

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Date: 17 February 2021

Venue: Virtual Meeting

Time: 6.30pm

Present Councillors: Philip Stearn Chairman  
Gill Mercer Vice Chairman  
Dudley Hughes Geoff Shacklock  
Bert Jackson Peter Tomas  
Andy Mercer Peter Wathen  
Harriet Pentland Lee Wilkes

## APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Barbara Jenny and Robin Underwood

## MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2020 were approved as a correct record.

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

Councillors	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Peter Tomas	20/01244/VAR and 20/01196/FUL	His company had carried out work for both applicants in the past		Yes
Harriet Pentland	20/01447/QRY	Attended a meeting as an observer as part of working with Tom Pursglove MP		Yes
Geoff Shacklock	20/01361/VAR	The applicant is a family friend		Yes – will not take part in this item
Geoff Shacklock	20/01533/FUL	Had been advised that there was a possible family connection		Yes – will not take part in this item

It was noted that two of the public speakers were District Councillors and were known to all of the Committee members.

Several members of the Committee had received correspondence regarding several of the applications, and stated that they had not pre-determined the applications and came to the meeting unbiased, and with an open mind.

**(b) Informal Site Visits**

Councillors Peter Wathen, Lee Wilkes and Bert Jackson, Lance Jones and Dudley Hughes declared that they had visited Hillside, Brick Kiln Road, Raunds (20/00347/OUT).

Councillors Bert Jackson and Lee Wilkes declared that they had visited 28 College Street Irthlingborough (20/01196/FUL).

Councillor Gill Mercer declared that she had visited John Clark Way, Rushden (20/00937/ADV) and (2001464/ADV).

Councillor Bert Jackson also declared that he had visited Home Suite Home, 4 Higham Road, Rushden (20/00445/FUL), John Clark Way, Rushden (20/00937/ADV) and (2001464/ADV), Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden (20/00534/FUL), and Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden (20/01244/VAR).

**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 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 considered and had a resolution to grant planning permission. Update to follow on next steps for application.
- 19/01024/OUT 11 dwellings, Mike Wells Cars, Montague Street, Rushden – decision issued.
- 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 – decision issued.
- 20/00840/FUL demolition of detached two storey outbuilding. Extension of existing 8 bedroom care home to create six additional bedroom suites with ancillary facilities. Parking for 13 cars at 2 Essex Road, Rushden – decision issued.
- 19/01219/OUT Outline application for up to 3500 dwellings at Priors Hall, Kirby Lane – with case officer to resolve
- 19/01781/FUL – Hybrid application for residential development and commercial development at Land at Federal Estates, Newton Road, Higham Ferrers and Land at Chelveston Renewable Energy Park, Caldecott – with case officer to resolve.
- 20/01158/FUL – Erection of maintenance unit, wash bay and further ancillary items for vehicle storage and refurbishment, including resurfacing works and the provision of car and HGV parking at Rockingham Motor Speedway – decision issued.

The Committee requested that application 10/00857/OUT be deleted from the report.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) That the report be noted.
- (ii) That the progress of the delegations to the Head of Planning Services as detailed in Appendix 2 be noted.

**APPEAL DECISION MONITORING REPORT**

The Committee received a report which provided an update on the planning appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate from 9 November 2020 to 22 January 2021.

**RESOLVED:**

- (i) That the report be noted.

**PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 20/00347/OUT – Hillside, Brick Kiln Road – Raunds Town Council and on behalf of the applicant
- 20/00445/FUL – Home Suite Home, 4 Higham Road, Rushden – Ward Member, Rushden Town Council and agent on behalf of applicant

**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 road safety, particularly in respect of visibility. The relocation of the bus stop from the right side to the left side was seen to be relocating the issue of visibility, rather than addressing it. Concerns were also raised regarding the safety of pedestrians when crossing Brick Kiln Road, as it was felt that they would likely cross directly from the site, as opposed to walking up to the traffic lights. It was felt that the proposed development would increase the actual vehicle movements from the site and intensify the traffic movements on the already busy Brick Kiln Road. The visibility splay minimum requirements had also not been met, with it being less than the necessary 120m. The Committee also felt that the application was contrary to several policies of the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that although the minimum visibility splay requirements of 120m were not met in either direction, it was very close to this. Officers were of the opinion that there would not be a severe impact on highway safety, and the Highway Authority had not objected to the application. 2m wide footways linking either side of the site would be included as part of a Section 278 Agreement.

It was proposed to refuse the application on the following grounds, relating to highway safety and amenity for new residents:

- The proposal will result in an intensification of use of the access when compared to the current, longstanding low activity as opposed to an unlikely theoretical fallback position;
- There would be inadequate visibility from the new junction, which falls short of the Local Highway Authority's standards of 120m in each direction for a 40mph road, and as the area would change to residential there would be more families / children using Brick Kiln Road and it would be more dangerous for them to cross.

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**.

**(ii) 20/00445/FUL – Home Suite Home, 4 Higham Road, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the creation of 34 flats and 3 dwellings. Demolition of some buildings on site. Change of use of the majority of the site from retail to residential

During debate on the application Members raised concerns regarding the impact of the development on the existing street scene, and it was felt that the proposal constituted an over development on the site, in comparison with neighbouring properties and their curtilages. The amount of parking provision was considered inadequate particularly in an area with such a high rate of people commuting out of town using their own vehicle and was well below the County required provision of 70 spaces, with just 38 spaces proposed.

The Committee highlighted that whilst the proposed development would retain and preserve the building, the new block of flats would overwhelm and detract from this. These concerns were echoed in the comments received from the Senior Conservation Officer who considered that the development would have a negative impact on the building's significance as a non-designated heritage asset.

Members were also not satisfied that the proposed amenity space was insufficient, and that the access to it was poor and provided little to no privacy. The suggestion that residents are able to access amenity space at a nearby park was not considered ideal and it was noted that the applicant was not able to contribute any S106 funding which the Committee felt was unacceptable. Concerns were also raised in respect of the noise levels and air pollution and the impact that this could have on residents of the development.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised the development was in accordance with policy H4 of the Rushden Neighbourhood Plan. The S106 had been considered and assessed in line with policies and could not be rightly justified through the development. Officers advised that the proposed flats fronting Higham Road would be required to keep the windows closed in order to meet the noise standards, and that other means of ventilation would need to be sought by residents. An air quality assessment had concluded that air quality standards would be met and that there would not be an impact on residents. Officers also confirmed that access to the roof garden would be via fire escape stairs. A condition could be imposed to ensure that the roof garden was sectioned off for the benefit and privacy of the residents of the three townhouses.

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

At 20.29pm, it was proposed that Council Procedure Rule 8 (Duration of Meeting) be suspended to enable the Committee to continue the current application. On being put to the vote, it was

#### **RESOLVED:**

That Council Procedure Rule 8 be suspended to enable the Committee to complete consideration of the current application.

### **CONTINUATION OF PLANNING APPLICATION**

Officers also acknowledged the potential harm to the heritage asset, but advised that this had been balanced against the renovation and retention of the building, and the development of flats was seen to be a meaningful way to do this.

It was proposed that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- Lack of parking;
- Poor design and layout;
- Negative impact upon the heritage asset;
- Negative impact on the character and appearance of the street scene;
- Lack of Section 106 contributions resulting in unsustainable development; and
- Overdevelopment of the site

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

. **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting was adjourned at 20.44 and would be reconvened on Monday 1<sup>st</sup> March 2021 at 6.30pm, to consider the remaining applications on the agenda

**Chairman**

# PLANNING MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

**Date:** 1 March 2021 – Reconvened from 17<sup>th</sup> February 2021

**Venue:** Virtual Meeting

**Time:** 6.30pm

**Present**

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

## APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND INFORMAL SITE VISITS

### (a) Declarations of Interest

<b>Councillors</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>	<b>DPI</b>	<b>Other Interest</b>
Robin Underwood	20/01196/FUL	The agent was known to him		Yes
Geoff Shacklock	20/01361/VAR	The applicant is a family friend	Yes – will not take part on this item	
Geoff Shacklock	20/01533/FUL	Had been advised that there was a possible family connection	Yes – will not take part in this item	

Councillors Lee Wilkes and Barbara Jenney had received correspondence regarding several of the applications, and stated that they had not pre-determined the applications and came to the meeting unbiased, and with an open mind.

It was noted that a number of the speakers were known to Members of the Committee.

## **(b) Informal Site Visits**

Councillor Barbara Jenney declared that she had visited Starbucks, John Clark Way, Rushden (20/00937/ADV) and Rushden Service Station, John Clark Way, Rushden (20/01464/ADV).

## **PUBLIC SPEAKERS**

The following people spoke on the items as indicated:

- 20/01242/FUL – 1 Braesby Lane, Glapthorn– objector and applicant
- 20/00937/ADV – Starbucks, John Clark Way, Rushden – District Councillor and Rushden Town Council
- 20/01464/ADV – Rushden Service Station, John Clark Way, Rushden – District Councillor
- 20/00534/FUL – Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden – Rushden Town Council and a Supporter
- 20/01244/VAR – Rushden Memorial Clinic – Ward Member
- 20/01361/VAR – TLO1257 90298 Benefield Road, Glapthorn – Agent for the Applicant
- 20/01533/FUL – Bluefield Farm, Nassington Road, Apethorpe – an Objector and the Agent for the Applicant
- 20/01196/FUL – 28 College Street, Irthlingborough – a District Councillor, on behalf of Irthlingborough Town Council and the Agent for the Applicant

## **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) 20/01447/QRY – East Northants Resource Management Facility, Stamford Road, Kings Cliffe**

The Committee were asked to give it views to Augean South Ltd, on its proposals for an extension in the area and life of the East Northants Resource Management Facility (ENRMF) including an extension to the west of the existing landfill site (comprising active hazardous waste and low level radioactive waste (LLW) landfill) and increasing the throughput of the waste treatment facility (“Proposed Development”).

During debate on the report, Members raised concerns regarding the potential penetration of the capping layer due to the proposed planting. It was felt that the provision of photomontages was insufficient, and there were concerns raised regarding the change in scenery and landscape.

In response to the issues raised, officers advised that the nature of the site containment including the basal and side wall lining system and the capping layer would be specified through the Environmental Permit.

On being put to the vote, the Committee **agreed to authorise the Head of Planning Services to respond** to ASL's Development Consent Order Pre-Application to include:

- Request that the applicant undertake an analysis to determine what trees and vegetation would have grown on site in 200 years time to ensure protection of the capping layer;
- Further explanation of the dome profile be provided
- Confirmation that the soil thickness of 1m – 1.5m beneath the dome would be sufficient
- The provision of additional photomontages; and
- Request that the applicant take into the account the advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority

**(ii) 20/01242/FUL – 1 Braesby Lane, Glaphorn**

The Committee considered an application for part conversion of a detached garage including addition of habitable space, raised roof, external staircase and two dormer windows.

Members raised concerns about potential overlooking in respect of the outside staircase and its landing but were pleased to note that bamboo screening would be conditioned to mitigate this.

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.

**(iii) 20/00937/ADV – Starbucks, John Clark Way, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for 16no. Adverts

- 1) Int-Illum 9mtr Totem
- 2) In-Illum Drive Thru Directional
- 3) Int-Illum Height Restrictor
- 4) Int-Illum Preview Menu Board
- 5) Int-Illum Speaker Canopy
- 6) Int-Illum 5 Panel Menu
- 7) Int-Illum No Entry/Thank You Directional
- 8) Int-Illum No Entry/Thank You Directional
- 9) Int-Illum 1500mm Roundel
- 10) Int-Illum Drive Thru Letters
- 11) Int-Illum 1500mm Roundel
- 12) Int-Illum 250mm Wordmark
- 13) Int-Illum 250mm Wordmark
- 15) Non-Illum Welcome Mesh Directional
- 16) Non-Illum Thank You Mesh Directional
- 17) Non-Illum Banner Frame

The Committee noted that 11 out of the 17 proposed signs were illuminated, and raised particular concerns regarding the 9m totem sign, which was felt to have the most impact on local residents. Members welcomed the proposed additional condition to limit the lux levels of the illuminated totem sign to a maximum of 600cdms<sup>2</sup>.

Members requested that the totem sign be conditioned to ensure that its orientation would be set, and an informative be included to request that the hours of lighting be reduced where possible.

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 inclusion of additional conditions regarding the maximum lux levels of the totem sign, its orientation, and an informative regarding the lighting hours.

**(iv) 20/01464/ADV – Rushden Service Station, John Clark Way, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for:

- Welcome sign – individually cut brushed aluminium sign
- Greggs sign – internally illuminated fret cut aluminium sign
- Sainsbury's on the go – internally illuminated fret cut aluminium sign
- 24 hours – internally illuminated fret cut stainless steel sign
- EG Ground sign – internally illuminated fret cut aluminium sign with built up stainless steel EG letters
- Sainsbury's on the go – internally illuminated fret cut aluminium sign
- Greggs sign – internally illuminated fret cut aluminium sign
- Starbucks on the go – internally illuminated fret cut aluminium sign
- Opening hours sign
- Statutory information sign
- Window vinyl's
- BP totem sign

During debate on the application Members took into consideration the cumulative impact of all proposed signage on the site, and its impact on local residents. Members welcomed the proposed additional condition to limit the lux levels of the illuminated totem signs to a maximum of 600cdms<sup>2</sup>.

Officers advised that Campaign For Dark Skies had not been formally consulted, however they had advised that the application was below the threshold of those that they would typically consider.

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 additional condition regarding the lux levels on the update sheet.

**(v) 20/00534/FUL – Land West of Rushden Lakes, Ditchford Lane, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for a revised scheme to construct a new link road between Ditchford Road and Rushden Lakes (with associated site clearance and earthworks) alongside junction works, car parking, footpaths, cycleways, lighting, drainage works, hard and soft landscaping and associated works. Reconfiguration of existing car parking and Service Yard areas and the temporary storage of excavated material for a period of up to five years.

The Committee noted that the application was greatly improved and supported the enhanced scheme. Members sought clarification regarding the provision of electric charging parking spaces, which officers confirmed they would advise on.

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 in the officer report and update sheet, with the wording of the two additional conditions to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services.

**(vi) 20/01244/VAR – Rushden Memorial Clinic, Hayway, Rushden**

The Committee considered an application for the variation of condition 2 to reflect changes in drawing referencing the site plan pursuant to application reference number 19/01777/FUL – conversion and extension to create 14 one and two bed flats for occupation by persons over 55 years of age, including communal parking and amenity spaces (resubmission of 19/00594/FUL). Condition number(s): 2 – drawing numbers.

The Committee noted the three proposed changes submitted to vary condition 2: the relocation of the bin storage area to allow for an additional parking space; construction of a brick wall to the front pedestrian gate; and the provision of new electric vehicular access gates to the front with new brick piers. These were all welcomed as improvements to the overall scheme.

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 in the officer report and update sheet.

**SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8**

At 20.26pm, it was proposed that Council Procedure Rule 8 (Duration of Meeting) be suspended to enable the Committee to continue the business on the agenda. A view would then be taken after 30 minutes as to whether to continue with the remaining applications 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

**Councillor Geoff Shacklock left the meeting for the consideration of the following two items and did not return.**

**(vii) 20/01361/VAR – TLO1257 90298, Benefield Road, Glapthorn**

The Committee considered an application for the variation of condition 2 (approved plans) to allow for variations to the approved stables and outdoor arena pursuant to application 19/01872/FUL – change of use from agriculture to equestrian; erection of stable block and hay barn; creation of all weather outdoor arena; temporary equestrian workers dwelling; access, parking, landscaping and associated works.

The Committee noted that the site would need to be accessed via private motor vehicle, but that this was typical of rural and remote setting.

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 in the officer report and update sheet.

**(viii) 20/01533/FUL - Bluefield Farm, Nassington Road, Apethorpe**

The Committee considered an application for change of use of barns and associated land from agricultural to wedding venue, with associated vehicular access, car parking, landscaping; open roof canopy to the side; two free standing pergolas to the rear and installation of a ground source heat pump (consisting of alterations to previously approved scheme 18/00627/FUL).

The Committee was pleased that the application sought to bring farm buildings back into use and noted that the proposed second access would now not be used. Members sought clarification regarding the road surfacing and length of pothole repairs required on the access road. Officers advised that the distance of repairs required to the access road had been measured at 50m, but that this could be conditioned to 60m to provide additional assurance, and it was the officers view that concrete would be used to infill the holes.

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 in the officer report and update sheet, with an amendment to condition 5a to change the distance specified from 50 metres to 60 metres.

. **SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 8**

At 20.56pm, it was proposed that Council Procedure Rule 8 (Duration of Meeting) be further 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

. **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

The meeting adjourned at 21.00 and reconvened at 21.05.

**(ix) 20/01196/FUL - 28 College Street, Irthlingborough**

The Committee considered an application for 1.No 3-bedroom dwelling including parking and amenity space (resubmission of 19/01935/FUL).

The Committee was disappointed at the removal of the wall and requested that a condition be imposed to ensure that it would be reinstated should the application be granted. The Committee also noted that the application had been refused in July 2020, and although the proposed access had been altered, it was felt that two of the reasons for the previous refusal had not been addressed within the current proposal. The Committee raised concerns regarding the loss of parking on College Street and felt that the proposal represented an overdevelopment of the site.

In response to the issues raised, officers noted that the application had previously been refused contrary to officer recommendation. Officers advised that the wall had been removed as it was structurally unsound and was unsafe due to being at risk of collapse.

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** for the following reasons:

- Overdevelopment of the site which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area
- Unacceptable impact on the Irthlingborough Conservation Area
- Would result in the loss of parking provision in the area

The final wording of the third reason for refusal regarding parking provision, to be delegated to the Head of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman of the Committee and Ward Member.

**Chairman**