

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 12 December 2018

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

Present	Councillors:	Phillip Stearn	Chairman
		Gill Mercer	Vice Chairman
		Richard Gell	Andy Mercer
		Roger Glithero JP	Geoff Shacklock
		Marika Hillson	Alex Smith
		Helen Howell	Robin Underwood
		Dudley Hughes JP	Peter Wathen
		Barbara Jenney	Pam Whiting

## 316. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harriet Pentland, Ron Pinnock, Roger Powell and Anna Sauntson.

## 317. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 14 November 2018 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

## 318. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

### (b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Dudley Hughes declared that he regularly walked the land at Brick Kiln Road.

Councillor Marika Hillson declared that she had visited West End Land North of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds (17/00266/FUL), Land East of Addington Road, Irthlingborough (18/01009/OUT), Land Off A45 London Road, Raunds (18/02081/FUL) and 2 Harrington Road, Irthlingborough (18/01796/FUL).

Councillor Robin Underwood declared that he had visited West End Land North of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds (17/00266/FUL) and 42 Victoria Road, Rushden (18/01439/FUL).

## 319. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

### **320. SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS AND DELEGATIONS TO HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES – UPDATE**

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the progress of drafting S106 Agreements in respect of matters where the Committee had previously resolved to grant planning permission and on the applications where actions had been delegated to the Head of Planning Services.

The progress on delegations to the Head of Planning Services was noted as follows:

- 15/00119/VAR Priors Hall – unlikely to proceed with the new owners.
- 18/00004/FUL Rushden Lakes – Highways England holding objection remained.

In response to a question as to how quickly the decision notice could be issued if Highways England removed their holding objection in relation to Rushden Lakes, Officers confirmed that if there were no proposed major amendments then the decision notice could be issued fairly quickly. If there were any proposed major amendments then they would be brought back to the Committee.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

### **321. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7.05pm to enable Committee Members to fully read and understand the update sheet. The meeting reconvened at 7.20pm and Members confirmed that they had read the update sheet.

### **322. PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 17/00266/FUL - West End, Land North of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds - on behalf of Raunds Town Council, agent for the applicant and an objector

### **323. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

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

#### **(i) 17/00266/FUL – West End Land North of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds**

The Committee considered an application for a distribution centre (B8 use class) together with ancillary offices (B1), parking, services and site landscaping. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation as it was a major development of over 1000sqm of floor space.

Members noted that Raunds Town Council, Stanwick Parish Council and Ringstead Parish Councils had objected to the application. It was also noted that comments had been received from 89 local residents and adjacent land owners expressing concerns with regard to the application. A letter from Tom Pursglove MP, supporting the level of strong local objection, had also been received. The Local Highways Authority had not objected to the application subject to a request that visibility splays be conditioned. It was also noted that Natural England had not objected to the proposal and the Lead Local Flood Authority had advised that the impacts of surface water drainage had been adequately addressed and conditions were recommended. Raunds Town Council had submitted a further letter of objection on the day prior to the Committee's meeting and a further letter of objection had also been received from BP who held the freehold interest on the entire service plot area.

Officers acknowledged that the site was in a prominent elevated position and would be highly visible from the surrounding areas. The Local Planning Authority had therefore appointed an independent landscape and visual consultant to assess the proposal. The consultant had concluded that the planning application *"although would give rise to certain significant and adverse landscape and visual effects, taking into account that there was a previous planning permission on the site for commercial development, the site is a protected local employment site in the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan, and the nature and extent of the mitigation measures proposed, the proposed development would not give rise to any insurmountable conflict with any of the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to landscape, the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, or in respect of design."*

The Council's Senior Environmental Protection Officer addressed the Committee to provide a response to the issues raised by TPS Planning on behalf of Raunds Town Council.

During debate on the application, Members stated that they were not convinced that they could support the officer's recommendation on the application as they had a number of concerns. These included the visual and amenity impact, employment issues and various planning policy matters. It was noted that the landscape and visual consultant had accepted that the application was in a prominent elevated position and the impacts would be significant and adverse. The proposed building would be highly visible until the landscaping had developed. The previous application on the site had been for 15 small/medium units and the current application was significantly different. There would be 272 HGV movements per day with 4-5 HGVs per hour at night which would lead to significant gate noise. With this number of vehicle movements the air quality would be affected and the development would be close to homes and children's play area. Policy 24 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) required the provision of smaller units. The adopted Raunds Neighbourhood Plan (RNP) should be given significant weight and any proposals should not have a significant impact on residents. Raunds already had its fair share of warehousing in the district and this application did not create diversity of employment. RNP Policy 13 sought the need to maintain a full range of employment opportunities in the local area. There was no evidence to support the proposed number of jobs as the operator of the building was not yet known.

Members also felt that the officer's recommendation was at variance with the NPPF, particularly paragraph 82, which stated that for storage and distribution operations there should be a variety of scales. There was now a completely new planning policy regime in place with the JCS having been adopted in 2016, the NPPF recently updated and the adoption of the RNP, and therefore any previous decisions made under the old regime, should not be considered. Concern was also raised about reference being made to a possible future planning application which would mitigate this application's non-compliance with JCS Policy 24 especially as the land being referred to had not been allocated for employment.

In response, the Head of Planning Services stated that the NPPF made a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The JCS had identified the site as a strategic site which had been allocated for warehousing and RNP Policies 13 and 14 supported the proposed development. A different access was now being proposed which would help to solve the significant impact of access to the site on local residents. NPPF paragraph 38 stated that planning authorities should approach decisions in a positive and creative way and it was his view that that had been done in this case. It was accepted that the application did not strictly meet JCS Policy 24(a) but a balance needed to be considered. The Planning Officer also clarified that whilst the plan submitted with the previous application had shown small to medium units, that had only been indicative and the permission itself had not been restricted to small units. The current condition in respect of the visibility splays, as requested by the Local Highway Authority, could be amended to require them to be in place prior to construction of the development. The proposed location of the gate house was also clarified and that would also be subject to condition.

Councillor Peter Wathen, having heard all of debate, advised that he was minded to recommend that the Committee refuse the application.

**During consideration of this item, Councillors Richard Gell and Roger Glithero both left the meeting and did not take part in the voting.**

#### **324. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8.50pm to enable Officers to consider the wording of the proposed reasons for refusal. The meeting reconvened at 9.05pm.

#### **325. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8**

At 9.05pm, the Chairman proposed the suspension of Council Procedure Rule 8 (Duration of Meeting) to enable the Committee to complete consideration of the current application. On being put to the vote, it was

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Council Procedure Rule 8 be suspended to enable the Committee to complete consideration of the current application.

#### **326. CONTINUATION OF APPLICATION 17/00266/FUL – WEST END LAND NORTH OF BRICK KILN ROAD, RAUNDS**

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to refuse** the application, contrary to officer's recommendation, for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposal by virtue of its scale and location would result in unacceptable landscape and visual impacts and as a result of being visually overbearing would be detrimental to residential amenity. As such the proposal is contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policies 24(e) and 8(e) and Raunds Neighbourhood Plan Policy 14. The benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the identified harm.

- (ii) The proposal does not include a proportion of floorspace in the form of smaller employment units, contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 24(a). As a result it fails to contribute to the delivery of a mix of jobs and a diverse economy in conflict with North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 23 and Raunds Neighbourhood Plan Policy 13.

### **327. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

At 9.15pm, the Chairman proposed that the meeting be adjourned until 6.30pm on Wednesday 19 December 2018 to complete the business on the agenda, with the exception of applications 18/02081/FUL Land Off A45 London Road, Raunds and 18/01867/FUL Land Between Winward and 40 Main Street, Upper Benefield, which would be deferred until the Committee's scheduled meeting on Wednesday 9 January 2019, subject to the Committee's approval at the reconvened meeting. On being put to the vote, it was

#### **RESOLVED:**

That the meeting be adjourned until 6.30pm on Wednesday 19 December 2018.

**Chairman**