

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 13 February 2019

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

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

## 403. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dudley Hughes JP, Roger Powell and Anna Sauntson.

## 404. MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 09 and 23 January 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

## 405. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

### (b) Informal Site Visits

No informal site visits were declared.

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

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

## 407. 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.

Members considered a request by the Planning Development Manager for an extension of time for the agreements in respect of 10/00857/OUT Irthlingborough West, 16/01431/OUT Nene Business Park, Irthlingborough and 18/0036/VAR Freemans Court, Rushden until 29 March 2019.

The Planning Development Manager advised that it was proposed to bring a full report to the next meeting on the application at Irthlingborough West to give the Committee a number of options on how to take the application forward.

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

- 15/00119/VAR Priors Hall – current application unlikely to proceed with the new owners. Formal requests for EIA screening and scoping for a revised scheme had been received.
- 18/00004/FUL Rushden Lakes – Highways England had confirmed that they had no objection and the decision notice had now been issued.
- 18/01009/OUT Addington Road, Irthlingborough – refusal reasons had now been agreed and the decision issued.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- (i) That the report be noted.
- (ii) That the extension of time for 10/000857/OUT Irthlingborough West, 16/01431/OUT Nene Business Park, Irthlingborough and 18/00636/VAR Freemans Court, Rushden until 29 March 2019, be approved.

#### **408. PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 18/01765/FUL and 18/01766/ADV - Asda, 161 High Street, Rushden – a Ward Member and an objector.

#### **409. 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) 18/02043/FUL – Chelveston Renewable Energy Park, the Airfield, Chelveston**

The Committee considered an application for the construction of a hydrogen fuelling building with on-site hydrogen generation, storage, ancillary maintenance and storage units, security fencing and hardstanding. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation.

Members noted that Chelveston Parish Council had objected to the application on the grounds that it further industrialised the site and challenged the applicant's assertion that Hydrogen was a clean fuel. Higham Ferrers Town Council had also objected to the application and it was also noted that a representation from a nearby resident objecting to the application had been received. The Local Highways Authority had no objection to the application but had made a number of comments.

During debate on the application, Members noted that this part of the district already had a large amount of energy production and this application was further industrialisation of that part of the district. It was also noted that the height of the building was not in compliance with the Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Neighbourhood Plan. Local residents had a number of concerns with the application, in particular the route that vehicles attending the site would use and ensuring that vehicles by-passed Caldecott and Chelveston villages. It was suggested that to give reassurance to residents it should be conditioned that route B was the route to be used. It was also felt that the permitted construction hours should also be conditioned.

In response to the issues raised, officers confirmed that a condition had been included that required the details of the route to the site to be re-submitted to ensure that it was the optimal one but they would be happy to discuss the final wording of the condition with the ward member.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report and update sheet, the inclusion of an additional condition restricting construction hours to those detailed at paragraph 7.16 of the report and that ward members' views are sought before deciding the final wording of condition 6.

**(ii) 18/01765/FUL – Asda, 161 High Street, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the installation of grocery collection lockers in the customer car park. The application had been brought before the Committee as Rushden Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds that they had safety concerns regarding the positioning of the lockers due to sight lines.

Members noted that several representations from nearby residents had been received. It was also noted that the Local Highways Authority and ENC Environmental Protection had no objection to the application but had made a number of comments.

During debate on the application, Members stated that there were already two high barriers separating the site from the properties on Higham Road, so it was unlikely that there would be any significant difference for nearby residents. It was suggested that condition 3 should be amended to ensure that it covered all purchases and not just groceries. It was noted that a planning application had been submitted by the applicant to extend the opening hours of the store and some Members felt that if approved, that application would have an implication on the use of the collection lockers. To protect local residents, it was suggested that it may be helpful to amend the condition to include the current opening hours and if longer hours were needed in the future, the applicant could make a further application.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report and update sheet and condition 3 being amended to read:

The grocery collection lockers hereby approved shall only be in operation between the hours of 8am – 10pm Mondays to Saturdays and 10am – 4pm Sundays. No purchases shall be left in the lockers outside of these hours, or overnight.

Reason: in the interest of residential amenity

**iii) 18/01766/ADV – Asda, 161 High Street, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application to attach vinyl lettering to the proposed grocery collection lockers in the customer car park and accompanied planning application 18/01765/FUL. The application had been brought before the Committee as Rushden Town Council had objected to the proposed works.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer's report.

**410. APPEAL DECISION MONITORING REPORT**

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from 7 January to 25 January 2019.

The Planning Development Manager highlighted a number of key points that had been made during some of the appeals:

18/00379/FUL – Metkey 1, Land Corner of Washbrook and Pytchley Road

- The Inspector concluded that the need for one bedroomed dwellings in Rushden, as identified in the Rushden Housing Mix Requirement (RHMR), did not specifically mean flats and that the RHMR was explicit that consideration should be given to the development of smaller houses and bungalows rather than flats.
- The Inspector noted that even though ENC had not adopted the Highways Authority Parking Standards, it could give as much weight to them as they saw fit.

17/02142/REM – Land Between Oakleas Rise and A14 Midland Road, Thrapston

- In contrast to the previous application, this Inspector concluded that as the Parking Standards had not been adopted, then limited weight should be given to them.
- The Inspector concluded that garages could be included as parking spaces as conditions could be added to a decision to ensure that they were retained for parking. The Inspector also had the view that whilst tandem parking was not unusual, in this application tandem parking within shared parking courts was not acceptable as it had not been demonstrated that it could be managed.
- The National Space Standards were also given a lot of weight by the Inspector compared to the Housing Quality Index by Homes England.

17/02370/FUL – 5 Cotterstock Road, Oundle

- The Inspector concluded that in cases where an additional dwelling was proposed to be erected in a rear garden, the host dwelling still required a garden which would be sufficient for a property of its size to ensure that residential amenity was not harmed.

The Committee congratulated officers on their success in defending most of the appeals.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

**Chairman**