



## **Area Planning Committee Thrapston**

**Tuesday 3 May 2022**

# **Committee Update Report**

This page is intentionally left blank



**Committee Update Report  
Area Planning Committee (Thrapston) – 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022  
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.
NE/22/01607/FUL Page 11	<b>110 Wharf Road, Higham Ferrers</b>  <u>Updates</u>  No updates.	<b>GRANT</b>
NE/21/01807/FUL Page 23	<b>10 Burystead Rise, Raunds</b>  <u>Updates</u>  Further objections from a neighbour which can be viewed in full using the link above. Material matters are summarised below and relate to the paragraph numbers in the report, as follows:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 – Criticises the report for not identifying <u>all</u> the additional rooms (<i>bathroom, store and utility aren't mentioned</i>);</li> </ul> <i>Officer Response</i> – The key elements of the proposal are identified and it is made clear there is to be an internal reconfiguration. The mention of one additional downstairs bedroom is highlighted as it could be material to parking requirements.	<b>GRANT</b>

Page 3

Agenda Item 13

- 5.1 – Critical of Raunds Town Council’s comments in respect of measurements, and the suggestive use of language in respect of the height differences;
- 6.5 – Contends that the proposal conflicts with Policy R2 of the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan;
- 7.1.1 – (Visual Impact)
  - Does not agree that the render finish is in keeping with the area
  - Contends that the 0.65m measurement relating to permitted development is incorrect, that it should be 0.35m (*both are incorrect, explained further below*)
  - States there is no side access between Nos 8 and 10; and
  - Trees on the objector’s boundary (not on the application site) are not taken account of

*Officer Response* – 5.1 is the Town Council’s comments and 6.5 is where the policies are listed, rather than explained in full. Section 7 is where the issues are discussed and Officers have reached a different conclusion to the neighbour.

In respect of the permitted development measurement dispute, both measurements (0.35m as in the report and 0.65m as contended by the neighbour) are incorrect. Permitted development for larger rear extensions is up to 6m on semi-detached and terraced properties, which would make the Officer’s 0.35m measurement correct in other cases, but as this is a detached property, permitted development allows for up to 8m for a rear extension, so most of the proposal is in fact under what permitted development could allow for (The Officer does mention the 8m situation at 7.2.2). It is only the slight projection to the side (toward No.8) that means the proposal cannot qualify as permitted development.

It is also worth mentioning that an outbuilding, or outbuildings of up to 2.5m in height along either boundary would also be permitted development as long as there is still 50% of the curtilage (front and rear gardens) left over.

In terms of side access, the 1m gap to the boundary would allow for this, and in terms of trees on the neighbour’s boundary, these are not protected or felt to materially affect the proposal in planning terms.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.2.1 (Amenity) – Queries whether the 45 degree line should be used rather than the 60 degree line as shown on the plan, and in respect of the relationship between properties, states that it should say No.8 and No.10 and rather than No.12 and No.10</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer Response</i> – the neighbour is correct regarding the properties identified, it should say No.8 is set down instead of No.12 (No.12 is on higher ground, No.8 is on lower ground). In respect of the 45/60 degree angles, the 60 degree angle is the correct one to have been used. The wall closest to No.8 is to be 2.447m in height, which is less than the 3+ metres referred to in the SPD. It would rise to 3.462m at the ridge but at that point it would be further away from the property It is appreciated that there is a levels difference between the sites of around 1m, but this wall would also be set in from the boundary of No.8 by a metre. Officers view remains that the amenity impact on both properties (8 and 12) is acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.2.3 (Amenity) – Queries whether path of the sun has been considered in relation to No.8 and points out that the extension is 1m from the boundary of No.8, but the report says “more than” 1 metre</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer Response</i> – Yes, the path of the sun has been considered in drawing the conclusion that the extension would not be oppressive or overbearing when viewed from No.8. In respect of the distance shown in the report, it should say 1m instead of more than 1m, as the distance is exactly 1m.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised that Planning Officers arranged for Committee members to visit neighbouring properties but this did not happen.</p> <p><i>Officer Response</i> – Officers arranged for a visit to the application site and no other property.</p> <p><u>Overall Officer Response</u> – Other than correcting inaccuracies relating to the permitted development situation at 7.1.1, property Nos at 7.2.1 and distance from boundary at 7.2.3 the material issues raised do not alter the recommendation to approve.</p>	
NE/21/00783/FUL	Carinya, Main Street, Barnwell	GRANT

<p><b>Page 33</b></p>	<p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>No updates.</p>	
<p><b>NE/22/00134/LDP</b></p> <p><b>Page 53</b></p>	<p><b>20 New Road, Oundle</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>No updates.</p>	<p><b>GRANT</b></p>
<p><b>NE/22/00088/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Page 61</b></p>	<p><b>110 Main Street, Aldwincle</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>Points of clarification/additional information:</p> <p>Confirmation was sought over the shared access and parking to the property. The access currently serves No. 110 Main Street. There is ample parking to the frontage and rear of No. 110 to serve the existing property.</p> <p>The access would also serve the proposed dwelling, which provides parking and turning to the rear of the site.</p> <p>Planning permission had been granted to the frontage of the site for the conversion and extension of garage to create detached dwelling with integral double garage, 16/00727/FUL. This property would have an integral double garage, with parking and turning provided to the frontage of the dwelling. It would appear from the site visit that this permission has not been implemented.</p> <p>As such, the access would serve the host property, No. 110, and the proposed dwelling to the rear of the site with adequate parking and turning provided.</p> <p>No updates to the report.</p>	<p><b>GRANT</b></p>

Page 6

<p>NE/21/00379/FUL</p> <p>Page 75</p>	<p><b>Land Opposite Elizabeth Close, Raunds</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>Points of clarification/additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within Flood Zone 1 in its entirety;</li> <li>• The road on the eastern side of the site, understood to be known as 'Whiteman Lane', is unadopted. This is a reason why vehicular access could not be used to serve the site;</li> <li>• <b>If considered necessary, the doors/windows of the dwellings can be conditioned to accord with the relevant Building Regulations criteria relating to safety, as referred to in the comments from the Police comments. This is not considered a necessity by Officers. Additionally, the Agent has indicated an acceptance of a condition, if deemed necessary, to add a habitable room window at ground floor level in the side elevation of Plot 1, to assist with 'natural' surveillance.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Education Contributions:</b></p> <p><b>Further justification has been received from the Senior Project Officer for Developer Contributions to demonstrate that the requested contributions towards education would be required to support the development to accommodate the extra school places required by future residents of the scheme. It is now requested that the education contribution forms one single sum rather than be apportioned to the different education stages (early years, primary, secondary) but that the sum is used within the Raunds area. This will enable the money to be used more flexibly and can be secured as part of the S106 negotiations.</b></p>	<p><b>GRANT</b></p>
<p>NE/21/01330/REM</p> <p>Page 127</p>	<p><b>Land At St Christopher's Drive, Oundle (Extra Care scheme)</b></p> <p><u>Updates</u></p> <p>One representation has been received since the publication of the Committee Report. The comments are from a person who has previously objected. A response to the matters not addressed in the report is summarised below:</p>	<p><b>Delegate to Officers upon receipt of LLFA advice</b></p>

Page 7

### *Siting of the Extra Care facility*

The siting of the Extra Care facility within the wider outline site is established under the Outline Permission at Condition 32 which refers to the 'Land Use Plan' The Masterplan for the site, included under the outline application, identifies the same south-western corner of the site for the Extra Care use as currently proposed.

Other matters, including parking and drainage, are addressed under the Report.

#### Further Updates:

A consultation response from the LLFA was received on 28.04.22 not objecting but requesting further advice. The comments are summarised as follows:

- The applicant is seeking to discharge the stipulations included in Conditions 7 (Surface water drainage scheme) and 8 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the original outline planning consent (19/01355/OUT) as part of this reserved matters application.
- Further clarification is needed on the size of manholes, chambers, catchpits and details required on permeable paving
- The proposed tree pits for attenuation need to be moved further away from buildings and trees.
- Drainage data needs to be based on FEH rainfall data, which provides better predictions, not FSR drainage data.
- Drawings need amending to show updated flow rate.
- Infiltration test results and soil condition details are required.
- Amended maintenance schedule is required showing details of porous paving and surface water storage tanks.

The applicant submitted the information requested above on 29.04.22 and this has been sent to the LLFA for further comment. Any comments from the LLFA will be reported to members verbally at committee. The recommendation need not be altered as a result of the comments received thus far.



Additional points of clarification:

- The submitted Transport Assessment and Design and Access Statement set out the evidence for the need for parking spaces associated with the use. This concluded there will be a need for 31-32 spaces, comprising 14 for residents, 13-14 for staff and 4 for visitors. The provision of 36 exceeds the need and the LHA are satisfied with the provision proposed;
- Fire Service Comments: Comments were received but not listed in the report. The comments are general and refer to the guidance document. The comments refer to a need for buildings with a floorspace greater than 2,000 sqm, to have an access that meets the requirements set out in the relevant Building Regulations document.

Recommended amendment to Condition 3 (landscaping):

*Prior to the first occupation of the Extra Care Facility hereby approved, details, including a timetable for implementation, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, of a full planting and landscaping scheme. The details are to include substantial natural boundary screening proposed, along the western boundary shared with adjacent residential properties. The landscaping/planting shall thereafter be undertaken in full and maintained in perpetuity with the approved details. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species.*

*Reason: In order to clarify the landscaping terms of this consent, the visual amenity of the site and the function of the external space around the extra care facility.*

**Proposed Recommendation Amendment**

The applicant has submitted sufficient levels information for officers to be able to assess the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity, as covered in the Committee Report. However,

	<p>condition 14 of 19/01355/OUT requests a full levels plan. This information has not been included on one drawing and as such the recommendation has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>In addition to this, full comments from the Council's Senior Tree and Landscape Officer have not yet been received and as such the recommendation has been amended to reflect this also. This is not expected to be an objection given the distance to the nearest protected tree.</p> <p>Paragraphs 1.1 and 10.1 should read as follows:</p> <p><i>That planning permission is not granted until the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has given its advice on the application; and until full levels details have been submitted; and until comments from the Council's Senior Tree and Landscape Officer have been received that do not raise a substantive objection; and once the LLFA advice is received, the levels plan is received and the Council's Senior Tree and Landscape Officer has commented, the Committee delegates the power to determine the application to the Director of Place and Economy to act in accordance with the appropriate option as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>If the LLFA recommends that planning permission be granted to the proposed development, grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the report or substantially similar conditions, or:</i></li> <li>• <i>If the LLFA recommends that planning permission be refused, then refuse planning permission on the grounds of drainage, or:</i></li> <li>• <i>If the LLFA recommends that the application be amended to make it acceptable in drainage terms and those amendments will, in the opinion of the Planning Development Manager <u>in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Area Planning Committee</u>, result in a materially different development, then the application will be put to public consultation and brought back to the Committee for a determination, provided the applicant has agreed to an extension of time, and If the applicant does not agree to an extension of time then refuse planning permission on the grounds of surface water drainage.</i></li> </ul>	
NE/21/01309/REM	Land At St Christopher's Drive, Oundle (residential scheme)	Delegate to Officers upon

Updates

Paragraphs 1.1 and 10.1 should read as follows:

That planning permission is not granted until the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has given its advice on the application and once the LLFA advice is received, the Committee delegates the power to determine the application to the Director of Place and Economy to act in accordance with the appropriate option as follows:

- If the LLFA recommends that planning permission be granted to the proposed development, grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in the report or substantially similar conditions, or:
- If the LLFA recommends that planning permission be refused, then refuse planning permission on the grounds of drainage, or:
- If the LLFA recommends that the application be amended to make it acceptable in drainage terms and those amendments will, in the opinion of the Planning Development Manager in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Area Planning Committee, result in a materially different development, then the application will be put to public consultation and brought back to the Committee for a determination, provided the applicant has agreed to an extension of time, and If the applicant does not agree to an extension of time then refuse planning permission on the grounds of surface water drainage.

One representation has been received since the publication of the Committee Report. The comments are from a person who has previously objected. A response to the matters not addressed in the report is summarised below:

*The Outline Permission – reference to quotes from it*

It is necessary to note that where planning permissions are considered to be unlawful, the Judicial Review (JR) process exists. Planning permission was granted on 20 November 2020, after which there was a time window for a Judicial Review. No such JR was submitted

*Foul water drainage*

receipt of LLFA  
advice

Recent comments from Anglian Water address this matter.

*Acoustic Fence siting and maintenance*

The fence is to be within the application site and can be required to be maintained in perpetuity by condition.

*Other Matters*

Matters including access, parking, noise, street trees and access to the school are addressed within the report.

*Other queries/points of clarification*

The site is entirely within Flood Zone 1.

*Bus Service*

The Applicant has advised that the S106 secured a financial contribution towards a bus service. They advise that until a Reserved Matters consent is in place, it is unlikely that details on a future bus service will be known.

*Extension of Time*

An agreement for a decision by 10<sup>th</sup> May has been agreed with the Applicant.

**Further Updates:**

A consultation response from the LLFA was received on 28.04.22 not objecting but requesting further advice. The comments are summarised as follows:

- The applicant is seeking to discharge the stipulations included in Conditions 7 (Surface water drainage scheme) and 8 (Flood Risk Assessment) of the original outline planning consent (19/01355/OUT) as part of this reserved matters application.
- Further clarification is needed on the size of manholes, chambers, catchpits and details required on permeable paving
- Cross sections of control chambers and details of hydraulic curves required

- Drainage data needs to be based on FEH rainfall data, which provides better predictions, not FSR drainage data.
- Infiltration test results and soil condition details are required.
- Amended maintenance schedule is required showing details of porous paving, chambers/manholes/catchpits and surface water network.

The applicant submitted the information requested above on 29.04.22 and this has been sent to the LLFA for further comment. Any comments from the LLFA will be reported to members verbally at committee. The recommendation need not be altered as a result of the comments received thus far.

Further points of clarification:

- The pedestrian track which adjoins the ROW on the northern part of the site will not be available for a fire engine or other emergency service vehicle;
- The species mix was amended as part of the proposed landscaping, to address the October comments from the Ecologist. No subsequent comments from the Ecologist were received on the amendment but Officers are satisfied with the amendment including the inclusion of more native species;
- Fire Service and Rescue comments: To expand on the reference in the report, the submission from the Fire Service is a guidance document for developers, not specific to this site/application. There are no apparent issues with the proposed layout/development in relation to its contents.

This page is intentionally left blank