



## **Area Planning Committee Thrapston**

**Monday 20 December 2021**

# **Committee Update Report**

This page is intentionally left blank



## Committee Update Report

### Area Planning Committee (Thrapston) – 20<sup>th</sup> December 2021

#### Index of Applications for Consideration

All plans and documents can be viewed using the link [here](#) using the Case Ref. No.

Case Ref. No. and Page No.	Location	Officers Rec.
<b>NE/21/01272/FUL</b>  Page 11	<b>Napleton Lodge, Station Road, Raunds</b>  <u>Updates</u>  None	<b>GRANT</b>
<b>NE/21/00994/FUL</b>  Page 21	<b>2 Orchard Lane, Woodnewton</b>  <u>Updates</u>  <u>Public comments</u>  An additional comment in support of the proposal has been received.  <i>Officer response:</i>  Noted. This does not raise any additional material matters that would affect the recommendation to grant permission.	<b>GRANT</b>

Page 3

Agenda Item 11

<p>NE/21/01134/FUL</p> <p>Page 29</p>	<p><b>33 Kelmarsh Avenue, Raunds</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p><u>Public comments</u></p> <p>An additional comment has been received challenging the existing drawings, which showed three existing bedrooms. The comment states that there are four bedrooms.</p> <p><i>Officer response:</i></p> <p>Following discussions with the agent the existing plans have been withdrawn and the agent has confirmed that the property has 4 bedrooms currently and that this proposal would increase this to 5 bedrooms. The off-road parking required by Highways standards for 4 or 5 bedroomed dwellings is 3 spaces. Therefore, there is no intensification in the parking requirements. The property has two spaces on the drive and, as is the case currently, the on street parking can provide the third space where required. Officer site visits have shown that on street parking is not problematic in this location and therefore the recommendation to grant permission remains.</p>	<p><b>GRANT</b></p>
<p>NE/21/00320/FUL</p> <p>Page 37</p>	<p><b>Mill House, 18 Latham Street, Brigstock</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>Change of wording to condition 2 – The applicant is required to have the maintenance system maintained in accordance with the approved FRA. In order to ensure that the council can monitor that maintenance has been carried out in accordance with the FRA the condition is amended as below:</p> <p><i>The drainage system hereby approved shall be maintained and inspected in accordance with the requirements of the submitted and approved Flood Risk Assessment which requires all leaves, litter and debris to be cleared from all areas of the site and from visible surface features of the drainage system. The inspection of all pipework, threshold drains and roof gutters and the</i></p>	<p><b>GRANT</b></p>

	<p><i>collection of any silt present at 6 monthly intervals, when extreme rainfall is forecast, and after significant storm events.</i></p> <p><i>A CCTV survey of underground drainage pipes must be carried out at 10 year intervals and any silt and debris found as a result must be removed and any repairs to damaged or failed components be carried out as required.</i></p> <p><i>If regular monitoring indicates permeable sub-base is not draining satisfactorily it must be replaced.</i></p> <p><i>Records and receipts for the maintenance and inspection must be retained on site and made available for inspection by the Council on request.</i></p> <p><u><i>Reason:</i></u> <i>In the interests of flood risk and water management.</i></p> <p><i>A plan has been submitted and agreed with the officer as a record of the existing play equipment that is located within the part of the site subject to this application. This plan will be retained on file as a record of the items that the Environment Agency has agreed can be retained on this part of the site and in order for the Council to be able to robustly enforce condition 3 in the future should the need occur.</i></p>	
<p><b>20/00990/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Page 55</b></p>	<p><b>Hargrave Lodge Farm, Shelton Road, Hargrave</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p><u>Email from applicant's agent</u></p> <p>Emphasising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The location / design of the building has been informed by a detailed assessment of the landscape impact (report submitted with the application); and</li> <li>• A noise impact assessment has been provided and there has been detailed and productive discussions with the Environmental Protection (EP) team.</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer response:</i></p>	<p><b>GRANT</b></p>

	<p>These documents and EP comments have been taken into account in reaching the recommendation to grant permission once drainage matters are resolved.</p>	
<p><b>NE/21/01375/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Page 67</b></p>	<p><b>28 College Street, Irthlingborough</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p><u>Officer dialogue with agent</u></p> <p>Following discussions with the applicant's agent, they have confirmed that they would be amenable to having a 1.8m wall in lieu of the 1.5m close boarded fence and 0.3m trellis between the side of the property and Nursery Gardens.</p> <p><i>Officer response:</i></p> <p>Either is considered to be acceptable in planning terms and can be controlled by condition, but a wall is deemed to be the more desirable of the two treatments. The scheme presented to Committee shows a fence in this location but if Members would prefer a wall, this can form part of an amended recommendation to approve and conditions can be easily adjusted to suit.</p> <p><u>Email from applicant's agent</u></p> <p>Disputes comments made by the Town Council as follows, with the Town Council's original points shown in brackets:</p> <p><i>"We note that the Town Council continue with their objection and on the same grounds as previously. In response to the points they raised in numerical order please see below.</i></p> <p>(1 - unacceptable impact on/not in keeping with the conservation area. There has been no change to the design of the property therefore our previous objections in</p>	<p><b>GRANT</b></p>

relation to the impact on the conservation area and removal of public open space still remains.)

*Incorrect statement. The design has changed to include amended boundary screening.*

(2 - Overdevelopment - the original garden of the plot for 28 College Street has already been substantially reduced by the previous development of 1 and 2 Nursery Gardens. The harm to the conservation area overrides any public benefit of providing an additional house.)

*The inspector agreed this the previous proposal did not represent overdevelopment. Dwelling type and location as previous application.*

(3 - Parking - Section 109 of the NPPF, affecting the Highway, if a parking survey was to be required prior to Planning consent, the following would apply - the proposed installation of a dropped kerb for access to the planned driveway will reduce the amount of on street parking by at least 2 parking spaces in this already very congested road. Parking is already a problem along the full length of College Street, the road being a main access to the Irthlingborough Infants and Junior school and to the retained fire station. With recent new developments this has had a detrimental effect to the parking provision, the surrounding streets having old Victorian houses with no off-street parking available. The Town Council regularly receives numerous complaints regarding the safety of school children in the area with the limited parking available. This proposal which would further reduce the parking provision and would be detrimental to the area and existing properties. There was a recent incident in Eastfield Road where a vehicle was parked too close to the corner making the dropped kerb impassable for a person in an electric wheelchair and the police had to be called.)

*The inspector did not have any issue with the proposed access and parking arrangements of the previous application. Drive and parking are as per the last application.*

(4 - Fencing - The replacement of a significant brick wall boundary with fencing was

not considered acceptable and was not in keeping with the conservation area. This view was shared by the Inspectorate who said "the fence would detract from the sites openness and from the visual qualities of the street." (Please see letter from the Town Council dated 25th September 2020 addressed to Mr P Bland regarding the demolition of this wall and the request for planning enforcement to order the re-instatement of the wall.). In para. 11 of the statement from the Planning Inspector he concluded that the boundary treatment should be high, this is presumably reflecting the original and further in Section 12 he concludes that there is significant harm to the conservation area. The Town Council feel that there has been insufficient change to the design and mitigation measures in terms of the loss of the historic wall to warrant any changes to the decision to refuse this application.)

*Incorrect statement. The boundary wall is being reinstated. The fence has been omitted to the front boundary.*

(5 - Visual impact - it is considered that the proposed new driveway has a detrimental visual impact. To create the required visibility splays it takes away some of the existing house, this is a significant house in the conservation area and therefore alters the street scene.)

*The inspector did not have any issue with the visual impact of the previous proposal. This application is based on the previous submission.*

(6 - Lamp post - the proposal indicates that an existing lamp post will need to be removed to enable the construction of the new driveway. It does not provide details of where the relocated lamp post will be sited or confirmation that the proposed relocation site is acceptable and would meet all the current legislation.)

*The position of the lamp post is not a planning matter and will be agreed directly with the highway authority.*

(7 - Nursery Gardens - the proposed new driveway is close to the existing junction



Nursery Gardens/College Street the Council has concerns about the effect of this application on the splays of the Nursery Gardens junction)

*The location of the drive was agreed with the highway authority prior to submission, hence no objection from the LHA.*

*The town council do not object to the general openness of the site as highlighted by the inspector and addressed by removing the fencing along the front boundary and amending the height and type of fencing within the site.*

*I believe the TC objection should be disregarded”.*

*Officer response:*

Officers have weighed up comments from all consultees / neighbours and consider the proposal to be acceptable on its planning merits. Therefore, the recommendation is for approval as shown in the report, and now with the option of having an extra section of wall instead of a fence as discussed directly above.

Two Additional recommended conditions

12. The dwelling hereby approved shall incorporate measures to limit water use to no more than 105 litres/person/day and external water use to no more than 5 litres/person/day.

Reason: To ensure the development complies with Policy 9 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016).

13. No demolition or construction work (including deliveries to or from the site) that causes noise to be audible outside the site boundary shall take place on the site outside the hours of 0800 and 1800 Mondays to Fridays and 0800 and 1300 on Saturdays, and at no times on Sundays, Bank Holidays and Public Holidays unless otherwise agreed with the local planning authority. **No deliveries to the site shall occur between 08:15 and 09:15, or 15:00 and 15:45.**

<p>Reason: To ensure the protection of the local amenity throughout construction works. Delivery hours are restricted to not coincide with the increased traffic associated with drop off and pick up time for children at Irthlingborough Junior School nearby.</p>	
--	--