

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 14 August 2019

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

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

151. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Anna Sauntson and Alex Smith.

152. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Barbara Jenney	18/02351/FUL 103 High Street, Rushden	Has a bias interest.		Yes (left meeting to speak as a Ward Member)

(b) Informal Site Visits

No declarations of informal site visits were made.

153. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 19/00454/FUL - Land Adjacent to Rectory View, Church Road, Hargrave – Hargrave Parish Council, an objector and the agent to the applicant
- 18/02351/FUL - 103 High Street, Rushden – a ward member.

154. 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) 19/00454/FUL – Land Adjacent Rectory View, Church Road, Hargrave

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two dwellings which would be constructed from the same materials as the two dwellings that were currently under construction on the front of the site. The application had been brought before the Committee at the request of the Ward Member. The original application had been amended to reduce the number of dwellings from three to two.

Members noted that Hargrave Parish Council had objected to the application on the grounds that National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF para. 70) stated that garden developments should be resisted, the district had an adequate housing land supply without permitting garden developments, the Joint Core Strategy 2016 (JCS) stated that the preferred development option was for minimal development in rural areas and the density and layout of the site was inappropriate for the site and for Hargrave. It was also noted that there were 10 objectors in total (some of which had submitted multiple representations), along with a letter of support. The Local Highways Authority had no objections to the revised scheme but did request that the access surfacing be of a hard bound material for a minimum distance back from the highway of 5 metres, surface water from a private drive must not discharge onto the highway and a swept path analysis was required for emergency vehicles.

During debate on the application, Members noted that the proposed number of dwellings had been reduced from three to two but the plans had not been amended to reposition the remaining two dwellings better. The JCS stated that a key concern was to maintain the character of the smaller towns and villages but the design of these properties was not in keeping with the village and would have a detrimental impact. There was no identifiable local housing need for this type of development and the site would be better suited to bungalows or smaller dwellings. Due to the elevated position of the site there would be extensive overlooking and lack privacy on neighbouring properties and if the Committee were minded to grant the application then a condition should be included to ensure boundary screening between the development and the property known as Xanadu as it would be possible to look into the ground floor windows of that property.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, there were six votes for the motion, one against and two abstentions, therefore the Committee **agreed to refuse** the application, contrary to officer recommendation, for the following reasons:

- 1) By virtue of the height of the dwellings and the elevated nature of the site, the proposal would have a dominant impact on its surroundings and would adversely affect the established character and appearance of the area, contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 8d.
- 2) The proposal for two large dwellings fails to address the identified need to accommodate smaller households and older people, contrary to North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 30a.

(ii) 18/0226/FUL – Fairline, Nene Valley Business Park, Oundle

The Committee considered an application for the installation of a three storey modular office block to the south of the premises' car park. The application included reinstating parking spaces to the northern area of the car park to compensate for the proposed loss of spaces. The application had been brought before the Committee as Oundle Town Council had requested a condition that Officers did not consider to be reasonable.

Members noted that Oundle Town Council had no objection to the application but had requested a condition for temporary permission; however, the proposal was for a structure that would remain on site until the end of its lifespan and officers considered it to be unreasonable to put a time limit on the presence of the office building being on site. The Local Highways Authority had no objections to the application but had requested a condition to secure the proposed parking layout.

During debate on the application, Members believed that the application was a sensible proposal to enable the business to expand and would help to support a local business.

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.

Councillor Barbara Jenney left the meeting for the following item and spoke as a Ward Member.

(iii) 18/02351/FUL – 103 High Street, Rushden

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of an existing vacant building. The application had been brought before the Committee as East Northamptonshire Council owned the site.

Members noted that Rushden Town Council had no objections to the application. The Council's Senior Conservation Officer had no objections in principle to the demolition of the building subject to further details of how the site would be reinstated to be conditioned. The Local Highways Authority had no objections to the application but would require a Construction Management Plan to be submitted.

During debate on the application, Members stated that the building was important to the future development of Rushden High Street and demolition of the building would enhance the conservation area. It would be necessary to ensure that once demolished the site would be fenced off securely.

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, subject to an amendment to condition 2 which shall require the submission of a timetable for the reinstatement works and state that the site shall be securely fenced off in the interests of public safety.

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

Chairman