

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 9 December 2020

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Time: 6.30pm

Present

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

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Roger Glithero and Harriet Pentland

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The minutes of the meetings held on 11th and 12th November 2020 were approved as a correct record.

The minutes of the 18th November to be amended under Declarations of Interest to read 'Councillor Geoff Shacklock met with neighbours, the applicant, and had attended some Parish Council meetings, but did not take part in any debate.'

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

Councillors	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Robin Underwood	20/00840/FUL 2 Essex Road, Rushden	Speaking as Ward Member against the application		Yes (did not take part in consideration of the application)

(b) Informal Site Visits

Councillors Bert Jackson and Andy Mercer declared that they had visited 4 Higham Road, Rushden (20/00445/FUL).

Councillor Gill Mercer declared that she had visited 4 Higham Road, Rushden (20/00445/FUL).

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

There were no questions under Council Procedure Rule 10.3.

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 no extensions of time had been requested.

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.
- 19/01425/FUL 84 dwellings, Rear of Green Close Wellingborough Road, Irthlingborough – with case officer to continue negotiations
- 20/00090/FUL 10 dwellings, 7 Wharf Road Higham Ferrers – wording agreed. Awaiting completion of S106.
- 19/01318/FUL change of use from agricultural to provide football facility at SP97144 68428 Land Off Newton Road, Higham Ferrers – with case officer to resolve outstanding matters
- 19/01726/FUL 14 dwellings, Land Off Huntingdon Road and Market Road, Thrapston – wit case officer to resolve and complete S106
- 20/00101/FUL change of use from offices to flat and retail unit, 4 Church Street Rushden– decision issued.
- 18/01648/OUT Land South East of Ferrers School, Higham Ferrers – decision issued.

RESOLVED:

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

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 20/00486/FUL – Blotts Barn, Brooks Road, Raunds – An objector, and the agent for the applicant
- 20/00840/FUL – 2 Essex Road, Rushden – Ward Member

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) 20/00445/FUL – 4 Higham Road, Rushden

The Officer advised that the recommendation had changed, and it was now recommended that the application be deferred. This was due to receiving a late viability report and letter from the applicant's solicitor, which would require time to review and consider. It was suggested that the application be deferred to allow proper consideration of late information received, to be reported back for full consideration at a future meeting of this Committee.

The Committee considered the Officer's amended recommendation in respect of the Application for the creation of 34 flats and 3 dwellings, demolition of some buildings on site and change of use of the majority of the site from retail to residential. The Committee did not enter into any debate on the Application.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred in full, and brought back to be considered in full a future meeting of this Committee. On being put to the vote the Committee **agreed to defer** the application.

(ii) 20/00486/FUL – Blotts Barn, Brooks Road, Raunds

The Committee considered an application for a proposed commercial development for a B1 office unit and ancillary storage barn.

During debate on the application, Members noted that the application was finely balanced between economic development in the area, versus the preservation of local wildlife and amenity. Concerns were raised regarding the suitability of the road due to its poor condition and narrowness and how it would cope with the increased levels of traffic, particularly from HGV vehicles, as a result of the proposed development. The safety of road users including pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders was also of great concern, due to the lack of pavement and the road being single track only. It was felt that there would be an unacceptable increase in risk to road users. The Committee noted that two previous applications for extensions to the existing studio/office had been refused and were both awaiting appeal decisions. Members also felt that the proposal contravened policies R13 and R14 of the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that four of the existing informal passing places would be upgraded, which would benefit all road users. Brooks Road from the Raunds direction up to the site was deemed fit enough to serve the proposed development. Members had sought clarification as to whether office use could be enforced and were advised that condition 17 could be strengthened to include a B8 element to it, although the proposed unit was not large and would be used in conjunction with the office, not as a separate entity.

The Committee noted that Brooks Road was not adopted, as per the advice received by the case officer from the Local Highway Authority and contained in the report. However, third party advice given during the debate stated that the road was adopted by the Local Highway Authority, and showed as such on the Northamptonshire County Council website. It was

agreed that this matter would need to be clarified with the Local Highway Authority before a decision could be made on the application.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to allow officers to seek advice in relation to whether or not the highway is adopted and assess any impact that this would have on the recommended conditions.

On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to defer** the application.

Prior to the debate on the Application, Cllr Underwood declared that he would be speaking in objection on the following and did not take part in the debate or the vote.

(iii) 20/00840/FUL – 2 Essex Road, Rushden

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of detached two storey outbuilding; extension of existing 8 bedroom care home to create 6 additional bedroom suites with ancillary facilities and parking for 13 cars.

During debate on the application Members noted that the previous application had been refused, in part for the lack of amenity space proposed for residents. It was recognised that this matter had been addressed in the current application, with an increase in amenity space for residents now proposed. It was also noted that the visual impact on the surrounding properties had also been somewhat improved. The increase from 5 to 13 parking spaces was welcomed. Members sought clarification regarding the potential size of service vehicles that would be visiting the premises, and whether entrance gates, visibility splays and a construction management plan would need to be conditioned.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that all residents rooms would have a view of either the amenity space or local vicinity; not the car park. The existing gate had been removed and was not shown on the proposed plans, however gates set back from the highway could be conditioned if Members requested this. The wall had been reduced in size and so was visibility splay compliant.

It was moved and seconded that the application be granted, subject to an additional condition regarding the installation of entrance gates. On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to grant** the application. The wording of the additional condition to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair, and Councillor Barbara Jenney.

Chairman

PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 16 December 2020

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Time: 6.30pm

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

. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

At 18.35 it was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned for a period of five minutes, to allow time for Councillor Lance Jones to access the meeting.

. CONTINUATION OF MEETING

At 18.38 Councillor Lance Jones joined, and the meeting continued.

. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Roger Glithero and Barbara Jenney.

. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

(a) Declarations of Interest

No Declarations of Interest were made.

With regard to the lobbying of applications, Councillor Pentland had received an email from Raunds Town Council in respect of 20/00960/FUL and stated that she had not pre-determined the application and came to the meeting with an open mind.

(b) Informal Site Visits

No informal site visits were declared.

QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.3

There were no questions under Council Procedure Rule 10.3.

PUBLIC SPEAKERS

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 20/00960/FUL, West End, Land North of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds – Raunds Town Council and the agent for the applicant.

PLANNING APPLICATION

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) 20/00960/FUL – West End, Land North of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds

The Committee considered an application for the erection of four employment units (Use Class B1(a)/B2/B8 with ancillary offices, including new vehicular and pedestrian access, HGV and car parking, internal access roads, servicing, external lighting, landscaping, infrastructure and associated works. During the presentation on the application, the Planning Officer confirmed that one of the drawings submitted as part of the application was inaccurate on closer examination.

The Committee noted the refusal reasons for the previous application; the lack of provision of smaller employment units, and the visual impact and overbearing nature which would have been detrimental to residential amenity. Members expressed concern that the current application demonstrated only a marginal improvement, and that whilst there were now smaller units proposed, they were still considered large in their size. The smaller units would be located on Greenfield land, and the development would consist of 80% of B8 units. The proposed gap between two of the units was considered very narrow, meaning that the buildings would still appear as one large unit and have an overbearing visual impact. It was noted that the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning and Delivery Unit's Landscape Advisor considered the visual impact on public open space to be 'major moderate', which would be classed as significant.

The proximity of HGV's to the Border Park housing development at a distance of 25m, and a play area at approximately 15m distance was considered unacceptable, as it was felt that the noise and air pollution from HGV's accessing the site 24/7 would have a detrimental impact upon the residents. Clarification was sought as to the position of the proposed noise barriers and their height. Concerns were also raised regarding the access road to the site, both due to its condition and ongoing maintenance as well as the heavy flows of traffic that would be using it on a daily basis, and the impact of this on the A45 roundabout. The road was not adopted, and there would be no guarantee of it being adopted in the future. It was noted that the police had advised that double yellow lines on the road would not be enforceable. Members stated that the proposed turning circle within the development was inadequate as it was not suitable for larger vehicles and requested an informative for this. Members stated that the development would be contrary to JCSS Policy 8(e), JCSS Policy 24 (a) and (e), and Policy R13 and R14 (a-f) of the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that in respect of the noise pollution, the application fell into the lower category, where £27,653 of damage mitigation cost as a result of the air quality assessment was considered appropriate. However, both Highways England and Northamptonshire County Council Highways did not have any schemes that these funds could be spent on, and so the applicant had instead concentrated on landscaping and providing electric charging parking spaces. It was confirmed that the proposed noise barrier would be located on the opposite side of the bund and would be 3m in height. There would be no barriers located on the access road to the site; these would be at the entrance to each of the units. The Committee was advised that the Greenfield land was not protected open space and would be a natural infill site for development. Regarding the road, this would be built to an adoptable standard and would include improvements to some of the existing road from 10m from the A45 roundabout onwards. It was agreed that a maintenance plan would be required to ensure the road was kept up to such standard, and the turning circle was confirmed as being for smaller vehicles only. The access road would be widened on the left-hand side of the exit, but this would not be an increase of 3m. There would be a 3m wide pedestrian path installed to access the Border Park development.

Members expressed their concerns that the development was contrary to the aforementioned policies, as well as the visual, noise and air quality impacts and the loss of public amenity. It was therefore 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, for the following reasons:

- Air quality – failure to make provision for the payment of a contribution to mitigate the air quality damage that would be caused by the proposal.
- Harmful visual impact.
- Overbearing impact on occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- Noise effects caused by unacceptable disturbance to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- Encroaches onto greenfield land, not allocated for employment development.

The final wording of the reasons for refusal is delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman of the Committee and Ward Member.

Chairman