, Rushden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended drawings have been received which slightly reduce the width of the extension by 400mm for the part which runs along the boundary with number 110 Harborough Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officer Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This change is not considered significant and will lessen any impact of the extension on number 110. Accordingly, it is recommended Condition 3 should be updated as follows to reflect the new drawings:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Except where otherwise stipulated by Condition, the application shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the 1:1250 scale location plan received on 28th June 2018 plus the amended 1:100 scale proposed South, West and East elevations and floor plans all received on 13th August 2018.*

*Reason: In order to clarify the terms of the Planning Permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted.*