550. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7.00pm to enable all members of the Committee to read and understand the update sheet which had been circulated. The meeting reconvened at 7.07pm.

551. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Marika Hillson, Roger Powell, Anna Sauntson and Alex Smith.

552. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 April 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

553. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
<th>DPI</th>
<th>Other Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gell</td>
<td>18/01648/OUT Land South East of The Ferrers School, A6 Higham Ferrers Bypass, Higham Ferrers</td>
<td>Is a member of the Ramblers Association who had made comments on the application.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Office Site Adjacent A6</td>
<td>Is a member of the Ramblers Association who had made</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Harriet Pentland declared that she had visited Land South East of The Ferrers School, A6 Higham Ferrers Bypass, Higham Ferrers (18/01648/OUT), Proposed Office Site Adjacent A6 Roundabout, John Clark Way, Rushden (18/02433/OUT), 33 High Street, Woodford (18/02284/FUL) and High Beech, 8 Hayway, Rushden (18/02429/FUL).

Councillor Roger Glithero declared that he had visited 2 Orchard Cottage, Laundry Road, Apethorpe (19/00250/FUL).

554. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

555. 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 agreement in respect of 10/00857/OUT Land between Wellingborough Road and Finedon Road, Irthlingborough and 18/01092/FUL Rushden Ambulance Station, Station Road, Rushden until 30 June 2019.

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

- 15/00119/VAR Priors Hall – current application was unlikely to proceed with the new owners. Submission of a revised planning application was anticipated.
- 18/02309/VAR Asda, 161 High Street, Rushden – draft conditions had been circulated.
• 18/01388/FUL – Land East of Brindley Close, Northampton Road – decision had now been issued.

RESOLVED:

(i) That the report be noted.

(ii) That the extension of time for 10/000857/OUT Land between Wellingborough Road and Finedon Road, Irthlingborough and 18/01092/FUL Rushden Ambulance Station, Station Road, Rushden until 30 June 2019 be approved.

556. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

• 18/01648/OUT - Land South East of The Ferrers School, A6 Higham Ferrers Bypass, Higham Ferrers – on behalf of Higham Ferrers Town Council and the agent for the applicant.
• 18/02433/OUT – Proposed Office Site, Adjacent to A6 Roundabout, John Clerk Way, Rushden – an objector and the agent for the applicant.
• 18/02426/FUL – High Beech, 8 Hayway, Rushden – a Ward Member and the agent for the applicant.
• 19/00250/FUL – 2 Orchard Cottage, Laundry Road, Apethorpe - representing Apethorpe Parish Meeting.

557. 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) 18/01908/FUL – 16 Slate Drift, Collyweston, Stamford

The Committee considered an application which proposed to replace a three bedroomed bungalow with a two storey five bedroomed dwelling. The application had been brought before the Committee as Collyweston Parish Council had objected to the application on a number of issues including that Collyweston was a Category A village and the proposal did not meet the requirements of the Local Plan due its size and that the access was an unadopted road. Members noted that the Local Highways Authority had objected to the application as Slate Drift was a private road accessed off the A43 and served more than five dwellings which was a contravention of Northamptonshire County Council’s adopted policy.

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 the update sheet.
The Committee considered an outline application on land to the west of the A6 Higham Ferrers for the development of up to 300 new dwellings of which 30% would be affordable, with vehicular access from the A6 roundabout known as the John Clarke Way Roundabout. The application had been brought before the Committee as it proposed a major residential development.

Members noted that Higham Ferrers Town Council had objected to the application on a number of grounds including poor access and connectivity on foot and by car to the town, insufficient buffer between the proposed houses and the more anti-social sites such as the school and commercial site and that only one access for 300 dwellings would lead to congestion on the A6. It was also noted that three representations had been received from nearby residents making a number of comments in respect of the application. The Local Highways Authority had no objections to the application.

During debate on the application, Members noted that the site had been allocated in the adopted Higham Ferrers Neighbourhood Plan (HFNP). Members’ main concern was that the site would only be accessed by one access point onto the John Clarke Way roundabout, which was already a busy roundabout, and that the Local Highways Authority had deemed that acceptable. Notwithstanding the response from the Local Highways Authority, Members in applying their local knowledge expressed concerns that a single access for a development of 300 dwellings would cause a significant build up on the highway network in the area. It was noted that an emergency access road had been included but it was not clear how that would solve the potential issues and it was questioned whether this could be used as a general access. Concerns were also raised about how the development would be cut-off from the town and direct links were needed to integrate it. It was noted that negotiations were still ongoing with the applicant on the proposed conditions and due to the Committee’s concerns Members felt that these could be brought back to a future meeting for consideration. Members were disappointed that the Town Council and Ward Members had not been consulted on the terms of the S106 Agreement and detailed conditions. Members were pleased to see that a significant amount of affordable housing had been included in the application.

In response, officers advised that the emergency access road was not proposed for public use due to safety issues and that a bollard or barriers would be provided to prevent use by the public. The policy for the site in the HFNP stated that access to the site would be from the John Clarke Way roundabout.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed to defer the application to enable consideration of the following matters:

1. To seek an independent highway consultant opinion regarding the suitability of the proposed single point of access; and
2. To reconsider conditions and the heads of terms.

Councillor Harriet Pentland left the meeting and did not return.
The Committee considered an outline application for a petrol filling station incorporating an A1 (shop) use, plus two buildings containing A3 (restaurants/café) and A5 (hot food takeaway). The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of the Ward Member.

Members noted that both Rushden Town Council and Higham Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds that the site had been designated for B1 use and should remain as this, both Town Councils also considered the site to be a Gateway site and, in accordance with Rushden Neighbourhood Plan Policy EN6, any development of this site should enhance the visual approach to the town, therefore the application was contrary to the adopted Rushden Neighbourhood Plan. There were also concerns that the proposed access to the site was unsafe. It was further noted that 18 representations had been received from nearby residents objecting to the application. The Local Highways Authority had no objections with regards to the existing A6 bypass roundabout.

During debate on the application, Members had concerns about the proposed access from the A6, particularly for lorries and tankers. Lighting would be an issue for residents and it was suggested that lighting for the site should be no greater than street lighting to mitigate any problems for residents. Whilst acknowledging that this was an outline application for access only, Members advised that they felt that the indicative layout shown needed to be greatly enhanced. Members also raised concerns that given the proximity of the nearby secondary school a health impact assessment had not been undertaken, particularly with the provision of two take away facilities.

Officers advised that there was an extant planning permission for employment use on the site which would rely on the same access as proposed for the current application.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed to defer the application to enable consideration of the following matters:

1. Officers to investigate and provide further information/comparison between extant permission and the proposal in terms of traffic impact; and

2. That a health impact assessment be requested from the applicant.

Councillor Richard Gell left the meeting and did not return.

558. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8

At 8.58pm, the Chairman proposed the suspension of Council Procedure Rule 8 (Duration of Meeting) to enable the Committee to conclude the business on the agenda. On being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED:

That Council Procedure Rule 8 be suspended to enable the Committee to consider the remaining planning applications.
(iv) 18/02171/FUL – Land off Fenn Close, Nassington

The Committee considered an application for the construction of 12 dwellings and access road. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation.

Members noted that Nassington Parish Council had no objections and fully supported the development. It was further noted that one representation in support of the application and two representations objecting to the application had been received from nearby residents.

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 the update sheet, with the addition of a condition (or other suitable mechanism) to secure that the road is completed to adoptable standard, and the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement by 8 September 2019 (or other date to be agreed), which secures obligations as set out in the report.

If a satisfactory legal agreement to secure obligations as set out in the report is not completed by 8 September 2019 (or other date to be agreed), it is delegated to the Head of Planning Services to refuse the planning application.

(v) 18/02429/FUL – High Beech, 8 Hayway, Rushden

The Committee considered an application which proposed the demolition of an existing dwelling and annex and the erection of five two storey detached dwellings with amenity space and parking, which included modification of the existing drive and access. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of a Ward Member and that Rushden Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds that the proposed scheme would be an overdevelopment of the site. The Local Highway Authority had no objections to the application.

During debate on the application, Members highlighted that the site had already had two planning permissions granted on the same footprint and it was a good, low density development. It was proposed that if permission was granted, there should be a condition about construction vehicle deliveries not arriving when children were arriving or leaving the school.

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 the update sheet with an amendment to condition 11 to prevent deliveries during school drop off/pick up.

Councillor Robin Underwood left the meeting and did not return.

Councillor Geoff Shacklock left the meeting for the following item.

(vi) 19/00250/FUL – 2 Orchard Cottage, Laundry Road, Apethorpe

The Committee considered an application which proposed the removal of six metres of an existing boundary wall to the front of the property to allow vehicular access, install timber drive gates and rebuild the stone wall to a reduced height of 600mm two metres either side
of the new gates. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of the Ward Member and as Apethorpe Parish Meeting had made comments on the application which were contrary to the officer’s recommendation.

Members noted that one letter in support of the application and one letter objecting to the application had been received. Members further noted that ENC’s Senior Conservation Officer had objected to the application as it was his view that the wall contributed strongly towards the character and appearance of the Apethorpe Conservation area and also the setting of the Grade I listed Apethorpe Palace.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed to grant the application, contrary to officer advice, on the basis that the heritage impact is outweighed by the benefits of providing off street parking.

A materials condition is to be imposed with the final wording of the condition delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and Ward Member.

Councillor Geoff Shacklock returned to the meeting.

(vii) 18/02284/FUL – 33 High Street, Woodford

The Committee considered an application which proposed the partial demolition and change of use of a former public house to a dwelling and the erection of a pair of three bedroomed dwellings in the car park to the rear of the public house with associated parking. The application had been brought before the Committee as Woodford Parish Council had objected to the application as the revised scheme had not addressed the loss of on street parking and the entrance/exit from the new parking spaces had restricted visibility.

Members noted that 18 representations on the application had been received from nearby residents. The Local Highways Authority had no objections to the 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 the update sheet.

559. APPEAL DECISION MONITORING REPORT

This report was deferred until the next meeting of the Committee.

560. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED:

That the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business because exempt information, as defined under paragraphs 6 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 may be disclosed.
This report was deferred until the next meeting of the Committee.

Chairman