

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 03 July 2019

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

Present Councillors: Phillip Stearn Chairman
Gill Mercer Vice Chairman
Roger Glithero JP Geoff Shacklock
Barbara Jenney Alex Smith
Andy Mercer Peter Wathen
Ron Pinnock Pam Whiting

63. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Helen Howell, Harriet Pentland, Anna Sauntson and Robin Underwood.

64. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 June 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

65. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Roger Glithero	19/00963/ADV Enterprise Centre, Michael Way, Raunds	Member of the Enterprise Centre Working Party.		Yes

(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Peter Wathen declared that he drove past the Enterprise Centre, Michael Way, Raunds (19/00963/ADV) on a regular basis.

66. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

67. 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 noted that the Planning Development Manager had not requested any extensions of time for S106 agreements.

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.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

68. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 18/02433/OUT – Proposed Office Site Adjacent A6 Roundabout, John Clark Way, Rushden - an objector and the agent for the applicant.
- 18/00344/FUL - Rose Cottage, High Street, Duddington – Duddington with Fineshade Parish Council and the agent for the applicant.

69. 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) 18/02433/OUT – Proposed Office Site Adjacent A6 Roundabout, John Clark Way, Rushden

The Committee considered an outline application for one drive-thru unit (use Class A1/A3/A5); alongside a petrol filling station (Sui-Generis/A1). The application had been considered by the Committee on 8 May 2019 where it was resolved to defer it to enable consideration of the following matters:

- Officers to investigate and provide further information/comparison between extant permission and the proposal in terms of traffic impact; and
- That a health impact assessment be requested from the applicant.

Members noted that both Rushden and Higham Ferrers Town Councils had objected to the application on the grounds that the site had been designated for B1 use and should remain as this, they 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. The Local Highways Authority had no objections to the application.

During debate on the application, Members noted that the main concerns raised at the previous meeting had now been addressed. The indicative plan was much improved and the loss of one of the units had allayed fears on the health impact. A lot of traffic passed by the site each day and it would be difficult to measure the impact of extra vehicles. Suitable fencing needed to be installed by the footpath to protect pedestrians. It appeared that access to the site had now been addressed and the Local Highways Authority was satisfied. It was suggested that if the Committee were minded to grant the application then an informative should be included advising that the site was a gateway site and therefore considerable attention needed to be paid to the design of the buildings.

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, update sheet and an additional informative advising that the site is a 'Gateway' site therefore considerable attention needs to be paid to the design of the buildings and the landscaping at the Reserved Matters stage.

(ii) 19/00344/FUL – Rose Cottage, High Street, Duddington

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a two storey and single storey extensions to the side and rear of the existing dwelling. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of Duddington Parish Council as it had made comments contrary to the Officer recommendation.

Members noted that ENC's Senior Conservation Officer had objected to the application. No comments had been received from the Local Highways Authority.

During debate on the application, Members noted that the application was in a conservation area but the building was not listed. The materials would be in keeping with surrounding dwellings and it was difficult to find any detrimental impact the development would have.

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 recommendation.

The wording of the conditions to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and Ward Member.

(iii) 19/00963/ADV – Enterprise Centre, Michael Way, Raunds

The Committee considered an application which sought advertisement consent for a site development board promoting the proposed development on land to the north of Asda. The application had been brought before the Committee in the interests of transparency as the applicant was East Northamptonshire Council.

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. Any issues raised during the consultation period should be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and Ward Member.

70. APPEAL DECISION MONITORING REPORT

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from 25 May 2019 to 20 June 2019.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

71. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Committee received a report which proposed a number of amendments to Part 3.2 (Scheme of Delegation) of the Constitution. The proposed amendments related to development management and were aimed at improving efficiency of decision making. The proposed changes were for Members' comments only as a further report will be presented to Council to seek approval for the changes to the Constitution.

During discussion on the report, Members raised a number of concerns with the proposals which needed further discussion. It was proposed that an informal meeting of the Committee be held to discuss the proposals in more detail.

RESOLVED:

That the report be deferred to enable further discussions to be held on the proposals.

Chairman

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 10 July 2019

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

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

72. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Anna Sauntson.

73. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Roger Glithero declared that he had visited OP7200 TF0003, Stamford Road, Easton on the Hill (19/00798/OUT).

74. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

No questions were submitted under Procedure Rule 10.3.

75. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 19/00594/FUL - Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden – an objector, Rushden Town Council, a Ward Member and the agent for the applicant

76. 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) **19/00594/FUL – Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the conversion and extension of the existing memorial clinic to create 14 one and two bedroom flats for occupation by the older population (over 55s) with secure amenity space, communal living areas and associated parking. This was a resubmission of planning application 18/00646/FUL. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation.

Members noted that Rushden Town Council had objected to the application on the grounds that the proposed scheme would be an overdevelopment of the site and that Rushden already had an overprovision of flatted developments. The Local Highway Authority had made no objections. It was further noted that 10 representations had been received from nearby residents objecting to the application.

Officers advised that following the Committee's site visit, the applicant had now submitted a revised roof design for the flat roof side extension and if members were minded to support that new design, a re-consultation would take place with any concerns raised being brought back to the Committee.

During debate on the application, Members noted that whilst the application was a considerable improvement on the previous application, it was still not ideal. The proposed side extension did not look in keeping with the streetscene. Flatted development was not supported in Rushden and the town needed more two bedroom houses. Members raised concerns over how the condition for Over 55s accommodation could be enforced. The heritage of the building had lots of history and was important to the town. It was accepted that conversion to flats was the only option for the site but larger units were preferable. It was noted that there would be a deficit in visitor parking but the Local Highways Authority had raised no objection. The site was close to a school and it was suggested that if the Committee were minded to approve the application then delivery times to the site should be restricted to avoid dropping off and pick up times.

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 recommendation, due to over-development of the site, the single storey extension to the side being out of keeping with the streetscene and harm to the non-designated heritage asset.

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

An informative is to be added to the decision notice to advise that the mix of flats is considered to be a significant improvement over the previous scheme. If an alternative scheme is able to preserve the frontage of the building and streetscene, it is likely to be viewed more favourably.

(ii) 19/00798/OUT – OP7200 TF0003, Stamford Road, Easton on the Hill

The Committee considered an outline application for a residential development of up to 115 dwellings with associated access, open space, landscaping and drainage. The application had been brought before the Committee as it was a major residential development that fell outside of the Scheme of Delegation.

Members noted that Easton on the Hill Parish Council had objected to the application due to the large scale of the development in proportion to the size of the village and the resultant problems that would bring to the infrastructure. Collyweston Parish Council had also objected to the application on the grounds that site was open countryside agricultural land and outside the village boundary. Ketton Parish Council had concerns that the proposed development would affect the rural aspect of Ketton and its conservation areas. It was further noted that 21 representations had been received from nearby residents objecting to the application, along with three representations in support. The Local Highways Authority had raised several concerns regarding traffic impact and congestion as there was already issues with traffic diversions for accidents on the A1.

It was the view of the Planning Officer that the development was neither supported nor sustainable and the benefits of the application did not outweigh the harm it would cause.

During debate on the application, Members noted that the site sat on the edge of the village, off the A43 which was a very busy, single carriageway road. The site was high quality agricultural land and was an inappropriate place for development. There would be no connectivity to the village except via the A43. The nearby SSSI would change its character and habitat as more people walked through it.

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

1. The proposal, by virtue of its unsustainable rural location and the scale of the development, fundamentally conflicts with the adopted with the adopted spatial strategy for the district, which seeks to direct major new developments to the most sustainable locations, namely the Growth Towns followed by the Market Towns. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policies 1, 11, 28, and 29 and NPPF paragraph 103. The Local Planning Authority recognises the benefits of the proposal, in particular, the contribution to housing supply, including affordable housing and associated economic benefits; however, these do not outweigh the identified harm. Whilst policies relating to the supply of housing can be considered up to date, the proposal is not in any event considered to constitute sustainable development in accordance with the Framework.
2. The development would integrate and connect poorly with the existing settlement, leading to concerns that it would not function effectively and due to its scale, it does not respect the existing local character. Furthermore, the application fails to demonstrate that the quantum of development proposed ('up to' 115 dwellings) could be satisfactorily accommodated in accordance with planning policies related to design. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policies 8 (a) and (d); 15(d) and the NPPF paragraphs 127 (criteria a, c and f) and 130.

3. The proposal, as a consequence of causing increased recreational pressure, would adversely affect the Collyweston Quarries Site of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserve and Local Wildlife Site. The benefits of the development in the location proposed would not clearly outweigh both the likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of SSSI sites. The proposal is therefore contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 4 a) I and v; b ii); Rural North Oundle and Thrapston Plan Policy 10 and the NPPF paragraphs 170 a) and d); and 175 a) and b).
4. In the absence of an agreed heads of terms and legal agreement, the Local Planning Authority cannot be certain that the proposal would provide the necessary infrastructure to mitigate its impacts/meet the needs of the development, contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 7 a) and Policy 10; and Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan Policy 15.
5. The application has failed to demonstrate that the development would have satisfactory access arrangements and that it would not result in an unacceptable impact on the Highway/Highway safety, contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 8b.

Chairman

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 31 July 2019

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

Present	Councillors: Phillip Stearn Gill Mercer	Chairman Vice Chairman
	Roger Glithero JP Helen Howell Barbara Jenney Andy Mercer Harriet Pentland	Geoff Shacklock Alex Smith Robin Underwood Pam Whiting

147. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ron Pinnock, Anna Sauntson and Peter Wathen.

148. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

(b) Informal Site Visits

No declarations of informal site visits were made.

149. 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 – agent for the applicant.

150. 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) 18/01648/OUT – Land South East of the Ferrers School, A6 Higham Ferrers Bypass, Higham Ferrers

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. The application had previously been deferred to allow the Council to instruct an independent highway consultant to review the suitability of a single point of vehicular access to the site and to reconsider the conditions and the heads of terms for a Section 106 agreement.

Members noted that following the Committee meeting in May 2019, the Ferrers School had now requested a condition limiting noise from construction during examination periods from early May to the end of June and Anglian Water had no objection to the application.

Officers confirmed that the independent highway advice received had reached the same conclusion as the Local Highway Authority and therefore the recommendation remained the same, but with an extended time frame for the completion of the Section 106 agreement.

During debate on the application, Members raised concerns that the development would be separate from Higham Ferrers and therefore connectivity to the town was imperative. The footpath was important and without the Right of Way the application would be unacceptable. Advice was still awaited from the Local Highways Authority on the status of the Right of Way and if it was established that it was privately owned then maintenance of the Right of Way would be included as a condition. Contributions to a community facility in the town would also support connectivity. There were concerns that the Committee were being asked to determine the application without knowing the full conditions but officers clarified that a delegation to the Head of Planning, Chairman, Vice Chairman and Ward Members was being requested to agree the conditions. If a decision was not made by 7 August 2019 the applicant's agent had already indicated that they would apply for non-determination of the application. The Applicant had indicated that if members were to resolve to grant planning permission then the Applicant would agree to an extension of time to finalise the conditions and Heads of Term.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were eight votes for the motion, two against and no abstentions, therefore the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 legal agreement by 7 August 2019 (or other dates as agreed), which secures the obligations as set out in the report. Heads of Terms and conditions are delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and the relevant Ward Members.

Planning permission should be refused if the upgrade (and if the Public Right of Way is not currently adopted, maintenance thereafter) of Public Right of Way UK2 cannot be secured.

(ii) 18/02428/FUL – Land South of Top Lodge, Top Lodge Road, Fineshade

The application was withdrawn by the applicant.

Chairman