

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Date:** 12 February 2020

**Venue:** East Northamptonshire House, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

**Time:** 7.00pm

**Present**

<b>Councillors:</b>	<b>Phillip Stearn</b>	<b>Chairman</b>
	<b>Gill Mercer</b>	<b>Vice Chairman</b>
	<b>Roger Glithero</b>	<b>Harriet Pentland</b>
	<b>Helen Howell</b>	<b>Geoff Shacklock</b>
	<b>Bert Jackson</b>	<b>Peter Tomas</b>
	<b>Barbara Jenney</b>	<b>Robin Underwood</b>
	<b>Andy Mercer</b>	<b>Lee Wilkes</b>

## 396. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

## 397. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Andy and Gill Mercer	19/01594/OUT Land Rear of Abbott House and 1-3 Glapthorn Road, Oundle	Members of Northamptonshire County Council, who are the applicant.		Yes – left meeting for this application
Peter Tomas	19/01777/FUL Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden	Works for the owner of the site and the applicant is known to him.	Yes – left meeting for this application	

### (b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Roger Glithero declared that he had visited Car Park and Land, Rockingham Motor Speedway, Mitchell Road, Corby on a number of occasions.

Councillor Bert Jackson declared that he had visited Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden (19/01092/FUL), Land Rear of Abbott House and 1-3 Glapthorn Road, Oundle (19/01594/OUT), Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden (19/01777/FUL) and 332 Addington Road, Irthlingborough (19/01607/VAR).

Councillor Harriet Pentland declared that she had visited Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden (19/01092/FUL) and Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden (19/01777/FUL).

### **398. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3**

There were no questions under Council Procedure Rule 10.3.

### **399. PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following people spoke on the item as indicated:

- 19/01092/FUL Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden - an objector; Rushden Town Council, a Ward Member and the Applicant
- 19/01594/OUT - Land Rear of Abbott House and 1 – 3 Glapthorn Road, Oundle – two Ward Members, Oundle Town Council and the Agent for the Applicant
- 19/01769/FUL - Car Park and Land, Rockingham Motor Speedway, Mitchell Road, Corby - the Agent for the Applicant
- 19/01777/FUL - Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden - an objector; Rushden Town Council, a Ward Member and the Agent for the Applicant.

### **400. CHANGE TO THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

The Chairman advised that application 19/01607/VAR 332 Addington Road, Irthlingborough would be considered first.

### **401. 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) 19/01607/VAR – 332 Addington Road, Irthlingborough**

The application was for the variation of condition 24 (approved drawings) to allow for a redesign to provide 60 care beds grouped into six household units of 10 beds each in line with the latest Care Quality Commission Guidelines pursuant to planning application 15/00376/FUL – demolition of existing public house for the development of 56 bedroom nursing home. The Planning Development Manager advised that information had been received from the Council's solicitor, highlighting a recent Court of Appeal decision which may have a bearing on the application. It was now being recommended that the application be deferred to enable officers to consider the matter.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to defer** the application to a future meeting of the Planning Management Committee.

**(ii) 19/01092/FUL – Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden**

The Committee considered a hybrid application which comprised a full application for the erection of retail units, restaurant units, office floor space, physiotherapy/leisure floor space, ancillary storage floor space, (with associated site clearance, earthworks, site levelling and formation of banks) together with proposals for access, footpaths, parking and servicing space, hard and soft landscaping, drainage works, attenuation ponds and other associated works and an outline application for the erection of employment units with some matters reserved (layout, scale, appearance.) Also the construction of a new link road between Ditchford Road and Rushden Lakes (with associated site clearance and earthworks) alongside junction works, footpaths, cycle ways, lighting, hard and soft landscaping and associated works. (Resubmission of 18/01197/FUL). The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation and was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) as it represented Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development

Members noted that Rushden Town Council, Irthlingborough Town Council and Higham Ferrers Town Council had not objected to the application but had all raised concerns and had requested involvement in the Section 106 discussions. It was further noted that Kettering Borough Council, Northampton Borough Council and the Borough Council of Wellingborough had all objected to the application. Kettering Town Centre, Wellingborough Town Centre and Corby Town Centre had all objected to the application. The Local Highways Authority (LHA) had had not objected to the application but requested that conditions be attached to any planning permission that may be granted.

The Council's retail consultant had concluded that the application was acceptable in sequential and impact terms although they were mindful that aspects of the health of town centres locally were a matter of concern.

During debate on the application, some Members acknowledged that whilst the site may be isolated from the rest of the Rushden Lakes development it was not isolated from existing development in the area, for example a service station and restaurant. The proposed application would be a valuable extension to Rushden Lakes. It was noted that the Council's Retail Consultant had stated that the application was acceptable in both sequential and impact terms. The Local Plan Part 2, which had now allocated the land for development, was currently out for consultation and so should have some weight given to it. Members fully supported a no poach condition but questioned why Raunds and Thrapston were not included in the list of towns. If the Committee were minded to grant the application then the proposed conditions should be brought back to a future meeting of the Committee for consideration. The recommended reason for refusal was very specific, loss of open countryside, however recent reports to the Planning Policy Committee recommended development of the land. It was positive that the application would lead to job creation, including during construction. Members had concerns at the number of proposed parking spaces, particularly parent and child spaces. The objections being made on this application were the same which were made on the original application for Rushden Lakes and which were rejected at appeal. Some Members felt that the application appeared contrived and appeared to be a condition to get the road which had been previously approved built. The site was not allocated in the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan. There was some concern with the retail consultant's report as in a report for a previous application it was stated that additional retail units would have an impact on Rushden Town centre. If minded to grant, a no poach condition should be extended to businesses already located in Rushden and a significant amount awarded for Rushden Town Centre.

In response, Officers clarified that the area of land included in the Local Plan Part 2 consultation was a more extensive area of land and the proposed additional site allocation did not include retail. As the consultation on the Local Plan Part 2 had not yet concluded, very little weight could be given to that Plan. If the Committee were minded to grant the application it would then be required to be forwarded to the Secretary of State for him to consider whether to call it in.

It was moved and seconded that the Committee is minded to grant the application. On being put to the vote, there were nine votes for the motion, two against and no abstentions, therefore the Committee **agreed to be minded to grant** the application subject to a s106 agreement and conditions, contrary to officer recommendation. The application is to be reported back to the Committee with proposed conditions and heads of terms for Members approval. Conditions/obligations to include:

- Additional parent and child spaces;
- Very strong no poach condition – to include duration and type – condition should be strengthened from garden square conditions;
- Subsidised bus service obligation;
- Adequate bus stop/layby provision;
- Car charging points and adequate electrical infrastructure to support future additional charging points.

Officers are asked to liaise with the applicant to identify whether parking has been artificially restricted by the Local Highway Authority, and subsequently to ensure adequate parking provision is secured.

#### **402. ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 8.35pm and reconvened at 8.45pm.

**Councillor Roger Glithero left the meeting and did not return.**

#### **403. CONTINUATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**Councillors Andy and Gill Mercer left the meeting for the following application.**

##### **(iii) 19/01594/OUT – Land Rear of Abbott House and 1-3 Glapthorn Road, Oundle**

The Committee considered an outline application for the development of 33 extra care apartments for older people with associated access, parking, community green space and landscaping (all matters reserved except access). The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation as it was a major residential development.

Members noted that Oundle Town Council had objected to the application as the site was an important open greenspace within the town; the proposal would adversely impact on a neighbouring listed building and the proposed number of parking/disabled parking would be inadequate. Members further noted that 26 letters objecting to the application had been received from nearby residents. One letter supporting the application had been received. The LHA had commented that once essential work had been carried out on a bridge to the east of the site there would be no bus route within 400m of the site.

It was noted that the applicant's agent had now confirmed that the applicant was willing to provide the required developer contributions towards fire and rescue and libraries. Therefore, refusal reason number three fell away and no longer formed part of the Officer's recommendation.

During debate on the application, Members acknowledged that an extra care facility was needed in Oundle but this was the wrong location. It was one of the last areas of open space in the town and the application would be harmful to the setting and the surrounding listed buildings.

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 applicant had not submitted sufficient or robust evidence to support the assumption that the application site is redundant and has therefore failed to demonstrate that the site is surplus to requirements in terms of its function as an area designated as open space for sport and recreation. Furthermore, the applicant has not put forward an alternative area of open space which is of equivalent value and level of accessibility to serve the local community, as is required by Joint Core Strategy Policy 7 (c and d) and Rural North Oundle and Thrapston Plan Policy 15 (c) - Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities. The proposal would also, therefore, be in conflict with the aims of the NPPF, as set out at Paragraph 97.
2. The proposed development would be harmful to the landscape setting and, in turn, the architectural and spatial quality of Yarrow House, the Science Building (Grade II) and Oundle School Memorial Chapel, which is listed at Grade II\* in recognition of its particular importance of more than special interest. The development would also have a negative impact upon the Oundle Conservation Area for the same reasons. The development would, therefore, not accord with the advice contained within NPPF Paragraph 196, Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan Policy 9 (a and b) – Buildings of Local Architectural or Historic Interest and Joint Core Strategy Policy 2 (a, c and d) Historic Environment.

**Councillors Andy and Gill Mercer returned to the meeting.**

**(iv) 19/01769/FUL – Car Park and Land Rockingham Motor Speedway, Mitchell Road, Corby**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a maintenance building, a concrete inspection area and the resurfacing of loose gravel hardstanding to tarmac. The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation

Members noted that Deene and Deenethorpe Parish Council, Bulwick Parish Council, Benefield Parish Council, Weldon Parish Council, Stanion Parish Council, Brigstock Parish Council and Corby Borough Council had not objected to the application. Gretton Parish Council had not objected to the application but had commented that it was imperative building work ensured that adequate drainage was put in place to prevent any risk of flooding on roads in the vicinity of the proposed works. It was further noted the LHA had no objections to the application but requested the imposition of a condition.

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. Conditions to be strengthened in relation to ensuring the use does not result in further contamination of the site.

**Councillor Peter Tomas left the meeting for the following application.**

**(v) 19/01777/FUL – Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the conversion and extension to create 14 one and two bedroomed flats for occupation by persons over 55 years of age, including communal parking and amenity spaces (resubmission of 19/00594/FUL)

Members noted that Rushden Town Council had objected to the application as it was an overdevelopment of the site and Rushden already had an overprovision of flatted development. Members further noted that four letters objecting to the application had been received from nearby residents. The LHA had no objections to the application, but commented that the applicant had proposed kerbing delineating the vehicle cross over, which would not be required. Confirmation of the arrangements for refuse collection as the access would remain private was required.

During debate on the application, Members noted that there was an excess of flats in Rushden. If the Committee were minded to grant the application then conditions should include the provision of electric charging points and sprinklers. It was noted that a plan had been received on how the collection of waste from the site would be dealt with. It was clarified that as the building was not listed, the retaining of internal features could not be conditioned; however the applicant was looking to retain what they could.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were six votes for the motion, one against and one abstention, therefore the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to completion of a legal agreement (or other suitable mechanism) to secure obligations (Section 106) as set out in the report by 17 February 2020 (or other agreed date), conditions detailed in the officer's report and update sheet and the following amendments to conditions:

- Condition 19 – to be strengthened to future proof electrical infrastructure, to enable additional electric charging points to be added in future;
- Condition 16 – check the latest guidance and strengthen if possible to ensure sprinkler provision if this can be reasonably secured;
- Condition 9 – to include sensor lighting where appropriate.

If a satisfactory legal agreement is not completed within the agreed timeframe, delegation is given to the Head of Planning Services to refuse planning permission. The wording of the reasons for refusal shall be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee and the Ward Member.

**Councillor Peter Tomas returned to the meeting.**

**(vi) 19/00956/FUL – Bluefield Farm, Nassington Road, Apethorpe**

The Committee considered an application for a change of use of agricultural buildings to B1 (offices). The application had been brought before the Committee in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation as Apethorpe Parish Council had objected as the original application had included light industry involving storage and distribution.

The original application had sought consent for B2 (general industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) uses but had now been amended to omit these two uses.

Members noted that Apethorpe Parish Council now supported the application for office use only. It was also noted that the LHA had now withdrawn their objection but had made a number of comments.

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.

**Chairman**