

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 18 December 2019

Venue: East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Time: 7.00pm

Present

Councillors:	Phillip Stearn	Chairman
	Gill Mercer	Vice Chairman
	Roger Glithero	Ron Pinnock
	Helen Howell	Geoff Shacklock
	Barbara Jenney	Alex Smith
	Andy Mercer	Robin Underwood
	Harriet Pentland	Lee Wilkes

326. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lance Jones and Peter Wathen.

327. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The minutes of the meetings held on 13 and 20 November 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

328. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Geoff Shacklock	19/01154/FUL Lutton Farm Buildings, Washingley Road, Lutton	Applicant is known to him.		Yes

(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Barbara Jenney declared that she had visited Hamblin House, Hamblin Court, Rushden (19/01437/FUL).

Councillors Helen Howell, Harriet Pentland and Lee Wilkes declared that they had visited East View, Raunds Road, Chelveston (19/00499/FUL).

329. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

There were no questions under Council Procedure Rule 10.3.

330. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the item as indicated:

- 19/01437/FUL – Hamblin House, Hamblin Court, Rushden – Rushden Town Council and the agent for the applicant.

331. SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS & DELEGATIONS TO HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES

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 requested an extension of time for applications 10/00857/OUT, Land between Wellingborough Road and Finedon Road, Irthlingborough for additional time to arrange a meeting with relevant parties and 18/02171/FUL Land off Fenn Close, Nassington for additional time to conclude the legal agreement.

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 new planning application had been received.
- 18/01648/OUT 300 dwellings, south east of Ferrers School, Higham Ferrers – negotiations were progressing.
- 19/01024/OUT Mike Wells Cars, Montague Street, Rushden – negotiations were progressing.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the report be noted.
- (ii) That the extension of time for applications 10/0857/OUT and 18/02171/FUL until 28 February 2020 be approved.

332. 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) 19/01437/FUL – Hamblin House, Hamblin Court, Rushden

The Committee considered an application for a change of use from existing commercial offices to domestic dwellings and alteration and refurbishment of existing commercial offices to form dwellings consisting of four single storey one-bedroomed ground floor flats; one single storey two bedroom first floor flat, one two storey one-bedroom dwelling and one two storey two-bedroom dwelling and waste bin storage. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation and that Councillor Barbara Jenney had referred it to the Committee as Rushden Town Council had made an objection due to the proposed dwellings not having any provision for parking within the development, no provision had been made for amenity space, the floor space for some of the dwellings did not comply with building regulations and the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site.

Members noted that a letter in support of the application had been received from a nearby resident. The Local Highways Authority (LHA) had advised that they objected to the application owing to the proposed parking arrangement as they had concerns with any consent which relied on an agreement for parking that may come to an end.

During debate on the application, Members noted that under permitted development planning permission was not needed for change of use from offices to residential and the application had been made because of minor external changes to the exterior to accommodate new doors and windows. Concerns were raised at the number of flatted dwellings in Rushden and that there was an overprovision of that type of property. The proposed flats would not be suitable for disabled people as there would be access issues due to no specific parking on the High Street. Concerns were also raised about how bins would be stored and collected and the Planning Officer advised that the applicants had submitted a waste management plan which offered a private collection service. There was also concern about the lack of consultation with the Police about anti-social behaviour, particularly as there was a lack of lighting in the alleyway which would be used by future residents. If the Committee were minded to grant planning permission, a condition should be added to ensure that construction vehicles did not park on the High Street and used the car park instead. Members supported the concerns of the LHA about the guarantee of parking provision in the future especially as the public car parks in Rushden did not allow for overnight parking. It was noted that the site was land locked and questions were raised about the right of access across land to future householders. The Planning Officer advised that he had been assured by the applicant that there was right of access over land. In light of the questions around access over land, it was suggested that deferral of the application should be considered to ensure that assurance is received over access on land not owned by the applicant.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred. On being put to the vote, there were 10 votes for the motion, none against and one abstention, therefore the Committee **agreed to defer** the application to seek clarity on:

- The rights of access;
- For officers to consider and report back on the potential for the following two conditions:
 - Construction vehicles cannot deliver from the High Street/can only deliver from the car park
 - Lighting for the alleyway serving flats 5 and 6 and the alleyway to the High Street.

(ii) 19/01154/FUL – Lutton Farm Buildings, Washingley Road, Lutton

The Committee considered a retrospective application for the continued retention of caravans for seasonal agricultural workers and stationing of welfare facilities. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation.

Members noted that no comments had been received from Lutton Parish Council. The LHA had commented that if the number of caravans on the site was to increase then they would require improvements. The Planning Officer advised that they had considered the response of the LHA however as the proposal represented a modest increase in the number of mobile homes it was considered that there would be minimal implications for vehicular movements, so the recommendation remained unaltered.

During debate on the application, Members fully supported the application as it provided employment and was a large producer of local produce.

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 with the following amendment to conditions:

- Amend condition 4 to clarify that the five new caravans are included in the restriction for Area 3.

(iii) 19/00499/FUL – East View, Raunds Road, Chelveston,

The Committee considered an application for a two storey rear extension and conversion of first floor of a detached garage to habitable room with two new dormer windows. The application had been brought before the Committee as it had been submitted by a staff member.

Members noted that Chelveston Parish Council had not objected to the extension element of the application, but had objected to the Velux windows on the front elevation and to the proposed location of the Heat Pump.

The Council's Senior Conservation Officer had identified the building as a non-designated heritage asset because of the building's architectural qualities, and if assuming it was used as a post office, it would also have some communal value which would add to its significance. It was considered that the proposed development would be harmful upon the significance of the non-designated heritage asset by harming its character and would therefore be contrary to the guidance contained within the NPPF and Policy 2 of the JCS.

During debate on the application, Members stated that they did not support the refusal. Having looked at the streetscene, there was already a mix of housing and the setting of the houses did not cause any significant issues. It was accepted that the proposed extension was large, but it was felt to be subservient to the existing dwelling. Concerns were also raised at the proposed windows, including the false window, and it was felt that they needed to be more in keeping with the original property.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were 10 votes for the motion, none against and one abstention, therefore the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, contrary to officer recommendation, as the proposed extension would not result in visual harm to the dwelling/streetscene, subject to:

- (i) Receipt of amended drawing(s) amending the false window on the north side elevation to an obscure glazed window;
- (ii) Re-consultation of neighbouring properties on the amended drawing(s);
- (iii) No objections being received as a result of the re-consultation;
- (iv) Imposition of conditions (to include a condition to restrict construction times and to require sash windows) – conditions to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and Ward Member.

333. APPEAL DECISION MONITORING REPORT

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from 26 October 2019 to 3 December 2019.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

334. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED:

That the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business (Planning Enforcement Report) in accordance with paragraphs 6 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 as exempt information may be disclosed.

335. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8

At 9.00pm, it was proposed that Council Procedure Rule 8 (Duration of Meeting) be suspended to enable the Committee to continue 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 continue the business on the agenda.

336. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT REPORT

The Committee received a report providing an update on planning enforcement complaints as at December 2019.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

Chairman