

-PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 07 October 2020

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Time: 6.30pm

Present Councillors: Philip Stearn
Gill Mercer
Dudley Hughes
Lance Jones
Barbara Jenney
Andy Mercer
Geoff Shacklock

Chairman
Vice Chairman
Peter Tomas
Robin Underwood
Peter Wathen
Lee Wilkes

188. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Roger Glithero and Alex Smith

189. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The minutes of the meetings held on 9th and 10th September 2020 were approved as a correct record.

190. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

Councillor	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Peter Tomas	20/00833/FUL - 1A Midland Road Higham Ferrers	Was active in trying to retain the library and lobbied Higham Ferrers Town Council to buy the building		Yes

(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillor Bert Jackson declared that he had visited 1A Midland Road, Higham Ferrers (20/00833/FUL) and 4 Church Street Rushden (20/00101/FUL).

Councillors Harriet Pentland and Robin Underwoord declared that they had visited 1A Midland Road, Higham Ferrers (20/00833/FUL)

191. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

There were no questions under Council Procedure Rule 10.3.

192. 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 Committee noted that extensions of time had been requested as follows:

- 18/01648/OUT – Land South East of Ferrers School, Higham Ferrers – extension until 12/11/20 – to allow discussion to continue between parties and to allow for the completion of the Agreement
- 19/01392/OUT – Land Off Huntingdon and Market Road, Thrapston – extension until 12/11/20 to allow negotiations to continue regarding the level of healthcare contribution
- 19/01355/OUT – Land Between St Christophers Drive and A605 Oundle Bypass, Oundle – extension until 12/11/20 to allow comment/amendment to continue between parties
- 20/00090/FUL – 7 Wharf Road, Higham Ferrers – extension until 12/11/20 to allow comments/amendments to continue between parties

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 decision had been issued.
- 19/01569/FUL – 105 High Street, Rushden – The decision had been issued.
- 19/01425/FUL – Rear of Green Close, Wellingborough Road, Irthlingborough – Additional conditions and wording of conditions with case officer to continue negotiations regarding an extension to the 30mph speed limit beyond the cemetery entrance on Wellingborough Road
- 20/00090/FUL – 7 Wharf Road, Higham Ferrers – Wording of conditions had been circulated to Members
- 20/00430/FUL – Land Rear of 23 and 25 St Marys Avenue, Rushden – Wording of additional conditions with case officer to be drafted
- 19/01318/FUL – SP97144 68428 Land Off Newton Road, Higham Ferrers – Outstanding matters to be resolved and the wording of the conditions with the case officer to resolve.
- 19/01976/FUL – Former Rushden Ambulance Station, Station Road, Rushden – Wording of additional informative with the case officer.

RESOLVED:

- (i) That the report be noted.

- (ii) That the extension of time for applications 18/01648/OUT, 19/01392/OUT, 19/01355/OUT and 20/00090/FUL be approved.
- (iii) That the progress of the delegations to the Head of Planning Services as detailed in Appendix 2 be noted.

193. PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 20/00664/FUL– 51 Thorpe Street, Raunds – the agent for the applicant

194. 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 applications included in the update sheet.

(i) 20/00347/OUT – Hillside, Brick Kiln Road, Raunds

The Committee considered an Outline application for residential development for up to 21 dwellings and access (with all matters reserved except access)

During debate on the application, Members raised concerns regarding the access road to the proposed development, as it would result in having three separate junctions onto Brick Kiln Road located in close proximity to one another. It was requested that permeability be conditioned should the application be granted, to ensure the proposed access would feed into Kelmarsh Avenue. Members also sought clarity in respect of whether or not the Local Highway Authority had accepted the 40m distance between the centre of the proposed access and the centre line of Kelmarsh Avenue. The Committee felt that the proposed access would not be betterment to highway safety, as the existing access was very rarely used. Concerns were raised that the Local Highway Authority (LHA) had based their advice on Brick Kiln Road having a 37mph limit, when it had a limit of 40mph. Members sought clarity on the net reduction of vehicle movements stated by the applicant, as this had led to the removal of the objection from the LHA. It was suggested that a private transport consultant could be employed to examine the access issues of the proposed development. Members were dissatisfied with the proposed parking arrangements and felt this would lead to on street parking causing congestion.

In response to the issues raised, officers confirmed that the LHA was satisfied with the 40m centre line distance between the proposed access and Kelmarsh Avenue. Parking matters would be considered at the reserved matters applications stage. The Committee was advised against employing a private transport consultant, as the LHA had stated that they were satisfied with the proposals. Should the application be granted, informatives for both permeability and land for parking use could be included.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to clarify the following matters:

- An assessment with regard to the reduction in vehicle movements when comparing the potential number of vehicles using the existing access with the likely number of vehicles using the proposed access.
- Opinion on whether or not national level advice in Manual for Streets (MfS) is relevant to this proposal given that MfS is only applicable to roads with a speed of up to 37mph.

- Clarification as to whether the Local Highway Authority expects the junctions to be kept clear in order for their most recent 'no objection' response to be valid.

On being put to the vote the Committee **agreed to defer** the application to seek clarity on the matters specified above.

(ii) 20/00664/FUL – 51 Thorpe Street, Raunds

The Committee considered a retrospective application for change of use from open space to residential garden land (re-submission of 19/00249/FUL)

Members raised concerns that the application did not comply with JCS Policy 7, and noted that the application was retrospective. Raunds Town Council had not been consulted when the land had been sold to the applicant. It was argued that the land was still in use as amenity land, and that it had not been demonstrated that it was surplus to requirements or that other suitable land was available nearby. The Committee felt that the land should not be discounted if it was not included in the Neighbourhood Plan.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that the applicant had been able to demonstrate compliance with JCS Policy 7, thus making the principle of the development acceptable. The refusal reasons from the previous application had also been overcome.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted.

In accordance with Paragraph 16.4 of the Council's Procedure Rules, a recorded vote was requested. The votes were cast as follows:

Votes for: Councillors Barbara Jenney, Lance Jones, Gill Mercer, Geoff Shacklock and Peter Wathen (5)

Votes against: Councillors Dudley Hughes, Bert Jackson, Peter Tomas and Lee Wilkes (4)

Abstentions: Councillors Andy Mercer, Harriet Pentland and Robin Underwood. (3)

Therefore, the motion was **carried** and the Committee **agreed to grant** the application, subject to the conditions detailed in the officer report.

(iii) 20/00973/FUL – 89 Springfield Avenue, Thrapston

The Committee considered an application for a rear extension over two floors and partial conversion of garage and first floor extension

The Committee acknowledged that the application had been brought before them as the applicant was a staff member. It was noted that there had been no objections received from the Town Council or neighbours, and that there did not appear to be any highways issues.

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 report.

(iv) 19/01726/FUL – Land Off Huntingdon and Market Road, Thrapston

The Committee considered an application for the erection of 14 dwellings (Partial re-plan of 16/01690/REM pursuant to 07/02457/OUT)

Members acknowledged that the proposal was now for 14 dwellings as opposed to 17, in order to satisfy County Archaeology who were now satisfied with the proposals. The Committee sought clarity as to whether or not County Archaeology had been made aware of the intention to use a management company to manage the open space, and requested that they be informed if not already done so.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that there was a condition for a heritage statement in the outline application, which would require the applicant to demonstrate proposed safeguarding measure for the Ancient Monument on the site. Officers also noted that the conditions would need to be renumbered, should the application be granted.

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 a S106 Agreement and the conditions detailed in the officer report, and subject to clarification being sought from the County Archaeologist to ensure they were satisfied with a management company managing the open space; this matter to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services receiving a further response from County Archaeology.

(v) 20/00833/FUL – 1A Midland Road, Higham Ferrers

The Committee considered an application for the change of use of former Higham Ferrers Library building to offices (B1 Use) with retention of part of building for community use (D1 use) and demolition of a store building.

Members acknowledged the loss of the library, but were pleased to see an application which would regenerate the building and retain its internal and external character. The lack of formal parking was noted as being a potential issue for any application received for the site, but it was not felt that this would be a particular issue, given the nature of the application.

Officers advised that there were some errors with condition numbering, which would be rectified before the decision was issued.

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 report, and the necessary corrections to the conditions numbers.

(vi) 20/00101/FUL – 4 Church Street, Rushden

The Committee considered an application for the change of use from offices to 1no. flat at first floor level, front extension to ground floor and creation of new shopfront. Change of use of store/garage to create a new retail unit accessed from Church Street. Installation of shutters to all three shopfronts (Resubmission of 18/01853/FUL)

Members welcomed the creation of further retail space, albeit with small units proposed, as the current dilapidated state of the units detracted from the conservation area. However, concerns were raised regarding the bin storage area at the bottom of the stairs and clarification that this would be fire proof was requested. The lack of on site parking was also cited as a major concern, with only a single layby space located to the front of the property.

The Committee raised deep concerns regarding the safety of future occupants, as there was an existing antisocial behaviour hotspot located in the alleyway behind the door adjacent to the building.

It was noted that the Crime Prevention Design Officer had not identified any antisocial behaviour associated with the site itself, but it was known locally to be next to a hotspot.

Members requested CCTV was installed, along with sufficient lighting to act as a deterrent and safety measure in respect of the alleyway.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that a parking beat survey had identified available car parking spaces off site within a mile radius. The bin storage would be fire proof, and would be required to comply with building regulations. Although the Crime Prevention Design Officer had acknowledged the presence of antisocial behaviour in the immediate vicinity, it was felt it would be unreasonable to install CCTV/lighting to the alley. It would overlook third party land and would also be placing responsibility to monitor and reduce antisocial behaviour onto the applicant, which was deemed unreasonable to enforce as it was an existing issue. Officers advised that there were some errors with condition numbering, which would be rectified before the decision was issued.

195. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8

At 20.27pm, 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

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 necessary corrections being made to the condition and plan numbers and subject to further consultation with the Police relating to residential amenity concerns associated with the known anti-social issues in the surrounding area. The outcome of the police consultation to be shared with the Chair, Vice Chair and Ward Member before permission can be issued. If adverse comments were received by the police, the application would be brought back to a future meeting of the Planning Management Committee for further debate.

Chairman