

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Date:** 24 June 2020

**Venue:** Virtual Meeting

**Time:** 6.30pm

**Present**

<b>Councillors:</b>	<b>Andy Mercer</b>	<b>Chairman</b>
	<b>Gill Mercer</b>	<b>Vice Chairman</b>
	<b>Dudley Hughes</b>	<b>Alex Smith</b>
	<b>Bert Jackson</b>	<b>Peter Tomas</b>
	<b>Barbara Jenney</b>	<b>Robin Underwood</b>
	<b>Lance Jones</b>	<b>Lee Wilkes</b>
	<b>Harriet Pentland</b>	

## 66. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Roger Glithero, Geoff Shacklock, Phil Stearn and Peter Wathen.

## 67. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2020 were approved as a correct record.

## 68. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

Councillors	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Harriet Pentland	19/01355/OUT	Works for Tom Pursglove MP who submitted a letter of objection		yes
Gill Mercer	19/01355/OUT	Member of Planning Policy Committee		Yes (left the meeting for this item)

### (b) Informal Site Visits

Councillors Harriet Pentland and Bert Jackson declared that they had visited Land Between St Christophers Drive and A605 Oundle Bypass, Oundle (19/01355/OUT).

The solicitor for the Council requested that Members should state if they had been lobbied in respect of the planning application being considered during the meeting, and confirm that they came to the meeting with an open mind and were not biased or predetermined as a result of having been lobbied.. Councillors Bert Jackson, Barbara Jenney, Lance Jones, Andy Mercer, Harriet Pentland, Alex Smith, Peter Tomas, Robin Underwood and Lee Wilkes all declared that they had been lobbied and would enter the debate with an unbiased and open mind. Councillor Dudley Hughes also made the declaration after joining the meeting at 6.45pm.

**69. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3**

There were no questions under Council Procedure Rule 10.3.

**70. 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.

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

- 15/00119/VAR 735 dwellings, Priors Hall – the current application was unlikely to proceed, and a new planning application had been received.
- 19/01024/OUT 11 dwellings, Mike Wells Cars, Montague Street, Rushden – negotiations were ongoing between ENC, Lead Local Flood Authority and applicant.
- 19/01092/FUL – Rushden Living, Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden – The Secretary of State had received a call in request from a third party for the application. The initial target date for consideration of the case was now 15 June 2020.
- 19/01872/FUL – TLO1257 90298 Benefield Road, Glapthorn – Wording of conditions to be agreed.
- 19/1630/OUT – Land Adjacent Brook Farm Cottage, Brooks Road, Raunds – Wording of refusal reasons to be agreed.
- 19/01633/OUT – Land adjacent Brook Farm Cottage, Brooks Road, Raunds – Wording of refusal reasons to be agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) That the report be noted.
- (ii) That there were no requests for extensions of time for applications
- (iii) That the progress of the delegations to the Head of Planning Services as detailed in Appendix 2 be noted

**Councillor Dudley Hughes joined the meeting at 6.45pm.**

**71. Appointment of Chairman**

The Vice Chairman, Councillor Gill Mercer, declared an interest in the planning application for Land Between St Christophers Drive and A605 Oundle Bypass, Oundle (19/01355/OUT) and left the meeting. It was moved and seconded that Councillor Andy Mercer be appointed as Chairman. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed to appoint Councillor Andy Mercer as Chairman for the discussion of the planning application.

## **72. PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 19/01355/OUT – Land Between St Christophers Drive and A605 Oundle Bypass, Oundle – 2 on behalf of Oundle Town Council, 3 Ward Members, 1 in support, the applicant and 4 objectors,

## **73. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered the planning application report and representations made by public speakers at the meeting. It was noted that there was additional information on the application included in the update sheet.

### **(i) 19/01355/OUT – Land Between St Christophers Drive and A605 Oundle Bypass, Oundle**

The Chairman advised the Committee that a late letter of representation had been received from Tom Pursglove MP, objecting to the application; the same letter had been received a few days previous, and the Chairman read the accompanying email to the Committee for consideration.

The Committee considered an application for an outline planning application for the erection of up to 65 dwellings and an extra care facility of up to 65 units (all matters reserved except access)

The Committee were advised that the Planning Policy Committee had endorsed the site, and that the Draft Local Plan Part 2 should be given some weight as the site was allocated for development. Policy 29 of the Joint Core Strategy required the further allocation of land at Oundle to deliver the current requirement of 645 dwellings from 2011-2031, and the St Christopher's Drive site was identified as an appropriate location for additional housing. The Oundle Neighbourhood Plan should carry no weight as the Oundle Neighbourhood Plan Examiner had concluded that the Plan should not proceed to referendum.

Members raised concerns regarding the single access road to the proposed development, and were advised that the Local Highway Authority had assessed the access to the site and deemed it as being suitable for the proposed level of development. It was also noted that a condition regarding construction traffic would be imposed, requiring a Construction Management Plan to be submitted.

During debate on the application, Members sought clarification regarding the effectiveness of the proposed noise barriers. Several modelling variations had been carried out and it was confirmed that 3m acoustic fencing would provide the most effective noise mitigation, in comparison to a higher barrier which would not provide much more mitigation and be more invasive overall. It would be the responsibility of the developer to produce a scheme which would meet with the World Health Organisation guidelines. The Committee was advised that the indicative plans were for illustrative purposes only, and that there was flexibility within the design and number of dwellings on the site.

Members noted the provision of the extra care facility would provide 100% affordable housing, made up of 65 extra care units through the S.106 Planning Agreement, and sought assurance that this would be secured. It was confirmed that should the extra care facility not be provided, that the S.106 Planning Agreement contained an alternative covenant for the provision of not less than 40% affordable housing to be provided on site.

**Councillor Harriet Pentland left the meeting during the debate and so did not participate in the vote for this item.**

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were 4 votes for the motion, 1 vote against the motion and 3 abstentions. The Committee therefore **agreed to grant** the application subject to the completion of a S.106 Planning Agreement and Conditions as detailed in the officers report.

**Chairman**

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 08 July 2020

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Time: 6.30pm

Present Councillors: Philip Stearn Chairman  
Gill Mercer Vice Chairman  
Dudley Hughes Alex Smith  
Barbara Jenney Peter Tomas  
Lance Jones Robin Underwood  
Harriet Pentland Lee Wilkes  
Andy Mercer Peter Wathen  
Geoff Shacklock

## 74. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Roger Glithero.

## 75. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 June 2020 were approved as a correct record.

## 76. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

Councillors	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Peter Tomas	19/01623/FUL	His company has worked at the site previously		Yes
Peter Tomas	19/01935/FUL	His company has worked for the applicant previously		Yes
Robin Underwood	19/01935/FUL	The agent is known to them		yes
Geoff Shacklock	19/01623/FUL	The agent and applicant are known to them		yes

### (b) Informal Site Visits

Councillors Gill Mercer, Andy Mercer and Robin Underwood declared that they had visited 105 High Street, Rushden (19/01569/FUL).

Councillor Dudley Hughes declared that he had visited OP0061 SP9676, Addington Road, Woodford.

**77. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3**

There were no questions under Council Procedure Rule 10.3.

**78. 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.

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

- 15/00119/VAR 735 dwellings, Priors Hall – the current application was unlikely to proceed, and a new planning application had been received.
- 19/01024/OUT 11 dwellings, Mike Wells Cars, Montague Street, Rushden – negotiations were ongoing between ENC, Lead Local Flood Authority and applicant.
- 19/01092/FUL – Rushden Living, Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden – The Secretary of State had not called in the application. Planning permission could be issued once the S106 was completed as all conditions had been agreed.
- 19/01872/FUL – TLO1257 90298 Benefield Road, Glapthorn – Wording of conditions to be agreed.
- 19/1630/OUT – Land Adjacent Brook Farm Cottage, Brooks Road, Raunds – Refusal issued 16<sup>th</sup> June 2020.
- 19/01633/OUT – Land adjacent Brook Farm Cottage, Brooks Road, Raunds – Refusal issued 16<sup>th</sup> June 2020.
- 20/00148/FUL – Manor Farm, Cotterstock Road, Glapthorn – the decision had been issued
- The Committee were also advised that the Cowthick Plantation application, which ENC had submitted an objection against had been approved by Corby Borough Council subject to conditions and a S106 agreement.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) That the report be noted.
- (ii) That there were no requests for extensions of time for applications
- (iii) That the progress of the delegations to the Head of Planning Services as detailed in Appendix 2 be noted

## **79. PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 19/01623/FUL – Newbrook Farm, Islington, Titchmarsh - on behalf of Titchmarsh Parish Council, the agent on behalf of the applicant and an objector
- 20/00274/FUL – Glebe Meadow Fishery, Ditchford Lock, Ditchford Lane, Rushden – on behalf of Rushden Town Council, the Ward Member and the agent on behalf of the applicant
- 19/01238/FUL – OP0061 SP9676, Addington Road, Woodford – on behalf of Woodford Parish Council, an objector and the agent on behalf of the applicant

## **80. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered the planning application report and representations made by public speakers at the meeting. It was noted that there was additional information on the application included in the update sheet.

### **(i) 19/01623/FUL – Newbrook Farm, Islington, Titchmarsh**

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of agricultural land and buildings to haulage yard (a Sui Generis use) plus B1(C) B2 and B8 uses and erection of security fencing and gates. (Fresh application following refusal of 18/02401/FUL) (Retrospective)

The Committee noted that the application related to five units on the site, with the remaining two units to continue being used for agricultural purposes. The Committee were advised that future occupiers of the units must adhere to existing limitations of any conditions imposed, and that the units could revert back to agricultural use without the need for further planning consent.

During debate on the application, Members raised concerns regarding highway safety, particularly in respect of pedestrians and cyclists travelling along Thrapston Road, along with the volume of traffic and heavy goods vehicles that would potentially travel through the village. Members also noted that a 'turn right' sign at the site exit could not be enforced, and was not deemed necessary by the Local Highway Authority, who had not objected to the application.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, there were 6 votes for the motion, 3 votes against the motion and 2 abstentions. The Committee therefore **agreed to grant** the application

### **(ii) 20/00274/FUL – Glebe Meadow Fishery, Ditchford Lock, Ditchford Lane, Rushden**

The committee considered an application for the retention of farm shop (Resubmission of 19/01842/FUL) (retrospective)

During debate on the application, Members noted that the Local Highway had removed their previous objection to the application. The site access was in close proximity to a bridge with traffic lights, allowing for safe access to the site as vehicles were either slowed down or at a standstill at that point. The Committee noted that the farm shop provided much needed supplies for those using the river and facilities.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to grant** the application.

### **Councillor Barbara Jenney joined the meeting at 19.35**

#### **(iii) 19/01238/FUL – OP0061 SP9676, Addington Road, Woodford**

The committee considered an application for the erection of 2 no. dog kennel buildings; an exercise/training barn; a quarantine unit; a maintenance garage/workshop together with associated new site access from Addington Road

Members raised concerns regarding potential noise disturbance and odour, and the impact this could have on the local residents, particularly overnight when there would be no staff or volunteers on site. The Committee was advised that the proposed development would comply with the 'very good' BREEAM standard, and that dogs would be secured in separate kennels indoors overnight. The closest building to the site was between 230-280m away. There would also be a robust management plan in place to ensure that noise was kept to a minimum during the day, and the kennels would face South-East, so any noise would be directed away from the village.

### **81. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8**

At 8.30pm, 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 agreed to

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Council Procedure Rule 8 be suspended to enable the Committee to continue the business on the agenda until 9.30pm.

### **82. CONTINUATION OF PLANNING APPLICATION**

During debate on the application, Members also raised concerns that the application was for a non agricultural development in open countryside and requested a sequential test be carried out to determine the suitability of other potential sites. The Committee was advised that a sequential test was not required, as the application was not for leisure purposes, and that JCS Policy 25 was supportive of rural economic development in principle and dog kennels were often located in rural areas.

Highway safety and site access matters were also raised, with Members expressing concern for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists along what was a fast and narrow road. Members also debated the sustainability of the site, with it only being accessible to motor vehicles. The Committee was advised that due to the nature of the business, dogs would be collected by appointment only which would require a vehicle; there would be a low likelihood of pedestrian visits to the site. The detrimental impact of installing a footpath to the site would outweigh the benefits, as it would be seldom used.



It was proposed to refuse the application on the grounds of: Loss of amenity by reasons of noise and odour; unacceptable visual impact; not a sustainable location, and would result in the loss of agricultural land.

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**. The wording of the reasons for refusal was delegated to the Head of Planning Services in conjunction with the Chair, Vice Chair and Ward Member.

**Chairman**